

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Friday, June 16, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 51 students of Grade 7 and 8 standing of the Springfield Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Schmidt. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield, the Minister of Health and Social Development.

We also have 46 students of Grade 6 standing of the Wellington School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Werner and Mr. Slobodian. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable First Minister.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make, relatively brief I hope, with respect to hydro matters. I have four copies. I would like to advise the Legislative Assembly that at its June 14th meeting, that is to say on Wednesday, the Board of Manitoba Hydro approved a comprehensive program for the development of the lower Nelson River power sites. The four specific locations are known as Long Spruce, Upper Limestone, Lower Limestone and Gillam Island. All are located between the Kettle generating station now under construction and the mouth of the Nelson River itself, are similar in size and have a total estimated power potential of about four million kilowatts.

As has been anticipated the Long Spruce site, about 14 miles to the east of Kettle Rapids, will be given first priority. The Board has instructed that work be initiated within an in-service target of not later than 1978. The possibility of having some power available by late 1977 will be carefully examined. It says it is expected that the generating stations will be very similar in capacity and characteristics. Investigation will be undertaken to determine possible means of securing maximum economy in the design and construction of the four similar stations through standardization of major components. The review will also include the feasibility of closer integration of the direct current transmission facilities with the power plants themselves.

The Board is confident that substantial economies can be obtained by planning for continuity in the construction program. In this way maximum utilization could be made of equipment, camp facilities, forms, aggregate and concrete facilities. With proper planning greater work stability could also be achieved on the four projects.

The Board also issued instructions that studies be made of all future power sites to insure that initial access facilities logically integrate with long-term requirements. It might be noted, for example, that the road from Gillam to Long Spruce is now in service.

At Long Spruce the location of the construction camp, quarries, access roads and power supply lines is being determined. Crippen Acres who designed the Kettle Rapids Dam and generating station have been engaged in a consulting capacity on certain aspects of design work for the Long Spruce project.

It is anticipated that the four lower Nelson sites together with the minor power supplies assured from the Jenpeg and Notigi locations will take care of Manitoba's electrical requirements for at least the next 15 years. During this period it is probable that some surplus energy would be available for export sale. Expressed in present-day dollar values the estimated cost is expected to approach \$1-1/2 billion dollars.

I might add in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that this is not so much an announcement of new policy intent as it is a specification and elaboration on already announced general policy direction. It is an elaboration of the policy declaration that we, the Province of Manitoba, would be going for the full development of the Nelson and taking an all-hydro approach to our energy requirements for the next generation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I think that the statement of the First Minister warrants very little comment from this side for the explanation that was given at the end of the statement and was not in the written form presented to the House. The truth of the matter is this is really a declaration of policy which indicates in a more specific way the intention of the government. I don't think we on this side quarreled or disagreed with the probability that there was going to be the development of the Nelson River, the lower Nelson River project, nor was there any criticism to be registered to the fact that the maximization of the potential in the north was -- or the water resources in the north was in the interests of Manitoba. The quarrel that has been registered by the members on this side and certainly by Dr. Kristjanson and Mr. Campbell with the government has been that there was no need for Lake Winnipeg regulation to have commenced because this project, or the projects that have been mentioned, in the main should have been commenced first and would have satisfied our requirements.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the First Minister that the Board having arrived at the decision that they have made when the Committee on Public Utilities will meet again and Mr. Cass-Beggs and the members of the Board will be present, it will be our intention to examine in greater detail the information that is supplied in a very general way, and to in effect be in a position to examine and assess what is being done and to either confirm or reject the position of many who are experienced in hydro that this full development takes into consideration the development of -- and the control of Lake Winnipeg, which in many people's opinion is an unjustified expense for the amount of power and the cost of power to be supplied.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be in order to add an addendum to the statement which I just made, and the addendum is very simply this, Mr. Speaker, that the whole development of the Nelson, which is clearly stated in the policy statement I have just given, is dependent in turn, according to the advice we have been given, on Churchill River diversion and Lake Winnipeg regulation, without either of which the full development of the Nelson does not become as economically viable; and that furthermore Lake Winnipeg regulation would seem to be as much justified as ever, perhaps more than ever given the fact that as of yesterday the level of Lake Winnipeg stood at 717.5 feet. I wonder if my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition would care to walk to the edge of Lake Winnipeg and contemplate its state of nature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that if the First Minister can add an addendum then I can add an addendum as well and I ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would concur. I would only caution that it should not turn into a debate. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I must suggest, Mr. Speaker, through you to the First Minister, that notwithstanding the declaration and statement made by him, that is a statement of opinion, there are people whose opinion I think Manitobans, and certainly I, hold higher who have more knowledge about hydro matters, who disagree with the conclusions that the First Minister and some of the members of the Board have made. And I think that this particular situation will be debated for some time and I would hope that when we arrive at Public Utilities that we will be in a position to deal with this in a greater manner, and I would hope as well, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister would allow the majority in the Committee to have these people present who object to the conclusion and to be able to present their evidence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief statement about -- and I have copies here for the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the Speaker, and one or two for the Clerk, in fact I think we'll have some extras perhaps to pass around to other members as well -- with regard to a new program developed and now ready for implementation by the Department of Industry and Commerce, an Airport Assistance Program for southern Manitoba designed to provide assistance to small airports and will be available to municipal airport commissions to help in the construction, upgrading and improvement of airports in the south half of the province.

The purpose of the program is to encourage and assist in the development of airports which meet Ministry of Transport standards for safe flying operations and are licensed and available for public use. Manitoba Airport Assistance Program developed after considerable

(MR. EVANS cont'd) consultation, Mr. Speaker, with representatives of local municipal governments and flying clubs, provides the following grants and loans for approved airport projects.

1. A grant up to a maximum of \$3,500 for the cost of construction, extension, upgrading and improvement of airports including land acquisition.

2. A loan of up to a maximum of \$20,000 repayable over 20 years at an interest rate of one quarter of one percent over the borrowing rate of the Province of Manitoba for approved projects involving the construction, extension, upgrading and improvement of airports.

3. A \$5,000 annual airport operations grant to assist in the continued maintenance and operation of licensed airports open to the public and listed in the Canada Air Pilot publication.

I won't go into the other detail which is included in the statement, and which members can read, I would just say that the program of assistance has been designed to encourage maximum local participation. I might add that several airports have been developed in southern Manitoba at very low cost and these airports have usually been developed through close co-operation of municipal governments and those interested in flying. Municipalities have made land available and have assisted by using municipal equipment for grading, levelling and seeding. Flying clubs on the other hand have usually donated labour, material, equipment, and have operated the airport in lieu of paying rent to the municipality and as a result, Mr. Speaker, we do get airports in southern Manitoba at very low cost. And this program, Sir, is designed to be sufficiently flexible to accelerate these developments, maximum local co-operation.

We have copies of a brochure outlining the program in more detail and also containing application forms, which I will ask the Clerk to distribute to all members of the House, and hopefully all the MLAs will do their utmost to encourage municipalities in this part of the province to make full use of this program. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to acknowledge and thank the Minister for his statement in respect to the assistance that the government is providing for the development of airports and airstrips in Manitoba. I think in general terms that this direction that the Department is going in should be received with some considerable satisfaction. The Minister in his general statement has not indicated how this will relate to the Ministry of Transport at the federal level from which normally the direction comes in respect to aviation matters. However I presume that this will develop in due course and that in general the benefits which should accrue here will relate to some extent to tourism in our province because there is an increasing tendency for tourists from the country to the south to use air facilities in Manitoba, and I'm sure that the assistance that is being granted here will have a favourable effect upon the total tourist input into the Province of Manitoba. So, Mr. Speaker, until further details are known I would say that in general terms we applaud the direction in which this assistance is going to take the province.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 92, an Act respecting Certain Former Employees, now Deceased, of Moose Lake Loggers Limited. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. I would suggest that when messages of His Honour are coming they should be read right after the motion is made. It would facilitate things.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James) introduced Bill No. 91, The Provincial Judges Act. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin) presented Bill No. 89, an Act to amend The Snowmobile Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING introduced Bill No. 94, an Act to amend The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Act. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the First Minister. I wonder whether he can indicate to the House whether the province will be prepared to make a contribution, cash contribution, to the flood fund in South Dakota.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, when my office attempted to contact the office of the Governor of South Dakota it was with the thought in mind that in the immediate aftermath of the flood and the tragedy involved therewith that the State of South Dakota would perhaps be in need of some logistic support, in need of some organizational Emergency Measures type of support, and we have been advised that in fact food and clothing, particularly food of a kind that is non-perishable, canned, etc., would be helpful, and I understand the Minister of Industry and Commerce has undertaken to see if quantities, appropriate quantities of canned food might be made available, and I believe he has that in hand. Insofar as our Emergency Measures people are concerned, I understand they are now in direct contact with their counterparts in South Dakota.

Insofar as cash contributions are concerned, Mr. Speaker, appeals are being made on a private subscription basis. Going beyond that I find it somewhat incongruous however to think in terms of cash assistance from the Crown to, shall we say, the State of South Dakota within the United States of America where financial consideration is not the primary consideration, it is the immediate need for logistic support, food and clothing. Money, Sir, I have the distinct impression that money is not the principal requirement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Industry and Commerce then could indicate the nature of the contribution that Manitoba is intending to make, and I wonder if he can confirm in dollars what that would really represent?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there are various forms of assistance that we can provide. We would hope that, and I can't give a figure - if you wanted a dollar figure, a value figure, I'm not in a position to do so - but we would hope to ship a substantial quantity of food paid for by the Manitoba Government as the Premier has indicated.

I should also say that through our Emergency Measures Organization of the province we are co-ordinating a program of collecting food and clothing to ship there, as well as cash contributions if individuals so wish, and I might add that arrangements have now been made by the Government of Manitoba with the co-operation of municipal firehalls in Winnipeg and Brandon to receive contributions of any kind to be made available for the citizens, and for the Town of Rapid City. I am happy to say that the people of Manitoba are responding greatly but I would take the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to stress again that anyone who would like to donate can phone our provincial EMO office at 284-2070 in Winnipeg, or their nearest EMO office in the province, and again contributions can be made to municipal firehalls. We have made those arrangements.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can indicate whether any merchandise has in fact been sent to South Dakota yet?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I can't tell offhand. I would hope that some is on its way, but I can't tell you just offhand.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have another question to the First Minister. In view of the response that was received from the Americans during our emergency in 1950, would the government not consider, would the government not consider a substantial contribution directly to the State of South Dakota for its emergency?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the response of the government was instinctive on Monday; it was instinctive in the immediate aftermath of the tragedy itself, and the immediate consideration was one of logistic support in an effort to help the authorities in South Dakota cope with the immediate problem. Subsequently we have been advised that there is in fact need for additional supplies of non-perishable food, canned foods, and clothing, and there I understand a systematic arrangement has already been undertaken under the aegis of EMO (Manitoba) and by the Department of Industry and Commerce relative to marshalling together quantities of foodstuffs, and then also with respect to a private appeal among Manitoba citizens. To go

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) beyond that, Sir, to think in terms of cash contributions from the government to the Government of South Dakota, through a special fund is something which it is not I suggest prudent to react instinctively on because, I say again, I really cannot believe that money is the over-riding requirement at this time, particularly within a country such as the United States of America given its per capita wealth and its great national capabilities.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder then in view of the statement of the First Minister whether he would consider the purchasing of clothing directly from manufacturers in Manitoba for shipment to South Dakota - purchasing by the government.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is a proposal which would have to be considered, if not for long, at least considered for more than just a split second. I understand, I say once again, that the Department of Industry and Commerce is making some effort to marshal together some quantities of non-perishable canned foods. So far as clothing is concerned, I understand an appeal is being made to private citizens and to private organizations and that clothing is being marshalled together at firehalls in Metropolitan Winnipeg and Brandon. I really don't know that anything much more systematic could be done. However the suggestion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition about purchasing quantities of clothing if this is deemed to be required, I am sure that it will be given consideration, but at the moment I can't give a definitive reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of the statement that he just made this morning, would he feel that the International Airport at Winkler and the Stanley Flying Club qualify for such assistance under his program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I regret because of noise in the House, and because of the acoustics, I couldn't hear the specific question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I wonder if we could have the co-operation of all the honourable members to cut down the hum and the buzz so we can hear each other. Would the Honourable Member for Rhineland repeat his question?

MR. FROESE: Yes, my question, Mr. Speaker, was to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, in connection with the statement that he made this morning re assistance to airfields in southern Manitoba, would the freight field at the International Border at the Winkler Port of Entry, and also the Stanley Flying Club, be qualified for assistance under this program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, under the program as long as the airport does not receive Class 1, 2 or 3 scheduled, or irregularly scheduled unit toll commercial air services, they can apply. I am not sure what kind of traffic comes into those particular locations that the Honourable Member from Rhineland mentions. My inclination is, and I also say it's available to municipal airport commissions. I have stated that in the statement earlier, but my inclination is that it would likely qualify. But again I would have to know more detail of the extent of operation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable First Minister. Has the Minister been informed that one of the factors leading to the high level of Lake Winnipeg at the present time is the fact that Lake of the Woods, the run-off was speeded up in order to accommodate water expected from Minnesota?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the regulation of the Lake of the Woods drainage basin by means of the control works on Lake of the Woods, on the Winnipeg River, would no doubt be a contributing factor. It is also true to say however that water levels in Lake Winnipeg have been substantially above 715 feet for much of the time for many of the last seven or eight years.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the First Minister. Is it possible for him to make representations to the authorities that made the decision to lower Lake of the Woods, to consult with them in the hope that this would not occur again because of the destruction of the breeding grounds of the water birds.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable lady would like to provide more detailed information and specification as to just what her concern is, I am sure that it would be

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) considered seriously by the Minister of Mines and Resources, for possible reference to his counterpart in Ontario. However, as I say, that would depend on the nature of the more specific information the honourable lady would provide.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry and Commerce in regard to the subject he brought up this morning, assistance to airports. Will the Minister inform the House when he speaks of southern Manitoba, does he mean that area below parallel 53?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Specifically it does include the honourable member's constituency.

MR. BILTON: I didn't get the answer.

MR. EVANS: I say specifically, Mr. Speaker, it does include the honourable member's constituency.

MR. BILTON: I thank the Honourable Minister for the answer. Could he go so far as to tell us as to whether or not this material is being distributed to the known municipal and private flying clubs?

MR. EVANS: Actually, Mr. Speaker, the description of the area - I won't take up the time of the House with this - but the description of the area is provided on Page 4 of the booklet that was distributed. I can say that we trust we have got pretty well most of the airports, or possible airports, in the more or less agricultural portion of the province. As the honourable member does know, we have a very positive and over the past year or two expanded program for the construction of northern airstrips and northern airports so this is to complement what's being now done in the north.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, having information that at 8:30 yesterday morning, the level of Lake Winnipeg was 717.85 feet, is the Acting Minister of Mines and Resources able to say what that level will be in the event that the Lake is regulated in accordance with the government proposal?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the maximum level of regulation is of course 17 feet. Now it's possible - I mean 715 feet - it's possible of course that by regulation it could be even lower than that, but at most, at the very maximum it should not exceed the 715 which is a good two feet lower than what is now being experienced on Lake Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he could indicate now whether he's met the new criteria of God set by the Member from Inkster?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order.

MR. SPIVAK: That's what he said about me. That's exactly what he said about me. When we make any predictions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Section (a) Citation 171 indicates a question, oral or written, must not be ironical. --(Interjection)-- I'm not going to argue the question with any member but I would indicate that we should act as gentlemen and ladies. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the Minister can indicate to the House what type of liability insurance is covering the animals in the Veterinary Clinics while they are under treatment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, that is a matter for any district board to consider and I presume there might be any number of arrangements throughout the province.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I have a question also for the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister of Agriculture indicate how many Veterinary Clinics in the province have now been completed with their construction program?

MR. USKIW: Not having been given notice, I'll have to take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Churchill asked a question of

(MR. EVANS cont'd) me in the House last June the 7th, respecting icebreakers. I think his question was since the icebreakers will remain idle as the strike continues at Montreal, I wonder if the Minister could request that they be used to open the Port of Churchill at an earlier shipping date this year. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the strike of Long-shoremen at Montreal and Three Rivers has not idled any icebreakers. As a matter of fact, the icebreakers have normally finished their duties in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence and the Gulf of St. Lawrence by May 15th, although this year it was a little later. The icebreakers then proceed to various shipyards for their annual maintenance and refit for the season in the high Arctic. They then load with supplies and about July 1st begin to move north and put in at navigation aids, the Hudson Strait navigation aids I am informed are scheduled to be in place around July 10th. An icebreaker support will remain in the Strait area to provide assistance to any commercial vessel which desires to navigate those waters at that time, and the point being, Mr. Speaker, we have investigated it and I am afraid we are not able to follow the honourable member's suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Universities and Colleges. Will there be members on the new Consolidated Board of the Health Sciences Centre nominated by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Universities and Colleges.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, yes there will be citizen members appointed by the government.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Another question for the Honourable Minister of Universities and Colleges. Do the \$100 million expansion plans for that Health Science Centre include any provision for detoxification of addiction treatments, and if so, could the Minister advise the House the extent of their plans.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the \$100 million was a figure that was developed over a number of years going back to 1967. I have no specifics on it but it was a figure that came about as a result of four different institutions all requesting facilities for new programs and plans. The rationalization that we are now achieving will bring all these plans together so they can be looked at, not as individual components but as to the needs for one major institution.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Highways. Can the Minister indicate if there has been any change in policy with regard to the construction and maintenance of roads within the boundaries of Indian reserves?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any change in any policy as regards to roads in reserves.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister received any communication from the Lake St. Martin Indian Band Council requesting assistance for the construction of roads in their reserve?

MR. BURTNIAK: If there had been some letters it was quite some time ago I believe. I'll have to check. I do believe there was some representation made but it's quite some time ago.

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

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate to the House when he checks his information whether the government took any action and if so, to what extent in this particular case?

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, if there is going to be any policy changes as such, that of course will be announced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, and is related to the announcement this morning that Bobby Hull has signed a long-term contract with the Winnipeg Jets. Has the Minister reached any decision as to whether World Hockey Association games in Winnipeg next winter will be exempt, or whether any category of them will be exempt from the Provincial Amusement Tax?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I might say that there is very little chance that anybody will be exempt from paying the normal tax. There's always the possibility of a grant but I might say that certainly I would be more than hesitant to recommend a grant when the World Hockey can pay someone around \$2 million; I don't think that the people of this province should subsidize this kind of operation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, asked in agreement with what the Minister has said. Would the Minister consider discussing with officials of the Winnipeg Jets the possibility of special reduced ticket prices for senior citizens.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in fact we would be very much interested in doing so; in fact we have plans just to do this, senior citizens and maybe some of the younger citizens also.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I thank the Minister of Industry and Commerce for his answer, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask him if the department could inquire of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, of the Minister of Transportation rather, as to why if two icebreakers could do all this work 20 years ago, what the other ten icebreakers are doing now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: First, Mr. Speaker, there's nothing preventing the honourable member himself from writing or corresponding with the Federal Minister of Transport at any time, or phoning him as a matter of fact. However since the honourable member is greatly interested, and he's always bringing up these intriguing and interesting questions, we will make an inquiry to see why.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify comments, or an answer I gave with regard to Lake Winnipeg regulation. I did not mean to imply that although 715 was the maximum regulation limit as expected, that is, the maximum regulation limit is often talked about - it's always talked about - that this is the maximum amount, or the maximum level of water on the lake because I should have qualified it and said the 715 maximum relates to the normal conditions, or the historical, or the long run situation on the lake, and if you have abnormal, if you have very great conditions of precipitation, for instance, if you have a lot of water and you have very abnormal conditions, let's say the lake goes up to some ridiculously high figure, 720, 725, we couldn't say that we're going to keep it at 715 of course. But we will be able to keep it somewhat lower, a couple of feet lower perhaps than it would have been otherwise, so I want to make that clear.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. EVANS: Now, while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, there was a couple of questions asked of me that I'd like to respond to. I was asked - this great interest on the other side of the House with regard to what the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management was doing with regard to infestation along various water drains - I believe the Honourable Member for Morris in particular raised this question - and I'm advised that the department is active in identifying areas where insect infestation may be developing but that the question of spraying of these insects is really a matter for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture but that the Department of Mines and Resources is working closely with Agriculture as much as possible. I discussed this matter with the Minister of Agriculture and he tells me he has a long list of specific locations in the province which are being sprayed because of infestation. But I'm sure that he would be pleased to hear from honourable members privately if they have any localities that they think need specific attention.

Now, while I'm on my feet, and it's a related subject, the Honourable Member from Riel raised the question asking a question about the restriction of DDT usage and I want to advise, I'd like to make this clear, that the use of DDT has been restricted for some years in Manitoba under the Manitoba Pesticide Control Act, which incidentally is administered by the Department of Agriculture. The means of restriction are that since that 1963 users of DDT have had to sign a form at the point of purchase indicating the intended use of the chemical, but I'd also advise honourable members that the Federal Government in their Pest Control Products Act has since January 1 of 1971 restricted the use of DDT by registering it for restrictive uses, namely for use only in the control of pests, there's 12 specific conditions for pest control of

(MR. EVANS cont'd) crops and livestock. And the point I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that I'm advised through federal regulation that the use of DDT is controlled and restricted to situations where it does not or should not significantly affect the environment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the First Minister I would address my question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Was the matter of bringing the several hospitals under one board, was this a voluntary matter on the part of the boards, or was pressure being put on them?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Universities and Colleges.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if I might answer this question. This came as a result of numerous meetings, consultations, and I was very happy that the step taken by the boards of the four institutions came as it did because it showed that they are responsible people knowing that they are operating very important facilities for Manitoba and Winnipeg, and this step was taken after a great deal of consultation with them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of Mines and Resources and Environmental Management for his speech, but I would like to ask him if the department did not make a commitment to the municipalities that had provincial drains within their boundaries that they would take care of insect infestation this year. I believe such commitment was made and I wonder if the Minister could confirm that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Well, I'm not sure whether the honourable member heard my, as he calls it, speech properly, because what I did say is that we are, the department is identifying and looking for those particular areas of infestation but that we ask the Department of Agriculture to do the actual spraying, so we are undertaking this collective responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: A question to the Minister then. Is the government assuming their responsibility for spraying along provincial waterways located in the municipalities in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, some two or three weeks ago I had a list of provincial waterways or drainage ditches which were listed for provincial spraying, or departmental spraying, and since that time we have added numerous other drains to the list on request of local authorities, so the program is well in hand in that respect.

The Member for Rhineland, Mr. Speaker, some time ago asked me a question on whether or not there are public funds towards training programs for farmers, and I want to indicate to him there are two such programs, one is a training and industry program which includes agriculture and that is group classroom type training programs which are supported by Federal-Provincial funds and of course the other is the Manpower Program that was carried out during the winter months to which I made reference in answer to a question from the Member for Rock Lake the other day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . the Minister of Agriculture has confirmed that such a commitment has been made and I ask him now why that commitment has not been lived up to?

MR. USKIW: I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether the allegation of the Member for Morris is something similar to the one that he raised in the House the other day with respect to the phasing out of Ogilvie contracts.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . if he will advise the House as to the reasons why that commitment made to the municipalities has not been lived up to?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what commitment he is talking about. I talked about a list of provincial drains which we undertook to spray, and are doing, and I talked about an added list after we'd had a number of requests from the local governments throughout Manitoba, those are being sprayed. I'm not aware of any area that we have some responsibility for that has not been looked after.

MR. JORGENSEN: I seem to have some difficulty getting through to the Minister. There are areas in this province that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Morris would take the time to inform the Honourable Minister of Agriculture specifically, then we wouldn't have to have the crossfire on the floor. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the Honourable Minister circulates a list of drains that's being sprayed in the province amongst the House members.

MR. USKIW: There is no difficulty on my part. I'll have to get the list from my department.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Highways. Can the Minister tell us what is being done to correct the dangerous condition of Provincial Trunk Highway No. 1, the west-bound lane between the Red River and St. Norbert? I understand there's a number of dangerous bumps and no speed markings.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, if there is anything like the honourable member has suggested I'm sure that the department will be looking at it and maybe something can be done. I'm not familiar with the problem that the honourable member has just stated but if there's anything like that then certainly the department will be looking into it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the same Minister. When he has checked the particular reference made by the Member for Portage, would he also look into the matter of the bridge two miles south of Winkler on Highway 32 which hasn't received a cover and which is very dangerous and could result in accidents as well. Would he also look into this one?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the bridge department is well aware of the bridges in Manitoba in all areas and they're well aware of the bridges which are in better shape than those that are not in such good shape and of course restrictions are put on these bridges as to the number of tons that can be carried for the safety of the people that are crossing it, and of course wherever possible if the bridge is in such a position, or condition, that it must be replaced, it will be done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would like to inform the Minister that this is a new bridge . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member place his question. I must once again ask honourable members to realize that the question period is for questions not for statements. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the House Leader. Could he advise the House when the amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act will be brought in.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, may I try to reply to that question. I think I've indicated we have submitted to the city various proposed amendments and have been waiting for a response from the city. Now I'm under the impression that we've just received a letter which would indicate - I'm saying under the impression because I looked at it very quickly this morning - and it seemed to indicate that the city was prepared to proceed to turn them over, to finalize them and have them printed, but I want to make absolutely sure. I am meeting with some of the city people on Tuesday and once I'm satisfied that they are set, and I think they are, then they'll go.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I don't know who to direct this question to but I missed the announcement regarding Lake Winnipeg and I'd like to ask a direct question of how much of the level given is attributable to wind setup? Is there anyone can answer it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm informed in the absence of the Minister that they do not give the statistics based on the wind effect, that this is the water level.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Perhaps I could ask a further question, I see the Minister has just returned. The level announced was I take it a level read yesterday after several days of north wind, and in view of the literature distributed by the Minister a few days ago with this graph, curve on Lake Winnipeg, I wonder if he can tell us how much of the level is attributable as a result, if we can go by this, as to how much is attributable to wind setup?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: I'm informed, Mr. Speaker, from the people in our Water Control Branch that they do attempt to measure it without wind effect. But, you know, I can't say specifically right here - I can find out - specifically, you know, what are the two measurements, but I believe we do make a measurement with and a measurement without wind effect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, did I hear correctly that the level given was the level that was read yesterday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways. I want to congratulate him for changing the sign at St. Jean ...

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member place his question.

MR. FROESE: I'm being courteous. They've changed it in such a way to invite people into Manitoba to visit Friendly Manitobans - I appreciate this - I'm wondering how many more signs of this type will be set up? I think it's very well deserved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I know that there have been lots of requests for all sorts of signs, and I want to suggest to the honourable members that we don't want to put too many signs on the highways because then all of a sudden you'll find that the highway numbers will lose their identity, so we want to keep away from as many signs as possible. But this particular sign that the Honourable Member for Rhineland is talking about it was put up some time ago. There was a lot of criticism about the sign and that is the reason why the sign was changed and I'm very happy to hear that the honourable member appreciates it.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I note that the Honourable Member for Charleswood is not here. It's an indication possibly that the Attorney-General and the honourable member have been able to get together for the Order for Return so I take it we can pass that. Has the House Leader of the Conservatives any comment on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: No, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Attorney-General would have to make a comment at that because I was not a party to negotiations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, ... the honourable member and he advises me that he is going to communicate to me later the precise information he wants if he can determine that, and I'm waiting to hear from him further.

MR. SPEAKER: It'll stand.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, would you kindly call the motion standing in my name and the amendment of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, the amendment standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, on page 5.

ORDERS OF THE DAY -- SPEED-UP

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are now dealing with the annual speed-up motion which is standing in the name of the Minister of Labour, the House Leader. --(Interjection)-- The Member for St. Boniface says it's my favourite. I don't think so. I've never liked it, in fact I've abhorred it. Actually this is the steamroller resolution which has been put forward by every government that I've been in with in this House, whether it was the Conservative or the NDP. When the NDP boys sat on this side of the House they sure objected to it very strenuously and the very House Leader that is now proposing it was objecting to it very strongly. I think one of the reasons that this always comes forward is because they are starting the session so late. Look at some of the other provinces. British Columbia starts its session early in January, they're almost finished by the time that we start ours. Why can't we start our sessions earlier? I can't see why we always have to wait till the middle of March or somewhere around that time before we start our sessions. I don't know what the reason is. Are they not prepared? Are they bickering among themselves as to the legislation? Are they debating the legislation that they want to present among themselves and can't come to

(MR. FROESE cont'd) an agreement? Is that it? Or just what are the reasons why they can't come forward with a program much sooner than they are doing? Maybe some of the backbenchers should get up and tell us. They probably know better or would come out with a statement of that kind.

I for one have great difficulty when a resolution of this is brought into effect because of the way things are handled once the steamroller is on. Especially with the various bills that go before Committee, and then under the new rules that we have to have the proper amendments prepared or give notice of within -- what is it? -- 24 or 48 hours? This is a very difficult thing for an individual member or for smaller groups as the Liberals and the other Independents as well. This presents a difficulty. I know yesterday we presented or passed a bill in Committee, we only got through with one bill. I intend to present an amendment to that bill actually reversing the last amendment that was passed because I feel that is restricting the legislation very badly and really is negating a lot of the intent of the original bill and I will present an amendment to that --(Interjection)-- I know it's my privilege but this means that I have to look after it so that things are done. This is where I find difficulty in looking into the various bills that appear before us, to speak on them and do it intelligently so that I know what the bills contain, because if you don't you're talking off your hat and this sooner or later comes out in no uncertain way. I know this happens to other people when they speak on bills and they haven't done their duty and haven't really done their homework on them.

I too note from past experience what happens when the steamroller resolution goes on. Two years ago we started an Agricultural Committee meeting after midnight. Imagine! After midnight starting a committee meeting dealing with legislation of this province. I thought that was a real shame. Certainly proper attention is not being given to legislation and it certainly doesn't augur for good legislation. Last year we had an example in connection with the farm machinery bill which came in at the last moment and the way that particular bill was emasculated it didn't resemble itself, and do we have a reprint as yet? I don't think the bill has been reprinted in its revised form. I don't think it's available yet. I feel that if things like that happen where we amend legislation to the extent that we did that particular bill we should have reprints on our desks actually before third reading is given so that we know in what terms we are speaking of and also so that we can inform our people back home in a proper way. I still am not sure whether all the regulations under that particular bill have been assented to, are in effect at this time.

Another objection that I find takes place is that adjournments are denied and this I can prove, I have record of, that on certain occasions I will want to make adjournments because I haven't been able to study the bill and that they are so rushing through that they will deny adjournments and this I take exception to very strongly as well. It's certainly not democracy and not democratic. On the other hand what do we see? We have several tax bills on the Order Paper and they've been on the Order Paper now for weeks. We don't proceed with them. So we're accommodating certain groups in this House, most likely the government itself, but I'm rather skeptical that you're accommodating the Official Opposition in this case because you're fighting a by-election and then you accede, you will accommodate. But later on when the steamroller resolution is on and when we ask for small requests they are denied. I think you should examine yourself on this point and see whether this is not the case. I'm just wondering whether the name that your party has is correct, whether you should not take the word "democratic" out of your name. I don't say that this applies at all times but certainly at certain times of the year this is factual.

I certainly go along with the Liberal amendment here that Saturday sittings should be avoided, that we should at least have a little rest over the weekend where we can do some of the homework that we are unable to do during the week. I also agree that the amendment as it is being proposed that government business take precedence in all cases -- I'm just wondering how do you determine once the speed-up motion is on about the last hour of the day for private business. There is no way of knowing when adjournment will take place so that you can apply the last hour for private members' business. This will fall by the way completely in my opinion. --(Interjection)-- Yes. The Member for Inkster says I'm right and I'm sure this is bound to happen. I can't see it any other way. I still feel that at least on occasion we as members on this side of the House should have some right too in putting our ideas forward on private resolutions and so on.

But, Mr. Speaker, coming to the last point, and that is that each sitting be a separate

(MR. FROESE cont'd) sitting. This I take very strong exception to because here you bring in a bill in the morning, by the afternoon you give it second reading and by night you want it passed, and this is uncalled for. This is something that -- how can we give proper attention? How can we give proper scrutiny to legislation on that basis? I know that with each separate sitting you need prayers by the Speaker but I think if ever it was necessary I think this is one time when it is necessary because otherwise we can't do our job in a proper way and do it well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am proposing an amendment seconded by the House Leader of the Liberal Party, the Member for Portage la Prairie, that the motion be further amended by deleting the words "and each sitting be a separate sitting" in the third line thereof.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, I believe that the intent of the motion just presented by the Honourable Member for Rhineland would in effect attempt to amend the main motion instead of the amendment proposed by the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: On the same point. A sub-amendment can only deal with an amendment that has been made and the amendment of the Member for Rhineland deals with the main motion so therefore it's out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I must concur with the direction in respect to the point of order by the two honourable members.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost. (On Division)

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have support? Call in the members. Order, please. The motion before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie to the motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Froese, G. Johnston, Patrick and Sherman.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Bilton, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Craik, Desjardins, Doern, Einarson, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Graham, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Mackling, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 5; Nays 34.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Noes have it, I declare the amendment lost. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable the First Minister. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, before this motion goes through final vote I want to say a couple of words. I'll be very brief. But we're going for a procedure to speed-up the affairs of this House at a time when there have only been two bills of any significance which have been passed in this House. We've had a total of eight bills that have received final reading, six of which were nothing more than housekeeping bills. Only two bills of any significance have passed this House. We're going for speed-up at a time when four of the ten standing committees of this Legislature have never even met yet and this is the way that this government wants to conduct the affairs of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very regrettable that they choose to conduct the affairs of the Province of Manitoba in this manner and yet we realize that if after three months only two government bills of any significance have received third reading, it's time that we get on with the affairs of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed. So ordered. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 78 was read and passed) Resolution 79 in the amount of \$329,000 passed ... The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I commented on the matter of Churchill Forest Industries yesterday. I would like to know from the Minister what is the situation now because they have appointed a trustee and it's being managed by the government now. I think we have every right to know what the situation is today, and I think we should have an up-to-date report on Churchill Forest Industries and its operation. I would request that we do get that at this time.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the operation is legally run by the Receiver appointed by the Courts and the Receiver Mr. Leif Hallgrimson is responsible to the Court for all of his actions, including all of his expenditures. But having said that I would like to remind the honourable member that I tabled in this House only a matter of weeks ago a very detailed, a very comprehensive, and very lengthy report, on the operations of the Forestry Complex at The Pas going into all kind of figures and to great detail, and that, Sir, is a fairly recent document and it brings you up to date, almost up to date. But I have also endeavoured to make statements from time to time as reported to me by the Receiver on the progress of the operations. And further, I would add that the Receiver does make information available to the Rhodes Smith Enquiry, the Royal Commission of Enquiry that is involved in investigating the entire loan and the entire background of the loan - but this also includes the operations, the current operations. So information is being made available and I would like the honourable member to take the time to read what I have given him because it gives you some very fundamental information on all the aspects of the operation. There is no attempt on our part to hide anything, or disclose anything, we will show you what we have.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, I said it before, and I'm going to say it again, that this complex is highly over-capitalized. The fact is that the people of Manitoba paid far too much to build this particular type of facility. This opinion I'm expressing is based upon information given to me by very reputable engineering experts, and including Stothert Engineering Limited, who have stated quite categorically that if the government built it purely as, let us say a Crown corporation, or if it was built normally by a company that was well established in the forestry business, that it would have cost considerably less.

Now honourable members will appreciate that having recognized that we do have this extraordinary burden of capital expense, it is extremely difficult to make the thing pay, to make it go, and all I can say is that the Receiver is doing his best to make the thing to, to make the complex a success. We've got as you know, and incidentally we indicated in that report the various levels of employment over months of the year, I think you can see in there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if we could just have a little less noise so it's possible for the Chair to hear and members who wish to hear, can hear.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I had some information, I had some information for the honourable member in relation to this question that he has asked me about the Forestry Complex, and I don't seem to be able to put my hands on it but there is - I had some up-to-date information on the amounts of money spent at various periods of time, which I was going to make available. However, this can be made available presumably at a later date,

The point being, Mr. Chairman, that I am prepared at any time and as often as feasible to give information on The Pas Forestry Complex. We are hoping that some members of the press will visit the Forestry Complex next Tuesday as a matter of fact, that they will come up and take a look at the progress that has gone on, the fact that we are now installing pollution controlling devices, which is a very expensive item, which was never included in the original cost of construction. We were always told that it would be but when we went into Receivership we found that this was not the case so we have to spend at least a half a million dollars on pollution control machinery and to try to do our best to minimize the pollution emanating from the plant. So at any rate ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm having quite a difficulty in associating the remarks that the Honourable Minister is making to the resolution under discussion. Perhaps I was remiss in allowing the question that the Honourable Member for Rhineland - but what we are on is the official inquiry re the Churchill Forest Industries, not the report on Churchill Forest Industries as such, but it's the inquiry, and I would say to honourable members that ...

MR. EVANS: Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll conclude the debate ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ... on this because I would refer them to Citation 149, subsection (c) of Beuchesne which rules out of order any matter on which a judicial decision is pending so I think that.

MR. SHERMAN: ... point of clarification, Mr. Chairman. Have we completed consideration of Resolution No. 78?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right we have, we are on 79.

MR. EVANS: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I wasn't aware that we had gone completely beyond 78 particularly since the honourable member asked me something about the Forestry Complex. I thought we were still on the MDC. However, be that as it may, I am not disputing the Chairman. I'm not disputing this. Now that I have been informed that we are on Resolution No. 79, we are only talking about the official inquiry. I agree with the Chairman, I will only say this that all information on the operations under Receivership, as well as details pertaining to operations and construction, etc., before receivership, will be given to the Honourable Rhodes Smith of the Inquiry Commission, and that the Receiver is, I think even monthly, giving him operating data so in that respect this information is being made available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: We are dealing with the allocation of \$329,000 for the official inquiry of the Churchill Forest Industries, and this opens up the whole thing. We are discussing Churchill Forest Industries under this item because we are spending money \$359,000 for this very purpose, and I think this won't nearly cover the amount that it will cost. I feel the allocation is much too small and that you will find that we will have to allocate more monies later on. Yesterday I referred to an article in the press . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member is going to refer to that article, I am going to rule him out of order.

MR. FROESE: Well on what grounds?

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . rule you out of order, that you are referring on a matter on which a judicial decision is pending. I stated the citation already, and I would say that your grounds of debate here are very limited.

MR. FROESE: On that same point of order, Mr. Chairman, we are allocating money for this very purpose, and surely we as members when we allocate money for a certain purpose, we are allowed to discuss that item. There's no such thing as not being able to discuss an item to which we are allocating money to, and if you're going to rule against it, I'll challenge your ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I stated that the honourable member could speak on this motion but not on the inquiry itself.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I certainly can't follow that ruling, Mr. Chairman, because we are spending . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I would refer the honourable member to Citation 149, subsection (3) "refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending".

MR. FROESE: It's not judicial this inquiry. This is not a court. It's not under a court, It's under a commission established by this House to which we as members were a party to and certainly we have every right to discuss it when millions of dollars are being squandered in my opinion and we are supposed to shut up and not say a word on it. Certainly I won't let this thing go unchallenged.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, if I might speak on the point of order or I think you brought the member up on a point of order. I think all members in this House are privileged to have as wide a latitude in debate in respect of particular estimates, but I think it is customary, and in fact a rule of the Legislature that a matter on which a judicial decision is pending is not to be discussed. Now I think that a strict interpretation of the situation respecting the whole The Pas Forestry Complex, you may find it difficult to specify but there are at least three different actions that are before the courts that involve this area. There is the receivership action itself, Mr. Chairman, there is a bankruptcy action, there are also lien actions - I should use that in the plural - as well as the hearing, The Pas Forestry Commission hearing itself. Now that isn't a matter that's strictly before the courts, the latter one, but it is a commission appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and they are hearing evidence, and I think that whether or not strictly interpreted, there might be more latitude. I think that it is

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) customary, not in the Legislature or in Parliament, to discuss the matters that are before that Commission of Inquiry. If it's discussion of the amount of money, or generally the fringes of the matter, yes I think that's in order, but not the subject matter that they're dealing with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I find it very difficult to follow the rationalizing of the Attorney-General on this particular point. Sir, it's a general rule in this House that debate be limited to the item under discussion, and one only has to read the item under discussion to know whether or not the remarks that are being made are in order, and the item does say the Official Inquiry re Churchill Forest Industries. That in my opinion opens up discussion on that inquiry, and I don't know how one can interpret it otherwise. If the government felt that this matter should not be debated then it should not have been in the Estimates in the first place under this particular item. I don't know how you could bring it before the House under the consideration of the Estimates, and then not have it debated. It seems to me, Sir, that once an item is brought before the House in the Estimates as long as remarks are limited to that particular item, they must be in order, and as long as the Member for Rhineland proposes to deal with the inquiry, rather than the - and I would take the opposite position that the Chair has taken - rather than the broad operations of the plant itself, then his remarks would be in order, but I would think that his remarks would be out of order if he attempted to discuss the whole complex because that is not the subject matter of the item that is before us now. The subject matter is the inquiry itself, simply the method of the inquiry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, without knowing exactly what the honourable member is going to say it's hard to determine whether or not what he's going to say would offend the rule and the custom of the House but if he is going to talk about the mechanics of the inquiry, the composition of the inquiry, the costs of the inquiry itself - not the matters that the inquiry are dealing with, then that's in order, obviously in order. But it seemed to me that the honourable member was going to be referring to the dissertations, or evidence, or facts, that are before the inquiry, and that would not be in order. Now within those parameters debate is allowed, and I agree with the Honourable Member from Morris if that is what the Honourable Member from Rhineland is wanting to do, but not if he's discussing the subject matter that's before the commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, we are allocating \$329,000 toward the Churchill Forest Inquiry Commission, and I want to know how this money is being spent, whether it's going to need much more money. I know that for instance from the reports that we read daily in the newspapers, this is public knowledge, and why shouldn't we discuss something that everyone knows. Certainly we are entitled to discuss those things. This is not before a court, this is before an inquiry commission set up by this government to which we are a party to and I have every right to discuss those things because I am party to allocating those funds that we are allocating right here today. When we see in the paper that \$11,000 or \$11 million went out per week after the NDP government was elected, certainly they should be responsible for these payments that went out and I want to know on what justifications were these payments made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The honourable member I think understands what the basis is of the rules of this House and parliament and what has been the tradition as between the Courts and the Houses of Parliament and Legislatures. Now the honourable member wants to discuss the issues that are before the inquiry and before the courts and that is against the rules. The honourable member should appreciate that what the newspapers are reporting are evidence that comes before the inquiry on oath and that is fair comment and that's a reporting in the newspapers and that's all right. But it has never been the policy, the custom or in accordance with the rules of this Legislature or any Legislature or the House of Parliament to debate the evidence that's coming before a Commission of Inquiry or before a court. The honourable member wants to consistently offend against those customs, privileges and rules and he's out of order.

MR. EVANS: A point of order. I would remind the honourable member, too, I agree I was out of order for a point there but that's because I didn't realize we were on Resolution 79, I thought we were still on 78, but I would remind all honourable members that on 78, under

(MR. EVANS cont'd) Item 4(a) The Manitoba Development Corporation, there was discussion on various aspects of the MDC and I believe including The Pas Forestry Complex and that was the place he wanted to discuss current operations of the MDC, for example, - I'm sorry, and of course of the CFI Complex in terms of, you know, how much employment is there now, you know what is the output how and so forth and so on. I know the honourable member is very interested in this and I try to answer that, but I agree with the Attorney-General, we're specifically now talking about the inquiry as such, the mode of operation of the inquiry, etc., not the operations of the Complex itself but of the Inquiry, how's the Inquiry being conducted. I think that is what is legitimate or acceptable type of discussion, because there has been opportunity and indeed there has been discussion on operations of MDC and its subsidiaries, etc., earlier on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland to the point at order, the discussion on the official Inquiry re the Churchill Industries Forest Products, not to the specific case itself but to the granting of the money. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I won't be restricted in my comments when we're dealing with this item because when this government is spending money recklessly and we're supposed to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Order. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the Honourable Member for Rhineland has made the statement that he did. I think that on reflection that he would reconsider that statement that he will not be restricted on any discussion that he cares to make in respect to this resolution because he must be. It's not only rules that have been made and honoured in this House over the years but it is a rule of the Mother of Parliament -- (Interjection) -- I wonder if my honourable friend would allow me the courtesy of allowing me to finish what I have to say on the point of order. Because, Sir, it is traditional, it is traditional that matters and investigation of this nature is not permitted in debate in the House or Committee thereof. My honourable friend is correct when he says that the evidence that is being presented to the Inquiry is public knowledge, and that is true; but at the same time the Inquiry, as I understand it, would fall under Citation 149 of Beauséjour because this is in accordance with the decision to establish the commission, I would respectfully suggest within the confines of subsection (c) of Citation No. 149 to refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending and, as I understand, as I understand the references to the Rhodes Smith Committee is in the terms to all effects and purposes a judicial inquiry into the conduct of the financial affairs of the CFI. Because of those terms of reference, it is in effect a judicial inquiry. And, Mr. Chairman, if I may just on a point raised by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, again he referred to the evidence before the courts that are contained within the papers.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we all know that on any murder trial or any other trial there are reporters in the courts, they inform the public as to what is going on and we're precluded in this House from referring to those specific cases while they're being adjudicated under the rules, as I say, Mr. Chairman, not only of this House but of the House in Ottawa and the Mother of Parliament. So I respectfully suggest to my honourable friend that he should restrict his remarks to the question of the financial input into the official inquiry, and if I understood the Honourable Member for Morris in his contribution, he said because the item is there it opens the whole ambit. I suggest to him that he can be partially right in this case providing it's not dealing with the matters that are before the Inquiry Commission which I respectfully suggest falls within the term of 149, section (c) being a judicial inquiry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel, same point of order?

MR. CRAIK: Same point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think that the government is taking a position here that puts you, Mr. Chairman, in a very difficult position because you know as well as the rest of us that this topic has been broached in detail in the House by the First Minister himself under other topics --(Interjection)-- Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the First Minister in this House on the reply to a resolution prefaced his remarks on the resolution dealing with the CFI question and what a former Cabinet Minister did or did not do at the same time that that Cabinet Minister was appearing before the Commission, and, Mr. Speaker, did not in any way inhibit the remarks of the First Minister at that time. Now as we said at that time, if the government wants to talk about this topic, that's fine, but there is that specific example in this House and it was not even on a related resolution. A man's integrity was impugned by the First Minister at the same time as that man was to appear before

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) the Commission.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of . . .

MR. CRAIK: I'm on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of privilege has been raised.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman will decide. Mr. Chairman will decide.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of privilege. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: My point of privilege is on behalf of the Premier. I want to object to the statement of the Honourable Member for Riel in impugning motives to the Honourable the First Minister, and also further to point out that if in the opinion of the Honourable Member for Riel at the time that that statement was made was the time to rise on a point of privilege on behalf of the person affected. If it had of been the honourable member that was the time to do it and I suggest that it is within the competence of this House to accept the points raised by the Honourable Member for Riel in respect of any statement that has been made which in his opinion he considered a breach of the privileges of the House, it should be taken into consideration at that time not later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of privilege. The point is so phony I won't remark on it. I said, I said, Mr. Chairman - Mr. Chairman, I'm on the same point of privilege. I said that the First Minister had impugned the integrity in my opinion of a former member of the government. Now if I want to say it I'm sure it is within my power to say it. What I'm trying to say is that this topic now has been broached in this House by the members of the government side at their will and they're in some difficulty in restraining now and we can use the example of yesterday during the Industry and Commerce debates when we spent a good deal of time talking about pollution control.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that I think you are in a difficult position in ruling on this and that the Member for Rhineland, although the item that we're speaking on has some restrictions put on it by Beausnesne, unfortunately the precedence set in this House is not all too good on this topic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: May I further establish the point of order that according to Beausnesne by a judgment of this House on March 24, 1965. Madam Speaker, the former lady Speaker of this House, dealing with a matter somewhat similar to the situation dealing with raising of Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, she ruled as follows: "Dealing with this debate I've had under consideration concerning the sub judice matter raised in the House by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition with respect to references to the Grand Rapids Water Haulage Commission," - I'm sure some of the honourable members that were here in 1965 will recall this - "In seeking guidance from our Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding in the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, I find that in the 1951 Edition of Rule 41 reads as follows: 'No member shall refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending nor make reference to judges, Courts of Justice, personages of high official station of a nature of personal attack or censure.' On April 5, 1957 the words "in a Court of Law" were added after the words "pending" where it appeared in the rule. Our rules of 1960 which we are presently using makes no reference to Rule 41 as it appeared in 51, thus I must rely on other parliamentary authorities and give consideration to the practice followed in the Federal House. May's 16th Edition on Page 359 refers to a court of law under examples of inadmissible questions, Section 6 reads: 'Reflecting on the decision of a court of law or being likely to prejudice the case which is under trial'. Also, Page 400, May's, refers to matters pending judicial decisions and reads in part as follows: 'A matter whilst under the adjudication by a court of law should not be brought before the House by motion or otherwise'. On Page 457, May's reads as follows: 'Matters awaiting the adjudication of a court of law should not be brought forward in debate'. This authority seems to be inconsistent, that a matter can be sub judice only when it is before a court of law. The Commission we are referring to namely the Grand Rapids Water Haulage Inquiry Commission is a Commission appointed under the Evidence Act, Part 5. Honourable members will appreciate and note that this is an Inquiry Commission and it's still sitting. Honourable members of this Assembly are aware that in the Federal jurisdiction there is at the present time a Royal Commission, an Inquiry Commission appointed under the Evidence Act Inquiring into a subject well-known to members."

Then there was another list of Citations and opinions expressed by the Madam Speaker at

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) that time; "In my opinion the Inquiry Commission is a commission or a court and must be considered in that line. In my view we owe respect and duty to it in considering our judgments as to whether we should or should not allow any discussion which may prejudice the work of that body." And further, the Honourable Madam Speaker ruled that the Leader of the Opposition could not speak on that matter that was before the commission and from that ruling the then Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Molgat, appealed to the House and the question: Shall the Chair be sustained? - was resolved in the affirmative, 41 to 12. All of the Conservative members voted in favour of sustaining the Madam Speaker as did the members of the New Democratic Party at that time, the only ones in Opposition as I check, Mr. Chairman, were the members of the Official Opposition Party and the Member for Rhineland.

I think that is sufficient to indicate to you, Sir, that even within our own House is has been ruled that a Commission of the nature of the Smith Committee is tantamount at least, under a judicial inquiry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm speaking to a point of order. I thank the House Leader for bringing this valuable intelligence to the House because what he has done now is substantiate the comments made by the Member for Riel who said earlier that the government themselves had been violating that very rule which he now says shall not be debated in this House, and I submit, Sir, that now any discussion on this subject is going to be ruled out of order. But I want to get the record clear, first of all, on the question of privilege raised by the House Leader. He rose on a question of privilege suggesting that the Member for Riel had imputed motives to the Premier. That, Sir, notwithstanding your comment that the point was well received was a phony point of order, it was not a question of privilege, because no such action, no such words were made by the Member for Riel. He simply said that the First Minister had impugned the integrity of somebody outside this House who was appearing before the Committee. That in no way can be ruled as a question of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on that same point of order. The House Leader referred to a certain inquiry. If I recollect, there was only the one judge on it and no doubt it could be referred to as a judicial inquiry. This is an official inquiry according to the item that we are just discussing and certainly is not a judicial inquiry at all and cannot be placed in the same category.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I have ruled that the subject matter of the official inquiry itself is out of order. Discussion is under — the topic that is under discussion at the present time is the granting of money for the official inquiry. If the honourable member wishes to speak to the granting of the money, he is in order. If he wishes to speak about the evidence that is being presented, then I'm going to rule him out of order.

MR. FROESE: Then I challenge your ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Does the honourable member have support? Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, while your Committee of Supply was discussing Resolution 79 dealing with the Official Inquiry re Churchill Forest Industries I ruled that the Honourable Member for Rhineland was out of order because he was referring to a matter of evidence and testimony on which a judicial decision is pending. I ruled that the honourable member could speak on the granting of monies under Resolution 79, whereupon he challenged my ruling.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is: shall the ruling of the Chairman of the Committee be sustained?

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. FROESE: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. In my opinion the ayes have it, I declare the motion carried.

MR. JORGENSEN: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order, please. The question before the House: shall the decision of the Chairman be confirmed?

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Shafransky, Toupin, Uskiw and Walding.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Bilton, Craik, Einarson, Froese, Graham, F. Johnston, G. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Patrick, Sherman and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 23, Nays 15.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the ayes have it. I declare the motion carried.
The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable the First Minister.
Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

. continued on next page.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - (Cont'd)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 79 . . . the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, it appears that we have one ruling for the government and one for the Opposition. But . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I would caution the honourable member that he is treading on some very dangerous grounds. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, we are now going to spend another 329,000 this year for the Inquiry Commission. I just wonder how much has been spent to date, whether the Minister could bring us up-to-date on how much has already been spent, because this is an expensive proposition and were it not for the blunders of government we wouldn't have had to pay out all this money, and the taxpayer of this province is the one that has to foot the bill. He will have to pay it. Not only that because I doubt whether that industry will ever make any money, that we will not for time to come be subsidizing this very industry that we are investigating here. Because when the contract was first entered into we were apprised of the information; we were given the information, the details of the contract, and at that time it was stated that we might be subsidizing them by half a million dollars a year. Is this being borne out? I think that unless the plant is brought to capacity that this will certainly be the case. I think there should also be improvements made in that the product should probably be refined to a greater degree so that we could get higher sales, get more money for the work that is being done . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the honourable member come to the resolution under discussion, not the operation of the Churchill Forest Industries.

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Chairman, you're making it very difficult to discuss the resolution before us at all. If we are not going to -- the resolution is that we provide \$329,000 for the inquiry, and when we discuss some of the aspects of the inquiry we are ruled out of order and this makes it very difficult to discuss a motion of this type, and when I mentioned before that this government was passing out \$11 million a month which in my opinion wasn't scrutinized well enough, that a blunder was made before . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. We've already decided that issue. The Honourable Member for Rhineland to the question under discussion. Either he will comply or I will order him to sit down. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Well then, Mr. Chairman, you might as well rule that I sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak on the resolution. Mr. Speaker, we make no hesitation in being in favour of this resolution and the money as provided there in that resolution because we support the examination by the Commission of Inquiry into all the details, all the aspects of the contractual negotiations resultant in the development at The Pas. And that Commission of Inquiry has been given broad terms of reference and we are prepared, this government is prepared to provide the funds that are necessary for the work of the Commission. Obviously the honourable members opposite, well certainly the Honourable Member from Rhineland, would deny the Commission of Inquiry the money, and is unhappy that there is a Commission of Inquiry investigating into this matter. --(Interjection)-- Now -- He says not at all, Mr. Chairman. But you know he speaks like some people say with a forked tongue. He is opposing; he speaks in opposition to this resolution; he does some grandstanding, Mr. Speaker, about being throttled in debate when every member of this House has to accept this same rule that is provided for every member of this House in connection with the matter, so he tries to -- he tries to get for himself some position of being someone who is righteous and wanting to do bigger and better things for the people of Manitoba in respect to this subject matter but wants to deny the money to the Commission to do its job. Now that's the position of the Honourable Member for Rhineland and let the record clearly indicate that. He has spoken out against every consideration providing adequate funds and support to this Commission of Inquiry and, Mr. Speaker . . . --(Interjection)-- All right let's hear your point of order.

MR. GRAHAM: I believe that the Attorney-General is imputing motives to the Member for Rhineland and I would suggest that he withdraw those remarks.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I don't reflect on the words that I have used as imputing motives. I have indicated that the honourable member, whatever his concern, evidenced a displeasure at the money being spent for the Commission of Inquiry and thus would want to eliminate this allocation in the budget. Now if his motive is that he wants to save the taxpayers money, that's a legitimate motive but we disagree with it. And if that's imputing motive to him,

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) yes, I impute that motive, that he disagrees that this money should be spent, and I think it's fair for me to characterize that as the motive of the honourable member. --(Interjection)-- Well the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, now speaks from his feet and says he never said so. But he had an opportunity while he was on his feet to debate that issue. But he chose rather to try to offend the rules of this House, and try to go into a discussion of the evidence that is before that Commission of Inquiry. He actually, Mr. Speaker, used the words "I do not intend to be restricted in the way I debate this matter in this House". --(Interjection)-- Yes. And he did use that wording.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I'll be very brief, that this Commission of Inquiry is a very expensive undertaking and I for one would like to be free from the inhibitions of the rules of this House and speak openly about the matters of my own personal knowledge but I cannot. I am prepared however to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have full confidence in this Commission. We have brought to this House earlier this session a technique whereby this Commission utilizing the funds that we have voted will be able to go before the courts, and I believe are now before the courts or ought to be, in application for authority to go beyond the jurisdiction of this province. And so far as I'm concerned the whole matter is well before the courts and the Commission of Inquiry. And for the honourable member to keep insisting that somehow he have a right beyond those of us who respect the rules of this House, is unthinkable. But let the honourable member if he wants get up later and say that he is fully in support of the Commission of Inquiry and the money that's being spent here and not cast aspersions upon the government for setting up this Commission, or voting the monies for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I'm quite happy to say that I have full confidence in the Commission that was set up. I have never said anything to the contrary and if the Minister says, or tries to imply that, it's wrong. It's completely wrong. I have never said anything in opposition to the Inquiry itself. But I don't like the implication that this is a judicial inquiry when it's not. It's an official inquiry set up by this government. There are other people on the commission than judges, and therefore it's not just a judicial inquiry, and when the House Leader before mentioned another inquiry it was a completely different situation. I am concerned with the many millions of dollars that have gone down the drain and when our area can get so very little money, when we're restricted almost in every way in development in our area, and when it's spent recklessly up in other areas, this is my main concern as a member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . that's already been a ruling. I think it's clear that the member has every right as expressed by the Honourable Member for Morris so speak about the Commission, about the money being allocated for the Commission's operation, the manner of the Commission's operation, but not the evidence that's appearing before it. I thought that was clear. And now he seems to have forgotten that and is broadening out again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: The Honourable Member from Rhineland seems to be concerned about the amount of money that's being spent. Well you know any responsible member of government, and any responsible member of the Legislature, wants to at all times to ensure that money is spent prudently, wisely, and in the most efficient manner possible. We all want to get the greatest value for our dollar. But for the honourable member to suggest that this is some sort of an outlandish amount because I think, although he may not have used that expression, this is the impression that I get from the way he makes his remarks and from what he's actually said, that far too much is being spent on the Inquiry. Mr. Chairman, I say -- well this is the impression he leaves us.

Mr. Chairman, when you compare that amount with the amount of money invested, the expenditure of money in the project this indeed becomes a very very miniature item, becomes a very miniature item of government spending when you compare it with the actual investment through MDC sources in the whole complex. And indeed to somehow restrict the Commission by limiting funds unduly would certainly be in my books, Mr. Speaker, a matter of false economy. That it would be a great disservice to the people of this province if we in any way restricted the Commission of Inquiry, the Rhodes Smith Commission which is doing a fine job, if we restricted it by limiting the budget, which I believe the honourable member seems to be suggesting.

It was necessary for example apparently for the Commission to go to North Dakota not long ago for very good reasons, and they were doing a service to all of the people of Manitoba

(MR. EVANS cont'd) by taking that short trip to North Dakota for various good reasons, to obtain more evidence, rather than less evidence, and surely we want to get to the truth of the matter. Surely therefore all members of the House must agree that the commission which is composed of very responsible, very respected people from various professions, various backgrounds, good Manitobans, surely we must have confidence and that they are only spending the money as is necessary.

Now a large part of the expenditure is really uncontrollable in the sense that one does not know for example how long, or how lengthy, a particular witness may wish to testify, how long will a particular witness wish to provide information. He may give very long answers, longer than one expects, and obviously then the Commission goes on for a lengthier period of time. There may be need to get a particular accountant, or a particular extra legal counsel for some special investigation because a new matter has arisen; there may be various reasons for monies to be spent in this fashion, or that fashion, but the point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that this amount and the amount of the actual expenditures will be made available, they will be in public accounts and they will be available for the honourable member to examine at that time, there'll be no attempt as per usual to try to put this in some other item, there will be an account in the Public Accounts of Manitoba which the honourable member can examine. But I say that this amount of money is the money that the Commission feels it needs to do a good job in this present fiscal year, and there is no way that I think honourable members of this House can deny a responsible Commission from the amount of money that it feels in its wisdom, and in its best judgment, it requires to do the job of investigation that the people of Manitoba are now demanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 79. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Well the Minister is giving us some examples as to what the commission has done. They have gone to the United States to hear some witnesses. I have attended some of the meetings where they had witnesses appear before them, and listened to some of the discussions, and sure enough the inquiry costs money. I know that, and I'm just wondering whether this is going to be sufficient. I think it's being underestimated. I think the cost will be much higher than what we are given to understand on this item. I don't say that I want to increase it but I think the estimate isn't a true one, isn't one that will stand up, that we will later on be asked for supplementary estimates, or at the next session make up for additional amounts, because if you take into consideration the number of witnesses that are appearing and that will have to be paid, and so on, and the quarters that are being used, all this adds up and I don't think that this money will suffice, that it will cover the expenditures. This is one of the reasons why I am wanting to discuss it. I am being restricted so much in my discussion on the whole matter that --(Interjection)-- well sure I am, because people in this province are allowed to discuss it, the press reports it, anyone can go in and listen to what's happening, yet when we want to discuss an item in this House where we are allocating money towards it, like the inquiry . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, it appears now that the honourable member is reflecting on a decision that was just made just minutes ago --(Interjection)-- he is. He's talking about whether or not he can speak about a certain item that was already settled that he could not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had made the point quite clear on the amount of expenditure that appears before you. The item of \$329, 000, but apparently I haven't made it clear so I will repeat it. That figure - this is the figure that was given to us by the Commission itself. This is their estimate of their financial needs over this fiscal year. It's not my figure, it's not the Minister of Finance's figure, it's a figure provided to us by that Commission and I trust that they have some idea of what their expenditure will be in the year ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, well there is another indication that as far as the Minister is concerned he can have all the discussion he wants but when it comes to me as a member of this House . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable member has been warned once already, I think.

MR. FROESE: Well just send me out then, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 79 in the amount of \$329, 000 --passed.

A MEMBER: No.

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

Order Please. That completes the Department of Industry and Commerce.

The next item is - agreed that we call it 12:30. (Agreed) The hour being 12:30 I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.