



Third Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

28 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVII No. 70A

2:30 P.M. Tuesday, May 29, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 29, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have 31 students of Grade 5 and 6 standing from the Belmont Elementary School under the direction of Mr. Craig. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and the Environment.

We also have 15 students from the Hugh John McDonald School under the direction of Mr. Sinclair. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

We also have 25 students from St. John's High School under the direction of Mr. Bochinski. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Fifth Report of the Standing Committee of Economic Development.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on Tuesday, May 29, 1979, to consider the Annual Report of Communities Economic Development Fund.

Mr. Hugh J. Jones, Chairman, Communities Economic Development Fund, provided such information as was required by members of the Committee with respect to the Fund.

The Annual Report of Communities Economic Development Fund was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Yesterday, the Minister of Health and Social Development indicated that he had telexed or written to the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses, in respect to an alleged misunderstanding involving six months of time that would be provided by student nurses free within hospitals. Is the Minister prepared to table that letter or telex, which he has forwarded to the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd be prepared to do that, I might say, just in elaboration for the Honourable, the Leader of the Opposition that I feel that the statement that I made at the Annual Meeting of the MARN contained an error in communication on my part.

I assume responsibility for that error. I had had a meeting with the MARN executive within the previous two weeks, in which we have come to a meeting of minds on the approach towards job orientation. The government's position is that it should not be an excuse for exploitation or exploitative labour of any kind. It should be paid familiarization. I thought that that was understood between the MARN executive and myself, and as a consequence my reference to it in my remarks at the annual meeting was fairly general. There was some misunderstanding which was clarified by the Telex to which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition refers. I can only assume responsibility individually for that misunderstanding and mistake in communication.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. This morning the Minister of Health and Social Development announced the okay to a personal care home for Selkirk as well as approval for the Selkirk District Board to proceed to revise its plans for a proposed new hospital. My question to the Minister: can we, as a result of his statement, be assured in fact that the new hospital has been approved for the Selkirk community?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker. What was conveyed to the hospital board and the town council of Selkirk was approval for immediate replacement of the Selkirk Nursing Home by a new facility which will be 32 beds larger than the existing facility and authorization for the Hospital Board to proceed immediately to redesign and development of a concept for the hospital that will then be forwarded to me and to my colleagues for government consideration for hoped-for approval, but there is some redesign necessary. That procedure may take some time and we would like the Board to get it under way as quickly as possible.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the Minister. Can he advise us as to how much time he expects that redesign to take?

MR. SHERMAN: Well I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Board itself and the architect involved would be the only ones able to answer that question. I think it will take several months. As the Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows, the original design concept involved a juxtaposed personal care home, plus space for Department of Health and Community Services personnel, plus some service relationship with the Selkirk Mental Health Centre. What we are talking about now is a 75 bed active treatment hospital and there will necessarily have to be some major design changes made. I would think the process will take several months.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister as to what possible advantage has been obtained by the 18 month delay in not proceeding with the original design plans which were practically ready for use in November of 1977, except for the fact that we are involved now with higher costs, involved with 18 months of unnecessary inconvenience and hardship for doctors and staff and for the residents and patients that have had to be subjected to the delay over this past 17, 18 months and possibly for an indefinite number of months ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that his question is more of an argumentative nature than one seeking information, and I would hope that he may want to restate his question.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ. The question simply posed to the Minister of Health and Social Development, if he could list to me the advantages that have accrued as a result of 18 months' delay in this decision. .

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of advantages. I don't feel that you would permit me to enumerate them in total, but there is one primary advantage and that is that this way, the perceived needs in the health care field in Selkirk are being met. We had in front of us — we're confronted with — a proposal for a combined hospital and personal care home and a combined total capital cost of some \$12 million to \$12.5 million which we could not accommodate in the budget of the taxpayers of Manitoba at this juncture. We have an excellent private operator in the field prepared to rebuild his personal care home in a larger configuration. We can now move on the hospital as a hospital facility without the additional appendages. There will obviously be a much lower capital cost involved for the hospital so that we are able to take the steps now and move forward. We were not able to accept a concept which even the previous government had not acted upon.

I remind my honourable friend again that he was in the government for eight years. There was a good deal of thinking and conceptualizing done but no steps actually taken.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a fifth question.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, approval had been given to the original concept well in the early part of 1977. The Minister fully is aware of that approval that had been given. Mr. Speaker, is the Minister now indicating in fact that although requests may be forthcoming from non-profit organizations in hospital districts to permit them to proceed with personal care homes, that from this point on preference is being given to applications by private owners for the construction of personal care homes in preference to applications by hospital districts?

MR. SHERMAN: Sir, if I could take those questions one by one the Honourable Leader of the Opposition points out that approval had been given for the original concept in the spring of 1977. I remind him that the spring and summer of 1977 were reasonably good construction periods; that the government changed hands in the fall of 1977 and nothing had been done on the approval that had been granted.

Sir, approval had been granted to that project as it had been granted to others, totalling \$135 million in immediate capital costs, not counting costs of money and operating costs which added up to half a billion dollars and we felt we were not in a position to commit the taxpayers of Manitoba to that kind of wild spending. —(Interjection)— Now, Sir, for question number two. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Minister that the answers he is giving do tend to lead to further argument in this case and I would suggest that he confine his remarks to the question that was asked.

MR. SHERMAN: If I may deal now with question number two, Mr. Speaker, the answer is: no, this doesn't indicate that preference will be given to private operators in the personal care home field. It merely indicates that preference will be mutually distributed between the public and private sector.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the same question, I would like to ask the Minister of Health what logic or reasoning is behind the decision to refuse the nursing home project to the Selkirk hospital district?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had answered that question. The personal care home operated by the Selkirk Nursing Home Corporation is being replaced with an expansion of 32 beds. It's a viable economic unit, to juxtapose a personal care home onto the hospital raises a number of questions not the least of which the question of public capital involved, the question of delay, the question of future accommodation in future budgets. I would like to get on with the job in Selkirk; this makes it much easier.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister knows he could have gone on with the job almost two years ago. But in any event, would the Minister then tell the House to what extent the province is involved financially with the approved project — that is the nursing home project?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet knows, Mr. Speaker, that from a capital point of view, the province is not involved in any way. The province will continue to pay the provincial share of the operating costs of the beds in the future, as in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a final supplementary.

MR. USKIW: Well, I'm not sure if it's a final one, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the Minister whether future per diem arrangements with private institutions will not reflect their capital obligations that they undertake now?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, they may, and they may not. They may, and they may not. The fact of the matter is that an agreement has been reached with the proprietors of the Selkirk Nursing

Home to replace their home at an acceptable level, and an acceptable per diem that the province can live with. We have not made a specific or staked out a specific direction in terms of the mix of public and private personal care homes, but we do believe that the field need not necessarily be restricted entirely to public activity. We feel where there have been good operators who have demonstrated they can deliver a good service, that should be recognized. In the case of the operators of the Selkirk Nursing Home, we're recognizing it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if the Minister can indicate any progress in the nursing station that's been requested at Ethelbert for the last eight years. —(Interjections)—

MR. SHERMAN: Some, I believe, Mr. Speaker. Some, I believe. We have, in fact, in my office, among my departmental officials, including one of my Assistant Deputy Ministers in particular, entered into discussions with medical personnel in Dauphin and throughout the Roblin n/Grandview/Gilber Plains/Ethelbert area of the province, with the objective of working out a solution. Whether it takes the form of a nursing station or an ambulance service, I can't tell my honourable friend as yet, but I can assure him that it's being actively pursued.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour. Will the Minister investigate the manner in which the Department of Labour inspects elevators, especially since the elevator in which Mr. Helleur was riding before he died has subsequently terrified two people by stranding them between the 8th and 9th floors of the building that they occupy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): I'm waiting for a report on that entire situation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, a supplementary to the Minister. When, in carrying out that investigation, would he also investigate the statement by a Department of Labour Inspector that this particular elevator is as safe as any other, because that generally tends to connote to the public that possibly the other elevators aren't safe, and I think that'll increase the terror that people might have in riding elevators.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I've been informed that there is an article saying something like that. I'll have that looked into.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, a final supplementary to the Minister. Would he have his staff inspect the present emergency notices on elevators to ensure that people who are stranded don't take the chance of trying to leave a stranded elevator instead of calling for help, using the emergency button. I don't know if the present emergency notices are sufficiently graphic to capture the stranded person's attention in an elevator and I think that led to this particular accident, so could his staff ensure that the emergency notices are made more prominent?

MR. MacMASTER: I'll have that looked into, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Mines and Resources. I would like to ask him why he did not announce in the House a very significant new agreement entered into between the province of Manitoba and the Abitibi Paper Company for a 20-year period of timber rights on the east side of Lake Winnipeg to be extended by four 5-year periods. Mr. Speaker, this is a very significant agreement dealing with over 10,000 square miles of Manitoba forestland, and I believe it should have been announced in this House before being released to the press of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and the Environment.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Well Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the honourable member regards the agreement as an important one. The company of course has been operating in Manitoba since 1925 and we are, of course, pleased to be able to conclude an agreement with them for another extended period of time, and I certainly would be happy to respond to any questions the honourable member has.

MR. BOSTROM: Well Mr. Speaker, given the seriousness of this very agreement, can the Minister give us a commitment that he will table this particular agreement in this Legislature in order that we will have the opportunity to look it over and see exactly what kind of agreement they have signed with this company?

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BOSTROM: As a specific question, Mr. Speaker, he does indicate in the News Service release that the rights of existing timber quota holders and also the rights of other timber operators and the timber needs of communities are being protected under this agreement, and I would ask him how this has been accomplished since he has added to the existing lease of the Abitibi Company an additional 4,000 square miles on the east side and on the west side of Lake Winnipeg. And it appears, Mr. Speaker, that he has given over virtually complete control to the Abitibi Paper Company, leaving the government of Manitoba with no control in that area.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the province retains the right to withdraw any area from the integrated wood supply area to which the honourable member is referring. The company has first right of refusal on wood that is produced by a local corporation, for instance, or local individuals. But if it's necessary, any area may be withdrawn from that integrated wood supply area, and simply an additional amount would be added in another area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Mines, Resources and the Environment. Could the Minister give a progress report on the removal of the arsenic from the Village of St. Pierre?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and the Environment.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House would be aware that last winter, when removal of the arsenic from St. Pierre was taking place, that some problems were encountered with frost in the material that was mixed with gravel. It was decided then that it would be necessary to delay final removal until that was thawed. I am advised now that final removal of the material will commence on the 15th of June.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: I'd like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Finance, and ask whether he could confirm that in the past fiscal year, the liquor tax in Manitoba was calculated at \$68 million in revenue, and projected for \$68 million, whereas the tobacco tax was collected at \$20 million last year, and is now projected for a 25 percent increase to \$25.8 million.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Minister Responsible for Manitoba Telephone System.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Well, Mr. Speaker, in response to the Member for Elmwood, I am not able to give the confirmations he asks for. I'll be pleased to accept that question as notice for the Minister of Finance on his return.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the Minister was given the raspberry, not me.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Given that the World Health Organization . . . —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the . . . The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, you'll note that the Minister was twice as unpopular as I was.

Given, to the Minister of Health, that the World Health Organization has called for a ban on cigarette and tobacco products advertising because of problems associated with cancer and lung diseases, etc., would the Minister support such a move in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: If it was the collective decision of the Executive Council, Mr. Speaker, I would, yes.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister whether he would personally support and recommend such a decision to the Executive Council.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that it is my responsibility as one member of the Executive Council to raise expectations or hopes in one direction or the other, where the use of tobacco is concerned. I'd certainly be prepared to discuss it with my colleagues. The honourable member was a member of the Treasury Benches, and he knows that that kind of decision is not made unilaterally.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have a supplementary yet, to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has had two supplementary questions. The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a fourth question.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the Minister whether he would consider the provision of funds for anti-smoking purposes, similar to the GASP campaign, which I assume is federally funded. - . I would also mention to the Minister, in passing, that some \$5 million is provided by the province to the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba.

So, would he consider the provision of funds to discourage people from smoking?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, we intend to intensify proper life style promotion, preventive medicine technique promotion in the years immediately ahead in the department. I would say to my honourable friend that his idea certainly has merit and I would be prepared to consider it, but we have some major priorities in the Health Care field, as I'm sure he recognizes, and I would place some priorities we have such as priorities in the field of research above that, but I will consider it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour.

Some two weeks ago, during the Minister's Estimates, I drew to his attention a building site on the west side of Salter bridge, and he assured me that it was going to be barricaded. I believe it is a city operation. I drove by there this morning and I want to ask the Minister, when is the city going to abide by the Manitoba Building Code and barricade that site, because it is not barricaded at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: What I said to the Member for Logan at the time, I must repeat initially, was that we were assured that that would take place. I can only assure him again thtt as soon as I leave the House, I'll attempt to get reassurance of the original position, but I reported to him in honesty that I had been informed that that area was to be barricaded immediately.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, my question is to the Acting Minister of Government Services.

Some four weeks ago I asked the Minister, and I realize he has been busy fighting floods, but he took as notice a question I had asked him with regard to leased land between the runways

of the Gimli Industrial site, and its possible sale. The Minister took the question as notice, and I think he has had sufficient time to come up with an answer one way or the other.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not having the answer for the Honourable Member for Logan today, but I will make doubly sure it will be there tomorrow.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Mines and ask him how the areas that he mentioned that will be available for communities and organizations to cut timber in the new agreement when, in his own press release, he indicates that those on the west side of Lake Winnipeg and those outside the license area on the east side are identified as "integrated wood supply area"? How will those areas that are within the designated agreement that he talks about, how will those communities have access to the timber that he indicated to the Member for Rupertsland that they would have that access?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: I assume, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member is referring then to the forest management license area in the agreement. There are two types of areas within the agreement, Mr. Speaker: One is a forest management license area, and the other is an integrated wood supply area. In the forest management license area, the company is the manager of the forest and that is an area that they have been working in for decades and the interests of those communities in that area are protected at least as well, and perhaps slightly better than they were previously. In the integrated wood supply area, the department continues to administer the sales, etc., in those areas.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister then explain to myself and to the members of this House what mechanism is there in the agreement to equally, or better, as in his own words, protect the rights of those communities in the new agreement when that agreement has been extended by some 4,000 square miles, or has been increased by some 4,000 square miles over the agreement that the company originally had?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, one must appreciate the difference in the two types of areas that are included in the agreement, and perhaps when the honourable member has had a chance to review the agreement he will have a better understanding of how those interests will be protected.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate what royalty rates are to be paid in this new agreement? Has there been a change from the normal policy that has been followed in terms of royalty rates? What is the arrangement there?

MR. RANSOM: \$9.00 per cord in the forest management license area and \$2.90 per cord in the integrated wood supply area. Those rates are the same as were in effect previous to this agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, Mr. Speaker. Could you inform the House what the government is doing to ensure that bicycles sold in Manitoba meet basic safety requirements?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what process is involved in ensuring basic safety requirements for bicycles, but I would expect that if there are any complaints that are brought to our attention in Consumer and Corporate Affairs, we would certainly investigate them.

MR. BARROW: Well, would the Minister look into the matter of the Hudson Bay selling bicycles that may have defective brakes?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, if any such complaints are brought to the attention of the department, we will undertake to investigate them.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there is a young man picketing the Bay now for a week with a bicycle bought at the Bay, 10-speed, defective brakes, and he's been there for 10 days in front of the Bay. Surely you must have heard some backlash on this performance.

MR. JORGENSEN: If the young gentleman wants to bring his problem to the attention of the department, we will be happy to investigate it.

MR. BARROW: If I bring the young gentleman and his bicycle to your office, will you grant him an interview?

MR. JORGENSEN: It will not be necessary to bring the bicycle to my office. If he will contact the director of the Consumers Bureau, his problem will be given attention.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Government Services.

Could the Minister indicate how many inspectors are doing appraisal work for flood damage in the Red River Valley at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check to the actual number, but I believe it is of the order of between some 16 or 18 inspectors who are actually out reviewing damage and filing or accepting damage claims.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, without asking the Government House Leader whether or not he'll convene a caucus meeting so that some of his backbenchers can get information, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Corrections. I wonder if the Minister could tell us when the tenders will be called or when the redesign will be completed on the jail at The Pas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services,

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, when there are any additional announcements to be made with respect to that project, they will be announced.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether negotiations are still under way or whether agreements have been reached to lease an existing building at The Pas to renovate it for a court house?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the same answer applies to this question as the one I just answered.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could then confirm that negotiations have not started or negotiations are under way, but no concrete results exist at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Member for Elmwood asked me a question with regard to the problems facing Venezuela and the staging of the 1983 Pan Am Games. I checked with the federal government. I am advised by people over there that the president of the Pan Am Games Society has mentioned that Venezuela is encountering

some difficulties and that the site of the games might have to be forfeited by that country. I also understand that Hamilton has informally indicated that they are very interested in carrying out that particular option. As the member pointed out yesterday, they were number two in the bid and I understand that there should be an announcement with regard to the situation in the next couple of weeks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Minister whether he would clarify: Did he say that Hamilton had formally made that request, or informally?

MR. BANMAN: Well, as the member knows, Hamilton was the runner-up in the bidding for the Games and I understand that Hamilton has, with some informal discussion with the federal government, indicated that they are still interested in staging that event and we should know something within the next few weeks about that.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would then ask the Minister whether he would continue to keep informed on the issue and to also explore the possibility of offering Winnipeg as a back-up to Hamilton in the event that they are unable to meet the commitments because we certainly can since we have.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will give the member the undertaking that I'll monitor it but he should be aware that these Games are bid not on a provincial basis, but are bid city by city and I'm sure the Deputy Mayor of the City of Winnipeg is following this particular event very closely. I am sure if there are problems with the Hamilton offer he would be on top of the situation and would be working with that particular problem.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister, in the event that the City of Winnipeg does bid for back-up or for the actual holding of the Games, would the province support such a bid?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is hypothetical. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question again to the Minister of Mines and ask him whether the Forest Management Committee that was involved in the managing of the resources and making sure that the company, that Abitibi had its required amount of pulpwood that it required, was made available to it, even in the area that was under contract; whether that Resource Management Committee is still going to be actively involved in the operations and allowances of the cuts that are required by the company or whether that's been done away with?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and the Environment.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer specifically that question because I am not entirely certain of the Committee to which the honourable member refers. But I can tell him that the company will be filing their annual plans as well as five-year plans and that the department plans to have a person whose sole responsibility is going to be the monitoring of the agreement to make certain that the plans are in fact satisfactory and that they are carried out as set down.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister give me the assurance that the timber operators in the west side of Lake Winnipeg and the Interlake will not be, as a result of this agreement, forced to move their operations into the Gypsumville-Grand Rapids area from the Riverton area, as there was even discussions of it when the large fire went through the Riverton area two years ago, that this might occur. I want the assurance and I ask the Minister for assurance that this agreement will not be the cause of the operators having to move out of their area giving the rights that they have bestowed to Abitibi?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the rights of the existing operators have been adequately protected by this agreement. If the member is talking about a long-term situation, then he must

certainly recognize that timber is cut over in an area and that eventually people have to move. And if there are two or three competing operators in an area, then naturally they're going to be in different areas and they may not have exactly the one they want. But I don't regard that as being anything different than has been the situation up to now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health and ask him if he would have his statistical research staff look into a recent report issued by Statistics Canada, which is rather disturbing showing for the year 1976, which is the latest year available, showing Manitoba to have the second highest incidence rate of cancer in Canada. The Canadian average, Mr. Speaker, is 290.1 and Manitoba is shown as 371.6, and I am wondering therefore if the Minister could have his staff look into the statistics and see if he can determine for us the types of cancer involved and perhaps the reasons why it is so high in Manitoba compared to the Canadian average. I believe it's the second highest in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would be interested in the receipt of that information in greater depth or detail from the honourable member or from the Bureau of Statistics, and I will look into it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final question.

MR. EVANS: I thank the Minister for his answer. I will give him a copy of that information and I'd like to ask another question of the Attorney-General, and ask the Attorney-General if he is now prepared to provide an answer to my question of a couple of months ago on the cost involved in the Lotteries Commission under the chairmanship of Mr. Graeme Haig. I believe he took as notice the cost of that particular Commission and I'd like to get that information, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have that information with me and I'll give it to the member right after Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Question Period having expired we'll proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — SPEEDUP RESOLUTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister responsible for Government Telephones,

THAT for the remainder of the Session, the House have leave to sit in the forenoon from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., in the afternoon from 2:30 to 5:30 p.m., in the evening from 8:00 p.m. and each sitting to be a separate sitting, and have leave so to sit from Monday to Saturday, both days inclusive, and the Rules with respect to 10:00 p.m. adjournment to be suspended, and government business take precedence over all other business of the House.

AND THAT for the remainder of the Session, the operation of sub-rule (3) of Rule 88 of The Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the House be suspended, but the report stage of any bill shall not be taken into consideration prior to 24 hours following the presentation of the report of the Standing Committee or Special Committee with respect thereto.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, one never resists the invitation to rise in his place, but I hardly think it's necessary for me to explain the provisions that are contained within this particular resolution. It's a standard one that has been introduced for the past number of sessions and which

we have found has expedited the final stages of the passage of the business of the House. The actual date upon which the motion will apply, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to think would be subject to consultations with my honourable friends opposite and we could perhaps arrive at a mutually convenient date for a speedup motion to begin. I'll probably have discussions with my honourable friends a little later on, on that particular subject. But as I say, it's a standard motion that — I don't think — at least it hasn't in the past number of years met with any opposition by members opposite, and I doubt very much if there will be any opposition to it on this particular occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: On the motion to go into Committee of Supply, I rise to take my one opportunity that a member has during a session to speak on a grievance. And my grievance, Mr. Speaker, is the notion that a member of this House on the government side may utter racist comments and attempt to dictate the qualifications that a member of our side, of the opposition, must have in order to question, scrutinize, and criticize government programs, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in so doing, slander many previous members of this House and of other Houses in other provinces of Canada, of the House of Parliament itself and the people of Manitoba in general.

And this, Mr. Speaker, arises out of a number of comments made last night during the Labour Estimates Debate by the Honourable Member for St. James, at which time the Member for St. James questioned my colleague's, the Honourable Member for Churchill's right to make his contribution to the Debate, and the reason that he gave for questioning the qualifications of the Honourable Member for Churchill was his short period of citizenship, a short period of citizenship at the time that he was elected to the House and the very fact that after having become a Canadian citizen, that it's only a bit less than two years that has transpired. And he attempted to suggest that this in some way is a qualification that a member of the House must have in order to make his contribution toward the deliberations of the House.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, as if to suggest that if one was born in this country one makes a better member; if one has resided for 10 years in this country, one is a more competent and capable member than one who has resided for six; if one has resided for 20 years one becomes a still better member. Well Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— That's right. Well Mr. Speaker, I know of no minimum time period of residence that one must meet in order to qualify to hold a seat in this House, other than that as prescribed in the legislation.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Churchill had met the residence requirements to qualify for Canadian citizenship. He had met the residence requirements that are prescribed to qualify for being elected to the House. He had met the requirements on both counts and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that it is up to or that it is becoming of any member of this House to question another member's residence qualifications to discharge his responsibilities, be it on the government side or on the opposition side.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone is to judge our competence on the basis of our residence requirements, then let it be the electors, as it was the electors in the case of the Honourable Member for Churchill, and they made their choice. They made their choice, Mr. Speaker, on October 11th, 1977, and a wise choice it was and a choice that they will repeat making from time to time, whenever the writs of election are issued.

Mr. Speaker, I had mentioned —(Interjection)— Now the Honourable Member for Rock Lake is asking “Do they know his background?”

A MEMBER: Darn right they know it.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Do they — you're God-damn right they know his background. They know it very well. They probably know it a helluva lot better than you do.

Mr. Speaker, I had mentioned that the Honourable Member for St. James had slandered previous members of Legislative Houses and of the House of Commons. Mr. Speaker, all you need do is go to the library and pick up a parliamentary guide for any year and you will find numerous names of honourable members who were born outside the boundaries of the Dominion of Canada, members of provincial Houses, members of the House of Commons, even members of the Senate, Mr. Speaker. And, relating this to what occurred last night, and many of them were born in the United States of America and had made a deliberate choice on their own part to emigrate to Canada and they settled here and became Canadian citizens and proceeded to participate in the political process and are making their contribution. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, had been elected to a Legislative Assembly, to Parliament, after a longer period of residence than others, and this varies. But the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that our political institutions are filled with members who were born outside of Canada.

Now for the honourable member for St. James to suggest that just because they were not born in Canada or just because their period of residence in Canada had been less than that of the Member for St. James, that therefore they are less qualified to pass judgment upon government programs is absolute nonsense. . Not only is it nonsense, Mr. Speaker, but it is a statement unbecoming of a member of the House to be made.

Just to mention some, Mr. Speaker, who have been born beyond the boundaries of Canada: Sir John A. Macdonald wasn't born in Canada; C.D. Howe wasn't born in Canada; Stanley Knowles wasn't born in Canada —(Interjection)— And now someone says my father wasn't born in Canada, and that honourable member may be correct. And some of us may not have been born in Canada — and on the government side I know at least one other who was not born in Canada. But despite that fact, Mr. Speaker, I consider him to be just as competent and capable a member as any other member of the House, and capable to serve his constituents equally well, and doing a fine job at it. —(Interjection)— And the Honourable Minister is correct.

Now, as I've said before, Mr. Speaker, for the Honourable Member for St. James to suggest that just because the residence of the Honourable Member for Churchill in Canada has been six and one-half, seven years, whatever it has been, eight years, that that is an insufficient time period to become fully conversant with and knowledgeable in the problems and issues of the province to enable him to pass judgment on issues coming up in this House is absolute nonsense.

What is the minimum time residence requirement, in the opinion of the Member for St. James? —(Interjection)— And now, perhaps he would suggest that one's residence must go back to that of one's great-great-great grandfather, and that if one could establish his family tree going back in Manitoba to those days, then that makes him eligible to participate in the deliberations of the House. But if it's anything less than that, then one is not qualified. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, now the Honourable Member for Pembina is chirping again from his seat, and if the Honourable Member for Pembina wishes to participate in this debate, he has every right to rise in his seat and participate in it. And he may have already spoken on it, or I think if he has not, Mr. Speaker, I think that by his conduct, he is demonstrating sympathy and support for the thinking of the Member for St. James. That is what is happening. —(Interjections)—

Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have seen an increasing number of new Canadians. By new Canadians, I mean anyone who had recently acquired Canadian citizenship. We're seeing an increasing number of new Canadians seeking political office, and being elected to political office. We find them particularly in the Province of Ontario, we find them in British Columbia, and those provinces wherein immigration tends to go. And eventually, the people settling there amongst them, the vast majority want to become involved in the political process, each in his own way. Upon being granted Canadian citizenship, they want to exercise their franchise.

Others have other aspirations, and want to involve in the process of serving their fellow man

as elected representatives. And they end up doing so. And again, some after a longer, others after a shorter period of residence. But, Mr. Speaker, in each of those cases, the constituents have made the decision on judging the competence and qualifications of the candidate, and not the Member for St. James, Mr. Speaker.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for St. James had slandered the people of Manitoba — had slandered all of the people of Manitoba. —(Interjection)— And the Honourable Member for Pembina wants to know what he had said. I hope that the Honourable Member for Pembina will read the next issue of Hansard. We have received the 2:30 p.m. Hansard, and I will help him along, the next issue likely will be No. 69B, 8:00 p.m. Monday, May 28th, and find the speech of the Member for St. James, and read it carefully and perhaps even read it back to many of his constituents. And have his constituents pass judgment on that speech that was made last night by the Member for St. James.

Because you know, Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned earlier, many new Canadians, they look forward to the opportunity to become actively involved in the political process as early as they possibly can. And the earliest that they can, other than expressing an opinion from the sidelines as it were, is upon the receipt of their citizenship papers.

I know in my own riding, I have met many who were not Canadian citizens at the time, and they are anxiously waiting for that day, that they will be able to fully participate with other Canadians in the political process, be it the exercise of their franchise in a polling booth; be it being more actively involved in the political process; whatever it may be.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. James has slandered all ethnic groups in Manitoba, because they take pride — they take pride in their members who receive an early endorsement by their constituents to serve their constituents in public life. Mr. Speaker, once again I may suggest to you that all you need do is go across the hall and you will find all kinds of history texts written; history texts on the early pioneer life in Manitoba, and every group takes particular pride in the fact that within a few years after arriving here, shortly after having obtained — at that time it was not Canadian citizenship, but they became British naturalized subjects — that they took an active part in politics.

And the history books are full of them. And everybody tried to become involved in politics as quickly and as rapidly as possible. The Honourable Member for St. James says that's bad because those people cannot make a worthwhile contribution. That is what he said to my colleague, the Member for Churchill, last night. That is what, in effect, he is saying to all others who have recently become Canadian citizens and have been elected to public office. That is what he's saying of all others who, in previous years, upon becoming citizens of this country, had become involved in the political process.

And in the process of making that statement, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. James, as I said earlier, is slandering everybody. Because he is telling . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the honourable member that he choose his words very carefully when he's using terms that are fairly strong. He has used the word "slander" on numerous occasions and I would advise him to be very careful in the choice of his wording.

The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, yes, I'm attempting to choose my words with extreme care. Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that racist comments of that kind constitute a slander on all people of the Province of Manitoba, because statements of that kind suggest not only that an individual who recently acquired Canadian status isn't capable of serving his constituents properly, but that people who had acquired Canadian status recently are also incompetent and incapable of making a wise selection, a wise choice of a person to represent them. Because, Mr. Speaker, as the old saying goes, sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Member for St. James to come into my riding and make that same statement. In fact, he doesn't have to come to my riding — I would suggest that the Member for St. James go to the riding of the Member for St. Matthews — go to the riding of the Member for Wolseley — go to Churchill and make the same statement there, and see what response he will receive from the constituents of those ridings, or for that matter, Mr. Speaker, go to any constituency in the province of Manitoba. Go to Roblin, go to Dauphin, go to any of the other 50 constituencies and see how a statement of that kind will be received by the Manitobans there.

Now, with particular reference to the racist comments aimed at our friends south of the 49th parallel, the suggestion — they'll go back to the United States, why did you come here, etc., etc. Perhaps the Minister of Tourism would want to include the member's speech, which he made last night in her tourist promotion kit, which she is distributing south of the 49th parallel. Perhaps the

people planning to visit Canada, our friends from the United States, may want to know what the attitude of some government members is toward them. But I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the speech of the Member for St. James should be included in the Minister's tourist promotion kit, I would also want my remarks included therein too, to place the whole thing in proper perspective, so that prospective visitors to Manitoba from the United States would know that the Member for St. James is not expressing the views of all of Manitobans.

It's indeed regrettable, Mr. Speaker, it's regrettable that when government runs out of rational, logical arguments, that then it stoops to the gutter, it switches to racism. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be identified with a House within which there is a government that looks upon new Canadians as second-class citizens. Therefore I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for St. James would be man enough to take the initiative or if he isn't, that the Acting First Minister would impose upon him to withdraw last night's statements and apologize to all who may have been aggrieved.

Now, perhaps the Member for St. James has no concern for the image of the House held by the public, which was created last night. But, Mr. Speaker, I do and I would like to think that our constituents are the best judges of our competence and qualifications, including residence qualifications and I'm referring to members of both sides of the House. And what grieves me most, Mr. Speaker, is to think that in our society, there are members who get themselves elected to this House, who will stoop to the racist slurs and attacks which we had heard in this House regrettably last night.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Labour and Manpower, and the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for the Department of Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures. .

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — FLOOD CONTROL AND EMERGENCY EXPENDITURES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to order. I'd like to refer members of the committee to Page 80, Resolution 110, Item 1, Flood Control Emergency Expenditures—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I just want to understand what the procedure is this afternoon. We're going to do the Flood Control and Emergency first, is that it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is my understanding.

MR. DOERN: And then assuming we get through that in the next half hour or hour, then what? You're going on to Executive Council, or . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that Legislation is the next item, and then Executive Council, I am told by the Clerk. Is that agreeable? Pass. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions in regard to this item. I assume that it's in order to make comment here and ask questions in regard to the handling of the flood and various related points. I think what I would like to say as a general critique before I get into any specifics that I feel that the government did not give sufficient credit to what can only be regarded as a co-operative effort. I don't have a comprehensive list of all the various organizations that participated in the flood fighting, but the impression was left that it was an effort that was in the hands of the Premier and the Minister of Highways, that these two valiant people were almost single-handedly stemming the tide. I suppose one would poke his finger in the dike and when he grew tired he'd lie down and take a rest and his replacement would then fill the breach. That is certainly the impression that was created through the media. We had an endless stream of photographs and daily press conferences. I watched most of them. Mr. Hryhorczuk and the Minister making the latest announcements of every detail and the Premier appearing in helicopters, flying here and flying there in his brand-new flood fighter's costume, and never did I hear any comment about the co-ordinated and co-operative effort that was involved here.

Now if I were to list the people involved, I'm sure it wouldn't be complete, but I have the impression that in addition to the province, in addition to the EMO, that the federal government was involved, that the Red Cross was probably involved, that the RCMP was probably involved, that of course

EMO staff, it's their responsibility and they were involved, that the Mennonite — I don't know whether it's the relief fund or . . .

A MEMBER: Disaster Service.

MR. DOERN: Disaster fund . . .

A MEMBER: Disaster Service.

MR. DOERN: The Mennonite Disaster Service was playing a key role. The Armed Services were certainly involved. Municipal governments made their contribution, and the citizens — individual citizens — also volunteered their time and effort.

And last but not least, I think also that the media deserves a fair amount of credit for attempting to plug into the situation and provide information and assistance. So, I see it as a massive co-operative effort on the part of the citizens of Manitoba, the three levels of government, and many private and public organizations.

As I said, the impression created was to the contrary, and I think there were some absurdities as well. You know, I recall that the two candidates who just slugged it out in Winnipeg-Fort Garry, did their best to involve themselves in the flood. You know, did their best and struck out completely. I recall photographs of Mr. Axworthy and his canoe, appearing out of nowhere in a mist, in a brand new immaculate outfit which somebody in an article in the Press commented on, saying, "How can you keep that thing so clean?" And I don't recall his response, but he paddled into the picture, threw a few sandbags and paddled away as the T.V. cameras rolled.

Sid Spivak, a former member of the House, and a former politician — likeable, amiable chap that he was — he wrote a letter to the Deputy Mayor which he then published in his pamphlet. And it was I think, one of the silliest letters I ever saw in my life, where he offered to the Deputy Mayor and the city, all of his volunteers to help in the floodfighting. And he got a letter back from the Deputy Mayor saying he was sorry that they couldn't accommodate his workers in the manner in which it was requested, but that there's no doubt that some of those Spivak supporters were working on the flood, and there's no doubt that some of them did volunteer, and there's no doubt that the city owed a great debt of gratitude to the Sid Spivak volunteer campaign team, and a few individual citizens. So it turned from a mere offer into a lot of praise for what was, at best, a hypothetical contribution. —(Interjection)—

Well, at least I'll give Vivian credit for not trying to cash in on the flood. You know, when we look at the volunteers who participated in the flood, they did so regardless of race, creed or political affiliation. And certainly in the City of Winnipeg, there was very little opportunity for individuals to participate — nowhere near like the 1950 flood where there was a massive volunteer effort.

In my own area I went down to check the diking taking place in Elmwood on Glenwood Crescent and on Bredin Drive, and there were simply maybe a dozen or slightly more homes that were sandbagged and it was being done by the city of Winnipeg, so there was really no need for volunteers in the local area. So, Mr. Chairman, that's my first comment to the Minister. I see the handling of the flood as being an attempt by the government to take the whole credit, or to hog the credit, for the floodfighting effort and I would expect that the government would at least acknowledge that they didn't do it themselves.

The other specific question growing out of that general comment, Mr. Chairman, is there was a great deal of helicoptering going on and I don't know what good this did. I always wanted to fly in a helicopter and I recall having a free ride offered to me once in 1954, which I didn't take, and I never got another opportunity I guess until about 1970s — that was 20 years later — I went once with some Ministers on a tour of the potential flood of the Red River. It was a horrible experience. We were on an army helicopter and it was deafening, you couldn't speak to the person beside you. It was an uncomfortable and unpleasant experience and, Mr. Chairman, I didn't see any particular advantage of taking Ministers to look. Perhaps once, errhaps an inspection in the sense to see if the extent of the damage might be of value, but repeated flights by high profile politicians I think is really only for the purpose of giving them media exposure. I can't see any real value in the Minister of Highways flying up and down the Red River Valley to see how far the water is extending and I thought to myself when this occurred, I couldn't understand why these inspections weren't made with, for example, planes from the government air fleet. I also wondered why so many trips were made and I'm also curious, Mr. Chairman, as to the fact that these helicopters are very expensive to rent — I assumed they were rented — and I would like the Minister maybe to indicate how much was spent on these inspections that were made and how many hours or thousands of dollars were spent on these various inspections. So perhaps the Minister could comment on that initially.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, only a city member, safe and well protected by the Winnipeg floodway, could possibly make those comments. To suggest that we made the flood, to garner for ourselves some PR, and then to flood out the constituencies of Emerson, of Springfield, of Rhineland, of Morris, of Pembina — all Conservative constituencies — you know, I, and the government, and the Premier, made that flood so that we could travel around there and be seen by people who, as late as last Tuesday, again demonstrated their overwhelming support for a Conservative administration by winning the highest plurality in the province, and increasing that plurality, by the way, Mr. Chairman, really, I don't think that that comment can be taken seriously.

Now, with respect to some of the other comments made in a general way, certainly I would want to, and would have, and do now commend the very same numbers and groups of people that have worked in a tremendously co-operative way over the past month, whether it's the Armed Forces personnel that were engaged, whether it's organizations such as the Red Cross, the Mennonite Relief Disaster Service, or EMO staff, plus the very hard work that many public servants, civil servants, put in by various departments, particularly those in Agriculture, Highways, and Water Resources, along with Health personnel. And I too commend the media in terms of the co-operation and the coverage provided during this case. It was a very important part of disseminating information to those directly affected.

Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member indicates that he watched some or all of the newscasts emanating during the time of the flood, he could not have missed the fact that one of the most, I suppose, heartwarming experiences has been the tremendous degree of co-operation that did exist. The First Minister, on every occasion, took the time to commend, particularly our municipal officials, for their co-operation. Indeed, if the flood — and I believe it has been handled reasonably successfully — a large part of it is because of the initial and ongoing co-operation and communications that was established between the local level of government, which has the first responsibility, and the senior government.

The meetings that were held on short notice, the total involvement of municipal Reeves and councillors of the affected areas, the meetings that were held here in Winnipeg, that were held in Morris, and the only way to get to some of those meetings was to be helicoptered in for these meetings, was to assure this kind of co-operation. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the very success of the evacuation procedure, whereby the overwhelming majority of people looked after themselves, took the Premier's requests in the manner and the spirit that they were given; warnings were given sufficient time in advance; and people made their own arrangements in about 70 percent of the cases of the some 7,000 to 8,000 people that, in effect, evacuated.

So, Mr. Chairman, let there be no misunderstanding as to the manner or way in which the government responded to the situation. We had a difficult situation to overcome initially in the sense that while 1950 flood proportions has — and augurs up vivid imaginations of those people my age and older in the city of Winnipeg — the fact that we were experiencing that kind of a flood was very difficult to have people in Winnipeg understand, simply because there was no flooding in Winnipeg.

But immediately south of the floodway the flooding was as extensive and in some instances more than we experienced in 1950. And the damage and the heartache and the inconvenience to people, you know, was of a first magnitude.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member asked about helicoptering services. I indicate to him that the helicopter's principle responsibility was to provide emergency services. Initially, they were employed to a fair extent to the blasting of ice jams on various streams and lesser streams and tributaries of the river system, including in other parts of the province other than the Red River Valley, particularly on the Icelandic River in the north which we had a flash flooding situation there caused by ice jamming. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, that was the reason for the embarrassment, I suppose, that was caused to me as the Minister responsible for having to withdraw an invitation on a particular day to the Leader of the Opposition to go helicoptering, because the helicopters were busy dynamiting an ice jam on certain rivers. So there was no question as to what the first call was on the use of these helicopters. I point out that the helicopters, as is the case, were on standby rentals for the period of the flood and as such the costs incurred were not that much magnified by any individual flight. To enable the government to have the helicopters available to them we had to lease them for that period of time. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Chairman, those costs will all be available to us when bills start to roll in. I have no idea, nor can I give the member any idea of those costs at this particular time, as he will appreciate, that the accounting for some of the costs incurred is just beginning.

I might also indicate, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the item before us that the three items, three Orders-in-Council that I think the members are aware of have been passed, are in effect. One deals

with the private property damage done to the residents in the flood-prone areas. The other one deals with the compensation payable through my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, particularly the Water Resources Branch that assists municipalities in the repair and the restoration of damaged municipal roads, bridges, culverts, washouts. And the other Order-in-Council, which was the first one passed of course, setting up the Flood Disaster Board which consists of Mr. Elswood Bole as a chairman, Mr. Sid Reimer as the vice-chairman, and Mr. Bernard Ayotte as a member, a three-man board.

The \$309,000, the specific item that is under review here is, I am informed, the standard kind of averaged figure that is put in the Estimates on a recurring basis, annual recurring basis. The members are of course well aware that already a very substantial additional supplementary supply order has been passed for some \$5 million. Again, I can't give the members of the committee at this time any clear indication as to what the total bill will be.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think I can add too much more than that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just on that one specific, the Minister indicates that a number of helicopters were leased and that he's not certain of the total bill, but I assume that before leasing arrangements were made somebody enquired as to the price. I assume that the Minister isn't expecting to get a bill and then to find out that he paid x thousands of dollars per hour. I assume that an inquiry was made, a price was obtained and that the rentals were made on that basis. Can he give us an indication of how much these helicopters — how many there were, and how much they cost per hour, per day, per week or per month?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: There were three helicopters rented by Emergency Measures Organization for the duration of the flood. I assume the normal commercial rental charges were charged. I would be quite happy to provide the honourable member with the specific costs of the details of the rental agreement. I would have to go back to the department to find that.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, then I would ask the Minister whether he could attempt to provide that to the committee tonight, because I assume that it will easily run till 4:30 and then we'll continue for a short time in the evening. Maybe he could provide us with that information.

The main criticism I have of the handling of the flood, Mr. Chairman, is the manner in which there was an apparent reluctance on the part of the government and/or EMO to alert people to the possibility of the seriousness of the potential flooding in the spring. I recall reading some articles in this regard where government personnel said that they were afraid and reluctant to cry wolf, that they didn't want to be wrong. And it struck me, Mr. Chairman, that in their very reluctance they probably failed to prevent the wolf from getting to the door, that if one is going to err, it should be on the side of taking precautions rather than on being concerned with making a prediction or taking a position which then might prove to be slightly inaccurate or slightly embarrassing. There seems to be some problem still after hundreds of years in the province, hundreds of years of recorded history, after 109 years of the province of Manitoba and of the fact that we had a traumatic experience in 1950, which is practically 30 years ago, there seems to be problems yet. I know and I've already heard that flood forecasting is not a science but an art, but I assume that there is also a scientific aspect or component that you don't just look up at the sky or stick your finger in the ground to determine whether there is going to be a flood that year. There should be monitoring techniques well established between the United States and Canada; there should be people in Manitoba who are expert in making predictions and at least providing evidence and providing information to people who have to make those decisions.

I assume that, at some point, the government had to make a decision to evacuate people from the Red River Valley. To do so, they it was a very serious matter, Mr. just couldn't take a rough guess; Chairman, to tell people that they had to leave their homes and no politician worth his salt would do that readily. He would do so with some hesitation and only after some evidence and some agonizing as to whether that step should be taken, because there is a sinister aspect to forcing people to leave their homes and their residences against their will.

So my general question to the Minister is this early warning system, which seems to be flawed, and I ask him whether he is going to be able — given this latest experience which he has — going to be able to make some improvements to sharpen the procedures to establish more data to do something of a useful nature in an attempt to avoid a similar situation? Because I believe that the

delay was costly, that the fact that people weren't given sufficient notice certainly cost millions of dollars. There must have been a great deal of grain that was not moved in time because there wasn't sufficient alert or warning; there may have been some cattle or livestock that was lost or damaged as a result; there may have been preventive measures in terms of diking or evacuation; there may have been property damage to farms and homes and so on that could have been prevented, to towns or cities, etc., etc. So I'm saying that there was a very expensive price tag to the delay, and there was also a reluctance on the part of government officials to blow the whistle.

So I ask the Minister whether he was satisfied with the performance of EMO and others, and whether there isn't some room for improvement, and what positive proposals the Minister intends to lay before the Executive Council to ensure that we don't find ourselves in a couple of years, or another decade, in a similar situation and there's slow and faulty action in that regard?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member himself alluded to the fact that those professional people involved in attempting to predict the runoff, that they themselves always remind us that it is not an accurate science but a guesstimate, and we tend to overlook the qualifying sentence that appeared in every flood report that was tabled by my colleague, the Honourable Brian Ransom, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who was responsible for water control, that indicated that as the matter then stood, whether it was in early March or mid-March these conditions prevailed. Weather being as variable as it is, the unusual amount of snow that we had would not have presented a problem had we had a normal spring, and that was so reported. As late as March 22nd, the flood reports still indicated — and I remind the honourable members of the Committee these are the same officials who served your administration in the '76, the '74 flood, essentially the same professional people who have contact on a regular basis with the American authorities. It all gets fed into a massive computer, I'm told, in Kansas, that gives us the print computer read-outs in terms of trying to assess what X number of millimeters of rain over a particular given area will do in terms of water flows; that as late as March 22nd, the reports still indicated that while there would be flooding in the area of the Red River Valley south of Morris, but that area north of Morris it was believed that the water would essentially be contained within the banks of the river.

So I can't say any more. Certainly I would want more accurate predictions; certainly people involved — and these are professional people involved — would like to be able to predict with greater accuracy. I point out that when the information was starting to come to them on or about that date, the degree of accuracy is remarkable, when you consider the nature of the kind of flood that we're dealing with; a river that spews its banks and then stretches over a 60, 65 mile area in length and in some instances up to 20, 25 miles wide, to be able to predict two or three weeks in advance to within inches and centimeters of the height of water at a point 50 or 60 miles downstream, you know, I call that a pretty marvelous prediction. In fact, I suppose one of the things that is troubling the people in Water Resources is, should they be attempting to predict that definitively. It has its upsides and downsides. If you predict a particular level of a rise and then that doesn't happen, in the meantime a good deal of effort and energy is expended in the building of dikes or in the moving of furnishings or feed and livestock and the predicted water level isn't attained, you don't get any thanks for making those kinds of predictions either, although I think most prudent people will agree with the Honourable Member for Elmwood, it's better to be on the safe side in these kinds of predictions. But that would not necessarily save any government agency

tions t at were oo ar o ase.

The suggestion however that the member leaves that the people , , did not have advanced warning, I have to refute totally and completely. People were relocated in an orderly calm manner with no loss of life or limb; grain, a substantial amount was moved, and I remind the honourable member it was more a question there of dealing with other government agencies such as the Wheat Board and such as the railways, to get cars in place, and those efforts had started in late February.

But nonetheless, harmless from pretty severe criticism if we made those kinds of predic some 3.5 million bushels of grain, I understand, were removed in a very short order from the Valley prior to it being damaged by flood. The extent of grain that is damaged has yet to be determined.

There's ample time for dike-strengthening to take place in all the affected communities. There was ample time for individual farmsteads to make their arrangements with respect to livestock and cattle. One of our difficulties, ongoing difficulties — and here's where the media role was so important to us — was to have them tell the story, because I suppose it's not much of a compliment to us politicians sometimes; they tend to believe what they read in newspapers before they believe it when it comes from the lips of a politician.

So, it was important to have the media indicate to the people involved as the flood progressed. If there's anything fortunate about a flood — and I really don't think there is — but if there is something fortunate about the uniqueness of our Red River Valley flood, is that it comes upon us slowly. The water rises by 3 and 4 inches a day, and it keeps . . . And this is, you know, a half-a-foot a day over a period of 10, 12, 14 days, and there is this time, unlike some of the kind of floods that tend to have a more dramatic nature, where a dam bursts and overnight a wall of 30 feet of water pours through a community or through a trailer camp. That's not the nature of our flooding here in Manitoba. So that the people did have adequate time to do all the things I mentioned — to relocate, indeed to be able to on their own, in most cases, make their own private arrangements with friends and relatives, to move in a fairly calm and an orderly manner. And government, although it had the authority with the special Evacuation Order that was passed, to indeed force people to move, I can report to the committee that that was not necessary. In all instances, reasonable persuasion, usually by municipal officials or friends, family members, other family members of a few instances where we had situations where some persons simply didn't want to leave.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to elaborate on that problem about moving grain and livestock. There was, in May, I guess early May, there was a comment made by the Canadian Wheat Board's Chief Commissioner, W.E. Jarvis, who said that operations were hampered by the Eleventh Hour prediction that flooding would exceed the 1950 levels. He also said that in early March, that the Wheat Board had issued 500 flood permits, allowing farmers in the Valley to exceed grain delivery quotas, but no one was yet aware of how serious the flooding would be.

And he said that when farmers and officials realized in mid-April that the flooding would be worse than 1950, they were unprepared, that grain facilities they had assumed were safe were suddenly endangered. And then there are further articles appearing around that time, saying that about three-quarters of the grain from flood-threatened Red River Valley farms had been saved — some 3.5 million bushels — but some 900,000 bushels may have been ruined, and would be difficult to estimate. And there seems to be, Mr. Chairman, this main problem here about the removal of grain stocks. And, you know, I'm not a farmer, so I'm not going to pretend to be. But it would seem that when you're dealing with problems like Wheat Board permits, and problems of bringing in grain cars, having sufficient boxcars in the areas to transport the grain, and the very place in which the grain is stored, it would just seem on the basis of common sense that if there's any danger whatsoever, that whatever is necessary to get the grain out of the flood-threatened areas should be done. And if it requires Wheat Board permits, if it requires hundreds of grain cars, if it requires storing the grain farther away, or taking the grain to elevators in eastern Canada, whatever is required should be done, and no chances should be taken.

Maybe it should be a standard policy that no grain should be stored in a flood-threatened, the traditional flood-threatened areas, period. Maybe there should be a complete re-assessment of elevators in the area. And there seems to have been problems between the railways and the Wheat Board, and the farmers and the government.

So I'm just saying to the Minister, and also of course in reference to the movement of livestock, and so on, can the Minister make any positive suggestions about breaking some new ground, so that we don't have this reoccurrence, where you're going to have people caught off guard, and then you have log jams that can't be broken in time.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, if my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, were here, he would be probably outlining some of the earlier approaches that he had made with the Wheat Board. The concern was there. Earlier, far earlier than those articles that are alluded to, there was a very serious problem involving Wheat Board policies as they affect the availability of grain cars.

In early March, the Wheat Board had some 4,800 grain cars standing on sidetracks at Thunder Bay, awaiting the opening of the shipping season there. The permits, special flood permits were being issued, but no availability of cars. We went after the railways for the cars, they indicated to us that the Wheat Board had them all tied up at Thunder Bay. So finally an icebreaker was sent in to hurry up the shipping season at Thunder Bay, and some cars started to turn around. And then some cars were spotted here.

It is my hope that with a new government in Ottawa responsible for the Wheat Board, that the matters of grain transportation, railway car allocation, etc., might alleviate some of these kind of problems. I agree with the honourable member, there needs to be a standing order. That was part of the submission made by Premier Lyon to the then Prime Minister when he visited us, and certainly the efforts that we'll be making to the Wheat Board; that in these predictable flood-prone areas, excepting the fact that we have to respect the quote system involved, farmers may not use that to circumvent or get grain in place, or on a market ahead of fellow farmers. That's one of the problems when you have a total marketing system, but surely in the interests of saving, even if

the figures are right, if they're upwards to 700,000, 800,000 or 900,000 or a million bushels of grain destroyed in this flood, that's a massive amount of foodstuffs representing, you know, at \$3 or \$4 a bushel, a very substantial item in terms of flood costs. And it would seem to be and this of course is what the Minister of Agriculture and this government will try to do is to see that this does not become an eleventh hour operation every five or six or three or seven or ten years, when these kinds of floods occur that we have a standing order, that come February or March if there is any sign or any possibility at all of recurring flood that some provision be made to remove the stored grain in the Red River Valley.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some criticism in regard to flood forecasting not only for Manitoba but also in the United States and I would like to know just when the Wheat Board was notified as to a danger of the type of flood that we've had. Because back home in our environment around the farm, it was not difficult to see what was going to happen back home, just with the amount of snow we had in our own area and this has happened in the past. We've had other experiences as well. The last time we could tell what was happening, in 1974, that we were going to get a lot of flood, a lot of run-off. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether the Member for Pembina wants the floor or not,

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I am told for instance, the Mossy River Dam was not opened as soon as it could have to reduce flooding in our area. Like there's some of our lands are still inundated; I suppose some south of Winnipeg are as well I would imagine. But we did not experience the same magnitude of flooding in our area as what we had here but we had more than normal and more than usual.

But getting back to the question of the Wheat Board, I am just wondering how much advance notice did they receive. I would like to know the date. If any notification was given by the Mines and Resources to the Wheat Board to prepare — and I understand that there are other problems like over-quotas, over-quota permits that have to be issued — is one of the reasons why there were insufficient cars due to the feed grain policy? You know, the open quota on the feed grain policy where farmers have been loading grain cars circumventing there's no quotas, tying up a lot of cars and thereby eliminating many many cars that would be available to the Wheat Board because the Wheat Board was given the responsibility of allocating cars but then they had two systems involved. They have a system where there is feed grain which is being loaded outside of the quotas and they are supposed to try and rationalize this entire thing, and it doesn't seem to have worked that well.

So I'm just wondering whether or not or if the Minister could give us some information of the over-quotas or when the Wheat Board was notified. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: I don't want to take issue with my former Deputy Minister of Agriculture who is now the Commissioner of the Wheat Board, Mr. Jarvis. I think the situation is that the question of the 1950 type flood, you know, was relatively short notice, but I can assure the honourable members that the Wheat Board was notified in the late February and early March, six, seven weeks in advance as to the desirability of moving grain out of the Valley.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. In accordance with Rule 19(2), the hour being 4:30, we will adjourn for Private Members' Hour.

SUPPLY — LABOUR AND MANPOWER

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats(Radisson): This Committee will now come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 59 of the Main Estimates, Department of Labour and Manpower. We are on Resolution No. 77. 1. General Administration (a) Minister's Compensation—pass; Resolution 77—pass.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, I'm sorry. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is the item under which we could debate the Workers Compensation Board. Mr. Chairman, if I did not make myself clear, I will change the inflection of my voice and the structure of the sentence. I am asking the Minister whether this is the item under which we can debate the Workers Compensation Board.

MR. MacMASTER: It's part of the department — it's a board that relates to our department, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I believe the answer is "yes."

MR. JORGENSON: Just to make sure that my honourable friend is perfectly clear, the item that we're on is the Minister's Salary, and encompasses the entire Department of Labour.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I appreciate the assistance from the honourable member, so now we know that we could debate the Workers Compensation Board for which the Minister is responsible.

Now, I only have one matter to raise with the Honourable Minister and I would like his response as to — if he could indicate what the general attitude of his government and the Board is toward a type of ailment that the Injured workers Association has expressed concern about, and I think is continuing to express concern about. Namely, and I must apologize that I'm not all that fluent and conversant in workers compensation matters, but as I understand it, an injury may arise at work for which a person becomes eligible for Workers Compensation. And then, in the opinion of the Board and I suppose, in the opinion of all the medical advice, the person makes sufficient recovery to return to work. But from time to time, the ailment may recur or another related ailment may occur at a later point in time, which some medical evidence would indicate that its history traces back, you know, to the injury first suffered. But the Workers Compensation Board may look upon that second ailment, if the person has been off the work force, as being quite separate and apart and not arising from one's employment, which makes it then difficult, in fact, impossible to continue collecting Workers Compensation. But it's the general principle, I'm not talking about the specific details of any particular case, but I believe that — if I could put it in a nutshell — it's the general principle of the Workers Compensation Board to reconsider complaints of ailments, injury that may subsequently arise, but which really does have its origins in an injury or — and I would suspect the Canadian Bronze thing may even, you know, give rise to other types of claims — but anyway, that it may have its origins at one's job. But at the present time, the Workers Compensation Board makes that distinction — that the subsequent ailment, they'll say, is quite separate and apart and in no way related to the previous. But on occasion, there is some evidence to indicate that there is a relationship.

Has the Minister a comment to make on that? I believe that the Injured Workers Association probably expressed their concern more fluently and in better words than I can because they're more conversant with that particular topic. But I think that I've given the Minister sufficient information to respond and state the present position of government and his board on that matter.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the position of myself as Minister in relationship to the board I don't think has changed any to what it's been for many years, and that is that the Board is to deal with cases and deal with them as expediently and professionally as they can, which I think the record bears out. I can't speak for other provinces but I certainly know for the Province of Manitoba, they've got a very credible record. There are several appeal procedures that I believe certainly safeguard a person's right to get another hearing from the Board if in fact their particular claim is denied, right up to the claimant being permitted to bring his own doctor and his own evidence, submitting his own evidence. There's quite a series of appeal procedures that are felt to be very adequate, Mr. Chairman, but there will always be, not only in this particular instance but in other instances in relationship to all factors of society where humans are making decisions. There will always be that element of doubt, I suppose, by people who are not totally satisfied with the results of a Board hearing. I am sure there are people who are not satisfied with the results of court procedures also.

But to get back to the specific point, there is no different relationship between myself and the Workers Compensation Board as has existed I would think since the conception of the Board in relationship to the Injured Workers Association. I plan on meeting with them very shortly. I should inform the Member for Burrows that this particular group has had meetings — and I'm guessing — going back many years. I wouldn't like to say either ten or twelve, but I remember years ago being aware of that organization, who in those days were making representations to governments,

and this goes back two governments in Manitoba that I'm aware of, and making further representations to the Compensation Board. And I will be meeting with that particular group to listen to their approach to see if they have suggestions of a different type of appeal situation. Because it has worked I think well for so many years, it does not mean that new approaches couldn't be looked at or a new procedure couldn't be established. But I'll be meeting with that particular group shortly and the relationship that I have with that Board is as similar as any other Minister I think in the past.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, one further question, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the president or the executive secretary of the Injured Workers Association — I will use his name because he gave me permission to do so — Mr. John Huta, whose name probably is familiar to the Minister. Would the Minister be prepared to, either as part of the presentation on behalf of the organization or on a personal basis, meet with that gentleman within the parameters of the Workers Compensation Board because I appreciate that certain matters can only be dealt with by the Board and not by the Minister? Would the Minister be prepared to give that gentleman a hearing and use his good offices to see to it if anything more can be done or if any wheels can be set in motion to give his case as thorough a hearing as possible? Would he do that?

MR. MacMASTER: I just finished saying, Mr. Chairman, that I will be meeting with that gentleman and his association very shortly.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I was more concerned — not that I am not concerned about the general concerns of the organization — but I was primarily concerned about the personal injury, the personal complaint, that Mr. Huta has. Would the Minister discuss that with him?

MR. MacMASTER: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, there is no problem there.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This being the portion of the Estimates that we can deal with the Workers Compensation, I want to say a few words on the Workers Compensation before we pass the Minister's Salary.

I suppose if there is any singular item of business that seems to get more attention from constituents in having problems drawn to your attention, I guess it is Workers Compensation. We have, over the years, made considerable improvements to The Workers Compensation Act. Some have not worked out as well as has been hoped that they would. I refer in particular to the Medical Review Panel, I think one of the problems here is that . . . I wonder if the medical profession as a whole are really aware of the recent changes in The Workers Compensation Act, because it seems that the cases that are reviewed by the Medical Review Panel in the main are ruled in favour of the previous decision of the Board doctors and the Workers Compensation. We are not finding that we are getting that many reversals of the positions. I know that the Manitoba Medical Association is approached for this panel and I know that the doctor of the patient's choice can go there with him. I know that we also have a worker's advocate — I think it's Mr. Norman Hebert — but nevertheless, we still get complaints from constituents who have had problems with Workers Compensation and are not satisfied and I know the Injured Workers Association is one, and I realize that sometimes there becomes a neurological situation involved with accidents, and I'm not saying that one way or the other; I'm no expert in this field. But I must say that I am not overly happy with the results that we have had since we instituted the Medical Review Panel which we thought in many cases would alleviate and maybe even regress some of the wrongs that these people have.

And I just think of a case that I was looking at the other day here, of a woman who had had two medical review panels. And in reviewing the case and the presentation that was made to the Medical Review Panel, notwithstanding that the specialist that had treated her said that if there was any doubt in the matter whether the woman had suffered from a lung disease or the removal of part of a lung because of the working conditions in the plant where she had worked, if there was any doubt in that, the benefit should go in this case to the person who was petitioning for an appeal. Nevertheless, the Medical Review Panel in its wisdom saw fit to uphold the previous decision of a medical review panel and a previous decision of the board. Even though, in this case, the woman had had chest x-rays in the year previous to the time, showing that the chest condition was clear, but in probably less than a year's time, due to the working conditions that she worked

under — that is her claim — and the subsequent treatment that she had, she wound up with a lung condition which involved the removal of part of her lung. She received no compensation whatsoever from the board. She's had two medical review panels. I thought perhaps maybe with the institution of a worker's advocate that maybe we would be able to get some of these cases settled in a more satisfactory manner. Perhaps we should be looking at something within the Act.

Now I don't want the Minister to misunderstand me. Some people advocate that we go to litigation if people are not satisfied. I think that the success of the Workers Compensation has been the fact that we have a board. But that board and these medical people are not always infallible. There have been cases in Ontario where people had been fighting for many years because of asbestos which gave them lung fibrosis, other diseases that are associated with that type of thing. There are many products, as the Minister knows and I guess every member knows, that are now on the market and unless you can get a proven case that this comes about in direct cause from that. It's very difficult for people, and I can just think of the cases in Ontario where for many years the workers around Sudbury who worked where asbestos was involved, and many of those people — some of them have died before the medical people involved at that time actually came to the conclusion that asbestos did give them this problem.

So I wonder if the Minister would be thinking of maybe upgrading the position of the worker's advocate to perhaps that of a workers' ombudsman, something of that nature to give these people at least that one final kick at the cat. I'm not going to suggest that we would go to the final ultimate that I think sometimes the Injured Workers Association advocates, where if they're not satisfied they want to go to litigation. I think that would destroy the whole concept of what we have built up over the years in Workers Compensation. But I do think that we should be looking at this.

I also wonder if the Minister would be prepared to set up an intersessional committee of members of this House who are interested. I'm sure that there are members on the other side who are interested. I know the Minister of Health was always interested when he was the labour critic on this side of the House. To hear grievances and explore the possibilities of maybe upgrading the Act and making it better. I think we have right now maybe the best Act in Canada. I think we are financially sound. I think that we can make improvements. We can't just stop. But nevertheless there are still the complaints that are coming forward of people who are not satisfied, and I think it goes back to perhaps that maybe the Medical Association, maybe the Minister should set up a meeting with the Manitoba Medical Association to make sure that medical practitioners are at least aware of some of the changes that have been made in the Workers Compensation over the past few years. And they're quite substantial when you look at them from what they were years ago.

I also, at this time, want to say to the Minister that, as I said to him before, previously in committee on safety, again I would ask the Minister to draw to the attention of the board and perhaps the news media of getting some more publicity for people so that they know what they should do if they become injured. Some of the real problems that we have, unfortunately, and I know that they have always issued the little pamphlet "What I Should Do If I'm Injured at Work." Unfortunately people in the workplace are just like people anywhere else: it's not going to happen to me. And many of these pamphlets get thrown into the garbage cans and whatnot, and when a person becomes injured, you know, regardless of how minute that injury might be, if it's not reported, then if something serious does happen later on, or a serious consequence develops from it, the person is put in a very difficult position in which to establish a claim.

The written word, the spoken word and the visual word, and I say that in all sincerity. The visual word is one I think that the media certainly could help the Minister and the department and the working people of Manitoba, and if we keep people on the job working safely, that I think is the object of what both employers and employees, and the Minister, I am sure, and members on this side of the House and members on that side of the House are all working toward. No one wants to see anybody injured, temporarily or even permanently, that they have to draw compensation. I think that if we could have something on the media that would tell people — they don't have to be of long duration, as long as they are repetitive of some type. The Workers Compensation Board a few years ago did do a program on safety of about 25, 30 seconds, I think, on TV. They were quite good. They seem to have stopped them. I think they could also expand that: What I Should Do If I'm Injured at Work. And the process many people don't even know, because it's all right where the plant is organized because then they can go to your shop stewards and whatnot and you have a process of being able to process the claim.

But in many places and many plants the people are not organized. And they have to depend upon whether management is going to see that people find out what they have to do, and there's also a discouragement in some respects by management. I know because I've seen it happen. They want to keep their safety records down so they try and keep a person on the job, even if he's

just doing some light duty work at that time, rather than have him become a ranking injury or something like that.

But I really think that if we can make our safety programs, our Workplace and Safety Health Act work, can make our Workers Compensation better, then we have got to get the message across to the people that they have to work safely, and a safe worker is a good worker because he keeps his workplace tidy. And after all, that is part of the problem that many times causes some of the accidents. Not always, sometimes management is at fault, but sometimes also so are the workers at fault because they don't keep the workplace tidy where they're working. And these are the messages we've got to try and get across to our people, the workers and also to the employers. Because it works to their mutual benefit, because the less ranking injuries you have the less permanent and temporary disabilities we have, the less it costs everybody and society as a whole, and especially the employers because they are the ones who are paying in the main the shot for the Workers Compensation. And so it behooves them to make sure that the workplace is a safe place to work and that the workers are encouraged in good work habits; good work habits are safe habits. Again I would draw that to the Minister's attention and ask him if he is prepared to recommend that to the board, that they make a stronger emphasis on the preventative sector of the Workers Compensation, because, as I said, and I'll repeat once again, good working habits are good safe habits.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I don't know the reason, the same as the Member for Logan does not know the reason why there are not many reversals of board decisions. In fact I don't have that percentage. There are those that claim the reason that there isn't is because the board is again doing that good a job that the facts are supposedly borne out by the review board. But it's a very real possibility of meeting with the medical profession and the board themselves and seeing if a better system, improvement on the existing system is not possible. I agree with the Member for Logan that we possibly have one of the best Acts in the country, from my scant knowledge of Workers Compensation Acts. There was a time when I knew them all very well.

And the publicity is one that we can't let up on. People have to be made aware, and continuously we must inform them and assure ourselves that they're knowledgeable enough to know that, regardless of how major they think the accident or the hurt or the incident is, that they should be reporting it. That's where a lot of problems creep into the Workers Compensation problems that follow.

Just while I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a comment so I can read it into the Hansard about an error that was made. It's on Page 4284 of Tuesday afternoon, May 15th's Hansard. It's approximately half-way down the page. The article says, "Last year, 77 funded; this year, 77 funded. Those figures are incorrect. I must have been slurring my words, I suppose, because the fact is that it should have read "Last year seven funded, this year seven funded", so I thought, for the sake of those of us who review Hansard in off periods of time that we should be made aware that those particular figures are not 77.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to be brief on the Minister's Salary. I want to indicate that I did appreciate his co-operation to an extent, although I didn't always agree with his answers or his remarks. Nevertheless I do believe he was trying. I have to say also that at the beginning I indicated that we would judge him on his performance and that we couldn't blame him for everything that took place in the Department of Labour. And to that extent he's excused because there was a whole year of inactivity in the Department of Labour, and I would hope that in getting to grips with the department he would really come to grips with the Workplace Safety Health Act because that is a major extension of the Department of Labour which I believe can be a very useful service for the people of Manitoba in the workplace field.

I would just like to call to the Minister's attention that I did make some recommendation under the Power Engineers Act, in respect to ammonia flooded systems and he took as notice that he would have a review of that area because I do believe that there are some dangers inherent under the present setup, and as he well knows, having worked in a large industry, we become creatures of habit around the workplace. Safety inspections come along regularly, but they're routine, they don't always see everything that is apparent, and I would suggest that this safety review should have a good tightening. The regulations should be checked so that we become more aware and that the Safety Workplace Act is enforced so that the members themselves, in the various industries, become aware and work toward a safer workplace.

In the other area in respect to the Power Engineers Act, I would hope that he would continue to monitor and review the areas in respect to the licensing of engineers and the exemptions that have been granted on occasions. I realize that sometimes it's almost impossible to have a replacement of a certain qualified technician or engineer or other journeyman, but those cases should be few and far between, and I would hope the Minister would really enforce that area, because operating with unqualified personnel or personnel qualified less than necessary is a hazard and shouldn't be tolerated. The other thing is this, that it creates unfair advantage from one firm to another in that one firm can pay less for people who are less qualified and after a while there's a desire to snowball this kind of a proposition by other companies who say, "If one company can get away with it, why shouldn't we?"

We'll pay less too and say we can't hire anyone for the money we're prepared to pay today. And that may not necessarily be the going rate but that may be a reason why they're not getting the right personnel.

In respect to the elevator area, it has been mentioned by the Minister that he's going to have all of this reviewed. But I would suggest that in view of the fact of what his inspectors have stated before the inquest or which has been reported publicly, I believe that there too, there has to be a review and a tightening of what the people are doing. Possibly, if the inspector is indicating that it was no worse than any other elevator, maybe the standards for inspection aren't being followed that should be or else they aren't high enough, I don't know, I'm not going to prejudge. But I would hope that the Minister would look at it because apparently in this one particular building alone, there's been problems not once, but many times. And, of course, with the Minister's own words who indicated that the elevator in that particular building hadn't been inspected for quite some time previously, so therefore possibly this routine should be reviewed as well.

The only real area that I would like to indicate my displeasure with the Minister, is in the area of minimum wage. He came in with a recommendation after much goading and after much criticism from this side, and he raised it by 10 cents for the first raise and then 10 cents later on. And, you know, I would just like to indicate to him that I would like to know his kind of thinking on what criteria he based this. After all, it was his department that said there are approximately 30,000 people involved in this particular area. And I'm sure that they're not all single people living at home; that many of them are family supporters and so on, and that in view of the fact that the cost of living inflation has risen by some 9 percent — a little better than 9 percent, and yet, the minimum wage has been held back much below that — I just do not understand the rationale behind it.

In fact, the other day, Mr. Chairman, it was indicated that industry profit skyrocketed 58 percent in the first quarter of this year. Now, that is part of the inflationary problem I would imagine. Wage gains in the same paper were behind inflation. Again, an indication that even those areas, where it's been negotiated and where people have some kind of clout, improved their standard of living, they too, are falling behind. And in an area where the people who have no protection, who are on the bottom of the economic ladder, the Minister has just given them a 10-cent increase after more than 18 months. I thought that that certainly needed some explanation from the Minister. Either he isn't being fair in respect to these people or else he has no concern for them or else his arithmetic is out — I just don't know what it is, Mr. Chairman — but I would certainly like to hear from the Minister on that.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, as I said, The Power Engineering Act and the problem relating to it, I assured the member that that's being reviewed presently and it certainly is. The unfortunate situation with the elevator in question — I haven't got a thorough report on it yet — but we have not been able to determine the fault of that particular elevator at this point. It's too bad, I suppose, in hindsight, that we hadn't been made aware that there had been problems with that particular elevator.

In regard to the minimum wage, the problems I suppose that the Board wrestled with were ones that I had to wrestle with and give opinions from various walks of life the decision was eventually reached. I'm sure, I know that the Member for Kildonan does not feel it's a satisfactory decision. It was one that was felt that was acceptable when you related all the factors, other provinces, our province, certainly the numbers of people and the fact that the 30,000 does not represent 30,000 people certainly actively involved in supporting a family but there are some involved in that particular figure, I suppose. There's a large number of people who relate to the minimum wage X amount of cents higher in starting rates. And after mulling it all through, that particular recommendation came in and I appreciate the fact that it's not acceptable by the Member for Kildonan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to say a few words before we end the

Estimates. I want to talk on the minimum wage too, but I think my colleague covered the subject quite well, but I think your attitude was the same as the Member for Roblin. And during his speech, in favour of your 10-cent raise he made a remark, that if we raised the minimum wage it would cause inflation and prices would go up, this would go up and that would go up and the whole gist of it, he missed the point. There's young men making \$7, \$8 an hour. Inflation is rampant and these people are on a fixed minimum wage and they can't cope, much the same as old age pensioners; and you well know that story, where they're frozen on a very small income and they can't possibly live within the degree of comfort and dignity on the minimum wage or the pension plan. I won't spend much time with that, Mr. Chairman, because I think it's been debated at great length especially by my colleague — all my colleagues in fact.

One thing I'd like to mention is the inquests — I don't know how they are in Thompson or other areas — but if we have a fatal accident the length of time between the accident and the inquest is enormous. It runs into months but what happens, Mr. Chairman, is that the witnesses forget or they have a different view. They get soft, they move, they change and the time element is always in favour of the corporation. Many points would have been brought out at inquests, had the inquest been within two weeks or a month even after the fatal inquest. They're never brought out.

And an old standby, of course, and I think the Minister would expect me to raise it once more, is the jurisdiction of rights in my area. And you want to understand that, they're neither under Manitoba nor Saskatchewan nor federal when it comes to health. They're neither fish nor fowl, a good red-herring as they say. What happens when these subjects come up? Corporations are callous. They don't want to be under any jurisdiction but they choose the one that's appropriate to them. It is done time after time after time. I brought this up at least 10, 12, maybe more times. The Minister said it should have been done, and it should have been done. It should have been done when we were in power. I accept responsibility for that; it was my fault or partly my fault but surely the Minister of Mines has said it's a problem, a serious problem and we will do something about it. He understands and you, Mr. Minister, must understand this and to say, "I'll look into it," which the Minister of Tourism used every time she was asked the question. "I'll look into it, I'll look into it," but my God, Mr. Speaker, she must have needed her glasses changed because she never ever saw any answer to it. Then your answer is not exactly satisfactory — when you say we're making progress, we're making progress — my God, Mr. Chairman, when a turtle starts out from the west coast to the east coast, it takes one little step and he's making progress. And this is the type of progress I'm given in this particular problem. Either say you're going to do it or you're not going to do it. But let's not hedge; I'd like an answer on that.

Now Mr. Chairman, it was very interesting on the Health and Safety Committee Review, and Mr. Gush, he's the top man in the Hudson Bay Mining Company and he said conditions in the smelter, the zinc plant were terrible, obnoxious, not fit for a man to work in and he said to increase production we will make these places healthier and safer by better ventilation, a little paint, ventilation fans. That's some expense, but in the long run it would pay off with contented people. Young people won't work in those places anymore. With an example, they work two weeks, draw a pay and take off. People who work don't even wait to draw pay. The old-timers will do it because it's a habit with them; they do it day after day. But Mr. Calendar, who now is the manager of all mines in my area, saw nothing wrong with this. Nothing. They were appropriate, they were okay, nothing wrong with this. So we have two people at the very top who can't agree on those conditions.

And I'm asking the Minister, and he knows full well as I do, that something has to be done in that area. And, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister owes it; he owes something to labour, he owes something to labour because we put him where he is today, when you go back in his history. —(Interjection)— No, no, there's nothing wrong with that, nothing wrong with that. He's had the opportunity to go through the labour movement; he rose to be President of Steel, he knows the problem as well as I do — much better than some of the members on this side and he can use that to great advantage but I'd ask the Minister to work a little in that direction — I know he hasn't got the best portfolio in the world or on that side, probably the toughest portfolio, Labour and Northern Affairs is no cinch, but my God, Mr. Speaker, we don't expect miracles but we do expect a few concessions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: The inquest situation, Mr. Chairman, I would have to agree that there appears — and I just say appears — because I don't specifically understand the systems of setting up inquests but I'll certainly carry that message to my colleagues. There was one recently that I was somewhat concerned with the delays in that particular one. The jurisdiction one, I don't know who made the mistake; I believe, and I'm guessing it was 1957, when the federal government agreed

that Manitoba and Saskatchewan — again I'm not sure if they couldn't get together or they chose not to get together or they decided that it was part of each and neither could agree on who was going to have the jurisdiction — but the federal government at that particular time decided that it would come under their jurisdiction as it does today. I think what the Member is saying and I'm not putting words in his mouth, but I think he will readily agree that both provinces' legislation is somewhat more restrictive and quite possibly, we have greater faith in jurisdictional policing of legislation when it's more at home in that being provincial. I have assured him that we have renewed discussion with the Province of Saskatchewan and with the federal government on this particular situation.

The happening took place in '57, I'm somewhat aware, I believe it was '76 or '77, the discussions commenced with Saskatchewan and the federal government and I'll assure him that I will be carrying on those discussions and hopefully before long there will be a resolution of this 22-year old problem, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on the Minister's Salary. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I'm aware of the difficult time that the Minister does have, having the portfolio of Minister of Labour within a Conservative government. Because, Mr. Chairman, we have seen within the committees, within the discussions in the last year-and-a-half and indeed, Mr. Chairman, in all the years that I've been in this House, a certain attitude towards working people, a certain attitude towards the labour movement on the part of members of this government and, Mr. Chairman, on the part of members of the federal House, who are of the Conservative persuasion, in terms of their attitude. Mr. Chairman, so the Minister has a double burden, one is to attempt to deal with his Department of Labour and the other is to attempt to deal with his colleagues and with the general attitude of his government and many members of his own caucus. So certainly, Mr. Chairman, the Minister does have that particular added burden.

My colleagues, Mr. Chairman, the Members for Churchill and Logan and Kildonan, Flin Flon, etc., etc., I think have done a very thorough job of their responsibility in terms of taking a critical look at the labour section of this department and of pointing out the weaknesses within it; in pointing out the problems within it; and in suggesting to the Minister some positive steps that can be taken. And, Mr. Chairman, I am in agreement with them in terms of what kind of thrust that they are recommending and urging upon this Minister.

There is, I suppose Mr. Chairman, a problem that comes up both in the Manpower Division and in the Labour Division, the old problem of blaming the victim. That is, if the labour movement attempts to make progress, takes the only actions that are available to them in terms of getting a fair share, a fair return for their labour, then they are blamed for causing strife, even though, Mr. Chairman, in many instances the situation is brought about not by the people within the labour movement but by a particular attitude of management, and Mr. Chairman, I could cite numerous examples that I am very familiar with even within my own constituency and my own area, where problems of labour management relations have been in a number of cases specifically because of the anti-union attitude of the employers involved.

But, Mr. Chairman, this attitude across Manitoba in general, the attitude of employers in general in the province of Manitoba, especially the larger employers, Mr. Chairman, has undergone some change. These employers were particularly pleased with the election results and the election of a Conservative government. They were not pleased, Mr. Chairman, that the balance, in fact that labour-management relationships had been brought back into balance under a New Democratic Party administration, and they wanted to get back to the situation, Mr. Chairman, where there was no balance, where in fact management had the control of the power and the influence and labour had very little control, very little power and very little influence. And, Mr. Chairman, that attitude on the part of the elected government, quickly spread to the attitude within the various executive and management people within the management sector of the economy.

So what we have today, Mr. Chairman, is a general attitude that it is all right to get unions; that it is all right to get after the working people; and that it is all right to blame working people for the ills of our society. And, Mr. Chairman, my colleague for Kildonan pointed it out, that the increase that has been obtained by working people in the province of Manitoba has been far less than the rate of inflation; whereas the profits of the industrial sector has been excessive in terms of patterns over the last number of years. And, Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons that the profits are so high now is because of the wage control brought in by the federal government, which made no attempt to control prices or profits, but only an attempt to control the wages of working people within Canada.

And, Mr. Chairman, that is a problem that the Minister of Labour faces, realizing that the balance

is no longer there between labour and management; realizing the attitude of his colleagues, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I thought maybe that attitude was only the attitude of a few members opposite, but it appears to be a general attitude, and certainly of the two persons I had a chance to listen to in the federal election campaign of their party, both of them used the unions as a scapegoat for the problems of Canada — both of the candidates of the Conservative Party that I had a chance to listen to during the federal election campaign. So, Mr. Chairman, I have to suspect that that attitude is widespread within that Party, within this government and within the caucus opposite.

Mr. Chairman, there is that situation within the Department of Labour for which the Minister has some of my sympathy, because he is in a very difficult situation to attempt to keep some semblance of balance between the two parties. But, Mr. Chairman, when we move into the Manpower Division, the Employment Services Division, the Employment and Youth Services sections of his department then, Mr. Chairman, the Minister in that particular incidence has no one to blame but himself for the current situation; and Mr. Chairman, we have no one to blame but him for the current situation.

A major component of the Manpower Division was in the Department of Northern Affairs, which the Minister had the authority over since October '77, Mr. Chairman. Some of it was transferred from the Department of Education, but, Mr. Chairman, transferred in such a way so that in fact the major cuts within that section, the major purges of civil servants within that section came while it was under the Minister's jurisdiction; it's almost as if, Mr. Chairman, as if certain functions had been transferred to this Minister so that this Minister could do away with them or severely restrict them. And, Mr. Chairman, it is the actions of this Minister under the Manpower Division that has been the biggest disappointment to the northern members on this side of the House, but, Mr. Chairman, the biggest disappointment to the people in northern Manitoba in general where a number of the programs in this component are cost-shared programs with the federal government, they were cost-shared under the Manitoba-Northlands Agreement, and they give emphasis, Mr. Chairman, to northern Manitoba. A good part of this section, Mr. Chairman, relates directly to northern Manitoba, and that section is the one that has been reduced; that section is the one that has been less effective than it ever was.

And, Mr. Chairman, this in spite of the enormous problems that exist and these problems have existed, I'll agree, for a considerable time, but, Mr. Chairman, for the first time under the New Democratic Party administration serious attempts and serious efforts were being made to deal with these problems to attempt at least to come to grips with these problems and begin to provide some opportunity and to reverse the historic trend that existed in the northern part of our province. But, Mr. Chairman, under the stewardship of this Minister, that trend has not been reversed; the historic trend that caused the people in northern Manitoba — especially in the remote areas of northern Manitoba — to be in a disadvantaged situation. That trend has now been accelerated under the stewardship of this Minister, Mr. Chairman, who campaigned on a platform of jobs in northern Manitoba; who campaigned, Mr. Chairman, on that as one part of his platform in northern Manitoba. And, Mr. Chairman, never has the situation since 1969 been so bad as it is now in terms of unemployment rates in remote communities; unemployment rates, Mr. Chairman, even in some of the urban centres in northern Manitoba, and the lack of opportunity for people within all of northern Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30, Private Members' Hour, and in accordance with Rule 19(2), I am interrupting the proceedings for the Private Members' Hour, and will return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Under Private Members' Hour, on Tuesdays the first item of business is Private Bills.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING — PRIVATE BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for St. James, Bill No. 33 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Bel Acres Golf and Country Club. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, Bill No. 41

— An Act to amend An Act to incorporate United Health Services Corporation, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READING

BILL NO. 31 — THE INVESTORS GROUP ACT AMENDMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN presented Bill No. 31, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Investors Group, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 31, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Investors Group. The Investors Group was incorporated in 1940 in order to carry on the investment contract business, and incorporation by special Act was necessary in order to grant the company the power to carry on the investment contract business and to provide appropriate investment powers and restrictions in connection with that business.

In 1964, Investors Syndicate Limited, a wholly owned subsidiary, was incorporated by a special Act to carry on the investment contract business. At the same time, an amendment to The Investors Group Special Act, all of the company's investment contract business and all of its reserves and contract liabilities in connection with that business, were transferred to The Investors Syndicate Limited. Investors Syndicate Limited continues to carry on the investment contract business under its Special Act of Incorporation.

At the time the investment contract business was transferred to Investors Syndicate, the Special Act of the Investors Group was amended to grant the Investors Group broad powers as an investment company. Since 1964, Investors Group has carried on business primarily as a financial service holding company and has not since that time carried on the investment contract business.

The purpose of Bill 31 is to permit the Investors Group to continue under The Manitoba Corporations Act and to be operated and regulated subject to the provisions of The Corporation Act. The nature of the company's business does not require continued Special Act status and the directors have obtained the approval by special resolution of all classes of shareholders of an application to the Legislature for an enactment of a bill in the form of Bill 31, providing continuance under The Corporation Act.

Bill 31 provides for a number of amendments to this Special Act, which are basically administrative or housekeeping matters to be attended to preliminary to the continuance under The Corporations Act. These amendments include:

No. 1. The reclassification of all voting common, convertible, and common B convertible shares into common voting shares.

No. 2. The reclassification of non-voting common class A convertible shares, and common C convertible into class A non-voting shares.

These reclassifications will restore the common share structure to the position existing prior to the creation in 1975 of class O and class C shares, paying tax-deferred dividends. This change reflects amendments to The Income Tax Act, which have eliminated the right to pay tax-deferred dividends, and does not provide for any increase in capital.

No. 3. The removal of a restriction in the Special Act limiting the amount of the dividends on preferred shares to a maximum of 8 percent of the amount paid-up thereon.

No. 4. The deletion or amendment of certain provisions in The Special Act not now in conformity with The Manitoba Corporations Act.

No. 5. Granting to the company the capacity and powers of a natural person as permitted under The Manitoba Corporations Act.

No. 6. Providing for a variable number of directors and permitting the shareholder meetings to be held in any one of four cities in Canada, they being: Winnipeg, Montreal, Toronto or Vancouver.

Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed Bill 31 with representatives and legal council for the Investors Group, and I am satisfied with management's explanation and terms of the purpose of the bill. The basic purpose is so that they can comply with The Manitoba Corporations Act, which was enacted a couple

of years back. Representatives of the company will, of course, present themselves to the appropriate committee of the Legislature for a section-by-section review of the Bill if so desired and respond to any questions that members may have or may wish to raise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 40 — ROSSMERE GOLF AND COUNTRY CLUB ACT

MR. STEEN presented Bill No. 40, An Act to Grant Additional Powers to Rossmere Golf and Country Club, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 40, An Act to Grant Additional Powers to the Rossmere Golf and Country Club, the purpose of the Bill is to grant additional authority for annual assessment. The present legislation that the said Golf and Country Club operates under, was a Bill that was enacted in 1969 which limits the Rossmere Golf and Country Club to an annual assessment — maximum — of \$40 per share. The purpose of such a share assessment is to enable the Club to obtain from time to time the necessary moneys to make capital improvements to their facilities.

Rossmere Golf and Country Club, Mr. Speaker, like many golf and country clubs in the Winnipeg area at all times try to keep their yearly membership dues in line with other such facilities. And like so many golf facilities, Rossmere has a number of inactive shareholders who hold shares that are valued at a fixed rate of \$200 per share. The annual membership fees and the casual golfer fees at Rossmere are used to meet their annual operating budget.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that Rossmere Golf and Country Club, approximately half of the acreage that the Golf and Country Club uses is city-owned land and leased from the City of Winnipeg and formerly the City of East Kildonan. And Rossmere is one of the private golf and country clubs in the Winnipeg area that does permit casual play and does accept dues for casual play from non-shareholder members.

The annual fees and casual golfers dues, as I said, Mr. Speaker, are used in the operating budget and the authority for annual assessment powers will provide the club executive and staff the means of giving them sufficient moneys to make major improvements into their facilities. Mr. Speaker, what the executive members of Rossmere would like to do is to have that maximum of \$40 assessment per share removed so that they can do two things: place assessments against the shareholders, the active shareholders as well as the non-active shareholders, so that the shareholders of the Club will be the persons that will be charged the necessary moneys in order to make the necessary improvements from time to time to the Club, rather than having these improvements charged against the annual dues.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question?

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the honourable member would direct his attention to a concern that this proposal may involve confiscation of an existing share by an existing shareholder, in that assessments could be levied against him, and on his failure to pay he then forfeits his share. Is that not a correct interpretation of this Bill?

MR. STEEN: Yes, I would say that's a correct interpretation, Mr. Speaker, and I can cite a personal example. I am a shareholder of the Granite Curling Club and I did not join this past year and they have a \$20 share assessment. So my share, which has a fixed value of \$50, has been reduced by \$20, because I did not pay my annual dues this year and my share assessment. So if I go another year-and-a-half, my \$50 share will be worthless. And that is the same thing that Rossmere is trying to do, is to try to get inactive shares either sold back to the Club or get these inactive shareholders

back as participating members.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One more question then. Is it the right of any shareholder to sell back his share to the Corporation and get his money back?

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, in conversation with the executive members of Rossmere, I am led to believe that an inactive shareholder can sell his share back for the par value to the Club.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity I have to ask the questions because that will certainly facilitate debate. I assume the honourable member is not certain whether that is a right incorporated into the statute or the by-laws or whether it is an understanding, and I wonder if he would undertake, if he can't answer now, to be prepared to answer that in Committee?

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I would attempt to get the exact answer for the member for Committee, but at the same time I might point out that members of the executive are willing to appear at Committee as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

BILL NO. 29 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CLEAN ENVIRONMENT ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I stood this Bill for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

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

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the effect of this Bill would be that the Minister is in the position of being able to propose an abatement project. The Minister would then apply to the Clean Environment Commission for an Order declaring that the project is in the public interest. This creates two problems.

One is that the Minister initiates the project and if an Order is issued by the Commission, then there may be an appeal by a member of the public, but an appeal in any case, the Minister is then placed in a position of adjudicating an appeal on an abatement project for which he has been instrumental in initiating. That is one rather serious problem.

The second one is that the municipality would have no obligation to pay any of the costs involved in this type of abatement project. This would mean that the Minister would be able to put pressure on the municipality to participate in an abatement project but in fact they would have no obligation to pay. We would not be prepared to place that kind of leverage, that kind of pressure, on a municipality to try and force them into an abatement project. The alternative would therefore be for us to further amend the Act to pay 100 percent of the costs of such a project which would perhaps be attractive to municipal governments but is not a position that we would want to get into.

So while this amendment I believe was perhaps stimulated by a specific situation, Mr. Speaker, it does create these situations which I have outlined which we are not prepared to accept, and we will not be supporting the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Minister indicated in the preparation of his Estimates that the reason that he cannot help out a citizen of the Province of Manitoba, who is being ill done

by, by a municipality in the Province of Manitoba, is that there was a flaw — a flaw, Mr. Speaker — in the legislation. And he said that the flaw was that only the municipality could apply for an abatement program. Mr. Speaker, we have now removed the flaw, and the Minister says: "I want the flaw; it's a beautiful flaw, it's the kind of flaw that we Conservatives are proud of and we would like to continue the flaw".

When I introduced the legislation, I indicated that it didn't go as far as I wanted it to go because unfortunately I would not be able to obtain a message from His Honour. But I said that the honourable minister could cure that very easily. What does the Minister get up and say? He says: "This legislation is unacceptable because it would only give us moral suasion and give us a means of pressuring the municipality". Mr. Speaker, it could go much further. The honourable minister said there was a flaw. Why doesn't he agree with the legislation in principle and remove the flaw when it gets to Committee? Remove the problems.

Here is the situation, Mr. Speaker. We have a citizen of the Province of Manitoba; the Minister knows of this, who is right next to a sewage lagoon of a municipality. He carries on a business there. The municipality applies to the Clean Environment Commission, and says to the Commission: "We are prepared to go for an abatement program if this Order is granted." They admit that; they admit that in writing. The Clean Environment Commission then grants an Order permitting a sewage lagoon to run within 500 feet of a man's property. After they get that Order, the municipality said: "We changed our mind; we are not going to apply for an abatement program."

So, we went back, Mr. Speaker, to the Clean Environment Commission, and I will concede that the Clean Environment Commission then said: "Look, we would have granted this application whether or not the municipality had undertaken to apply for an abatement program and therefore we will not change our Order even though the municipality has welsed and reneged on its promise." And there's no doubt about that.

So there's no change in the Clean Environment Commission's Order, Mr. Speaker, but there is also the fact which they acknowledge, that there is a man, a citizen, who is required to live next to a sewage lagoon. So this citizen moved himself, Mr. Speaker, and then went to the Minister for help. And the Minister said: "I'm sorry, the municipality is the only one who can make an application for an abatement program." And when that is referred to him, he says there is a flaw in the legislation. But we've removed the flaw.

Here is something, Mr. Speaker, where a municipality apparently doesn't want to deal fairly. We never understood that to be the case. We understood that they had a problem and it's the Member for Morris, Mr. Speaker, who initiated this kind of legislation, or, I shouldn't give him that much credit. He was one of the initiators. Oh, I'll remind him of it.

There wassa hog ranch situated in a place which was subsequently built up residentially. The hog ranch was operating very decently, in accordance with the best environmental standards. But you cannot make a hog ranch into a flower garden no matter what you do; you can't. And what we said was that what has happened here is, there is an incompatible use of property. But the hog ranch is behaving decently. If the people in the municipality want to change it, they should be permitted to say that there is an incompatible use; that they should apply to the Clean Environment Commission and if the Environment Commission says they're right, then the municipality and the province would share the cost of moving the hog ranch. It was considered to be such fair legislation that it was unanimously approved by every member of the House.

Now if there is any person in this House, think that we were shortsighted in not thinking that maybe the municipality wouldn't apply. Maybe they would continue to let the hog ranch and the people engage in incompatible activities. Or worse still, that they would be the perpetrators of an incompatible use, and not apply to have the person that they are next to relieved. We didn't think municipalities would do that. But there's one that did. And the Minister agrees that they did. He acknowledges that that's what happened.

So, he said, "I cannot help this man. There is a flaw in the legislation." Mr. Speaker, we have moved a bill which permits the Minister to do the following simple thing: He is entitled to say, "I am applying to see whether there is an incompatible use, and I want to see what the Clean Environment Commission says." And if the Clean Environment Commission says, "Yes, there is," then all that we are able to do with this Bill is to go to the municipality and say that the Clean Environment Commission has found that there is an incompatible use. Will you please enter into an abatement program? —(Interjection)—

The Minister says, "That's pressure." What pressure? I'll show you what pressure there should be, and which I would enact, and which, if we were the government, I would urge be enacted: That the Minister have the right to say that yes, there is an incompatible use, that the Clean Environment Commission has found it, that it is the fault of the municipality, because of improper zoning which permitted incompatible uses to be set side by side, and we are going to abate it and it will be paid for 50/50 by the province and the municipality.

That's what it should be. But we can't introduce a bill to that effect. So all we've done is introduce a bill which says to the municipality, look, a commission has looked into this. They have found out that it's incompatible. Won't you do what is fair? And the Minister says that that's improper pressure on the municipality.

Or, wierder still, Mr. Speaker, that it is a decision which he himself has to hear an appeal. Well, there are two things — and the Minister has no imagination — there are two things that you can do about that flaw. One is that you can deny an appeal to the Minister on that question, which would be ridiculous. Or secondly, you can do what the Minister has done so many times. He has referred matters to the Municipal Board, which are then sent to him, and he can decide the reverse of the Municipal Board. How much different is that?

You can refer now matters to the Municipal Board, and you can initiate them. The Municipal Board can then send them a recommendation, which by the legislation he can ignore. I'm not saying he will ignore it. But the Minister is saying that because that provision is there, he won't do it. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are two ways of removing that flaw. For the Minister who wants to be flawless, or who pretends that you can be flawless, there are two ways: Amend the Bill, and say that when the Clean Environment Commission makes an order on this particular type of proceedings, when he initiates the Abatement Program, there will be no appeal. Mr. Speaker, that removes the objection to my honourable friend voting for the Bill. Now I hope he's going to vote for the Bill. I have given him a simple way out of it.

Secondly, if he's worried about the money part of it, I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is not pressure on a municipality to go to the municipality and say, "Look, the Clean Environment Commission feels there's need here for an Abatement Program, will you please participate, because that's all this Bill enables?" I would go further. I would say that if the Clean Environment Commission finds that there is an incompatible use, you must participate, 50/50.

But the truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister wants the flaw. He wants a municipality to be able to go ahead, put up a nuisance program beside any farmer in the Province of Manitoba — and I am talking now with respect to a person in rural Manitoba who has been ill-done by by the municipality. The facts are not in dispute. They have put a lagoon within 500 feet of his property; they said that they would apply for an Abatement Program; they welched on their promise; and the man is now sitting there, having to move himself.

Am I asking for something that is unfair? I don't know the man.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know the man, and even if this Bill was enacted, it might not help that man. But it might help the next man. It might help the next person who a municipality, needing a nuisance activity — and they do need them, and I don't fault them — and if they build next door to somebody who is ill-done by, they are now able to say, "There's a flaw in the legislation, and thank God for the Minister of Mines, he won't remove the flaw, and therefore we can say to this guy, who we've created a nuisance for, 'I'm all right, Jack. I won't pay you a cent, live with it.'" Because the Minister likes flaws in the legislation, and won't do anything to change them.

And by the way, when this was brought up, and he said there was a flaw, he was asked, "Are you going to change it?", and he said he can't change it this Session. Not that he wouldn't change it. So, to be helpful, Mr. Speaker, and you fellows know how helpful I always try to be to the Conservatives — (Interjections) — In a moment, Mr. Speaker, in a moment of outstanding charity and generosity and goodwill, I myself sat down, Mr. Speaker, and prepared — no, I can't say I prepared all of the legislation, but I went to Legislative Council, and I said, "What can I do to help the Minister, who has a flaw, and he's very busy and he hasn't got the time to correct it this Session. And since I am no longer a minister, I have time, and I'm willing to help him, and I will bring this Bill before the House and then he can deal with it."

Now, what is there in this Bill which is going to, in a moment, cause every Conservative to get up and vote "no", because the Minister of Mines hasn't got the courage to acknowledge that he should have done it himself, and that this is going to be helpful to him, and that eventually, if he is half the person I think he is, he's going to bring in something. But in the meantime he has nothing, and there is a Bill before the House which can be given Second and Third Reading and which will put him in a decent position to deal with the question.

But you fellows are going to get up and say, "No, we're going to let the municipality take advantage of that individual in rural Manitoba, who by the way is not entitled to anything unless the Clean Environment finds that there is an incompatible use, No. 1; and secondly, the Minister still has to agree to an Abatement Program, and has to agree as to the amount.

If the man is asking for an outrageous amount of money, the Minister is still in the power of giving him nothing. But what he said, Mr. Speaker, is that he can't help the poor fellow, because

there's a flaw in the legislation. The flaw is removed. In principle he has said nothing against the Bill, and I tell every Conservative member that he has said nothing against this Bill. He approved it in principle when he was in his Estimates.

MR. ENNS: The trouble is that, who is the removee.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, under the Bill, under the Bill, there is nothing that can be forced on the municipality, just moral suasion. I would go further, Mr. Speaker, if I had the authority to do so . . .

MR. EINARSON: You did, several years ago.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says I did. And I will acknowledge, I will acknowledge, that I and you and every other member of this House never dreamt that an Abatement Program would be blocked by a municipality. So, is this the first time — to the Member for Rock Lake — is this the first time that he's ever seen a piece of legislation that had to be tidied up in order to take care of contingencies. That's all that we're doing.

But we did do something. We did do something in the full expectation that the municipality would be decent about it. We were wrong. So we introduce something which still leaves it in the hands of the municipality, perhaps gives it higher profile. We say the Minister can ask — look what the Minister refuses to do — the Minister can ask the Clean Environment Commission, is there an incompatible use as between the municipality and this individual? The rest of the people in the . . . And if the Clean Environment Commission says "yes" and he is worried about an appeal, take out the appeal.

Then all you can do is go to the municipality and say, "Look, you've got this fellow who is now being forced to live next to a sewer. We have legislation which says that if you pay the cost of him moving, we'll share it 50/50." ' And the municipality says "no", under The Act as it is amended, we still wouldn't be able to do anything. But at least you'd be able to show that there was an effort. You could do something if you were a Minister of the Crown, because you could say, as is said in many other areas, as with expropriation, you could say, "If there is an Abatement Program necessary, then the municipality and the provincial government will pay 50/50." And I happen to think that's the way it should be, but I can't make such a motion.

But the Minister can. And the Minister says there's a flaw in the legislation. You know, he discovered this great flaw. Well, if there is a flaw, why is he not closing the flaw? Those are his words I'm using, not mine. Here's a chance to deal with the flaw. What we are getting out of this is that the Minister of Mines and Resources loves the flaw, and will continue it. And I think, Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous; that there is absolutely no reason why the members of this House, despite what the Minister has said, should not move this Bill to second reading, to have it heard at committee, and if there is still some problem associated with it that the Minister doesn't want to hear his own appeal, then he can remove the Right of Appeal to the Minister when the Minister initiates the request.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, what we have been told by the Minister, and what you are going to be voting for, is flaws. Those people who oppose this Bill are voting in favour of flaws, demonstrable on the evidence, admitted by the Minister, which they will not correct.

QUESTION put, MOTION declared lost.

MR. GREEN: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please. The motion before the House is Second Reading — Bill No. 29 — An Act to amend The Clean Environment Act.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Boyce, Cherniack, Cowan, Doern, Evans, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Malinowski, Miller, Parasiuk, Pawley, Uruski, Uskiw and Walding.

NAYS: Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Kovnats, MacMaster, McGill, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom,

Steen and Wilson.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to all members that in the future when votes are conducted, that members conduct themselves in the proper manner. It makes it very difficult for the Page to call out the names in a manner that we can hear the names as they're called out.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 19, Nays 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington, Bill No. 34, An Act to amend the Fatality Inquiries Act — the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 37, An Act to amend the Museum of Man and Nature Act — the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable for Wellington, Bill No. 43, An Act to amend the Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Act — the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 53 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ACT

MR. PARASIUK presented Bill No. 53, An Act to amend the Employment Standards Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the government would have been able to deal with this problem of employees being forced to take lie detector tests. It was brought to their attention last fall. It is a practice that has been carried out in Manitoba industry; it's a despicable practice; it's a totalitarian practice, and when it came to the attention of the government, I assumed that they would act to deal with this problem. And it was asked in Question Period of the government what would they do about it, and we were told to sit tight and wait. "Soon" was the response, "Soon".

And they brought in a Personal Investigations Act, which deals with the problem of lie detector tests being required as a condition of employment for a prospective employee, but that Act — The Personal Investigations Act — totally omits dealing with the problem of an existing employee being required to take a lie detector test. And as a result, the purpose of this Private Members' Bill is to ensure that employees are not forced to take lie detector tests and also that they will not be dismissed for refusing to take a lie detector test. It's a very simple straightforward piece of legislation and it's one which I believe that all members of the Legislature are in favour of, and they will be in favour of it if they don't let the type of incredible bias come to play as existed with the previous bit of legislation where it was a good amendment proposed by my friend, the Member for Inkster, and they refused because it was introduced from this side of the House.

I believe that this Bill is required. I believe that the people of Manitoba want this type of protection. I believe that they want this type of protection which exists for people when they have to go to court. Courts do not allow lie detector tests. Governments do not use lie detectors, but companies do.

And the thing that's rather strange is that when George Orwell wrote his book "1984", everyone thought that Big Brother would end up being big encompassing government. And I have heard members on the other side get up and sometimes speak with intelligence, sometimes rant, about creeping socialism, creeping communism, creeping fascism. But what they don't do, is talk about

what's actually taking place in this country, and that is that we have built in a lot of safeguards into the way in which governments operate. We've built in safeguards with respect to the way most confidential pieces of information with respect to medical records and tax records, are in fact looked after. And indeed there are instances, in a change of government, when a federal Liberal Cabinet Minister will not necessarily break the law, but be unethical — right, be unethical — in throwing out files. Just as there was an instance when there was a change of government in October, where one of the Conservative members was somewhat unethical and went through a whole set of files in the Finance Department and other departments, which wasn't called for, which was unethical, and the present Minister of Finance had to send out a directive telling him to shape out or ship out.

But, Mr. Speaker, the real infringements of civil liberties are taking place in the private sector. They are taking place because the private sector isn't policing itself. I was amazed to find out that such reputable institutions as banks force their employees to take lie detector tests; large chains force their employees to take lie detector tests. —(Interjection)— Now we have the Member for Minnedosa saying that that's a good idea. I thought he had some respect for civil liberties; I thought he had some respect for civil liberties.

MR. BLAKE: He failed the test, though.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, you're the one saying it. He's a bank manager; he has to back them up. When it comes to the crunch; when it comes to the crunch, he will back them up. But I want to defend him. I don't want the Member for Minnedosa to be forced by his employer to take a lie detector test. I want to protect his civil liberties even if he doesn't want to protect his own civil liberties. And I am amazed —(Interjection)— Not at all. I have some faith in the integrity of the Member for Minnedosa even if his colleagues don't. Some people have said that that faith is somewhat misplaced; some people have said that it's misplaced, but I wouldn't want him to be strapped up and to have some person who doesn't really know what they're doing necessarily —(Interjection)— Banks will never do that, the Member for Minnedosa says. But they have done that; they have in fact done that. They have in fact required their employees to take a lie detector test. The RCMP doesn't require its employees to take lie detector tests. The Security Forces of this government don't require their people to take lie detector tests, and yet companies require their employees to take lie detector tests and the Member for Minnedosa has said he wouldn't work for a bank if it didn't require their employees to take lie detector tests, and I'm quite amazed.

I hope that he will get up and join this debate and give his reasons for that; give his reasons for that, because I would fully expect that he has some appreciation for civil liberties. And if he feels that the present type of protection is sufficient, then he's badly mistaken and he is opening doors to totalitarianism. Real doors. Not rhetorical doors, but real doors. You know, we've had situations — this item first came to light when a constituent of mine in Transcona applied for a caretaking job, a woman in her 30s. She had applied for a caretaking job and when she went down for the interview she was asked in a very forceful way if she would submit to a lie detector test. She hadn't been in the labour force for a number of years and she thought that maybe this was the way things were being done nowadays. So she went home and raised it with her husband and her husband thought, rightly so, that this was ridiculous. So he contacted me and we contacted the Human Rights Commission. We asked them to investigate the matter, and the Human Rights Commission came up with an incredible ruling. They said, "Well, because this isn't discriminatory, because everyone could be subjected to a lie detector test if they applied for that job, we don't really have power to deal with it; it's outside our jurisdiction." There's a flaw in the Act. We now have spring flaw.

So it was left to the competence and creativity of this government to deal with the problem which I'm quite certain the Attorney-General, I'm quite certain the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs feel is a very real problem. But they didn't deal with it. They didn't deal with it. I will support that piece, that portion of the Personal Investigations Act which prohibits a lie detector test from being required of a prospective employee. But I do believe that it's important for employees, actual employees to be protected. And the best place for that protection to come from is from the Employment Standards Act, not from the Personal Investigations Act. The Employment Standards Act is an act respecting wages, hours of work and standards and conditions of employment.

And even bank managers are workers. Even bank managers are workers. Some are better workers than others. But all of them are workers, and I believe that their rights should indeed be protected, not in the Personal Investigations Act, because it may turn out that the government says, "Oh no, we can cover this in the Personal Investigations' legislation that we're putting forward and

which will be discussed in the Law Amendments Committee." But frankly, the place to protect the workers against this despicable practice is in the Employment Standards Act.

So Mr. Speaker, I'm hoping that this bill won't be killed by the Conservatives. You know, we're approaching speed-up. It may turn out that they won't call this bill again, because they will have the power in speed-up right at the end. They have that power to kill this legislation, but it's a very straightforward piece of legislation. It's a very straightforward piece of legislation, and because we're so close to speed-up I'm really hoping that this government won't kill it. There's a tendency for people on that side to say, "Well, if anyone on this side has introduced a piece of legislation, no matter how good it is, no matter how needed it is, no matter how rational it is, we will turn it down because it comes from the NDP side." And I hope they don't pursue that narrow course of action in dealing with this particular piece of legislation. Because if they do kill this legislation, then what they are doing is showing their true colours, because the challenge is now theirs. We've introduced the bill. All the people on this side of the House are in favour of this legislation, so it's up to the people on that side of the House to ensure that it gets passed. It's been introduced, it's been seconded. It's on the table. It can be passed very quickly, it can be made law, and we won't have a continued situation of banks or large chains or other companies forcing employees to do things which other entities wouldn't and couldn't enforce their employees to do.

So I toss the challenge out to the Conservative majority. I ask them to ensure that there is some time given to their side of the argument with respect to this bill. I feel that if they have any integrity whatsoever then they will support this bill. If they have any — if they have a shred, a scintilla of integrity, they will support this bill. I've listened to the rhetoric of the Member for Morris over and over again regarding totalitarianism. He, every once in a while, is joined in this respect by the Member for Lakeside, who gets up and talks about totalitarianism, and when you give him a concrete, specific example of creeping totalitarianism in our present society — and this is only the beginning, because when you think of big corporations bugging each other's operations, when you think of that type of spying that goes on, then you know who in fact is infringing our civil liberties. I think it's important for legislators to be aware and protect citizens against encroachments from government, and they've done a fairly good job in that respect to date, but I think that legislators have fallen down on the job of putting in safeguards for the ordinary citizen and for the ordinary worker against infringements of civil liberties by corporations, especially large corporations. I think this is a continuing task for us, Mr. Speaker .

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, the next time this item comes before the House, the honourable member will have five minutes to complete his remarks. The hour being 5:30 I am leaving the Chair and the House will resume at 8:00 in two committees. Can I get some indication from the House Leader — will it be two committees at 8:00?

MR. JORGENSON: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will resume at 8:00 in two committees.