

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Tuesday, 15 April, 1980

Time: 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions .
. . Reading and Receiving Petitions.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on Tuesday, April 15, 1980, to consider the Public Accounts of the province for the fiscal year which ended the 31st day of March, 1979.

Your Committee received, or has been assured that it will receive, all information desired by any member from the Minister, heads of departments and members of the Provincial Auditor's staff with respect to receipts, expenditures and other matters pertaining to the business of the province. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to examine vouchers or any documents called for and no restriction was placed upon the line of examination.

MR. McKENZIE: I move, seconded by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report same, and asks leave to sit again. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the 1978-79 Annual Report of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER introduced Bill No. 41, An Act to incorporate The Bethesda Foundation.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to, I believe it's the Deputy Premier responsible for the Superintendent of Insurance. Then, in the absence of the Minister of Consumer Affairs, I would direct my question to the Acting Minister, I believe the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier advise whether or not there have been complaints that have been filed with the Superintendent of Insurance pertaining to the obtaining of information on the part of life insurance companies, health insurance companies, the reliability of same and the criteria which has been used by those companies in making determinations based upon the accumulation of that material?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Can I ask the indulgence of the House to go back just prior to Oral Questions? I forgot to introduce to the members of the Legislature 30 students of Grade 6 standing from King George V School, under the direction of Mrs. Richards. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

We have 29 students of Grade 6 standing from La Verendrye Elementary School, under the direction of Mr. Mel Hanna. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question on notice. The appropriate Minister is the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. If there's any other information that the Leader of the Opposition could provide, it might be helpful.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as a further supplementary which can be also accepted by way of notice, whether if same to be the case, is the Superintendent of Insurance in consultation with the Minister preparing a code, a code pertaining to the accumulation of such information, as in fact is being done presently in other provinces?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice on behalf of the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister responsible for Community Services and Corrections. Can the Minister advise whether a request has been referred to him by the Minister of Health and Social Development for a meeting with the Manitoba Association of Friendship Centres, such a request having been made on March 3rd of this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I have been in communication, in fact I believe the letter went out today, inviting the Manitoba Federation Association to meet with me in my office - this is the Manitoba Metis Federation Association. Is that what the honourable member was asking?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question was in relationship to a request by the Manitoba Association of Friendship Centres for a meeting with the Minister pertaining to concerns that they have and wish to deal with, with the Minister responsible.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, a letter has gone out to the association asking them to contact me to make a date that is suitable to both parties, to meet with me in my office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Environment, or in his absence, the appropriate Minister. I wonder if the province has been informed and has any new information on the hydrogen sulfide leak from a CN tank car at The Pas, Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: Order of the Day. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Acting Minister of the Environment. I am assuming, Mr. Speaker, that they will figure out who it is on the other side so that they can reply to my question. The second question to the Acting, or the Acting Acting Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker, is what action, if any, the province intends to take, because the CN line does pass through the centre of the town of The Pas and does carry dangerous chemicals on a regular basis through the town of The Pas, I wonder if there are any plans in terms of what can be done and any preparations made in terms of The Pas and the possible danger if such an occurrence should occur in a more serious way in the future?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, both Acting members are not present, one through illness and one through attendance at a funeral. I will therefore take the question as notice for the Minister and respond later.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question that the Minister might want to take as notice or the Minister of Transportation might want to deal with: During a previous suspected leak of a CN tanker at The Pas, when they phoned the emergency number listed by the CN for emergencies of this case, the person who answered the phone said, "You were lucky to get me; I was just going home." I wonder if the province could check whether the CN emergency number is in fact available at all times should a leakage in CN cars occur in the future, an accident occur in the future?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I will also take that question as notice for the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I could perhaps comment on the last question from the Member for The Pas. I would like to advise the House that through the efforts of the Department of Northern Affairs, we are co-operating with other departments to hold a series of meetings in the north, namely Thompson and The Pas, the first week in May to discuss the topic of transportation of dangerous chemicals through northern communities. The various communities of the north have been invited to participate, along with other government departments and companies. The response has been overwhelming to participate in this meeting. The actual dates for The Pas are the 8th and 9th of May.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question to the Minister's comments, I wonder if the Minister will also be inviting union members, that is direct worker employees of CN, who are quite concerned about this matter, to attend this particular conference that he is planning?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, I can bring further details to the House as to the number of people that have been invited and those that are planning on participating. I'm not sure just exactly all the personnel that will be attending, but certainly I can bring this information to the House.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask if the Minister would ensure that members of other communities on the CN line, Cormorant, Wabowden, etc., are also invited and made aware of this meeting, because I am sure they would have some concerns in this regard as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health. In view of the fact that we have now information that hospital beds are not being serviced at the Health Sciences Centre, and now Victoria Hospital due to lack of nurses, can the Minister of Health tell us whether there are any other hospitals in the province of Manitoba where we can expect to hear similar information?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, thus far I have no indications from any other hospitals of impending bed closures due to shortages of nurses. However, I must point out that at this time of year, it's certainly endemic and certainly customary in Manitoba that there are some relatively minor number of bed closures in Manitoba hospitals, particularly in Winnipeg hospitals. There is a historic pattern of turnover of nursing staff in the spring, and in the intervening months prior to the time that new nursing graduation classes complete their studies and come on the market, there have historically been some bed closures in Winnipeg hospitals. They have not been disruptive and they have not impeded patient care in any way, and we don't anticipate anything out of the ordinary at the present time for this year. I have no indications from any other hospitals of impending closures at this juncture.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister was surprised with the news that he received from the Health Sciences Centre, and in view of the fact that when he received that news, he was not aware that the same situation occurred in Victoria Hospital, does the Minister think that it would be of some value for him to, rather than waiting for the news to arrive, and because the warnings that he has received to get in touch with the hospitals in Greater Winnipeg, to find out what the situation is so that neither he nor the rest of the people in the province of Manitoba will be surprised by such announcements?

MR. SHERMAN: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, and I agree with the honourable member 100 percent, that in fact is what we are doing and what we have been attempting to do all this winter. I might say that with respect to the closure of two beds in the ICU at the Victoria General Hospital, we were not surprised by that action, and the Victoria General Hospital reports that it is in no way out of the ordinary or an unusual action. In fact, the administrator of the Victoria General Hospital has reported that closures of one or two beds in the ICU there occur regularly from time to time. It's related to the supply of specialty nurses which is hard to measure and predict with any accuracy, but in terms of the general subject area and the closure at the Health Sciences Centre, I concede, Mr. Speaker, that the declamatory closure measure did catch the government and the Minister's office by surprise, and for that very reason, I am attempting to be careful in answering the first question of the Honourable Member for Inkster. We have no indication from other hospitals that such closures are about to take place, we are monitoring them, we are staying in touch with them on an almost daily basis, but that had been the case in January, February and March, too, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that there is sometimes a difference of opinion with regard to what amounts to a surprise, and Mr. Speaker, knowing my

honourable friend's disposition to closure of any kind, and being concerned with it, can I ask the Minister, by what mathematics - when he said it in the House it was some concern to me - by what mathematics he determined that 75 would be 10 percent of the beds, and that 61 would be 4 percent of the same figure? My impression is that 75 is 10 percent of 750, and 61 would be 8 percent of 750, and not 4 percent as the Minister stated in the House.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think if my honourable friend checks the record, he will find that those references were not made by me in the House in the first instance. They were made by me in the House in correcting a figure that had been publicized through the media earlier in the two week period surrounding the Health Sciences Centre bed closures. The original information that came from the Health Sciences Centre was that 75 nurses had indicated their intention of resigning, and that that amounted to 10 percent of the nursing staff. In fact, Sir, as I subsequently reported in the House, that number was reduced to something in the 60s, and in fact it worked out to 4 percent of the nursing staff. How the original calculation was made, I'm not sure, but I assume that it perhaps was based on specific full time positions rather than equivalent full-times, which involves a considerable number of part-timers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Labour. Since the Minister of Labour is involved in resolving disputes and appointing mediators in disputes, can the Minister of Labour confirm that the NDP executive have asked him for a mediator to resolve their differences within the NDP party?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Well, I have had some experience in mediating and arbitrating, but I don't really feel that the members opposite would appreciate my contribution. If I was asked to though, Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to be the arbitrator rather than the conciliator.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Economic Development, who has been very concerned about aerospace development in the province, and ask the Honourable Minister whether it is correct that the Voodoo Aircraft now being used, I understand, by the Canadian Forces, are being serviced or maintained by the Bristol Aerospace Company in Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether all of the service on the CF-101 Voodoo is done in Winnipeg, but I know Bristol does a very large share of it.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could confirm that there are approximately 150 jobs involved in this type of maintenance or servicing, at least to the degree to which that company is involved, that there are 150 jobs and that they may possibly disappear when the new military aircraft is phased in?

MR. JOHNSTON: The word "possibly" is right, Mr. Speaker. Bristol and the aerospace industry in Manitoba have made representation and will be making further representation on the servicing of the new aircraft. The federal government Department of Defence do not intend to keep the old one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if the Minister would follow this up, because I understand he is going to be negotiating with Ottawa. I wonder if the Honourable

Minister would undertake to use this in his negotiations, and that is that there is a possibility of losing 150 jobs at Bristol Aerospace and that this should be a factor in allocating work to that company here in the province of Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, I am very pleased about the member's concern finally. We have been bringing that to the attention of the federal government for the last six months.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. GARY FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. I wonder if he could confirm that in April 1974, under another government, when presumably there wasn't any major exodus of people from the province, there was an epidemic shortage of nurses that temporarily caused the closure of 350 beds in Manitoba.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention the booklet that you distributed to honourable members in the House, which indicates Rule #370, questions by parliamentary secretaries, and it says that those, such as parliamentary secretaries, who are clothed with the responsibility of answering for the government, ought not to use the time of Question Period for the privilege of asking questions of the government. The Member for River Heights is in fact a parliamentary secretary, Sir, and by the Rules that you have distributed should be clearly out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I'll try and deal with one point of order at a time.

The point of order raised by the Honourable Member for St. George is one that does concern me, and I hope that the Honourable Member for St. George will read his book of Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding on Page 58 dealing with points of order. I find he did not have a point of order. However, I would like to point out that questions of confirmation of already known facts do not serve to provide any further information to the Chamber and I would have to rule the question out of order.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of order.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish that you would have let me discuss the same point of order before you made a decision, because I was going to suggest that my honourable friend did not have a point of order, and I wanted to answer the question that was asked of me, but now you ruled it out and it is quite difficult.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister for Economic Development, and ask him whether it is true that the fastest growing business in Manitoba is the bailiff business, which is up some 400 to 500 percent since the Lyon administration took office?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I watched the same television program the honourable member watched and naturally the bailiff business in the province of Manitoba is up because of the foreclosures that are happening in the housing industry, mainly in housing, and I might say, Sir, that it is a very disappointing thing. Certainly, if the manufacturing in the province continues to grow as it has in the past two years, we will start to have that business go down.

MR. DOERN: I would ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, whether it is also true that collection agencies in Manitoba are doing a booming business, largely due to the failure of this administration's economic policies?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the last part of his question is that the economic policy of this government is such that we have the third lowest unemployment in Canada. We have more people working in Manitoba in the past two years than we had previously and that will continue to grow.

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

MR. DOERN: This is a more personal question, Mr. Speaker. Did the Minister know that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I do not know whether it is in order to ask a personal question in this Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: This has been bothering me for a long time, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister know that a frown is only a smile turned upside down?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the member that facetious questions should not take up part of the Question Period, I would have to rule it out of order.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Attorney-General. I would like to know whether the Public Trustee's viewpoint, as expressed in a letter to the Editor of the Winnipeg Free Press last Saturday, relative to sterilization procedures as they are sometimes performed on mentally-retarded people, is officially sanctioned and endorsed as governmental policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice and review that letter and respond to the member at a later date.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister may wish to take this question as notice as well, but I would like him to apprise himself as to whether or not there is a substantial incidence of illegal or unauthorized sterilizations taking place with respect to mentally-incompetent individuals in our province, and I would ask him if he could to report back to us in this regard as soon as possible?

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice too.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister reporting for Hydro. In view of the fact that companies bidding on the Burntwood Environmental Study were asked to keep their tenders open or their bids open until April 14th, which was yesterday, can the Minister now inform the House whether that contract has been let?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the conditions with regards to the proposals that are before the Board. My understanding is that the Board still has the question under review and in due course will issue its own decision in that regard.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the unusual circumstances that bidders on the contract have been asked to hold their bids open for five months now, will the Minister require those bidding companies to keep their bids open for a further length of time?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that I can indicate to the member that it will not be my intention to indicate any instructions to the people that are involved in the proposals with regards to the Burntwood Study. But I understand, to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the Board has asked to look at the proposals and will be giving them further consideration.

MR. WALDING: A question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister can confirm that the favoured bidder, James McLaren, was also associated in the same bid with another consulting company by the name of InterGroup?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm who is involved in the bidding with regards to this proposal for the Burntwood River. I would suggest that the best method of examination is when the utility is before the Public Utilities Committee that the member raise his questions and examine them in full.

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

MR. WALDING: A fourth question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to further ask the same Minister whether the said InterGroup has done a considerable amount of consulting work for the federal government and one of the principles of that company is a well-known Liberal?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, what we have got now is a continuation of naming people or naming firms in the House without their own ability to be able to reply. That sort of question should not be placed in the House. That kind of information, if it is of importance, can be directed to the Utility, or the member can pick up the telephone, if it is a Manitoba firm, and phone them direct and ask them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in response to a previous question from the Member for St. Boniface as to whether or not there were character references obtained from the RCMP or the Police when the Licensing Board considered applications for operations of casinos. I can confirm to him, Mr. Speaker, that indeed individuals applying to operate casinos or working casinos are checked with the Police.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister and if the Minister remembers I also asked him who was being investigated before granting a licence, was it the group that would share in the revenue or those running the casino? I also asked the Minister if somebody with a criminal record could be licenced or if there was anybody at this time who had had a criminal record that were running casinos in Manitoba?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I can give to the Member for St. Boniface a copy of the application by the organization to operate a casino. Indeed, information is requested from organizations who apply for the licence and information is checked with the police as to those people who actually do the operation of the casino or work in the casino. It is a hypothetical question as to whether someone with a criminal record could be approved to work in a casino. I suppose the Board does received information back from the RCMP or the Police. The difficulty I would have in responding to that, Mr. Speaker, is if, for example, someone has been convicted a considerable number of years ago and has obviously conducted themselves outside of the law without reproach, then obviously their record should not be held against them. So it would depend, I would think, on the circumstances of the individual employee or operator who applies, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to receive a copy of the application, but then it might be that I will want to ask more questions. It

wasn't a hypothetical question, I asked if anybody - well, first of all it wasn't just somebody working in a casino, but somebody running the casino, the head of a corporation or an individual. Then I asked, are there any of these people who had a previous record who received a licence, or could they receive a licence. Now I think the Minister will agree with me that in a certain area if you have a criminal record you cannot, to safeguard the public - I'm not saying it's right or wrong - but they cannot be licensed, and this is the question that I was asking.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Premier. Can the Acting Premier commit to the House that the government will table its position on constitutional reforms, the Quebec referendum and alternatives to that referendum in this Legislature before major pronouncements on these issues are made outside the House so that a proper discussion of the government's positions on these matters can be made?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that question is more appropriately directed to the First Minister, and in view of the fact that there are a number of things taking place in the next week or two with regards to the question of national unity, the referendum and so on, and in particular I refer to the western Premier's conference next week in Lethbridge, that I think perhaps the member may wish to give that consideration. I fully expect that the Premier will be able to deal with the agenda as soon as he has returned from his trip to Ottawa.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Acting Premier was would he in fact make a commitment to the House that before major pronouncements are made outside the House on these vital matters, that the House would be given an opportunity to discuss these matters and the Minister has not answered that particular question. Perhaps he misunderstood it.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the government is pretty attentive to following that pattern with regards to advising the House much more so than has occurred in past years, Mr. Speaker. I would indicate to the member that if that pattern is followed, that would certainly happen. If on the other hand there are decisions made and statements made as a result of interprovincial conferences, it could be quite expected that there would be direct statements made, so I can't give the member that clear undertaking. It certainly will be passed on and available to the First Minister on the record.

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

MR. PARASIUK: In view of the fact that I infer from the Minister's answer that he has committed to the House, that no major statements on national unity and matters of that nature will be made before any major interprovincial conferences, or federal/provincial conferences, I would ask the Minister if he would pass on that commitment to the First Minister?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that wasn't just quite the commitment that the member is putting the interpretation on. However, his full remarks are recorded on the Hansard and the First Minister will be most pleased to hear the first of the Member for Transcona's wishes and his own concerns about statements in the House.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct this question to the Minister responsible for flood fighting and ask him - last year he gave an undertaking in committee that areas outside the Red River Valley would be covered

under the program of diking of farmsteads and the like that were affected by flooding. Could the Minister tell this House why the Manitoba Flood Board has refused assistance in the area of the Fisher River watershed when applications were made?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Honourable Member for St. George, the reason is simply that a government decision has not as yet been made. It calls for an extension of policy that would enable the Flood Board to provide the same services beyond the presently designated area, which is the Red River Valley, to the area such as the Fisher River and other areas. That matter is being considered by government and at such time that a decision is made, an announcement will be forthcoming.

MR. URUSKI: If the Minister will check Hansard and recall his comments; I'd ask him to recheck it because he made statements that rivers namely, and he quoted names like the Icelandic, Fisher, and other rivers and streams in the province of Manitoba, he indicated those areas would be covered under the government program. Now he is telling us that that policy decision has not been made. Could he undertake to review his statements of last year and instruct the Manitoba Flood Board to look at those areas and consider the applications of those people?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the honourable member is confusing several programs that are in effect. Those streams that he mentioned, indeed quite a number of them are in fact covered by flood-fighting and flood-protection programs through the reimbursement of costs incurred by municipalities affected. The Department of Water Resources under my colleague's jurisdiction assists in the flood damages and costs that were incurred by municipalities in these streams. But the program that he is referring to, the individual homeowners or farmers who are applying for assistance to raise or move or to ring-dike their individual farmsteads, that program has not been extended beyond the Red River Valley. It is my wish and my hope that it shall be, but it is not a matter of government policy at this point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs. Since 1966 the province of Manitoba, in relation to the Grand Rapids Forebay Agreement, has provided a night soil and garbage pick-up service for all the residents of the relocated community of Easterville. I wonder if the Minister could now tell us why this government has reneged on this flood agreement and no longer provides this service to the treaty residents of the community of Easterville?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In answer to that question, the province feels that it has lived up to its commitment. Discussions were held with the previous federal Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, and he agreed that it was definitely a federal responsibility and agreed that they would be responsible for the night soil pick-up in those two communities.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is aware that the federal government has not, to this point, agreed with the community to accept these responsibilities and whether, Mr. Speaker, he sees the province having no responsibility in light of the Grand Rapids Forebay Agreement and the fact the province has been providing this service under both Conservative and NDP governments since 1966.

MR. GOURLAY: Further discussions have been held with the federal authorities and they indicated to my staff that the local officer in charge in

Winnipeg here, I forget his name, had the authority to make the necessary agreements with the reserves. We have agreed to provide those services, but at a cost, and we are prepared to continue those services. However, the federal government will be picking up the tab on it, and we are waiting to hear further on that. We are prepared to continue with the service, but we feel that we've completed our commitment and subject to the further discussions by the federal people and the reserves in question, we'd be pleased to co-operate further.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I want to address a question to the Minister of Transportation on another matter. I wonder if the Minister of Transportation has any good news yet about the proposal for funding by the province of The Pas Handi-Van Service and whether or not this proposal, which has met up to all the requirements of the Minister of Highways and is similar to a service presently being provided to the community of Steinbach, whether that has been approved or will be approved in the near future?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Manpower for the province of Manitoba, relating to the issue that was raised by the Minister responsible for Manpower and Immigration federally, in which they have announced they will be seeking ways of improving job-creation programs for the provinces. I wonder if the Minister can announce anything to the House regarding any discussions that he may have had with the Minister, or any details of any cost-sharing that may be available through the provincial government with respect to any new programs of this nature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I read with interest on, I think three occasions, the Federal Minister of Immigration's pronouncements in the newspapers as to job-creation programs that were being considered, were going to be in place and were being thought of. I think it was Press Release No. 2, that we sent a telegram to Ottawa to get some definition of what they were talking about and there was nothing definite that time. There was nothing definite the first time, and I guess to exactly answer the question, I'm not sure if there is anything definite this particular time. But when in fact the Federal Minister makes the announcement, I'll be pleased to inform the Member for Rupertsland as to what the Federal Minister is talking about; I have no idea at this particular time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland, with a final question.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, given the fact that the federal government seems to be interested in pursuing this type of program, can the Minister report to the House that he is instructing his officials to come up with programs or proposals which can be discussed with the federal government, with respect to job-creation programs? I would think he would be looking particularly at those areas of Manitoba that are suffering from high levels of unemployment at the present time.

MR. MacMASTER: I would agree with the Member for Rupertsland that the federal government and, in particular, the Minister, seems to be interested in talking about programs, but I haven't seen anything, and once I do, I'm prepared to discuss them with him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The time for question period having expired, will proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The first item of business is an Order for Return, moved by the Honourable Member for Brandon East, which I took under advisement the other day when the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport, in accepting the Order for Return, had some reservations about the third part of the order. Is there some indication from the Member for Brandon East to let it proceed with just the first two sections? Am I correct in that matter? The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, are you advising us that you're ruling Section 3 of the request for the Order for Return - are you saying now, that of these three sections, 1, 2 and 3, that Section 3, in your opinion, is out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. It's improper to ask a question direct of the Speaker. However, I can advise the House that I do have a problem. If I were to make a ruling on whether or not Section 3 is in order or not, if I were to decide it was not in order, I would have to rule the entire Order for Return out of order. I'm just wondering if there's any consensus to proceed with the first two parts, so that I would avoid making that type of ruling? The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, considering the dilemma that you are obviously in, we would then request an Order for Return respecting Sections 1 and 2 only.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that acceptable to the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport?

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that deals with the Thorne, Riddell expenses as well as the legal expenses, dealing with the McKenzie Seeds to date. We don't have any problem with that.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt that Motion then? (Agreed)
The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Minister for Government Services, 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 and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for Natural Resources, and the Honourable Member for Roblin in the Chair for the Department of Government Services.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - GOVERNMENT SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): Call the committee to order. We're on Resolution 72, 3.(a)(1)--pass - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the other day in the House I asked the Minister a question about the pickup of garbage contracted out, and there are some interesting developments there in that the city of Winnipeg, I understand, uncovered some price-fixing on the part of some of the contractors that they used. I asked the Minister, I think a couple of days ago, if not longer, whether he had checked which firms we were using in the provincial government, and whether these same firms were alleged to be price-fixing or in collusion in terms of contracting city of Winnipeg garbage pickup, and I just wondered if he had anything to report to the committee at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I don't acknowledge that the question was asked of me in the House. I do remind the honourable member, though, that we have passed that item in the estimates. It's of course, quite appropriate for him to deal with it, as I imagine we will deal with many items in general in the considerations of the Minister's Salary. But I don't mind, because the member asked that question earlier on in the House and I didn't have the information in front of me at that time, yes we do hire a number of contracts in the different districts. I can list some of them, in District One it is a firm called Acme, in addition to a firm called Browning-Ferris, and outside of the city there are a number of additional, I assume to be smaller, individual contractors that bid on this type of work. There are individual names, W. Isakowski and Son, in District 3, that's in the Brandon area, they look after such things as the Land Titles Buildings in Brandon, the Courthouse in Brandon, and we have a chap by the name of Mr. N. Spangelo looking after the Land Titles Buildings in Morden; we have Acme again in District Four doing some of the work in the Thompson area, so the answer to the honourable member is that, yes, this is part of the regular process of the Department of Government Services and, to answer his more specific question, I have had no information with regard to happenings at City Council. We have had no reason to believe that there are any problems in the area of garbage collection with respect to the contracts that we administer through the Department of Government Services.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister whether he would either phone or write or have his department or assistant contact the Commissioner of Works and Operations, or the Committee Chairman responsible for Works and Operations and maybe get some data and then determine whether the same people are being used by the province, and if so, keep his eye on the situation, because there can be some very peculiar developments in this area.

I recall a situation four or five years ago when a contractor asked for an increase, said that they couldn't possibly . . . This is sort of a different story, but it's in the same area. The contractor said he couldn't possibly carry on at the same price, that he had to have an increase of 50 percent or something. My Deputy Minister told him that wasn't acceptable and that we would re-tender the contract. So we re-tendered the contract. The same person who said that he couldn't carry on, that he was losing money, then bid at about half the price that he was receiving. Now, this is a very strange situation and the impression was that here you had a man, a firm said they couldn't carry on, they needed a big increase, suddenly they re-tendered for the new contract and submitted an entry of half of what they previously received, and our assessment was that they were trying to drive out everybody from the industry. There was always a lot of dark rumours about different contracts and who ultimately owned them; I'm talking about criminal elements, etc. But these were only rumours, so I couldn't place much credence in them. But certainly that was a very peculiar experience, and now, as I said, I understand, and it has to be checked through, I heard some news report saying that the city had uncovered some collusion. I say I think it's incumbent on the Minister to find out the details and then to see whether any of those firms are working for him and to sort of keep his eye on the situation, to make sure that there is no monkey business in regard to provincial contracts.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the honourable member that his concern will be acted upon by departmental staff. The Deputy Minister informs me that he has been in touch with the chief commissioner, and I think, what with the services of both Mr. Hryhorczuk and Mr. Coyle, who have immediate close association with the city, that we can avail of ourselves and assure ourselves that there will be a full and free flow of information on this subject matter and that if there is indeed a problem, that we would be in a position to have that information made available to us very quickly.

I'm also advised, Mr. Chairman, that we are going to tender on a goodly number of these contracts very shortly, particularly Districts One and Two here in the city, and of course at tender time one hopes that the tender process helps to focus on any of the kinds of problems that the honourable member raises.

Forewarned is forearmed, and we will be looking at it with a considerable amount of caution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(1)--pass; 3.(a)(2)--pass; 3.(b)(1)--pass. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the central Vehicle Branch, we had an interesting discussion a couple of years ago about the possible use of air bags in automobiles, and my impression was, at the time, that the Minister was sympathetic to the purchase of a number of them to test, but when I look back at some news reports from a couple of years ago, the General Manager of Autopac, J.O. Dutton, said that they were going to begin a test project which will involve the entire government fleet. There was a decision made by the Corporation and then three days later in the paper the headline is, "Enns Denies Air Bag Reports". Can he explain just what happened? Is the Minister not just interested in this area, but actually going to do something; is anything being done in terms of some air bags being purchased and tested or experimented with by the provincial government?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can recall that period of time very well. It evoked considerable discussion about the pros and cons of various safety devices, seat belts versus air bags. The Autopac Corporation, of course, has an interest in the matter of safety or a reduction in the bodily injury claims, and the Chairman of Autopac did indicate at that time to me - I was at that time also the Reporting Minister for MPIC - hope or desire that they would consider putting, for instance, their fleet of cars, which are not that many that MPIC has, or try to arrange for a test involving air bags.

One of the problems about air bags is the relatively expensive initial cost of installation, which to this date, I would suggest to the honourable member, has hindered the air bag from becoming an acceptable safety feature in our automobiles. Even though the air bag has in many instances demonstrated fairly high safety features in specific applications, specific kinds of accidents, but the installation costs run - and I shouldn't be doing this, but if I recall - into the several hundreds of dollars and possibly in excess of that now. I would have to indicate to the honourable member that it was perhaps largely for that reason that the management at Autopac at that time decided to forego that particular test.

They did, as you will recall, enter into a fairly extensive twelve-month study, evaluation, of the use of seat belts by having all accidents reported in Manitoba fill out a special form indicated whether seat belts were worn or not, the position that the driver was in in the car at the time of the accident. Nobody at Autopac and certainly not this Minister was attempting to present that data collection as a scientific study of the problem; it was meant simply to give us some Manitoba based statistics that we could use from time to time as we discussed the virtue of seat belts, the compulsory wearing of seat belts, and/or other safety features. It was in this context that the question of air bags arose.

The short answer to the honourable member, after a long preamble, is that no, no experimentation with air bags has been carried out by the Department of Government Services with respect to its fleet or in fact to my knowledge, by MPIC.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I have to tell the Minister that to me this is disappointing in that I think that the province has a role to play here in terms of public education and, given the provincial budget approaching \$2 billion, given an expenditure here for the central vehicle branch of \$7 million, it strikes me that the Minister should be able to free up a couple of thousand dollars to do some experimentation.

The other question interests me more and that is in relation to seat belts, because I know the Minister showed some interest or feigned some interest in this about a year ago. As I said, I am sorry to see that he didn't get an Academy Award last night. I was one of his supporters, but he didn't get an award, perhaps an honourable mention. --(Interjection)-- Well, I don't know. No, he didn't finish in the top category. But he was interested in the issue, as any Highways Minister is. I have never attended a Highways Ministers' meeting, but I am pretty sure that when they meet together in National Conference that the overwhelming majority are in favour of compulsory seat belts. I expected him to come out in favour, as our previous Ministers did.

So I wanted to ask him, he was just saying that there was an acquisition of data and I assume that was when he was . . . Was that as Highways Minister that he ordered that or Autopac Minister or was it as Government Services Minister that he was acquiring and accumulating statistics as to whether a person was wearing a seat belt in a specific accident.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that was requested at the time and volunteered, I must say, by the corporation, by Mr. Dutton, Chairman of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, during the time that I had the responsibility for both the corporation and the Department of Highways and Transportation.

MR. DOERN: So the Minister doesn't have that information available to the committee.

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't have that information available. I would suggest that the information would be available and I think was left with the Department of Highways, as well as would be an appropriate question to raise again at Public Utilities Committee when the officers of the corporation are before us.

Just before we leave, the member mentioned his disappointment about not carrying on even with some modest testing of the air bag question. I really think and I don't in any way suggest an attempt to shift the responsibility for that suggestion, the suggestion did come from Autopac as a possible thing they might consider. But I think really upon thinking about it a little further they realize that there extensive tests carried out on these matters by far more qualified associations and people, namely the automotive industry itself, by various different safety councils and consumer safety testing device associations in the United States, where under fairly sophisticated circumstances actual crashes of numbers of vehicles and cars with dummy persons in them, etc.

The suggestion that we, in a small way, should attempt to collect data on that matter and not rely on the data that is available, I think is probably what deterred the decision from proceeding to attempting to test something on which a substantial amount of money and a substantial deal of experimentation has taken place. My information is that the data and the experimentation is there. It's there to be accepted and it is accepted by some. I know that the Allstate Insurance Company in the United States automatically reduces your insurance premium by 15 percent to anybody that installs an air bag in his vehicle.

So I don't think it is a question of deciding whether or not the air bag is a worthwhile safety feature. The problem is the installation costs amounting to several hundreds of dollars, and this has to be incurred after every crash, and it could be a relatively light crash that triggers the mechanism to inflate and then it has to be, apparently, taken back to a dealer for reinstallation. It's the technique or technology of making the air bag acceptable to the average motorist. Apparently it still has something wanting.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, as the Minister responsible for the fleet and as also the Minister responsible for Autopac, is there any premium . . . I guess seat belts are compulsory on all new cars. In the event of an accident, if a civil servant is wearing a seat belt during an accident - well either wearing a seat belt or not wearing a seat belt - is there any relation between that situation and the settlement that could be offered in the even of injury?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I do believe that we are straying from the estimates of the Department of Government Services, however the honourable member does touch on the kind of direction and the kind of support that I was giving to a seat belt in the consideration of seat belt legislation. It is my belief that rather than compulsory seat belt legislation per se, that there are a number of ways in which the encouragement of the wearing of seat belts can be done. It can be done, as in some jurisdiction, by in effect having it accrue to the benefit of the wearer of seat belts at time of accident. The country of West Germany, for instance, has compulsory seat belt legislation but no enforcement, absolutely no enforcement of it. But if you are caught in an accident and have occasioned bodily injury and you are hospitalized, you are responsible for 15 percent of your

medical expenses. Now that's a pretty solid incentive to the wearing of seat belts and the incidence of wearing seat belts is fairly high in those kinds of jurisdictions.

MR. DOERN: You said 15?

MR. ENNS: 15 percent. Now I am sure that there are some maximums to that because I don't think it was meant to deny the person the benefits of a long established system of social universal health care in that country. But in other jurisdictions, and the jurisdiction that I was principally interested in was in reflecting an immediate saving on the premium of Autopac to the wearer of seat belts. You may ask, how is this policed. Well it is policed simply because there is a penalty clause attached to the fact that at the time of any accident occurring and the person is not wearing seat belts that it reflects back on his premium.

So it was in this area of seeking some incentives through the wearing of seat belts that I was moving. However, I remind the honourable member through you, Mr. Chairman, who has kept this committee in such good order and with such a good deal of decorum, that we are now discussing aspects that are not germane to these estimates.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just another related point here and I'm talking about the car fleet and I am talking about the Minister responsible for it. Has he ever encouraged, by memorandum or public speeches or anything else, encouraged the civil servants who drive government fleet vehicles to wear their seat belts or buckle up?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, I can't say that I have done that. I can also not say that I do it by example, not wearing a seat belt in most instances.

MR. DOERN: I think the Minister should consider encouraging people, still on a voluntary basis, which would appeal to him, that the people who drive government vehicles in particular but their own vehicles as well, should be encouraged to use their seat belts. Maybe a voice recorded message saying this is your Minister speaking and then a little message, "Your government loves you," and similar things.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we have made an important deviation in the purchasing policies of the government fleet inasmuch as that we are now purchasing government vehicles with radios. And so perhaps it is quite possible that a taped message from the Minister could be available to the civil servants as they enter in the car, first thing in the morning. They could switch Peter Warren off for a short moment and hear a brief message, perhaps a short song from their Minister, encouraging them to wear seatbelts. I'll undertake to do that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1), the Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In the Minister's opening statement on page 2, the Minister stated that as a matter of department policy in recognizing the need for energy conservation, the Central Vehicle Branch has been instructed to purchase compact cars for its Vehicle Replacement Program and an improved vehicle cost information system has been initiated to obtain better information on vehicle operating costs. I think this is a good thing that the Minister is doing. What I want to ask the Minister, if he and other members of the Treasury Bench - and the best way that you can lead people is by an example - that the best leaders are those who, by their exemplary conduct and behaviour, set a pattern that others should follow - my question to the Minister is, when the new replacement of cars in the Vehicle Branch fleet, for the Ministers will come due, will we be seeing Ministers, and especially the Minister of Government Services, driving a compact car?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the subject that the Honourable Member for Logan raises is one that we have paid more than just lip service to. Of the approximately 1,300 sedans now in operation in the government fleet we have some 258 of them are now compacts and this will be added to this year as we approve an additional 150 replacement vehicles which will also be compacts. That means that by the end of this year, 38 percent of the sedan fleet will be compact cars.

The question that the honourable member raises with respect to cars for executive council members; I can indicate to the honourable member that the reduction has taken place to some extent, in the sense that the manufacturer is now producing what a few years ago would be called a medium compact, is now the standard car. Perhaps the best demonstration of that is, for those of you who walk out the front door of the building, if you notice the Minister of Health's red car - I don't know what make it is. Is it a Meteor? That was the last car purchased by the previous administration for executive council; it's about two or three feet longer than the cars that we are purchasing for our present cabinet Ministers. But I'm not attempting to suggest we have not come down to the compact cars for executive council, we are going to the current class of what the industry calls the medium-size Chevrolets, Pontiacs, or Fords.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well then, the Minister, by his statement, damns himself and the Treasury Bench because, as I stated in my remarks, the best way that you can lead is by example and if you're not going to show the examples to others then I say that you are providing poor leadership. And I would state that the Minister review this policy and the members of the Treasury Bench. I mean, if you want - you're not just influencing the members of the provincial government; I think you would also set an example to other people in other walks of society in our province if they could see the First Minister driving in a compact and the Minister of Highways and others, I mean, by your example you will provide good leadership. If you're not prepared to do that, then I would say that you are providing very bad leadership because all you're doing then is paying lip service to that sort of a program. And the Minister has stated that they are not prepared to do that. Well, then we just have to, by his very example, he has shown that for the civil servants, they'll have compact cars; for the members of the Treasury Bench, well, they'll have something that'll be just a little bit better. And I think that is a very poor example for the Minister and especially, the Minister of Government Services, who is primarily the one who provides the fleet.

I mean, yesterday, when the Minister admonished me that I should be riding the bus here to work because I was asking him about entrance egress to the Legislative grounds, I would say the old adage that he who lives in glass houses shouldn't throw stones.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't live in a glass house and I don't throw stones but, Mr. Chairman, there are occasions in the true tradition of the parliamentary system of government where we look to the opposition to showing some leadership as well and the Leader of the Opposition, of course, had an opportunity of showing that leadership in the selection of his car in this particular item and he chose a car similar to the ones that the members of the Treasury Bench ride in. I say this, more seriously, that the amount of mileage that most Minister's put on - and there will always be in the fleet, we're not suggesting for a moment that we will convert the fleet completely into compacts - there are, and there will be the recognition of special requirements by some departments. I can think of some requirements in the area of the Department of Highways and the area of Northern Affairs and other departments where stationwagons, or because of the terrain that they cover and the kind of people and/or supplies that they are called upon to carry, or to keep with them, will require the use of larger stationwagons, vans, other than compact vehicles. And it's in that sense, I believe, that the Minister's cars, whose mileage is substantial throughout rural Manitoba.

When you look at some of my colleagues on the Treasury Bench who are driving from Melita; from Boissevain; from Steinbach; from Woodlands, that metropolitan center of the interlake and such areas and even though I was Minister of Highways and I came very close to making those substantial improvements to all our roads,

there still are some roads that require some additional work that my colleague, Mr. Orchard, is now working on, that the use of a standard vehicle, I believe, is entirely justifiable on the part of the Treasury Bench members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b). The Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Well, this is an intriguing subject. Being an old army chap, I'd like to know whether there's been any cost study done in respect to having a fleet and having drivers for Ministers. Invariably I see, and the same thing happens to most members when the House is in session, but especially for Ministers that their cars are here all day long and they're only driven here in the morning, maybe out for lunch and then back again and here for the rest of the day until they go home.

The other reason I ask is that, specifically Ministers, who are under a great amount of duress because of the work that they have to do and of course the kind of functions that they have to attend, whether it wouldn't be feasible and more cost benefit to have drivers for them, so they wouldn't have to have the chore of driving as well, having the car laid up for a number of hours being idle and whether it wouldn't provide a better and more efficient service for Ministers. Now for weekends the pool car could be utilized in other fashions, or else possibly most Ministers, like other family people, have an extra car at home anyways, so there would be no problem and if there was Government Services' involvement occasionally, there could be mileage provided. But I am just wondering if there has ever been any look at this kind of proposition and, as I say, particularly because of the kind of pressure that Ministers live under whether they shouldn't be better off being driven than having to drive themselves?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it is an interesting suggestion by the Member for Kildonan. I know that he is aware, as I am aware, that in some jurisdictions this is in fact taking place.

MR. FOX: Ontario has it, Quebec has it.

MR. ENNS: The question of whether or not a cost-benefit study has been done to see whether this could be done at less public expense than currently for the reasons that he mentioned, and the fact that a number of vehicles are tied up or are not utilized for a good portion of the day is something that perhaps could be entertained.

I should indicate to the honourable members that there was an attempt made earlier on in our administration to utilize staff, particularly from the staff of Government Services, one of our building guides and security guards. We were encouraged and I was encouraging particularly the Premier and/or other Ministers as they had business in the city particularly, that the problem of parking and the problem of driving, all the things the honourable member mentioned, as the Minister has his mind on other things, whether or not it wouldn't be just a lot more functional and less expensive, quite frankly, to have somebody designated to drive and who was so designated that if a Minister had a luncheon meeting to attend that a five minute call down to the front desk and a person so designated could take any car or a car, a pool car available, and drive the Minister or Ministers or Premier to these functions.

However, Mr. Chairman, I must admit either it is our great proletarian background or whatever it is, we somehow feel uncomfortable by being chauffeured, with or without black gloves and uniforms and hats, and the great propensity for individual driving that inflicts most North Americans is still very much evident with these Treasury Bench Ministers. That experiment lasted only a few weeks, and the Premier and everybody else is jumping into their cars and driving. I might add that I could hope that some Ministers shouldn't drive as much. The repairs to the automobiles might be reduced from time to time. I better not get into that or else I will get into trouble with my Cabinet colleagues.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, aside from the philosophical levity that the Minister wanted to inject, I should also like to say that from a preventive maintenance point of view, professional drivers would look after vehicles much

more attentively than Ministers or than even I do for my own vehicle, because we have a tendency to procrastinate and put things off because we have others things which are more important than the vehicle at the moment. So I would suggest that the Minister have a hard look at this, that his department do a study, because in my opinion there are very many benefiting facets to having a chauffeur-driver Executive Council and possibly some others who are involved and who necessitate having cars. It could probably be more efficient than assigning one vehicle to each individual and with having four or five extra empty seats driving around the city, paying for parking and a lot of other things, as the Minister mentioned.

I would hope the Minister would have a hard look at this and see whether he can't get some indication from his staff, aside from the desire by the Ministers to do their own driving. I think human nature being what it is, it takes a little while for us to change our attitudes and sometimes we have to be pressured into doing it, even though it is for our own benefit. Like somebody should twist my arm that I should stop smoking. They haven't done it hard enough because I can't make the decision myself. But I think there would be benefits if the Ministers and some of the other top officials were chauffeur-driven. We would probably use less cars. They would be better maintained by professional drivers. There would be less charges on parking and a number of other things. So I hope the Minister will look at it.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there is a sizable increase here in acquisition costs. Last year there was a \$1.5 million allocated for vehicle replacement and this year it is \$2 million dollars. Can the Minister explain why there is a one-third increase in this particular item?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That really comes in 3.(b)(3). We should maybe stay with 3.(b)(1). 3.(b)(1)--pass; 3.(b)(2)--pass; 3.(b)(3) - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: The same question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENNS: I believed I mentioned this, either in my opening statement or earlier, that the fleet was allowed to age very seriously, as members are aware. The decision made by the former administration in 1976, I believe it was, to extend the mileage prior to replacement from 60,000 to 80,000 miles contributed to that and then our own indecision for a period of time while we examined the whole question of retention of the fleet and/or other policies relative to the fleet kept the policy decision to remain at 80,000 miles, to the extent that by deferring of the replacement program last spring resulted that upwards to 41 percent of the fleet had exceeded the four-year criteria for replacement and 32 percent of the fleet were expected to exceed 80,000 miles. The decision was made after a pretty serious and exhaustive study that continuation of the government-owned fleet was for government purposes in the best interests, and the determination to go back to the replacement policy that was in existence prior to 1976: That is 60,000 miles and replacement takes place, or four years leave that has required a pretty hefty increase in the numbers of replacement vehicles that this appropriation covers and essentially that is what is being reflected in this \$500,000 increase.

I must indicate to the honourable members that it could likely be higher than that when the actual costs are in for this year, when we report to the House next year.

MR. DOERN: In short the Minister is saying that the policy on the consideration of selling the fleet and leasing the vehicles has been abandoned and that they are now back to a three-year, 60,000 mile position, which was the previous administration's policy?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the leap is too fast, I am advised that we are now at 4 and 80, and enforcing it. We were beyond that in the last year already and we are moving to 3 and 60, which was the original policy, I think, that the Honourable Member for Elmwood is familiar with. We will of course be assessing very carefully the cost implications of having a substantial portion of the fleet

using compact vehicles. It could be that the compact vehicle requires a different replacement policy than the policy that has been in effect for a number of years.

Two answer the honourable member directly about the policy with respect to the fleet, yes. There has been an acceptance of the fact that for provincial government purposes the advantages of leasing are not of the kind that make it attractive for us to change our policy.

I might point out that there are different reasons for this. For instance, I am informed that the city of Winnipeg has just recently gone to a lease program and one of the advantages that the city of Winnipeg for instance doesn't have that we have is in the area of federal tax, and so the other advantages are of course the apparent and very obvious advantages to the private sector for leasing, in terms of their capability of writing against their tax problems. The government, as such, doesn't have those problems so the obvious advantages which at first flush appear to be there for a leasing program in effect, coupled with the substantial purchasing power that the government has obviate the advantages of leasing.

The fleet by the way is currently standing at some 2,400 vehicles. There was a reduction of some 60, 70 vehicles during the last few years. There's been some increase in the last year or two, the actual figures for instance, we had in September of 1979, 2,495 vehicles. They were made up in the following categories: 1,309 sedans, 121 wagons, 558 vans, and 507 trucks, for a total of 2,495 vehicles. We disposed of 55 vehicles during the year and we are now at 2,440 vehicles.

I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that there will be some further reductions, although small of nature. that would bring down our total by the end of this year to somewhere in the order of 2,410.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, this question is relevant to this whole section about telephones and post office, etc. Can we have some figures on the number of civil servants now as compared to the last couple of years? I'd like to know whether the numbers are increasing or holding, or what.

MR. ENNS: In the Department of Government Services?

MR. DOERN: No, in the whole Civil Service.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have that information, although not with me. It would be of course, I am sure, it's on the record, it has been given and information asked for and the answers supplied during the estimates of my colleague, the Minister of Labour responsible for the Civil Service. I haven't got the figures that I can refer to in front of me. I can give him the figures for the Department of Government Services but that would not be giving him the full . . .

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could between now and 8:00 o'clock obtain those figures because it is quite relevant to this section and although we will probably get through the section, I might want to make some comment on that, if he could get us that by 8:00 o'clock.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'd be more than happy to undertake to have that information for the honourable member prior to 8:00 o'clock tonight or at 8:00 o'clock tonight, if that's agreeable to the honourable member, that it would not necessarily hold up the line-by-line consideration of further parts of the estimates at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(3)--pass; 3.(c)(1)--pass; 3.(c)(2)--pass; 3.(d)(1)--pass - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, one question there. Again, it's a bothersome one. But can the Minister indicate how there could be a reduction in the purchasing requirements of the government? There appears to be a \$23,000 reduction here. I assume prices are going up and that needs are holding or increasing. How can there be a reduction here?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the department of Purchasing perhaps is a department that Government Services senior staff has directed an inordinate amount of attention to. There has been over the years, I suppose felt necessary at the time, but an overlay and overlay of paper work and the whole purchasing procedure becomes so awkward and requiring a great deal of unnecessary paper shuffling that we have made some very substantial changes in the purchasing bureau.

For instance, on these four or five issues alone the introduction of direct purchase order system is being implemented into Government Services effective April 1st. It is our intention, if this works out reasonably well in Government Services, to expand this to other line departments and other departments will be introduced to this shortly thereafter. The departments have of course been involved in the establishment of this system all along in its development.

Some of the advantages of this system are as follows: It will allow all departments to do more local purchasing. It has been a constant complaint - I hear the complaints from northern members and I hear the complaints from rural members - that the overly centralized purchasing has fairly well dictated that most, if not all, the purchasing is done in the city of Winnipeg and particularly where items are available at competitive prices that if the Department of Highways requires them in Thompson that the department be authorized to purchase them in the local regions. It will bring uniformity to the local purchasing now taking place.

What the former Minister of Government Services and Public Works is well aware of is that, due to the cumbersomeness of the purchasing procedure, the amount of what was referred to as emergency purchasing amounted into the millions of dollars, which obviously reflected the fact that departments were blatantly expressing their frustration at the system and calling everything an emergency purchase. The auditor from time to time pointed that out to Ministers of Government Services.

So this will bring uniformity to the local purchasing now taking place. There are several local forms of local purchase orders now being used by the different departments. We had actually counted up to 23 different types of forms being used for government purchases. This has now been changed to just 2 or 3. It will bring uniform controls to local purchasing. Each department now has its own. A limit of \$250 has been set for the local purchase order. Over this amount, emergency purchase orders would still have to be used. In other words, the reduction that is indicated, it's minute in this department but nonetheless it hasn't grown, is brought about because of substantial changes of this nature, also the substantial introduction of automation in the process of purchasing, better inventory control.

Well, I could indicate to the honourable members some additional benefits of the direct and local system of purchasing, but this is a new departure in the Department of Government Services. We are bringing it into effect in the Department of Government Services first. We have hopes of introducing it to the other departments as we are satisfied it's working in our department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)(1)--pass; 3.(d)(2)--pass; 3.(e)(1)--pass; 3.(e)(2)--pass; 3.(e)(3)--pass; 3.(f) - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I note that there is a reduction in expenditure on telephones. I wonder if the Minister can explain whether there are more civil servants on an extension phone, or just how this works. I know on some lines there's a Mountie, but I assume we're not paying for him.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the reduction is due as a result of the removal of a Watts line from one of the buildings at Century Plaza. The department of these two buildings will have to use DDT, Direct Dial system, and pay for it from their 1981 budgets. There were several instances where Watts privileges had been extended where expenditures that could just not be rationalized and justified were being incurred, not so much by government employees of Government Services, but by ancillary persons that had access to, or were available to the Watts system. I know of one particular instance where an immediate cost saving of some \$6,000 was involved.

We continue to provide the Watts service in the Legislative Building, the Norquay, the Woodsworth, Archives Building, 55 Carlton Street, 270 Osborne Street, and in additional various locations occupied by government staff in the downtown area as well as the Fort Osborne and Dublin and St. James complexes. There has been some tightening up of the amount of telephones required.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(f)(1)--pass; 3.(f)(2)--pass; 3.(g)(1) - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can give us any indication of how much money is spent by the government for these messenger services, these Zippers and Bisons and Pony Express, Pink Ladies. I was quite taken aback one day talking to a staunch member of the New Democratic Party, a young woman who told me that she was calling a messenger, and I said, "Which one?" and she said she was calling a Pink Person, because she couldn't bring herself to say that it was a Pink Lady. But I just wondered, do you feel that you have a handle on this sort of extra-curricular vehicle here, and also, do you know how much money is spent out of the departments or behind your back on accessing this form of communication which is fairly expensive?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that figure is not available to us in Government Services. We could provide it for our own department but these expenses are borne by the line departments, that is the Department of Health, the Department of Education. If they have occasion to use the Pink Lady they pay for her. I must suggest to the honourable member that it would, of course, be possible for him to arrive at that figure by careful perusal of Public Accounts, where all payments made by the province of Manitoba to businesses or individuals are listed. But it is not centred within Government Services and we could not begin to give the member a figure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(g)(1)--pass; 3.(g)(2)--pass; 3.(g)(3)--pass; 3.(h)(1) - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Churchill has been imported for this debate at great expense - by polar bear, I think and I want to ask the Minister about a problem that occurred several years ago and if he can enlighten us. It was discovered four years ago, or a little longer, that in the Norquay Building they were storing chemicals in the corridors. There were experiments taking place, there was a lab in the Norquay Building, I don't know if it's still there. Maybe the Minister could answer a number of questions, for instance, as to when the new lab will be open. Perhaps he could start with that and tell us whether it has been opened, or when it's expected to open.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we're hopeful that new facility will be in operation in the latter part of July, first weeks of August.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister then, since there was a lab in the Norquay Building, and I assume still is, as far as I recall, and it was drawn to our attention at the time that there were chemicals being stored in the corridors. That was ordered to be removed immediately and Mr. McMillan saw to that in January of 1976. Is there still a laboratory in that office building, and are the chemicals still stored, either in the building, hopefully not in the corridors, or on top of the building? Can we get some idea of what is happening there?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, some of the activity that the Member for Elmwood describes was undertaken by the Department of Natural Resources at that time which included in its responsibilities the environmental division. I am reasonably certain, I would want to double-check, that none of that laboratory type work is taking place in the Norquay Building. I remind all members that the stringent fire code that was passed by the previous administration in 1976 it was developed in 1975 and I believe actually passed in 1976 did have major ramifications in the things that departments of governments, and of course in the private sector as

well, were doing. I'm not suggesting that they were cleaned up or changed overnight, just as we are still wrestling with the necessary construction work and renovation work required for a number of our own facilities, a number of our own public health buildings, etc., but certainly such immediate items such as the member refers to, chemicals being stored in the hallways of a normal office building, paint and other flammable goods being stored under stair wells and the likes of that. I feel reasonably confident that our building managers throughout the system, throughout the various departments of government reacted to these new code requirements and that in most instances where they could be looked after, particularly of the kind that could simply be looked after by following a different procedure and a different practice, and by properly storing flammable or dangerous materials that in effect took place.

But to the best of my ability there is no lab work being carried on in the Norquay Building at this time. They are, of course, awaiting the new facilities of the new Environmental Lab to move into, but the work that is being carried on by Department of Natural Resources and/or the Environmental Branch as in other locations more suited for that kind of work.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister just inform the committee as to which departments will be going into the new lab building? Can we have a general list? Or if it's not convenient now we'll take it later.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'll double check with the staff and have that information later on. Essentially it will be the Department of Natural Resources. I would assume that it will also house the Environmental Lab facilities, as well as some aspects of the Department of Health that have requirements for lab work. There could be a number of jurisdictions that have access to or that actually will be designated some space in that building but I'll double check the information for the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. In his opening remarks to the committee, the Minister indicated that the review of the role of the Emergency Measures Organization will be undertaken, or has been undertaken by his department and he has mentioned this a number of times in the House also. I wonder if the Minister could take the opportunity now to elaborate on those earlier statements and outline what some of the changes will be and in what areas, and when he would expect them to take place?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity of talking about Emergency Measures Organization. It's a subject matter that obviously will continue to be of concern and ought to be of concern to all of us as members and to the general public. Let me begin by saying that possibly one of the problems is that we have demonstrated a reasonably a good response team and mechanism and organization to look after the kind of emergencies that we, as Manitobans, have become familiar with; namely, the kind of natural problems that arise or face a community when a flood arises. But I don't have to point out to the honourable members that again, in Manitoba, we don't have the incidence of the flash mountain flood roaring down upon us, that kind of emergency gives us a lot of time to organize. The water resources people, they predict days in advance that large portions of our province are going to be inundated. This enables us to contact the municipal people; it enables us to pull out of the different departments the resource people required; the water control engineers, the highway engineers are put on special duty; bridges can be checked and watched; Departments of Health and Community Services have time to organize, to set up receiving stations for people that will have to be evacuated; supplies can be laid in, and the techniques, the knowledge of responding to that kind of an emergency, which are the emergencies that we are perhaps most familiar with and I include in this same general description the emergency that governments have to respond to, after the fact, kind of thing that you have in the case of a violent windstorm, a tornado which unfortunately seems to be occurring more often in our province, and we are asked then to move in to restore immediately such basic utilities as hydro and

telephones, concern for live wires laying on the ground, the possibility of fires, and again the system in coordination with other volunteer organizations such as the Red Cross or the Mennonite Disaster Relief Group and others, always working with municipal people. That system is essentially there and principally there because we have experienced those kind of emergencies several times over.

We, however, felt immediately after the last flood that the whole system required an updating and a hard look at it. I want to assure the honourable members, as I have assured them in the House, that this was not a matter of simply reacting to some immediate concerns of the past month but rather one that we were directed to undertake by Cabinet and by the Premier upon conclusion of the difficulties we had last spring in the flood.

We are in the process of effecting some of these changes that I would like to outline to the honourable member at this time. We are recommending that the organization, as depicted on the following chart, be considered for approval and that the proposed re-organization will have the following major effects.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, I will be pleased to provide the honourable members opposite with the proposed chart if we have them available.

We hope that the proposed structure calls for a significant change in the staffing mix of the organization with an expanded regionalized concept. I am not proposing any large or any specific increase in the numbers of staff man years, of which there are 14 in this organization, but we want to regionalize them in a more effective way.

One of our problems is that to have the EMO operation in touch with whatever happens in all portions of the province that there be specific lines of communications open in the different rural parts of the province, in the north, in our major towns and cities.

I am proposing a significant change in emphasis on support to municipalities. The review calls for the establishment of two additional regional offices in eastern and northern Manitoba or, alternately, providing these services from a central location in Winnipeg. Those are the decisions that we still making at this point, essentially to work in support with the municipalities. A much greater emphasis and concentration will be directed toward the planning and research functions. A separate and professional training function reporting directly to the coordinator will be established. This function will provide emergency training opportunities to municipal, departmental and volunteer agencies, utilizing to the extent possible courses and facilities available through the Federal Government.

There is a substantial amount of federal assistance available to us in the area of emergency training for our own departmental staff, for municipal staff, or other volunteer organizations, if we set up the appropriate mechanism that can encourage municipal officials to take advantage of it. This would be short training courses, either here in Winnipeg or in some instances on-site, or in some instances in central or in eastern Canada.

The establishment of an Advisory Committee in order to draw upon the resources of volunteer agencies normally associated with emergency operations is contemplated in a more formal way. This has been done informally up to now, but we wish to build that into the structure. i.e. the ones I already mentioned, the Red Cross, Mennonite Disaster Services, Salvation Army, etc.

I might add that we will continue to improve the 24-hour emergency information response services. That was only introduced just about a year and one-half ago that we have the 24-hour telephone response number listed. We are not at all satisfied that that number is a well-kept secret or who all knows about it. Of course, that does away with the purpose of the whole exercise.

We are not suggesting that we have not been able to respond in a reasonably fast way in most instances. The actual detailed record of numerous incidences that have occurred indicate a substantial number. In most instances the persons do know and do contact Emergency Measures in the first instance. Our difficulty is in having other agencies, private or corporate or other governments, in following a pre-set pattern of response, the most notable ones being where other jurisdictions are involved. The case of the recent spills at MacGregor or in the case of the situation in the CPR Yards, where there is a tendency to have officials of that company or of that corporation accept the immediate responsibility on their own, and not recognize the possible dangers involved, and

not immediately in the first instance calling Emergency Measures, even if they know who to call and the number and they know that that ought to be done. There is a tendency for them to attempt to look after it on their own.

Of course there is always a question that in some instances a delay will take place. If it is out in the open, out on the highway, or out on the deserted stretch of track, it is quite feasible that somebody cannot get to a phone within two or three hours or just the immediate reaction to an accident, even here in the city in the yards where railway employees or other employees are charged with the immediate problems of looking . . . You know, we have an accident, let's access it, what their immediate reaction is to it. It is only then that they click into calling the local fire or police ambulance services. It is in this area that I am not satisfied that the full opportunities, full services of Emergency Measures are being fully utilized, that it should not be necessary . . . And surely that should be part of our function, rather than have employees, company or otherwise, having to make decisions when they are under a degree of stress, being involved in the actual accident, to be able to, at the drop of the hat or immediately, know precisely who all to involve at that time. They have their hands full.

There is also, and I say this somewhat advisedly, a tendency of relying too solely on the immediate experts, so-called, on the scene, because what to them is a controllable and manageable problem . . . I suggest to honourable members that they show some bias in this sense every once in a while, in the sense that because they know the properties of the chemical that they are dealing with or the nature of the potential hazard that they are dealing with, that is not to say and it is not good enough to say that they have a full appreciation of the concerns of the general public, of the community, the immediate workers that are involved that have to handle or be within the vicinity of the accident site. And it is necessary in my judgement that that judgement call for declaration of some form of emergency and calling into play the full resources of government and/or other agencies needs to be made by an experienced group of people that over the years develop an expertise in this matter, and I see that being housed in the Emergency Measures Organization.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(h)(1) - the Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister indicated there are 14 staff years in this department this year. I would ask the Minister how many were in the department last year and what are the positions that the persons under this department occupy?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, 1979-80 vote called for 14 SMYs; we are asking for the same number of SMYs in this year's estimates. Among the mechanical changes that we are proposing in the Emergency Measures Organization, and ones that we believe will make it possible for us to, in a very effective way, bring about that greater emphasis in our planning work and research work, and our work with municipal authorities is in the redeployment of staff within this 14-man group.

For instance, a decision has been made that it is not necessary for the Emergency Measures Organization to operate its own warehousing and inventory, a large inventory of goods and services. We have different departments where the rubber boots or the bed sheets and the blankets and other supplies that are needed from time to time are housed in different line departments. If it is a requirement for water pumps to pump out basements, the Department of Water Resources has it.

What was happening under the Emergency Measures Organization was they maintained their own inventory at the Fort Osborne Complex. They maintained clerks, and storekeepers, and clerk typists: three clerk typists, an accounting clerk, and a storekeeper. That is four positions within that 14-man Emergency Measures Organization that did not really contribute, in our view, in this reorganization plan, to the training and planning and research aspect of Emergency Measures. Those positions will be filled or moved into such items as training consultants, training assistants, municipal services officers.

In other words, field people that will be moving out through the municipalities, through the fields, helping with the development of local municipal plans. We would like to see each municipality have a basic emergency

plan on the shelf that the Reeve, the Council, the Secretary-Treasurer, the local police and the fire department, the volunteer fire department, are familiar with. Now it takes somebody, it takes a staff person to visit these municipalities and bring about and develop these plans with them. We believe that by taking away the functions, the clerking functions if you like, the storekeeping functions if you like, of what has occupied a good portion, two-thirds of the present staff of EMO was involved in those kind of functions.

Another particular function that we are taking away, we had Emergency Measures processing all the invoices and the vouchers for all the goods and services that Emergency Measures Organizations authorized and purchased during an emergency. The Department of Finance has indicated that they have all the staff, they have the facilities, they are quite prepared to handle the financial accounting concerns that up to now kept a couple of accounting clerks busy at Emergency Measures Organization.

Again, these positions are not being lost to Emergency Measures Organization, they are going to be redeployed to be able to enable us to concentrate on the development of actual emergency plans and research and training programs that we see the EMO fundamentally moving into.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would ask the Minister if he can indicate what exact positions he anticipates during the upcoming year. In other words, he has indicated that he would like to see some people out in the field proceeding with the development of local contingency plans, and of course that is an important area to direct his attention to. He has also mentioned that they are going to re-organize the Emergency Organization Response Centre, and I would assume that that would also incur some changes in staffing or places where staff will be in the future.

I would ask the Minister if he could draw for us a chart of how many people would be out in the field presenting these programs to local municipalities and LGDs and I would imagine also Indian Reserves, on occasion, if necessary and also if he can indicate how many will be back in the head office, so to speak, personing the shop.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in the area that we are most interested in, the degree of work that we do with our municipalities; we now, at the moment, under the current setup, have one senior municipal adviser and an additional municipal adviser located in Brandon. We intend to expand that under a senior municipal services officer to three municipal advisers, one in the western region, one in the northern region, and one in the eastern region; each one of them staffed with an administrative secretary. So we will, in effect, bump up that complement from what was two, to seven, in the area of municipal co-operation, municipal planning.

The precise order of the staff has not yet been determined, the plan is before government for consideration at this very time. I would hope to be in a position, within a relatively short period of days or weeks, to be able to indicate to the honourable member and members acceptance of this proposed re-organization of EMO. I am not in a position to state that at this time. I can indicate, and I'm indicating as freely as I can, the direction that we hope to go.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. As the Minister has indicated in his presentation, that we are indeed in the midst of changing times and that emergency situations that presented themselves to us in the past, while they have not lessened in either their total effect and impact on our society, nor in the amount in which they occur, we have had added to them a different type of emergency, part of a chemical industrial community that is rapidly overrunning most of the modern industrial society. We saw it start to occur in the early 1930s with the petro-chemical explosion - and I use that term not in the literal sense, but when it was discovered that many chemicals could be synthesized and invented from a petro-chemical base, and we saw from that time on chemicals begin to enter our environment in large numbers to where we're at the point now where we don't exactly know how many are out there, least of all what they do. There is no certain way of being able to determine how many are coming onstream. I have reviewed the literature fairly comprehensively, what literature is available to us and one piece of literature tells me that there are 250,000 new chemicals being

synthesized or invented every year, of which 3,000 are making their way into the industrial community; another piece of literature says, well it's not quite a problem of that magnitude, that there's perhaps 100,000, of which 400 are making their way into the industrial community.

But the fact remains that they are all making their way into the industrial community without any sort of pretesting; without any sort of analysis by either the companies, or any comprehensive analysis by the companies that are producing them, or by the government which is allowing them to be produced, or by those that would be responsible for protecting the environment and protecting the concerns of individuals such as Emergency Measures Organization.

The fact is that the only criteria that is being used presently for a new chemical, to determine whether or not that chemical will enter the market, is one of profitability. Does that chemical perform a function that another chemical might or might not perform, and does it do it in a more efficient and effective manner than the previous chemical, and it is marketable? In other words, can it be marketed, can it be produced for a profit? And that is, for the most part, the only significant criteria. And one only need look at the particular instance of vinyl chloride to see the whole process in a nutshell, where you have a chemical that, around the 1930s, at the time of the petro-chemical explosion, at the time that our scientific community advanced to the point where they were able to produce large numbers of chemicals from the petro-chemical base, we see vinyl chloride being invented, or synthesized, whichever word you prefer.

At that time it was considered to be a very safe chemical, entirely safe. As a matter of fact at that time it was thought to be usable as an anaesthetic for people undergoing operations, and it was not; for a couple of reasons, one of which was that it was not as efficient as the other anaesthetics that were on the market, therefore not as profitable, therefore one would not use it for that particular purpose. But had it been more efficient, had it been more effective, had it been more profitable, we would have seen it used for that purpose, just as we saw it used as a propellant in hair spray, if you can imagine that, not that very long ago either; where you would have people in a very closed room, perhaps in a bathroom or bedroom, spraying their hair with a substance that was being propelled out and therefore escaping, called vinyl chloride, a substance which we know now to be extremely carcinogenic.

The fact is that it wasn't until about 20 years after the widespread introduction of this chemical into the marketplace that we determined there was a problem. How did we do that? Well, we determined there was a problem in much the same way as we determine there is a problem with other chemicals, and that is, workers, who are the front line defence, who are being used as guinea pigs in this area, began to get sick. Now, they began to get sick with a very specific disease called angiosarcoma of the liver, a very rare cancer that could not be attributed to many other environmental influences. Had they begun to get sick with lung cancer, which they did also, but had they just contacted lung cancer, or another more common, perhaps a skin cancer, from this exposure to vinyl chloride, as a society we never would have been able to quite as rapidly pin down this substance as a known carcinogen. The fact is that we saw groupings of very rare angiosarcoma of the liver occur, and they occurred around vinyl chloride plants. In using cohort and epidemiological studies it was possible to isolate vinyl chloride as a substance that could be suspected of being a carcinogen; further animal studies and further cohort studies confirmed that there were, indeed, increased incidences of cancer of the liver, of the brain, of the lung, leukemia, that could be associated with worker exposure to vinyl chloride.

At the same time - not at the same time, a bit later, because that's the way the pattern usually develops - a bit later it was found that people living in the environment close to a vinyl chloride plant were also exhibiting, on a statistical basis, increased incidence of these sorts of cancer, and there were several studies done to that effect. It was also found that there were a number of other diseases or maladies that could be attributed to exposure to vinyl chloride in the environment, of which was increased risk of miscarriage, increased risk of problems with pregnant women and their children which were subsequently born.

So that was determined, and then we saw the standards begin to be made more strict in regard to exposure to vinyl chloride; to where we now have it, in the States at least, and it is a legal standard in the States, to be a standard of one

part per million for worker exposure over a time-weighted average of an eight-hour day. The reason I say all this is because I think it is pertinent background material to what happened in MacGregor, and I would like to talk about that in more detail than the next few minutes allow, but we will have an opportunity, I understand this evening, to talk about it. So rather than start into the details and then have to break off I would just like to continue in general comments until the hour being 4:30, and then we can talk in specifics after that time.

The fact is that vinyl chloride does not stand alone, neither as a known carcinogen nor as a substance that has been introduced into the workplace without testing and without proper testing, let me rephrase that, without proper testing, without comprehensive testing to be able to ensure that it is safe to workers who will be exposed and people in the environment. We speak about it in terms of occurring in 1930, well, it is happening today. There are substances that are being developed today that will, if we can extrapolate on the past into the future, which will present health and environmental problems in the future, and the Emergency Measures Organization has to be able to respond to the emergencies that are going to occur as a result of this blossoming petro chemical industry and chemical industry.

The Emergency Measures Organization is going to have to not only develop local contingency plans for municipalities, and I don't mean to take away from that because I commend the Minister on that initiative; I think it is important and I hope that the one that goes up in the north goes as close to my constituency as is possible, preferably in the constituency, although I realize there may be considerations as to the population centres being smaller in my constituency than in others, but at least as close as is possible, because we have those sorts of problems in our own constituency also, as witnessed just last week.

But I would hope the Minister would go about developing some mechanism to deal, to immediately find out what hazards these chemicals represent. If I can be so bold I think it was a mistake to rely upon Dow Chemical entirely in the MacGregor instance. I think the Minister will agree with my in hindsight, and I'm not saying that it was a mistake that I wouldn't have made in similar circumstances. I'm not trying to assess blame I'm just trying to point out that I believe that the best evidence possible available to us now indicates that we probably should have contacted some of the other emergency systems that were available to us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 4:30 having arrived, I am leaving the Chair for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 o'clock.

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This Committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to page 75 of the Main Estimates, Department of Natural Resources. Item 1.(a) Ministerial: (1) Minister's Compensation--pass.

Resolution 100 - the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just before the Minister's Compensation is passed, I do have a few words, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to say with regard to the proposed Flood Protection Program in Carman. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to really, in as serious a manner as I can, determine whether the Minister is really making the kind of blunder that I suspect he is making with respect to the entitlement of the people of the province of Manitoba to be reasonably dealt with, insofar as flood protection is concerned.

Now I want, Mr. Speaker, to be corrected if I'm wrong. I understand that the Minister intends to spend \$5 million in one community with regard to diverting the Boyne River, which floods periodically around that community, so that there will be no flooding in the future. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the cost benefits of the expenditure of \$5 million are in no way justified by any estimates that the Minister has before him. In saying that, Mr. Speaker, my preliminary - and again I wish to be corrected if I am wrong - my preliminary figures indicate that it would require \$750,000 a year in damages, every year; every year, Mr. Speaker, to justify on a one-to-one cost benefit basis, the expenditure of \$5 million in the community of Carman.

Now if there is something that I am overlooking, Mr. Speaker, in that I don't wish to have included in a suggestion that I am overlooking something, that there is a desire, a strong desire on the part of the people of Brandon to be protected; that there is inconvenience, and has been inconvenience in that community, other than that which I am aware of, and which everybody would sympathize with, Mr. Chairman; and I'm going to get to other communities before I leave this one to see how one community in Manitoba is being dealt with as against different communities, then I would like the Minister to correct me, to indicate that my assessment is not correct.

But when I was the Minister we looked at the situation, asked the engineers, Mr. Chairman, to bring in their views with regard to the amount of damages that are being caused and the amount of moneys that would be needed to overcome these damages; and the cost benefits were completely unrelated to each other. Now, if the Minister says those are out-of-date, then I would like to know what is in date and would he table, Mr. Chairman - because it is important; we're talking about an expenditures of \$5 million for a community of roughly 3,000 people - will he communicate to the House or put on the table the engineering estimates which show the cost benefits to be achieved from the expenditure of \$5 million, in one community? We spent on drainage, Mr. Chairman, approximately \$5 million in maintenance of drainage and constructing new drains throughout the province. Let's raise it to \$7 million, which would mean something between \$1.8 million and \$2 million in each community. Where is the justification for the expenditure of \$5 million in one community?

I'd like the Minister to produce the cost-benefit studies on which he is asking all of the people of Manitoba to get together, dip into their pockets, and pay money to Carman, to that town. Because, Mr. Chairman, if we are to do that, and it's not merely Carman that is involved, then I say that we should not treat those citizens differently and we should calculate how much this is going to cost us, because there are other communities, Mr. Chairman, that have had worse problems than Carman. The Member for Springfield should be on his feet screaming about the fact that his constituents had a road block and said that they wouldn't pay taxes because the province refused to provide a flood protection works into the Red River Floodway and then into the Red River, at a cost of less than \$5 million, and affecting more people, Mr. Chairman.

And I'm going to go through other communities, because I know them, on which the government has not been prepared to spend \$5 million, or anything like that amount. And therefore, on the assumption, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is not being nearly as erratic as I seem to think he is, I would like to have, from his department, the cost-benefit studies which show that if there is no diversion of the Boyne River that there's going to be \$750,000 a year, every year, in damages, to that community. I assume that the Minister has those figures with him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Chairman, I don't have those figures that the member refers to, but I can provide him with some background on the nature of the approach to that problem and others that other communities in the province are experiencing, have been experiencing in the past. I think the estimated cost of \$5 million is reasonably accurate. I think it's somewhat less, but in that neighbourhood, and I suppose given the nature of cost estimates anything could happen there.

The cost benefits in the past have been calculated on the historical record, going back as far as records have been kept, and that has been an arbitrary sort of decision, to use that time period for calculating costs and benefits. I think that there is a serious weakness in that system that is now becoming evident, and that weakness is that it assumes that over the period of record keeping that the conditions, circumstances surrounding climate and land use, have remained the same over the period during which records have been kept. Mr. Chairman, that clearly is not so, because the circumstances that prevailed in the Red River Valley and in other parts of the province were not the same today as they were in 1880, they're not the same as they were in 1900, or 1920, or 1930, in fact what makes more sense to my way of thinking, at least, and I think to a great many other people, is that the period of time that we must use now has to be a period of time that's based on

the more recent experience. Probably the period of time that is associated with what we might call the modern agricultural period, the period of land use that's associated with those modern practices, the period of time over the past 30 years, perhaps, and that when that period of time is used to calculate the cost benefits, then of course it changes the benefit ration, as does every year of experience that accumulates. If there is a flood in any given year then of course that changes the cumulative frequency, or if there is no flood then that changes the cumulative frequency. In the case of Carman there was a long period of time, I think from 1923 through to 1969, during which there was no flooding took place, and then from the period of 1969 to 1979, there were three serious floods in that period of time, and a fourth which threatened and which the town and the province took action to meet, and which then at the last minute did not materialize.

The chances, the probability of that having occurred, given the historical record, is extremely remote, extremely remote, Mr. Chairman, which indicates that the historical record simply doesn't indicate what is taking place now. The honourable member doesn't want to accept that, he wants to say that conditions are the same today as they were in 1900, or 1920, that's fine, he can argue that position if he wishes. I'm telling him what's the basis of the calculation that we're using now.

And using the shorter period of time, and I'm not exactly sure, I think it's from 1956 that it was calculated but I would have to check the details of that, then the cost benefit works out to approximately .7. That still, of course, is not 1, and so the honourable member wants to argue that that's not a good investment. Well, there are other things that we no longer calculate, or I guess we never did calculate cost benefits for, Mr. Chairman, things like roads and hospitals; we don't calculate what benefits are from those services related to the cost, we think that it is now appropriate to try and deal with the many communities who have flooding problems on a somewhat similar basis, but not entire. Because we still plan to use the cost-benefit ratio in determining what the cost-sharing of these projects will be and the formula that we are proposing, and which we have agreement with the communities involved, then we will go to the federal government with the formula and attempt to get cost-sharing on that basis; and that is proposed that the federal and the provincial government would pay on an equal basis for that portion of the project which is covered by a benefit return and that the difference between the benefit return and 1 would be shared between the province and the local community. In the case where the cost-benefit is .7, then the local community would be expected to pay half of the .3, or 15 percent of the entire project, plus to assume responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of the works as well. And that's a formula under which we are going to approach, not only Carman in this case, but other communities, Ste. Rose and Gimli, and I believe there are many more who experience flooding problems as well and that no doubt will want to examine that formula.

The Honourable Member for Inkster, I think, has referred to this as a corrupt practice. Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess if he wishes to make that allegation, that it's a corrupt practice, then he can do it. But I think that the people of the province will find that this kind of program is not only an entirely defensible but in fact it's a long overdue one.

I was going to answer some further question, but perhaps the member wants to pursue this for the moment.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to stay on this subject to try to demonstrate just how corrupt it is, because I didn't dream that it was nearly as corrupt as the Minister has made it.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, what engineering advice has the Minister got to say that a period from 1956 to 1980 is more accurate as to determining cost benefits than a period 1880 to 1980. I would like to see the water engineer who says that, Mr. Chairman, and tells us that that is a better indicator as to what a community can expect, because I would like to report that water engineer to the Association of Engineers and to the University of Manitoba. I have not yet met, Mr. Chairman, a water engineer who would give that advice. They say you can take any period you want, and if you want to use that period, that's your business. But in terms of determining probabilities, there is nobody that I have met who will say taking the last 30 years is a better indicator of damages than taking the last 100 years, or

taking the last 1,000 years, Mr. Chairman. And none of them have ever said to me that conditions to the west of Carman are such that the changes in those conditions are going to affect, in a material way, flooding in Carman.

So what we have, Mr. Chairman, is somebody taking the figures, which suit the advice, and then coming up with .7. I would like to know the interest rate that was used to come up with .7, because if the interest rate that was used to come up with .7 is a year ago, and we take today's interest rates, which are in the neighbourhood of 17 and 18 percent, Mr. Chairman, then we're not .7, we're down below .7. But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, where is the document indicating .7? I would like to see who signed this document, because we produced, Mr. Chairman, and sent to Carman, the engineering report which was used to indicate that the province of Manitoba could not do this. Will the Minister table that engineering report? And by the way, Mr. Chairman, that report went to the Water Commission, headed by Mr. Saunderson, and they never found anything wrong with the report. They said maybe social benefits should be included as a cost feature. But they never found anything wrong with the report and I would like those engineers that my friend is relying on to say that it's more accurate to put their names on the report and give it to the House in the same way as it was done in the past, Mr. Chairman, because the Minister has it.

But I don't believe that he has it, Mr. Chairman. And I'm not saying that the Minister is not saying what he believes, but I don't believe that an engineer, a water engineer will say that to determine frequency of floods in Carman that you can go from '56 and get a better determination of it than if you went back 100 years or 200 years.

The second thing, Mr. Chairman, to show you just how corrupt it is, and the Minister has correctly adopted my word, is that they are going to do this only on the basis that the municipality pays the difference between .7 and 1. And let us assume that the difference between .7 and 1 is \$750,000.00. First of all, Carman has already said that's not acceptable, we want a better deal. Now, that's not horrifying because the Minister may say to them I've gone as far as I am going, although I doubt it. I doubt it because I know the squeaking wheels around him are not going to permit him to be very firm. What they can do is move around some figures, and maybe get to less than \$750,000, but only wealthy communities can do it, Mr. Chairman. The formula is there for everybody; the formula is there for the Interlake; the people of Fisher are treated the same way as the people of Carman. We will give you the flood protection works but the people in the area have to pay the difference between .7 and 1, and it's only, Mr. Speaker, it's like the university education. We have devised a system of university education which makes the poor subsidize the rich, because we say that we're going to subsidize 85 percent, but only to those who will pay the first \$800; and as a result, the entire upper class goes to university and the entire working community pays for them. Because 85 percent is paid, but only to those who can afford the initial \$800.00. What they are doing in Carman is saying: You are a wealthy farm community, you can afford the first \$750; we'll get public moneys from all of the other people in the province of Manitoba to put up the rest of the \$4.2 million.

Now, the Minister has said something heartening. He said he needs the federal government as a cost-sharing. Am I correct in understanding that he has to get federal government cost-sharing, that if he doesn't get it he won't do it? Mr. Chairman, I see a light, a ray of hope, because I am going to the federal government and protest vigorously against my money, and the people of Manitoba's money, being used for this type of program, because of the nature of the program, Mr. Speaker. Has anybody thought of the extent of the program? Souris, the member's own constituency, has had the same type of thing. They had hundred-year floods, or what the engineer has calculated as hundred-year floods occurring twice in a period of five years. Are they not entitled to that program? The Member for Springfield represents people who are entitled to that type of program; the Member for Gimli, Victoria Beach has that type of problem, the Member for St. George has that type of problem. Mr. Speaker, the Pembina Dam makes more sense than that program. It costs more money, but the former Member for Morden used to come in and talk about it. Mr. Henderson, the Member for Pembina, used to talk about that particular program, which there was an indication of federal sharing for. But it makes more sense, Mr. Chairman, than talking about a community spending \$5 million for a flood diversion program for 3,000 people. Has anybody calculated the im-

mensity of what we are talking about? They used to say you spent \$64 million on the Red River Floodway, and there was. It was a good cost benefit relationship and 50 percent was shared by the people of Canada on the basis that it made some sense.

Do you know how much you would have to spend for flood protection in Winnipeg to equate what is now being done in Carman? Well, Mr. Chairman, I calculated this and I'll give it to you as I got it. I hope somebody will check me to see if I'm making any mistakes. There are 600,000 people in Winnipeg. That's 200 times the amount that there is in Carman. On the basis of spending 200 times the amount of money, we would have to spend \$1 billion on a flood protection program in Winnipeg to equate what this Minister says he is going to do in Carman, because he sits next to a man who says my people need it; \$1 billion, not \$64 million and take the \$64 million and make it three times on account of inflation, you're still one-fifth of the expenditure, and he is going to spend it in Carman.

Why, Mr. Chairman? Because he hasn't got the guts to stand up and say to these people: Look, it just doesn't make financial sense. You're nice people. We like you. You're good Manitobans but the Member for Inkster has people in his constituency who were flooded not by floods but three times in a period of less than a year they had their basements flooded by heavy rain and the province would not do anything, Mr. Chairman, nothing. I had to say to them we cannot deal with that type of problem. There was once that the federal government, just before 1973, said that they would take care of flood claims in Winnipeg as a result of flood damage - claims, not a flood program to prevent those people from being flooded and they were flooded - in Tyndall Park. They were flooded and my recollection is not 100 percent correct, but I would say three times in two years - I am being conservative.

Now the Minister has confirmed, Mr. Speaker, that he is going to spend a billion dollars, the equivalent of \$1 million spent in Winnipeg on the municipality of Carman. He has confirmed that it makes no economic sense, that it's got a ratio of spending a dollar and recovering 70 cents. Mind you, that is Progressive Conservatism: You spend a dollar, you get back 70 cents, that's good business. That's the way they operate. That is what he is saying, Mr. Chairman. And he is saying that there are weaknesses in water predictions in that predictions which take into account a longer period are not good sense and that you take into account the shorter period. I want to tell the Minister that, on the basis of his statement, I want to work for his department and I will give him a plus-cost benefit in Carman. Why go back to 1956? Why not just take the years that there were floods and say those are the years we are going to base it on?

Well, Mr. Chairman, to take my learned friend's position to its logical conclusion, that's what he is going to do. But what's 200 times \$5 million? Well, two times \$5 million is \$10 million, 20 times \$5 million is \$100 million, and 200 times would be \$1,000 million, I gather, which is \$1 billion. And this program is being specified for one community.

So when the Minister says that he is going to have to get federal funding, maybe that's the out; maybe that's the Minister's out. Maybe he will go to the Carman people and say I tried my best. I authorized the money. I authorized the expenditure but the federal government wouldn't go along. Well, I'm going to help the Minister. I'm going to ask the federal government and show them what is happening here and ask him where the cost benefit is, because we've produced, Mr. Chairman; we produced a report and we gave it to the community.

Now the Minister is going to spend money in the community; I think the other communities have a right to see the basis and the report and the signatures to the report from the department, or at least if not the signatures of the individuals which I appreciate should not be given, but at least that it is a report which the Department of Natural Resources will stand behind as indicating this .7 ration which I . . . I am not saying it is not there but when we produced it, it was there and given to the communities and subjected to the scrutiny of the Water Commission who, Mr. Chairman, were all composed of professional people. My recollection is that they didn't find anything wrong with it. They said maybe there should be other factors in terms of social benefits that have not been considered but they certainly didn't find anything wrong with the engineering factors and I think that the engineering factors should be put on the table right now.

MR. RANSOM: There is one point that should be made clear, Mr. Chairman, and that is the period of time that is used in the calculation of the benefits is not an engineering question. You don't have to be an engineer to make a judgement on whether or not a series of years are in fact comparable. I can make that sort of judgement myself, Mr. Chairman, and I challenge anybody to demonstrate to me that it makes sense from a statistical point of view to compare what happened in terms of run-off in 1915 with what happens in terms of run-off in 1975. The two are simply not comparable and anyone who has any kind of knowledge of statistics or biometrics will be able to tell you, they simply are not comparable.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the truth will out. The Minister is now saying that a longer period of time does not give you, in his judgement, a better statistical analysis as to what will happen. I challenge that statement, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has indicated that is not an engineering analysis, that is his analysis; that explains a lot of things, because I have indicated no engineer will adopt that position because the reverse is true. It is an engineering analysis. How does one figure out, Mr. Chairman, what is the frequency of a flood? And the way you figure it out is to take the number of years, take the number of floods and say that this is the frequency at which they will occur and the longer the period, the more accurate the prediction and that is an engineering fact, Mr. Chairman. If the Minister has said that he has ignored engineering facts, he's ignored engineering advice, and he's chosen to use smaller periods as a matter of his judgement in order to give a billion dollars worth of flood protection to Carman, calculated on the basis of a parallel with Winnipeg, then it all becomes understandable and I will have more ammunition to forward to the federal government. Because I think the federal government should know that the Minister has calculated this and still come out to .7.

I'm surprised the Minister hasn't let his judgement go further and say that I calculate that 1970 . . . When was the worst flood? No, they didn't have one last year, they had one about two years. --(Interjection)-- But you told me that it didn't occur, they didn't have one. They prepared for it and it didn't come. Isn't that what you said? --(Interjection)-- Well good, they had one last year. Was it a bad one? Why not work on last year's flood? Say, in my judgement, last year is the measure; why go to 1956? I mean you will get better results. You will have a better cost benefit, Mr. Chairman, if you take last year's flood and you could say nobody could tell me that I'm wrong; this flood could happen every year and you're right, it could. The odds against it are 100 to 1, but you could . . . No, maybe 100 to 1, maybe it was a 100-year flood. But the Minister says that he can take any period he wants and measure the frequency of the floods and that's not an engineering decision, that's his judgement.

Well, I thank the Minister for having told that because I will go to the federal government with the kind of judgement that is being used to calculate flood benefits in one community in Manitoba, that it's the Minister's judgement and it's not based on any engineering advice.

I can tell the Chairman of the committee that when I said I was criticized severely - not severely, that's an exaggeration; I was criticized - for saying that when we talk about Lake Winnipeg Regulation we shouldn't look at the past 80 years, we should look at the past 30 years because the people who are there are not concerned with what the beaches looked like years ago, they are concerned with what the beaches look like when in their living memory. And the Water Commission said: You can't do that, Mr. Green, you are playing with the figures. You have to take the last 80 years of experience to determine a situation and you cannot, because frequencies occur.

Mr. Chairman, all they are saying is that you will have three such floods in 300 years. They are not saying that they won't occur in three years but they are saying that the probability is they will occur over a period of 300 years. That's all they're saying and nobody has yet challenged the accuracy of the engineer's assessment of the number of floods or the frequency of floods in Carman. If you have to do mental gymnastics to get to .7, and .7 is closer to half than it is to one, and then say that you are going to make the community pay everything beyond the .7, what you are doing, Mr. Chairman, is providing that you are going to subsidize rich communities because the only community that will be able to pick it up is a community with a substantial tax base and substantially well-to-do people at

the local level. Carman is screaming now. They are saying that \$750,000 is too much. It's not enough of a good thing yet.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I see that the Minister really regards me as a friend. I can bail him out. All he has done is told them that if he gets federal sharing, he'll do this, and if we can help him by telling the federal government no, he will be able to go back to Carman and say I did everything I could, I am a good Progressive Conservative but the federal government won't pay, and we'll try and help him out in that connection, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I love to listen to the Honourable Member for Inkster, especially when it comes to flood control matters in our province and drainage and certain matters that fall in that particular field because the members opposite over the years have proved to me time and time again that's not part and parcel of their philosophy, it's not part and parcel of their political future for this province and, in many cases, I wonder if in fact they have any concerns at all for people that have been inundated with water over the years.

Mr. Chairman, we could talk about statistics, we could talk about all the decimal points and the facts as the honourable member has put them before the record but nevertheless in this province there has been land clearing going on for years that's likely not shown in the statistics, bush clearing, new traffic routes, new farming practices, the river beds are filling up with silt and the problems are there. They're real, they're alive and we have them in a lot of the rural constituencies. And whether in fact, as the Minister pointed out, it is the responsibility of the municipalities to deal with these matters or whether it's the problem of the municipalities and the province to deal with them jointly, or whether in fact we should bring the federal government into the scene, I think is maybe worth discussing at this time, but nevertheless the problems are real and they are out there.

We get back to cost-benefit studies and cost-benefit factors. How do you measure in a cost benefit the problems that I had a few years ago at the Duck and Drake River at Slater, where the water was all over the place. I got a hold of the Premier of the day and his Ministers and they met in Dauphin, laid those problems on their desks loud and clear, these people are flooded, nothing was done, absolutely nothing. I can see now, after I hear the Honourable Member for Inkster pointing out his philosophy in handling these matters, that those matters have a very, very low priority in the philosophy of the NDP Party.

The problems of the flooding at Ste. Rose: should we just walk away and leave those flooding problems and forget about them? There are real people living out there and they have had this on their agenda for years. I am grateful that the Minister has finally arrived at a decision in conjunction with the people of Ste. Rose, that the matter is serious and it has to be dealt with. Whether it is done by statistics or feasibility, the problem is real and it's live and it's there.

I am satisfied that over the years the people in my area do not begrudge one dollar that was spent for flood control for the city of Winnipeg or in the Red River. Those were dollars that were well expended and they have provided protection for those people and I don't think there is a person in this province who begrudges that kind of expenditure of tax dollars. But I think on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, that there are people outside of the Red River area and the city who have flood problems in this province and we, as a government, must stand up and recognize it. Certainly it is not feasible, a drain at Slater that's flooding people when you compare it to a flooding problem in Winnipeg, because there just isn't enough people there. But I have no problems at all in supporting the Minister in what he is trying to do in this province and bringing this matter out in the open and maybe more debate and discussion is needed.

I hope that we will finally convince the members opposite that there is a need for flood works and we have to deal with it and, as the Minister has pointed out, maybe bring the federal government in. I have a hard time seeing the Member for Ste. Rose backing off now that a Conservative government is going into his constituency and helping with the drainage problem. He wasn't able to get it from his own government but luckily now he is going to have some works take place there and I don't think the members opposite . . . Maybe they don't understand the full

context of this but there's a lot of works of flood and flood control to be done in this province and I congratulate the Minister for what he is doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I find it almost incomprehensible just how far Progressive Conservatives will go in spending public moneys. The member has no measuring rod. He says if there is a problem, spend the money. I mean we've heard him speak. Did he mention one figure? Did he mention any criteria upon which money should be spent? He says if there's a problem spend money.

Mr. Chairman, he has called the previous government socialists. Is there no basis upon which money should be spent? Is he able to demonstrate one program that was presented to the previous government where there was a cost benefit égalité where the program was refused? Is he able to demonstrate one? The only programs which were refused, Mr. Chairman, was where the amount spent would not justify the amount saved. That seems to me to be good fiscal conservatism. Does the member feel that you should spend more than it's worth? Because that's all I'm talking about. He doesn't have anything to say, Mr. Chairman, about the figures that I've given and he ignores the kicker.

Mr. Chairman, there is always a feature of these plans that there is a hook to it. You know, Anatol France said that the law in its majestic equality forbids both the royal prince and the hobo, forbids both of these people from sleeping on park benches. That's the law in its majestic equality.

The Minister says he, in his majestic equality, is going to do the same for Ste. Rose as he is doing for Carman. But there's a hooker, Mr. Chairman, the local area has to pick up the difference between the cost benefit and one. We saw this at the municipal level: that where a municipality had the money they could qualify for the cost-sharing and couldn't spend it on their own. It was the case for many years in municipal politics.

The Member for Seven Oaks will recall the dilemma. You have to be able to put it up. I don't know whether Seven Oaks have got it. I know that Carman have got it and I know that Carman are complaining about the amount that they have to put up.

So that doesn't affect the Member for Roblin. He doesn't think that's a problem. He doesn't consider that it's a problem that this program will be available to a rich community but it won't be available to a much lower productivity yield lands in other areas that might want flood protection, because there's a magic veto power, the same as I described with education.

So don't let the Minister say that we didn't have an interest. We have an interest and never refused a single program, as I can recall. If I am wrong the Minister will correct me. But I do not recall having refused a single flood control program where there was a cost-benefit ratio of one to one. We even agreed with some that were slightly less than one to one. But we don't agree that, first of all, you jockey the statistics to rule out the years which affect the program, then you come up with .7, which is just over half - it is closer to half than it is to one - then you say that you're going to get sharing on the basis that the community will pay their share, and the federal and the provincial will pay after the community pays, and therefore exclude . . . Because Ste. Rose will have a bigger problem than Carman, and that's saying nothing against the people in the area, but it is an area with not quite as affluent farmers as in the Carman area. And then saying: Look how concerned we are. You are not concerned. This is a gimmick and not simply a gimmick but a very, very expensive gimmick, a gimmick which is utilizing all of the people in the province of Manitoba to provide luxury for one group of its citizens because they happen to squeak a little louder; that's what is.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting argument that the Honourable Member for Inkster pursues. He has the remarkable capacity to carry logic to the point of defying common sense and he, no doubt, is able to satisfy himself of the soundness of his arguments but I think you'd have difficulty in convincing the people who need a service of flood protection; you'd have difficulty convincing them of the soundness of his argument.

I'm not going to debate this at length, Mr. Chairman, because I have pointed out the basis; I have stated that the period of time that one calculates the experience on has to be a period of time that is comparable in terms of modern experience. I am prepared to debate that point any time and I won't go to further length here.

I would just like to point out one or two things that show the inconsistency of the Member for Inkster and his former colleagues, as well, and that is that in the moving and raising program which was undertaken last year in the Red River Valley, Mr. Chairman, and which my information is that there have been 876 awards made under that program, and there have been \$6,405,048.29 committed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, today, just this very day, the Member for Ste. George rose in his seat to question the Minister of Government Services saying, when are we going to get this program in my constituency? This program, Mr. Chairman, had no cost-benefit analysis attached to it, no cost-benefit analysis. Did we hear the honourable members opposite last year, rise and condemn this program as a corrupt, arrogant practice that these Progressive Conservatives were undertaking? No, no, we didn't; we didn't hear that, Mr. Chairman. Well, the Member for St. Boniface says, "Better late than never." If the Member for St. Boniface wants to rise in his seat and say that this moving and raising program that we undertook last year was a corrupt and arrogant practice, Mr. Chairman, let him rise and say so.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, once you're invited like this to speak in the House I don't think that you can refuse. I don't think that the word corrupt could be aimed at me at all and if you want to challenge somebody you should challenge somebody else that makes the statement. But I certainly do say that something that is good in itself, you have to see what the total cost will be to the citizens of Manitoba. And it might be that, after doing that, you will realize that it would be something that is desired, but that you can't afford to do just for one community. If you carry that on and if the program was accepted all over the place, if it could be afforded by everybody, then how much would it cost the province of Manitoba? You have a situation now where some people might need it very badly but they haven't got the 30 percent; so what happens? They have to make a contribution, as taxpayers of the province of Manitoba, to another area. They can't even take care of themselves and they've got to go through another area.

Mr. Chairman, that reminds me of the negotiating that went on with the federal government at one time for certain programs; they had all kinds. They had a bunch of programs that looked so good in the social field, community projects and so on, that nobody could condemn them, they were very good; but it was clear that certain provinces could never take advantage of this. You know, you go on the assumption of doing something for the people, it's a universal program, but you know darn well that it's not a universal program because many can't avail themselves of that because they can't afford it. And that is the program.

Certain terms that the Minister used; I never used these terms, I'd hesitate before making this accusation and somebody else did. Everything is a good program, but it has to be measured at the total cost and if anybody should understand that it is my honourable friends.

When the Minister of Health stands up here, year after year and he said, cost first, need second, when we're talking about the health of the people of Manitoba; is that a good program? I challenge the member to answer that because that's exactly what the Minister of Health said and it's exactly what this government said many times when they talked about restraint. Of course, they don't mean themselves when they talk about restraint. You know, we're going to discuss fairly soon an increase of pay for us; so, it's always the same thing, it's the guy below you, you're always talking down to somebody.

Nobody can say that this is not a good program and you can go and wave the flag in those constituencies and if you're not going to be responsible, you're going to start talking about these bad people on the other side, that sooner you drown. And you can make a thing out of that, but when you're in charge you have a mandate to look after the affairs of Manitoba; there's a lot of things we would like. It would be nice if you had everything free, but we know that nothing is free. Who

all pays for these programs? The people of Manitoba and the people of Canada, besides the people of that particular municipality. --(Interjection)-- Who paid for the floodway? The people of Manitoba paid for the floodway.

A MEMBER: And Canada.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, very little in Canada, because at the time there was a kind of stupid statement made in this House that we were going to do it alone, although our sister province of Saskatchewan, for a kind of a similar program, another program, received much more than we did from Canada at this time. All right, and that, I would imagine, was looked at in every possible way. And they had a cost-benefit study and they figured well, all right, this is what it's going to do for Winnipeg; you have a concentration in this province; you have more than half the population around Winnipeg. I imagine this was done and, if not, it should have been done.

The member is trying to have me condemn programs - if you just look at the programs. It's ironic, because when I was charged with the Department of Health I had people, planners in my department and I'm sure that happens now, that came out with so many good programs, but you had to watch and see who, after all, is going to pay the cost; who's going to pay the cost. And these programs, in itself, are not good programs if it costs the rest of Manitoba and Canada too much money for what it's worth. And you would do that in your own family, your own household, if you had to decide on programs. It would be nice if you could give all your children everything they want, or your wife, or even yourself, but you have to see what - I'm preaching like a Conservative now, to a bunch of Socialists. It seems that things are reversed.

It should prove that we are responsible and that you're just looking at the next election that you're in the danger of losing and you'll stop at nothing to bring in certain measures now, and your philosophy has gone out the window. We saw that in the Throne Speech that was delivered here a few weeks or months ago, we saw exactly that. You went all the way around and accused that the former government, first of all, they had too many Ministers; you have as many, if not more. There were too many members of the House on board; you have more; you invented more jobs. It's always the same. And then we were told the Minister was challenged to say, well, all right, where are these scandals? Where was this money? What was the Minister of Health saying? The Minister was saying, if you have a problem you don't just throw money at it. And this might be a point that you should look at, to see if you're not just throwing money at a program.

As I say, you cannot condemn a program and say, all right, you're trying to help them, that's good, that's first. But then you'll have to realize at what cost. And this is all we're saying; we're saying that you act in a responsible manner when you devise these programs. And then if they're going to be universal, well, then they should be universal; but you know that they're not going to be universal because you know that some people cannot pick up the 30 percent tax. And these people, nevertheless - although you feel that this is a matter of a question of life and death - they might have the same situation or it might be worse in their own community. They can't do it; they can't pick up the tab, but they're asked to help pay for somebody else's problem because that's exactly what's to happen, that 70 percent is going to come from the taxpayers.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, there's one fact that I omitted to point out to the honourable members earlier and they may be interested in it, and that is that in this \$6,400,000 Moving and Raising Program, which was undertaken last year, that the federal government shared 50-50 in the cost of that program and there was no cost-benefit analysis; and that commitment to share 50-50 was made by the Prime Minister of the party that the Member for St. Boniface supports. And they did it, Mr. Chairman, without any kind of cost benefit.

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

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the expenditures for Ste. Rose, I don't remember the exact amount but it seems to me it was \$170,000 or \$180,000 that was proposed. I don't have the programs before me and how much is

going to be spent on that, but as I understand it the first phase of this program, if it's \$180,000, will be for design and surveying. And I believe it's based on whether or not the local government, the municipality or the village, whoever is involved, will have to cost-share in this program. Now I don't know whether that agreement has already been reached or whether this is just a bunch of numbers and words that we're using now. I'm not sure whether or not an agreement has been reached with the local authority; it hasn't been brought to my attention. Perhaps there could be an agreement already.

The second phase, we haven't been given any amounts of what a second phase will cost. I suppose we will not know that until a design has been completed. Now, I'm very pleased if we could protect the town of Ste. Rose, the village of Ste. Rose, which has been flooded from time-to-time. Will they be able to go ahead with it if the program is of such a magnitude that their share would be out of reach of the taxpayers of that community? Now this is something we have to see in the future. What we have heard up to now is only talk; this may never come about; it's only talk so far. And for the Member for Roblin to stand up in his place and make grandiose speeches, you know, I suggest to him that he'd better go back to Grandview and see why eight farmers have been flooded out year after year by a dam that's not designed properly and that was operated without a licence year after year; probably the previous administration was just as much to blame as this government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, they have given them a licence to flood; now they have a licence to flood those eight farmers. Before they were doing it illegally and now the Minister is saying, well we're now going to give them a licence to flood with the endorsement of the Member for Roblin, who gets up and talks about everything in Manitoba with the exception of the problems in his own area; that's what he has been doing. Then he gets up and says, you know, the Member for Ste. Rose is now opposed to Ste. Rose getting any flood protection. He was trying to put words in my mouth; he was trying to put things on the record, like the Member for Dauphin when he speaks, tried to put records that are untrue comments that are made; he wants them in the record. I say right now that the member doesn't know what he's talking about; he misled the House when he stood up and said that I had said that I didn't want Ste. Rose to have any flood protection. What I said was that most of the money was going in Conservative areas, that's what I said.

Mr. Speaker, I want to set that record straight, because not only did they - of course, we're used to the Member for Roblin, he misled all of his constituents in his report from the Legislature when he made comments about the Member for Fort Rouge and all the members of the house, in regard to the vote from the Speech from the Throne. So we know that he's very adept at misleading the House and misleading all its constituents. And I don't know whether he has apologized for them yet; of course he won't, because he hasn't got the integrity to apologize for having made an error. Now either the member doesn't know what's going on in the House, or he's trying to mislead them. So either way, he's in a very precarious situation, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to ask the Minister if he could tell us - there was an announcement made some time ago, I don't have the bulletin before me, that there would be Crown lands sold, available to lessees, agricultural Crown lands. Now, I was in the other committee, or I was not in the House when, I believe, we talked on the Crown lands in this department, but I would like to know how many applications have been received for the sale of Crown lands; how many acres have been sold and for what price? What is the mechanism for setting the value, the proper value to the people of Manitoba? And I would like the Minister to advise the House how many of these applications for Crown land to be purchased; how many of these agreements have been finalized? I would like to ask him also if he would advise us how many parcels of land have been sold back to the LGDs and at what price were these lands sold; what is the criteria for selling them back to the LGDs? Could he tell us also, Mr. Chairman, how many parcels of land have been sold for other uses, for commercial, private, industrial sites? I understand there was a bulletin put out, whereby tourist operators, tourist camp operators could have the privilege, I suppose you could use, of buying the land on which their buildings were situated, and that they had been leasing in the past, and that these lands could now be purchased. Could the Minister tell us how many people have applied and how many agreements have been finalized, and how much money has the Crown received? Okay?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I acknowledge the Honourable Minister, I would believe that these questions have been asked before and answered before when the Minister had the assistance of his staff. I think that at this point I can't move it out of order because it's under a point of complete discussion, but it has been asked before and has been answered before.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Ste. Rose finds himself in a difficult position, he really does. Because here's a constituency that he has represented for some years, and a town that he has represented for some years, who suffered severe flooding from time to time. They came to the government that he was part of and sought some assistance to try and protect the property, and I suppose even the threat to life in his community, they came to the government that he was a member of and, Mr. Chairman, they were turned away. We have now come up with a program that's going to help his community and other communities, and we have the Member for Inkster charging that this is a corrupt practice on the part of our government; it's arrogance on the part of our government to ask the people of Manitoba for funds to provide flood protection in those circumstances I think it would be difficult for the Member for Ste. Rose to go back to his constituents, to the Mayor of the town and the Reeve of the municipality and to the members of those councils, the members of the Conservation District, and say, you know this is a corrupt practice and you should have no part of it; you shouldn't seek help from this government in a corrupt practice of providing flood protection. --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose on a point of privilege.

MR. ADAM: On a point of privilege, the Minister is imputing that I made those statements. There's a member of the House that has made statements that it's a corrupt practice to build dikes around town. Now, he's tying in those remarks and he's attributing to me. I've never made any such statement. There's an independent member sitting in the House, the Member for Inkster, and if he wants to make those statements he can make them. But the Minister shouldn't tie that in, in making reference to the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable member, on the point of privilege, I don't think that the Honourable Minister made the remark that the Member for Ste. Rose was making corrupt statements.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, he certainly said that I did, which was wrong, absolutely wrong. If members on this side, because he's on this side of the House, makes a statement it doesn't mean that automatically everybody else has done it. He certainly made that comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, on the word "corrupt" which is unparliamentary, I have allowed it, whereas there hasn't been any actual accusations, and I have been trying to listen very carefully to see if there were actual accusations of corruption, and to this point I have not heard actual accusations of corruption.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think you have missed the point. I wasn't discussing the question of corruption, but the Minister said that somebody had talked about corruption, and he addressed his remark to me and he challenged me to repeat it and I never said it in the first place. I'm just talking that you said the Minister did not accuse the Member for Ste. Rose, but he did say that I had made the statement.

So automatically, if you don't support something, you're tarnished in every colour. That's McCarthyism to the best degree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Honourable Minister. Are you speaking on a point of privilege?

MR. RANSOM: Yes. I simply want to clear up, Mr. Chairman, the false allegation made by the Member for Ste. Rose and the Member for St. Boniface and I will, for the record, say what it was that I had said and we can review the record, Mr. Chairman, because I don't intend to go back tomorrow or two weeks from now, when we read the record and say, that's not what I said.

What I said was, Mr. Chairman, I said the Member for Ste. Rose is in a difficult position because the Member for Inkster has charged that this is a corrupt and arrogant practice on behalf of this government. And I said that the Member for Ste. Rose would have difficulty going back to his council and saying to them that this is a corrupt practice. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose on a point of order.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. ADAM: Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has the floor on the point of privilege.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for St. Boniface alleges that I had said that he had used the word "corruption". Not so, Mr. Chairman. In describing the moving and raising program which the government had committed some \$6,400,000, and had begun that program last year without a cost-benefit ratio being attached to it, I asked the members opposite, is that a corrupt and arrogant practice? And the Member for St. Boniface made some comment from his chair, and I challenged him then to rise and say whether he, in fact, believed that that was a corrupt and arrogant procedure or program, Mr. Chairman. So far from accusing the honourable member of making that statement, I offered the honourable member the chance to stand up and disassociate himself from the remarks of his former colleague.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on the same point of privilege.

MR. DESJARDINS: First of all, I would like to say that I am so grateful that somebody gave me a chance to speak in the House. Without him I could never say a word in this House, so I would like to thank the Minister who gave me this unique opportunity to speak for myself in the House. What was said, Mr. Chairman, is that somebody from out there, from their seat, made a statement, why didn't you - and the Minister also, - "Why didn't you criticize that program last year?" And my friend, my colleague here said, "Maybe we should have". And then I said, "Well, better late than never". That's exactly what I said from my seat. Then the Minister got up, and I'll see; well criticizing a program doesn't automatically mean that you think it's corrupt, that you think it's crooked, or anything like that. I have no comment on that. I don't know enough about it. And if he wants the person who made this accusation to deny it or repute it he can challenge him, not me. Because we have too many of these things, and the Member for Roblin is so good at that; you get up and automatically you say you're against everything because you sit on that side of the House, because something was said. You know, that's a red herring, and we can speak for ourselves, and if we make an accusation that's not true we could be asked to retract it, but I cannot allow for something to stand on the record. If I had't got up then it would stand on the record and everybody would have believed that I made this accusation. The Minister knows that. And that is wrong, it's not honest, and it's not right, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. ADAM: Yes, on the same point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. I have no problem with what the Member for Inkster has said. What he said is none of my business, he is a member of this House, he can say what he wishes; and the Minister has no right to say that the Member for Ste. Rose would have difficulty in going back to Ste. Rose to defend what the Member for Inkster says. And that is my point of privilege. I don't want the Minister of Resources to tie me in with the opinions of another member. I have nothing to do, I have no problem with that, and I don't intend to go back and defend anybody in this House, on that side of the House or on this side of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, since I am the subject matter of this discussion I would like to participate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. RANSOM: I believe I was speaking when I was interrupted on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carry on, Mr. Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I've been on the point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, if I might, and the Member for Ste. Rose has been speaking on the same point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: . . . I mean, I'm definitely speaking on the same point that I have heard . . . and I say, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. To the honourable members, I assumed that everybody was speaking on the point of privilege because nobody is speaking on the department that is under investigation.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I wish to be the one to accept the responsibility for having used the expression "corrupt". I don't remember using the expression, "arrogant". If I didn't use it, Mr. Chairman, I will adopt it. But I do not remember using the expression "arrogant", because I never regarded it as arrogance. If I did, Mr. Chairman, it's certainly not a word that I would have any discomfort with.

And, Mr. Chairman, when I use the word "corrupt", I use the phrase in the sense that the government is spending money, not based on any public need or equity, but on the basis of feathering the nests of certain people who it wishes to give a privilege to. I believe that is the basis for this program.

MR. RANSOM: I'm not speaking on the point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I'm continuing with . . . The Member for Ste. Rose had raised some questions, Mr. Chairman, which I was attempting to deal with. I am pleased to hear that the Member for Ste. Rose, in fact, disassociates himself from those charges of corruption and arrogance --(Interjection)-- . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose on a point of privilege.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I did not endorse what the Member for Inkster said, nor did I disassociate myself with what he said. I have no interest in what he said. I like listening to him, he is a very prolific speaker and I know that if we all listened to him more maybe we'd learn more. But I did not take a position for or against what he said. And the Minister should not say that I disassociate. Just leave me out of it please, Mr. Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I accept the fact that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose doesn't wish to disassociate himself from the remarks of the Member for Inkster.

MR. ADAM: Again, the Minister is trying to put me on one side of the argument or the other and he's not going to get away with it. If he intends to continue in that way I will get up on a point of privilege every time. So he had better start thinking about what he is saying. Let him answer the question. I asked him about how many farmlands have been sold, agriculture lands, please give me that information if he will. He doesn't have to give it to me, but if he intends to keep on talking about what the Member for Inkster says, I'm going to get up on a point of privilege.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I will be pleased to provide that information for the honourable member, and I can tell him that as of the 1st of March 1980, that we had received applications from 744 individuals who were wishing to become owners of land rather than tenants of the state. And of that number of applications, there are 576 that are in the process. There have been 106 that have been approved from the government's point of view; 62 have been rejected. There have been 204 appraisals that have been completed and Orders-in-Council at that time have been submitted to cover 79 offers to the individuals. I believe we discussed the question of appraisals before and I advised the honourable member how the appraisals were conducted. I do not believe that any sales have been completed at this stage. The prices are a matter of record. All the honourable member has to do is refer to the Orders-in-Council and he will see the parcels of lands listed and the prices that the government has placed on the land. There have been five applications for the purchase of sites for rural residences. There have been 15 applications for purchase of commercial; 7 recreational. And again, those are in process, Mr. Chairman, and none of them have been completed.

If I may return to some of the remarks that the Member for Ste. Rose has made concerning flood protection for Ste. Rose, I would just like to recount a bit of the history, Mr. Chairman, when he says that all the people of Ste. Rose have received to date is just talk. Well that may be, Mr. Chairman, that to this point there hasn't been any works actually under . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose on a point of privilege.

MR. ADAM: Yes, I wish the Minister would be very careful when he refers to remarks that I made. I never said it was just talk. I asked him if we were just talking about it or whether anything had been done. I didn't say that it was just talk. I wanted to know whether or not it was. I didn't say it was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can't rule on it because I don't remember the exact words and which one came first and which one came second, and I think that there are more intelligent people than myself in this room who do remember the way the words came.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose said that's not what he said, then fine, I'll accept that, but I would suggest that perhaps he should have a look at the record and see what in fact it says when it comes out. He may wish to make a correction there.

I can assure him that it's not just talk and I can assure him that they will get more positive reaction from this government than they received from the previous government. Because when they suffered flooding previously, Mr. Chairman, they were told that the costs are too great, the government cannot participate in helping you to put in flood protection for your community. So the town went ahead and on their own they spent some \$25,000 or \$30,000 to put in protection.

Now it wasn't entirely according to the engineering standards that provincial engineers would have recommended but I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that last spring when there was a flood in Ste. Rose that the dikes that the town had built worked. They protected the town from damage. They probably saved the government more money than the town spent on building them, because we didn't have to fight the flood to the extent that we would have. We didn't have to compensate the people to the extent that we would have. So it was fortunate that the local government, in that case, was prepared to accept some responsibility even though I think they had good reason to expect some help from the government. But they went

ahead, and they did work on their own and they provided some protection for their citizens. I can tell you that we will assist them to provide that protection and I would trust that they would have support. I would hope that I would have the support of the Member for Ste. Rose in providing that protection.

There is one other statement, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Ste. Rose did make and which I have to correct and that is he said that this government had issued a licence to allow the flooding of eight farmers at Grandview. Mr. Chairman, that simply is not true. The licence for the operation of the dam at Grandview was issued years ago; I don't know exactly when but certainly before we assumed responsibility for the government. So I simply correct the false allegation that the honourable member made with respect to that licence.

MR. ADAM: I thank the Minister for his information on the questions that I referred to him in regard to the land.

On the matter of the Grandview Dam, my understanding was that it wasn't put into design or that they never had a licence. Now I stand to be corrected on that. If I am wrong, then I will retract my statement, but the fact is that my understanding is that they now have a licensing to have the dam as it is. But the design is still the same and at only one year was it open. It was only open on one year and, as soon as it was open to its proper level that it should be, the eight farmers involved had no further problem. But it has since been put back the way it was and now the farmers are being flooded out. I was told by some people there, who are affected, that the town now has a licence to operate it the way it is. There are other ways of solving this problem. The engineers could go down there and make different designs to solve this problem with the eight farmers.

I know the Member for Roblin doesn't appear to be interested in this problem. I know they have been down to see him many times. He doesn't care that eight farmers are being flooded out. But the thing around Ste. Rose, the major project that the people of Ste. Rose area had approached the previous administration on wasn't really for a dike, it was for a diversion. That is the project that they had been asking for and there have been studies made on that. The cost benefits have been assessed and analyzed, and it was found that it would be too costly a project.

Now that's the way things were going and I think in a majority of the cases that's the way things are going to go now. If the government wants to change its priorities and move away from protecting farmlands from being flooded and rather move towards using most of the money to protecting towns, well that's their prerogative. The government can decide where its priorities are. That's fine; that's fair ball if they feel that it's time that we move away from protecting farmlands and spend more money to protect towns.

Now the Member for Roblin has never got up in this House once and said how about let's protect those eight farmers that are being flooded out around Grandview. He's never said that. You hear him talk about this, you hear him talk about that but he never goes down and solves the problems in his own area. But the major project in Ste. Rose was not a dike that they wanted, it was a diversion, a diversion like you have around Winnipeg, not that costly but it would work in the same way. And the interest alone would have been thousands and thousands of dollars and the maintenance alone would have been \$50,000 a year. I don't have those figures before me, I have them somewhere in my files. I am sure the Minister has them in his files and perhaps sometime when he has time or get his staff to pull it out and he would have a look at it. It wasn't accepted at that time. I want to tell you that some of the plans that the engineers come out with are pretty grandiose. They are pretty grandiose for more than what is required. I don't know whether they want to justify their existence.

I know that the proposal around Alonsa, the farmers around Alonsa at one time wanted to have a protection there for about 25 farmers and so they had a study made and the project came back to clean out the Garrioch drain, I think it was, for \$234,000, to do the work that was required to protect all those lands. The Minister stood up in his office and I think he was correct in saying no, there is no way that I can do it. The Member for Inkster, who was a Minister at the time, said there is no way that I can justify spending \$234,000 for that 10 miles of a clean out. And the farmers said to me, look. They came to me. I wasn't even elected yet but there was no member there and I was more or less available to pro-

tect the people's interests and they came to me and said, "Mr. Adam, would you arrange . . . we'd like to meet with the Minister because we have a problem. We'd like to get some drainage problems solved here and the engineers say that we have to spend \$234,000.00. And we don't want \$234,000.00. We don't need that." And I said, "You know what you do? Sit down a group of you farmers together. Sharpen your pencils a bit. Get in touch with a private contractor. Figure out how many yards of earth you have to pull out of that ditch and how many beaver dams you have to take out of it, and how much it is going to cost a yard to do that, and then come up with a proposal."

Mr. Chairman, they did that, and I said, "After you have done that, I'll arrange for the Minister of Mines, the Member for Inkster, to meet with you and discuss this problem." I believe I was there at that time; I came in with them. I think what happened was that they came in and they had a proposal for about \$40,000, give or take \$10,000.00. They came in and presented their case to the Minister, and the Minister was armed with all his Lieutenants and his Deputy Ministers and everything else. These poor little farmers who couldn't read very well or hadn't gone to school that much were there and here was the Minister with about five or six big armchair experts, Mr. Chairman.

After they had finished presenting their proposal, the Minister, I believe, turned to his Deputy Minister and said: Are these figures correct that they are presenting? And he said: I guess they are. Well, where does the \$234,000 come from? Well, they got their project and it's working. That's the kind of a Minister we want, not that kind of a Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the other day the Minister had agreed that he would bring us a more complete report on the question of the acquisition of the Grand Beach Hotel. I gather that he has not done so and perhaps he would want to use this opportunity to brief us more fully on why it is that the province chose to purchase that facility and why it is they chose to do it in the way that they did, Mr. Chairman. I think the public of Manitoba is entitled to know the logic of that acquisition.

MR. RANSOM: Indeed, Mr. Chairman. I was about to do that. Before I do, I must make one brief comment to correct a statement made by the Member for Ste. Rose. He said that they now have licence to operate the dam. In fact, the situation is that they are now operating the dam according to the licence, they've had the licence for years.

The question of the Grandome Motor Hotel, Mr. Chairman, I think I just would stick pretty closely to some notes I have here which I think outline the sequence of events behind the transaction. Since the original hotel was constructed in May, 1963, the operation has been plagued with financial difficulties as a succession of operators encountered difficulty in turning the hotel into a successful economic operation. The hotel was largely destroyed by fire in 1973, September or October of 1973; it has remained closed ever since.

The history of the matter since the fire would indicate that the Parks Branch have been striving to get the facility back into operation so that the public could be served. Now this could be done either by the province taking over the facility and operating it, or by leasing the facility to another operator. A series of prospective operators have showed interest in the hotel operation over the years but their interest has dwindled each time that the prospective purchaser became acquainted with the financial impediments that surrounded the situation.

In December of 1974 there was a submission to the Management Committee of Cabinet which indicated an estimate of \$292,000 to repair the damage to the main building caused by the fire. That also included some refurbishment of the 16 associated motel units. The facility was offered to the government at that time for \$165,000, which would mean a total outlay of \$457,000, if the facility had been purchased and the repairs made.

In an analysis of the economics surrounding the operation of the hotel the Management Committee's submission indicated that the anticipated gross earnings would only support an investment of \$150,000 using 11 percent interest amortized over 20 years.

So there were three alternatives placed before Management Committee at the time. One was for the government to take no action whatsoever; the second one was to encourage a private sale; or thirdly, for the government to acquire the hotel outright. The decision was to attempt to encourage a private sale, but this proved not to be possible, presumably for the same reason that the Management Committee themselves did not recommend to the government that they purchase it, because of the economics of the operation.

From our government's point of view, I think it is important that if the public is to be served that the accommodation there be made available in the Grand Beach Park. For that reason we have attempted to resolve this longstanding problem. The last major obstacle to clearing away the outside interests to enable the province to deal effectively with the facility and to get it back into operation involved the settlement of a mortgage that was held by Mr. Micay.

In August of 1964 the Grandome Motor Hotel Limited mortgaged its lease to Mr. Micay for \$130,000.00. Mr. Micay filed a caveat against the property on the basis of the mortgage of the lease. On July of 1967, the Grandome Motor Hotel assigned its lease to Victor Klus, who was the last operator of the hotel. In January of 1971, a mortgage extension agreement was entered into between Mr. Klus and Mr. Micay, and Mr. Micay filed a further caveat based on the 1971 mortgage extension.

Mr. Klus did not operate the facility after the fire in 1973. His failure to comply with the terms of the lease with the province resulted in the lease being terminated by the province in 1976. Mr. Micay was requested at that time to remove the caveats. In January 1977, Mr. Micay claimed \$25,000 as settlement of the balance due to him by Mr. Klus as of 1st April 1977. The balance owing then by Mr. Klus was \$38,719.00.

In March 1977 the Crown commenced proceedings to have the caveats removed from the title and in April 1977, following an offer to settle for \$15,000 by Mr. Micay, he commenced an action in the Court of Queens Bench claiming an interest in the lands by virtue of the 1964 mortgage of the leasehold interest. In May 1977 a tentative settlement was effected by the Attorney-General's Department and recommended to the Deputy Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs; and in January 1979, Mr. Micay's claim was settled by payment of \$14,500.00. The legal basis for Mr. Micay's claim was an interest in the land by virtue of the caveats and mortgage of the lease which did not cease with the termination of the lease in 1976.

The settlement secured to the Crown won a discontinuance to the Queen's Bench action commenced against the Crown by Mr. Micay; the withdrawal by Mr. Micay of two caveats which had been registered by him against the titles to Grand Beach Provincial Park; and thirdly a full release and indemnity given by Mr. Micay in favour of the Crown. I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that it was the opinion of the Department of the Attorney-General that the settlement was, in all the circumstances advantageous to the Crown. This was judged to be particularly so inasmuch as the claims and interest lodged by Mr. Micay continued to make it impossible to undertake any program for restoration or alternate use of the property. Mr. Micay's claim was settled by payment of \$14,500 as was recommended by the Department of the Attorney-General.

Problems which have plagued this operation for the past seven years have now been cleared away and we are examining the feasibility of getting this facility back into operation as soon as possible. For the past seven years, since the hotel burned, there have been no restaurant facilities for visitors to the park; such visitors have had to be referred to a restaurant in Grand Marais which has insufficient capacity or facilities to provide an adequate level of service. Tourists making enquiries are being referred as far away as the Birchwood Motor Hotel, 10 miles north of the park on Highway 59. In view of this situation, Mr. Chairman, I considered it was imperative to take steps to correct the lack of service to the public as soon as possible.

There was one specific question that had been raised, additional specific question, by the Member for St. Johns, he had asked what account the \$14,500 was paid from in January 1979? The account was 14CA110796.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster has one second. Order please. The time is 4:30 Private Members' Hour. I am interrupting the proceedings and will return at 8:00 this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, we're now under Private Members' Hour. Tuesday's first order of business is private bills.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The first bill is Bill No. 17. On the motion of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan, Bill No. 17 - An Act to amend An Act respecting the Agricultural and Community District of Newdale. (Stands)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, Bill No. 24 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Club Act, 1931, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stands)

BILL NO. 14 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE LAW SOCIETY ACT

MR. FILMON presented Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Law Society Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to explain the changes that are being made by virtue of this Bill 14. As members are no doubt aware, the Law Society governs the practice of the profession of law in this province under The Law Society Act. The bill which it is my privilege to introduce intends to make certain changes, some of which are relatively minor and straightforward, some of which are major as a result of a review which was carried on by a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Matas for a period of two years included I believe, as one of its distinguished members, the member of the Legislature for St. Johns. As a result, a number of these recommendations have resulted in the production of this bill and I will just basically summarize them, starting with first the relatively minor ones.

One of the provisions of this bill allows for a member of the Law Society to hold citizenship in another country. It's my understanding that in very few jurisdictions, if any, is there a restriction that says that a member of the Law Society, in order to have professional status in order to practise at law in that particular jurisdiction, that he cannot hold citizenship in another country. In fact, the situation has arisen whereby a former Winnipegger, a former Manitoban, a Canadian citizen now also has citizenship in I believe the country of Israel and is prevented from practising law or rather from being a member of the Law Society of Manitoba because of that. As a result, in reviewing this, the Law Society has decided that there isn't any good reason why this should be and this provision is being repealed as part of this bill.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, as a result of Mr. Justice Matas' committee's recommendations; one, the members are probably aware that the Law Society as a self-governing body has an elected ruling committee called the Benchers of the Society. Presently this consists of a number of practising lawyers, as well, it also consists of one student at law and one member of the Faculty of Law of the University of Manitoba Law School. The recommendation is that it be increased to two members of the Faculty and that is contained within this bill.

Finally on to the major thrust and change in The Law Society Act that is being brought forward as a result of this bill. It allows the Society for the first time to deal with incompetence as a reason to either suspend, disbar, fine or reprimand one of its members. This is a major recommendation of the committee under Mr. Justice Matas and, in fact, we would be one of the first jurisdictions going forward with that sort of provision in The Law Society Act or the governing of the profession of law in the province, but it's one that is very heavily and universally supported by members of the Law Society. In fact, jurisdictions all over North America are looking towards this and are intending to move in that direction.

What it means at the present time, Mr. Speaker, is that a person practising law basically can only be evaluated for any of these provisions of suspension or disbarment or fining or any of these things. They can be evaluated based on professional misconduct or, as it's referred to often, conduct unbecoming a member of the legal profession or criminal conviction for breach of trust or something of that nature. But competence has never been a reason under which they could legally be prevented from practising law. It involves a major step forward that will give power to protect the individuals and to ensure a professional competence under the membership in the Society. It gives them this authority and it is something that's very important to them.

There are such things within the bill that somebody who is incompetent, for reasons of mental instability, or alcoholism, or other reasons of this nature and in fact, they do apply as well in the judgement with reference to a complaint against a student at law, as well as a practicing lawyer. The same provisions, basically, can now become enforced that, due to their incompetence for this variety of reasons, they can either be suspended as a student at law, or they can be suspended, disbarred, reprimanded or fined by the Society as part of their mandate in governing of the profession of law in the province.

As an example, in the Society's 1978 Annual Report, Mr. Speaker, it showed that more than 200 complaints of delay, neglect, poor communication on the part of lawyers, were experienced and these all involve professional competence, more so than specific reasons for which the Society could reprimand or do any of those things to it's members in the past. Now the authority and the power would be vested within them to deal with complaints of this nature. As you know, the practice of law has become extremely specialized over the last while and, not unlike medicine, there are those who become very streamlined in their practice and deal with only certain aspects of law; for instance, they may deal for 20 years as a professional in conveyancing, commercial work and never have occasion to deal in matters such as the litigation that's involved in murder trials or heavy criminal-involved trials and under those circumstances they may not, in fact, be current or competent to deal with those specialized areas. Under situations like that where a professional, where a lawyer takes on a case for which he does not have competence or the background to deal with it, the society has no way of dealing with it at the present time. This would give them that right and in fact would provide better protection and a much higher standard of practice of law could be guaranteed I think to the public of Manitoba and consequently I would urge members to support the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital with a question.

MR. WALDING: I wish to ask a question of the previous speaker, Mr. Speaker. On the matter of the first principle that the member spoke to in moving second reading having to do with the citizenship matter, is the honourable member contending that the matter of citizenship is irrelevant as far as the competence of the lawyer to perform is concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The questions on second reading should be for clarification. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: I think perhaps I have been unclear in the explanation which has occasioned the question, so perhaps I could indicate that it means that somebody who is a Canadian citizen may also hold other citizenship. I think the member is referring to the fact that without being a Canadian citizen a person could not be familiar with our laws and the detail of the practice of law; but he still must be a Canadian citizen but he may also hold other citizenship is the point at issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I haven't perused that particular section perhaps as carefully as I should but when the member was making his explanation he said that a lawyer would not have to be a Canadian citizen, at least I thought that's what he said; and by the way, I see nothing wrong with that. If

there's any problem that some see, I am prepared to listen, but I think if a person came over and was a landed immigrant and spent his life in Canada, but didn't change his citizenship, went through school and preferred to remain a citizen of say, England or another country, I don't know that it's related to competence. It is related to some type of nationalism that we talked about with regard to land too. The Honourable Member wouldn't have been in the House when we had our great debates and the land question, when I asked why would a Canadian citizen, perhaps who lived in Cape Breton, be a better prospect for owning land in Manitoba than a person who lived in Noyes, Minnesota, and farmed Manitoba.

So I'm not particularly concerned about that particular section but when the member was explaining, he did I think say that a person who is not a Canadian citizen would be able to practice law in the province of Manitoba. There used to be a situation that you had to be a British subject, so a person coming over from Britain could practice here without becoming a Canadian citizen. Perhaps that is what has made the change, I don't know, but I can tell the honourable member that part interests me not in the least; that if a person is able to go through our schools and take our examinations, etc.; I'm not concerned that he is practicing law and is not a citizen of this country.

I do want to caution the member that the subject matter that he is talking about in very sanguine terms and saying that it's universally accepted and is a great step forward, need not have all of the attributes which he is expressing for with respect to this particular legislation. And if truth be known, Mr. Speaker, it scares the hell out of me. It is a great problem for any person in a profession or in any field of endeavour to have his livelihood and his right to continue in that livelihood be the subject of a committee of his "brethren".

And if the honourable member wishes to have it expressed in such a way that most Conservatives would understand, they would reject entirely the question as to whether a steelworker should be able to continue to practice his trade as a steelworker at the discretion of a committee of a union to decide whether he will continue that practice, as whether or not he is competent. Because, Mr. Speaker, competence is a matter of some subjectivity. Now I will admit that all things that are given to the Law Society to deal with can be subjective. It is difficult to understand how it could be subjective as to whether or not somebody has misused trust funds. I am not even going to try to do it.

But the things that are now dealt with are fairly clear. They were not clear to me in the Pilutik case and I said so, Mr. Speaker. I did not know how the Law Society got involved without a complaint from a citizen; without Pilutik having broken any rules governing members as to their behaviour with regard to a particular case or in court without anybody having complained. The Law Society apparently decided that they would suspend Mr. Pilutik on the basis that he drank; that they did not like his companions; that he swore; and that he had done nothing dishonest, which was their findings. And I had occasion to say at that time, Mr. Speaker, that if the Society decides to investigate lawyers on the basis of the fact that they like girls or that they swear or that they have associates who are not appreciated by other members of the society, that there would be a great danger that there would be no lawyers practicing in the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba.

And I therefore worry about where the society is going. And I understand, Mr. Speaker, that there has been I am sure, a very very conscientious study of the proposal and some great conflict, Mr. Speaker. I would be surprised if there was no conflict. The member says that it is universally accepted by the profession. I am at this point, I'm sorry . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: On a point of privilege, I said that it was almost universally accepted.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I caution members on using what they call purported points of privilege. It's misunderstanding of a statement which could be corrected at a later time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for helping me. If any member feels that I am misstating him, it's preferable that I am able to debate on what he said than what I thought he said; and if the member says he said almost universally, then I am going to ask him where his statistics come from because I don't know that is it almost universally accepted. As a matter of fact, to the lawyer, that is most important to me, it is not accepted at all, that being myself; which is more important than the almost universally that my friend is talking about. I am very concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the Law Society have further subjective jurisdiction over members of the profession. And I am not suggesting that the profession should be able to absolve itself; that members of the profession should not be accountable and expected to perform properly. But in all of the things that are suggested here the members of the profession is subject to the law of the land. If he is practicing in such a way as to not give service to his client he can be sued and held accountable for that, just as anybody else can be. Well, the member is shaking his head. I tell him, without any difficulty whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, that if a member of the profession handles somebody's work in an incompetent way and causes that person to suffer, that the laws governing the practice of law would permit that client to sue the lawyer and to recover damages. And I have absolutely no difficulty in deciding it.

Well, the member may says that this is loosing on the community people who may cause damages to their customers. And the Law Society is bound to protect him from the causing of that damage even before it occurs. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not certain that we should not let the public decide whether they wish to choose a particular lawyer or not and I do not know that we can protect the public from themselves to that extent. I was dealing with this problem last year in legislation that was brought forward by the Conservative party and I am dealing with it now, Mr. Speaker. We are dealing with a peer group and we are saying that peer group can disbar a lawyer on the basis of incompetence. And what we are in danger of doing, Mr. Speaker, is causing lawyers to start being afraid to stand up for themselves in dealings with other lawyers on the basis that some day they may have to appear before these people with a charge of incompetence.

Well, the member is shaking his head. I can tell the member that is the kind of thing that can happen and if the member will recall a movie that appeared in Winnipeg not long ago, the movie, "Justice For All", it was just before such a committee that one of these lawyers had to appear. And I submit that the movie, if there was falsity in it, it was only an exaggeration. It is not in the possibilities of what can occur.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Law Society is entitled to disbar somebody for breaking the rules of the society, for breaking the rules with regard to trust funds. They are even, I will concede, although on this I have some problems, entitled to disbar somebody for having been found guilty of a criminal offence which can be related to their duties as practicing lawyers. I do not know why somebody should have to be disbarred for driving while intoxicated. I am not suggesting that people should go running around while intoxicated. But it is a crime, it is punishable and the lawyer who commits that crime and is punished, seems to me should be in no worse position than another citizen, that he then be able to carry on with his profession. Now, there are some crimes, where the commission of the crime is itself related to standards of the practice of law. I don't see how a lawyer could be found guilty of perjury, let us say, even then the question is whether one would accept a criminal conviction as being conclusive that it has occurred. But, nevertheless, if the crime relates to his capacity to practice as a lawyer, then the society can deal with it and does deal with it. I don't know that I should have to answer for all of those things at this time because that is not really before us. If I have problems with the powers of the society at the present time I can deal with them other than through this bill. This bill is extending those problems and it is extending it into a very very subjective area, Mr. Speaker. And when that kind of thing happens, I think that there is a responsibility to nip it in the bud and to see whether it is absolutely necessary to do what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, they are going to be able to disbar somebody because his ability to perform legal services, which he has undertaken to perform, is impaired by reason of addictive to or excessive use or consumption of alcohol or drugs. Mr. Speaker, that's dangerous; there are lawyers who are alcoholics. Some of them are

known by their clients to be alcoholics. Some of them feel, rightly or wrongly, that they do better even though they are alcoholics than somebody who doesn't drink. Are we going to permit a disbarment because of an alcoholic problem, Mr. Speaker, and base it on the subjectivity that the Law Society says that his ability to perform has or has not been affected by that alcohol problem? Shouldn't we base any disbarment on a breach of some definable activity of the lawyer; that he used trust funds; that because he was an alcoholic he missed a trial that he was supposed to have attended. Some feature of his activities, rather than an opinion that he is unable to perform legal services which he has undertaken to perform by reason of excessive use or consumption of alcohol or drugs; because the next area, Mr. Speaker, even more of a problem.

I raise these, not because I'm in any way uncertain that they are put forward for the highest of all motivation and in the desire to protect the public. But I am not certain, Mr. Speaker, that we are going into a field which does not transfer tremendous power to a group of people over there, fellow practitioners, and every time that happens, Mr. Speaker, whether it's government or marketing board which my friend, the Member for Lakeside, is always so afraid of or anything else, I think we have to be very careful.

The Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Government Services would be interested in the next one because he is suffering from mental capacity or infirmity which impairs his ability to perform. The Member for Lakeside will see that as an interesting reason for disbarment. First of all, I assume that if a man is mentally incompetent and that a committee is appointed that he would not be permitted to practice law. If I am wrong then, of course, I would certainly be for the inclusion of that type of provision. But short of that happening, short of a person being declared mentally incompetent, are we going to permit the Law Society to start judging the mental capacity or the mental incapacity of persons to practice law. Mr. Speaker, it's an invidious example. I don't want to push it to the Law Society of Manitoba, but I don't know where it's going and how long it will go.

In Russia, they do a lot with people on the basis of mental incapacity or mental infirmity. They do a lot; they deal with all kinds of people on the basis of mental incapacity, and I am sincerely worried and I want to make it known to my friend and to other members of the profession that, no doubt, my friends in the Law Society will see this with giving subjective authority to a peer group. I think that there is great danger in it. I think that the problem of legal incompetence can be and has been and will continue to be dealt with by the same rules which govern other people in the service that they provide to the community, whether it be carpenters, whether it be lawyers, whether it be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: . . . whether it be garage mechanics in that they are accountable to their clients for their misconduct and can be sued in damages. I am concerned and want to know why it is necessary, outside of the normal rules that now give the Law Society the power to disbar, why we are now including these two items with respect to the consumption of alcohol or mental incapacity, even so found, still permits somebody to practice law, then I'd like the member to substantiate that. If that's the case, then maybe there is a problem. If it is not mental incapacity so found, if it is mental incapacity as determined by the Law Society, then I don't know whether that kind of power should go to the Law Society.

Mr. Speaker, we do have a legal profession that's been practicing in our province for many years. It's by no means perfect. As a matter of fact, the Member for Wolseley has described it as being at the opposite end of the extreme from no less perfect. In other words, I think the Member for Wolseley would say that it's not entirely bad, although I don't even know whether he would say that. It is certainly by no means perfect, but the fact is that putting lawyers in the position where, after having achieved the right to practice, which the schools and the profession are supposed to guard against, to at least set requirements for before you enter the profession, that after you have entered this closed profession, it seems to me that the rules which govern your being disbarred by a committee of your peers should be objective ones rather than subjective ones. I want to indicate to the member who introduced the bill, that I believe that I am not alone

in raising the questions that I have raised and that they will certainly have to be dealt with if this bill gets out of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I didn't plan on speaking to this particular bill, but the member brings up some interesting points. He will recall, a couple of years ago I introduced a Private Members' Bill, praying for the relief of one Ingibjorg Hawes, in connection with an Autopac claim that had been allowed to go past the Statutes of Limitation, the two-year period. No claim was filed so MPIC naturally declined the claim. I explained in presenting the bill, it was drafted by the Leader of the Opposition and seconded by the Member for St. George, there was a strong feeling that a great injustice had been done to this particular person. The bill got through committee and into third reading and was voted down on third reading, the reason being that the course of action should have been to sue the lawyer.

My statements at that time, Mr. Speaker, were, well you know who is really going to win when one lawyer starts suing another one. That lady is going to be the loser. That was two or three years ago, Mr. Speaker. The woman has been crippled and incapacitated to a fairly large extent, has received no relief whatsoever. There is no question when you look at the background in the case that there was a great deal of incompetence. The lady and her husband attended the lawyer's office weekly; there was weekly medical reports; there was a whole list of it and I won't go into it such as I did when I presented the bill praying for her relief. The officials of the MPIC have admitted privately that there was probably a \$100,000 claim. The particular lawyer in question, there have been proceedings started against him, but not before proceedings were started against him by the income tax people on five counts and probably five or six other . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Is the member referring to a case that is presently before the courts?

MR. BLAKE: It could be before the courts, Mr. Speaker, and I won't refer to that particular case. I'll get back to the bill, where I feel very strongly that if the Society is going to have a governing body that's going to police itself, then there certainly has to be some strong indication shown that they will be doing that job. There has been no indication up to now that that's been the case, and if this is going to provide the necessary teeth, then I could support the bill. But if it's going to allow situations to carry on as has been evidenced by, not only the one that I referred to inadvertently but many others that I'm sure members opposite could cite, then it becomes a problem for society and not just for the Law Society itself.

But my main purpose in rising, Mr. Speaker, was to bring to the attention of some of the members opposite in the profession that had opposed the particular bill at that time, but I realize that I'm not in order in bringing the matter up at this time. I'll certainly be bringing it up a later date. My main purpose in rising was to just bring to the attention of the members that there have been many many cases in the past where strong disciplinary action should have been, was never taken; some of it is still long overdue. If this bill will provide the necessary teeth for that to come to pass then I can support the bill, but if it's not, then I think we have to look to some other mechanism to provide the necessary protection to society.

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

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hadn't proposed to speak on this bill, and I will confess readily to members opposite that I haven't read it. I listened with some interest to the Member for River Heights when he moved it originally. And like the Member for Inkster, I misunderstood or misheard the honourable member when he was speaking on the matter of citizenship. I understood him to say that the bill would remove the provision that a lawyer had to be a Canadian citizen, but he has now clarified that matter. There was other reference made to British subjectship, if I can use that, and surely the key matter

there is whether or not the practitioner is one of Her Majesty's loyal subjects. Really, that is what the expression "British subject" means. It means someone who is loyal to, in this case, the head of state of this particular country. The Member for Inkster mentioned British citizens coming to this country; yes, they are Her Majesty's loyal subjects when they come here and so are people from any other Commonwealth country who accept the Queen as head of state. So a difference can be drawn between landed immigrants who are from commonwealth countries and those who are from not. But I tend to agree with the Member for Inkster that the matter of citizenship is really not that much of a factor when it comes to professional competence and I intended to further ask the Member for River Heights, as a follow-up question whether, if he felt that citizenship should not be a criterion for competence and whether he would support any move that also removed citizenship as a criterion for competence when it came to the teaching profession, because he might not have been here last year when I raised the matter of a regulation that the government had, having to do with teachers who were landed immigrants, who would in fact be prevented from teaching after six years because they did not have their Canadian citizenship. I had felt that was unfair and I make a little speech on it every year in the departmental estimates. I haven't persuaded this Minister of Education to make the change and I didn't persuade two former Ministers of Education to make the change anyway. The member can expect the same speech from me this year when we get into education estimates.

However, when it gets back to the principle of the bill itself, and that is what we are supposed to be discussing, the matter of competence of lawyers has been raised and it came as a surprise to me that it should be necessary to change a bill to give citizens the protection from lawyers on the grounds of competency. I had assumed all along that the job of the Law Society was to approve the competence of lawyers and to see that people were protected against incompetent lawyers.

Surely that goes back to the whole principle of self-governing professional associations in the first place. They were set up because the area of expertise of the particular profession was considered to be beyond the judgement of the average man in the street; that when it came to judging whether a doctor was a competent physician or whether a lawyer was competent in the practice of law, it was really something that the average citizen could not judge for himself and so the delegated legislative function was given over to an association made up of that profession so that they could judge on the competence of one of their fellows to carry out his privileged position, because it is a privileged position to be put in that position. And surely in giving a practitioner a licence to practice in the first place, that professional association has a duty to the public, to assure itself, and indirectly to the people, that the particular applicant for that privileged position had in fact gained the necessary training and experience and was competent to be let loose on an unsuspecting public, to practice on that unsuspecting public. If it were not for, in this case, the Law Society to put up that barrier and say, "You have to be this good in order to meet some criterion", then there would be no assurance to the public that they were getting a level of competence.

If there is no assurance of competence of a certain minimum level of confidence there, then I wonder why that Law Society Act has been in existence for however many decades it has been in existence. Surely if we grant to the Law Society or any other professional association that ability, that responsibility to see that a new applicant has met that standard of competence, surely the responsibility is there for that association to see that the level of competence is, in fact, maintained. Now I understand from listening to the last speaker but one that there are a number of areas involved in incompetence and a number of grounds under which a lawyer can be disbarred or lose his licence to practice or suffer some other restriction.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my intention to look at the bill a little more carefully, to read it over and also to review the remarks of the previous two members, before coming to a decision on whether I could support the bill or not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I too wish to express my sharing of the concerns and apprehensions expressed by the previous two speakers to this bill,

the last two previous ones, excluding of course the mover of the bill on second reading.

In response to the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to him that, in my opinion, I do not feel that this bill will resolve the problem which he had mentioned to the House. Because even if the bill before us were law and if a problem such as he had described were to arise, it would still have to be resolved in one of two ways; either through the courts, or failing that, if it should be a matter beyond the jurisdiction of the courts, then it would have to be brought into the House for the Legislative Assembly to deal with in the same manner as had occurred at the time when he brought the bill. Because all that this bill would deal with would be the matter of the lawyer's right to practice law, either as a barrister or a solicitor. But insofar as whatever effect it may have upon third parties, this bill would not rectify that matter whatsoever.

I too, Mr. Speaker, am concerned about a private organization such as the Law Society dealing with as subjective a matter as competence. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, who will define the level of competence, who is going to determine what will be the minimum standard of competence that will be expected of lawyers in order to entitle them to practice as barristers and/or solicitors. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, what will constitute incompetence. And this, as the Honourable Member for Inkster had pointed out very ably, it's a subjective matter, one difficult of definition and whether the Law Society will be able to define it in crystal-clear precise terms that will be capable of being applied to each and every complaint that will come before it, complaint of incompetence against a member of their profession, I don't know whether it will be possible to do that with that degree of clarity and precision.

Another question which arises in my mind, and I would hope that in the course of debate of this bill that it will be answered by those on the government side who may participate in the debate, is the matter of limiting the type of practice that a barrister or solicitor may be able to engage in, by ordering that a barrister or solicitor refrain from practising in respect of certain areas of the law.

My fear, Mr. Speaker, is that this may lead the Law Society into a rather fuzzy and woolly area because I would suspect that there are many areas of practice of law which, by their very nature, could conceivably involve litigation; could involve conveyancing; could involve matrimonial law and all of those areas of the practice of law could be part of the case brought to a lawyer by one client. It may be a divorce case, and tied in with it is property division. That in turn may lead to litigation. And other than the restriction that exists at the present time as between the role and function that a barrister may undertake, and that as solicitor, I don't know how much farther the Law Society may be able to go by saying to a lawyer, "Well, by reason of the type of incompetence which you have demonstrated, you are not permitted to practice divorce law, or you're not permitted to practice criminal law, or you're not permitted to practice estate law, or conveyancing," or any number of those or any others, or corporate law.

I have a fear, Mr. Speaker, that this may lead the Law Society into a very complex and a fuzzy area, an area within which even whatever it is that the Law Society wishes to do, it may find difficult to accomplish, difficult to enforce because of the complexity of it. So those, Mr. Speaker, are some of the questions which arise in my mind and largely which have come to my mind upon hearing the introduction of the bill for second reading, and I would hope that during the course of the debate that, I know that the mover of the bill will not be able to speak again until the closing of the debate, but there'll be others from the government side, and hopefully the Attorney-General will participate in the debate on this bill and clarify and answer to this side of the House, some of the concerns which we have expressed up to this point in time, and other concerns which likely might be expressed as the debate continues.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I thought that the Attorney-General had indicated he was going to speak. I'm sorry, that's why I took a little longer. Well, Mr. Speaker, I myself do not find any reason not to support the Section 5 of the bill which calls for the repealing of Section 37 of The Act. As a person who has

migrated to Canada from another commonwealth country, I also cannot see any reason for the fact of citizenship in another commonwealth country being any reason to be considered not worthy of practising a profession here, particularly in a case in the profession of law, where standards would be required by the Law Society and where a lawyer would have to requalify in order to practice in any province of this country.

So I will support the repealing of the citizenship requirement. Especially I think this applies where the person was originally a Canadian lawyer and obviously was competent in Manitoba in the law, and for one reason or another has moved to another country, so that he isn't in a position of having to requalify here. He was already called to the Bar, I take it, in the particular instance which the Member for River Heights referred to, in this province, and moved away and now finds himself in a situation where he cannot practice law in this province, and that to me doesn't really make very much sense at all. And in a situation like that and a situation such as the Member for St. Vital has referred to, where a person from another commonwealth country, where much of the law is, I think, common to the various countries, but the provision is still there that a lawyer migrating to Manitoba has to requalify in Manitoba, I just cannot see the necessity for that particular section.

I just cannot see the necessity for that particular section.

Much has been said about the embarrassment, I think you could call it, in which the Law Society might find itself or in which a barrister might find himself who was found to be incompetent. I think it was even suggested that this may have some personal connotations where a barrister had appeared before somebody who would later on be able to judge as to his or her competency. I would hate to think that the people who are administering the law in our province would behave in such a petty way.

The Member for Inkster is shaking his head. Obviously he has more experience with the people looking after the legal profession and their ways of operating than I have. --(Interjection)-- All right, never mind the profession, the Member for Inkster says, he just knows people. Well, I thought that was part of my qualification as well.

I suppose, and I don't think we have been informed about this, I suppose it would be the benches of the Law Society who would be making the decisions as to the competency or otherwise of the lawyer against whom a complaint had been made. I must admit that in my years in City Council, Mr. Speaker, I had some experience with members of the legal profession. I have to be careful what I say because I am closely related to a member of the legal profession. I don't want him to think I am referring to him; I have to go home to him. I have had some experience with members of the legal profession through my years at City Council, that have made me at times wonder whether they were indeed competent to practice law in this city. I have always felt that surely under the present regulations, there was some way in which these people could be handled.

Reading this amendment, this bill, I can only assume that this would not be so, that the governing body, the benches, whoever it is, finding a barrister or a solicitor or a student to be incompetent, "may" it says, not 'will', "by resolution" - and then there are a number of options open to them, including ordering the professional person to take courses of instruction and to refrain from practicing until he has established to the governing body that he is again, presumably, competent to practice in those areas of the law - "in order that the practicing certificate of the barrister may be cancelled, subject to such terms and conditions." I wonder if the Attorney-General could tell the House what is the present practice; what right the law society, what the benchers can do in a case now where a complaint is made by a member of the public as to the competency of a lawyer? We know that there are reasons for disbarment which, as far as I know, have nothing to do with competency, but is there really no way at the present time that competency is taken into consideration in continuing to allow a barrister to practice?

I would appreciate it if the Attorney-General could answer these questions, if he is going to speak on this matter, and I would expect that he is going to speak on the matter eventually, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Cultural Affairs, that this House do now adjourn and resume in Committee of Supply at 8:00 o'clock.

MOTION presented and carried and the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon (Wednesday).