

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Thursday, 12 February, 1981

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 . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Developments.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Report of the Manitoba Racing Commission, January 1, 1980 to December 31, 1980.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of Le Centre Culturel Franco-Manitobain, for the year ending March 31, 1980, and also the Manitoba Centennial Center Corporation, ending March 31, 1980.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Communities Economic Development Fund for the year ending March 31, 1980.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy.

RETURN TO ORDER NO. 6

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a Return to Order No. 6 dated April 15, 1980.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS Cont'd

MR. CRAIK: I would also like to table the 1979-80 report of Manitoba Mineral Resources Limited; and the report for the year ending March 31, 1980 of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board; and the report of the Mineral Resources Division for the year ending March 31, 1980; and the Annual Report for the year ending March 31, 1980 of the Manitoba Development Corporation.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege and, as you know, according to our rules, one ought to do so at the first opportune moment.

This refers to statements made by the Honourable Minister of Finance last Friday while participating in the debate on the motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. This is my first opportune moment to rise on this matter of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, because prior to doing so I wanted to do a number of things: No. 1, to check Hansard to ascertain that I am on proper ground; No. 2, check back in the Journals of 1974 as to the accuracy of some of the statements that were made by the Honourable Minister of Finance last Friday.

Mr. Speaker, my matter of personal privilege which affects me, and some of the statements made by him also referred to my then colleagues in Cabinet, and being part of Cabinet, directly or indirectly, it is also a reflection on me. At that time, Mr. Speaker, to cover up his own ineptitude and lack of courtesy on the part of his government, the Honourable Minister of Finance made the following statement with reference to the dates of tabling of certain reports, and I to refresh your memory, Mr. Speaker, I must read this paragraph. He said the following, that on February 15, 1974 — I am quoting the Honourable Minister of Finance, this is one day past the deadline, "The Department of Health and Social Development, Trade Practices Inquiry Act, Manitoba Crop Insurance Act, Manitoba Centennial Corporation, the Horse Racing Commission, the Department of Public Works" reports were then tabled.

Then he goes on, December 19, this is four days past the deadline, according to his calculation, "The Liquor Commission Report, the Queen's Printer Report"; day 22, seven days past the required deadline, "The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation"; day 33, eight days past the deadline, "The Workmen's Compensation Board"; day 58, 43 days past the deadline, "The Health Services Commission". The list goes on, Mr. Speaker. Day 69, 54 days past the deadline, Mr. Speaker, "The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, The Ombudsman's Report"; day 75, 60 days past the deadline, Mr. Speaker, and these members opposite talk about disregard of the House, "The Manitoba Design Institute, The Manitoba Export Corporation, The Manitoba Research Council, Department of Industry and Commerce", and I am still quoting the Minister. Guess what, Mr. Speaker, 75 days past, the Minister of Education, guess who the Minister of Education was at the time and he tabled "The Annual Report of the Public Schools Finance Board".

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I had indicated to you, I checked the Votes and Proceedings. I checked the legislation which makes it mandatory for the tabling of these reports and which sets out the deadlines for the tabling of them and I found the following, Mr. Speaker, with reference to some of the reports tabled on February 15. One mentioned was Health and Social Development. Mr. Speaker, that was for the year ending December 31, 1973, and there is a section within the Act that says that the department must prepare its report by no later than March 1st and upon the completion of the report the Minister must then table it.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind you that that report was tabled on February 15, 1974, even two weeks

prior to the deadline date set for the department to prepare its report, never mind the date for tabling of it.

On the same day, Mr. Speaker, another misleading statement with The Centennial Centre Report, that was for the year ended March 31, 1973, and the Centennial Centre has four months to report to the Minister. I checked the report and I found that the Auditor's Report was dated December 20, 1973. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that was done in all due haste, that was done forthwith, that upon the receipt of the Auditor's Report, the Minister then proceeded to print the report in whatever fashion he wanted to print it in for presentation to the House and tabled it on February 15.

The Horse Racing Commission Report, which was tabled today for the previous fiscal year, it too operates on the calendar year; it was for the calendar year ending December 31, 1973. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the commission has three months to report to the Minister, so therefore the Minister had time, until the end of March, to table the report. That was tabled on February 15, more than six weeks prior to the deadline date, prior to the deadline date for reporting to the Minister, another instance of the Honourable Minister of Finance misleading the House, into leading the House to believe that in some way we breached the law, that we did not comply with the legal requirement for deadline dates for tabling of reports.

On February 18, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister referred to the fact that the Liquor Commission Reports were tabled and that was a package tabling of a number of reports, the fiscal years of the various groups and agencies end at different times. The report on the administration of the Liquor Control Act was on a calendar year basis for December 31, and to make the whole series of reports meaningful, the reports were not tabled until it was possible to table that one. Surely, Mr. Speaker, you would not say that from December 31, 1973 to February 18, 1974 is any undue delay or a breach of the law in terms of the legislative requirements for the tabling of reports in this House.

The Queen's Printer Report, Mr. Speaker, that too was for its fiscal year ended on March 31, 1973, but I checked the report and I found that the Provincial Auditor's Report was not completed until January 10, 1974, for whatever reason, I do not know. Neither you nor I, Mr. Speaker, assign the priorities for the Provincial Auditor as to the sequence in which he deals with various departments. The Auditor's report was completed on January 10; the Queen's Printer, within four weeks after the completion of the Auditor's Report, reported to the Minister on February 11, and on February 18, the Minister tabled the report in this House. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is not a breach of the law.

On February 21, the Honourable Minister of Finance made reference to the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Report. The fiscal year of the Insurance Corporation ends on October 31, so that was the report for the fiscal year ending October 31, 1973. I checked that one and, Mr. Speaker, I found that the Auditor's Report was completed on February 11 of 1974.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is going on at great length. If the

honourable member would state his point of privilege, I believe, if he itemizes the items, that would be sufficient. I would require time to check them.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, each and every one of these incidents was a breach of privilege and I want that corrected and hence I must make reference to it in the House.

On the 11th of February, the Minister responsible for the Public Insurance Corporation received the Auditor's Report and promptly, within 10 days, he tabled it in the House, and the Minister of Finance accuses us of having breached the law.

On March 4, the Workmen's Compensation Board. That, Mr. Speaker, is for the calendar year, for the year ending December 31, 1973, and in that case, I checked the Auditor's Report and it was dated on February 16. The chairman of the board reported to the Minister the following day, on February 27, and four or five days later, the Minister tabled the report in this House. And we are accused of breaching the law, Mr. Speaker.

On March 29, the Health Services Commission. That is for the calendar year, Mr. Speaker. The Auditor's Report, and I want you to pay close attention, Mr. Speaker, the Auditor's Report was dated March 25. The chairman of the Health Services Commission reported to the Minister on March 26. The Minister submitted his letter to the Lieutenant-Governor on March 27, and on March 29, the report was tabled, with all due haste, as soon after the completion of fiscal year as possible.

Mr. Speaker, somebody from the opposition says, "What does the law say?" The law says upon the completion of the fiscal year, you prepare the report and you table it forthwith, and the report was tabled forthwith upon the completion of the fiscal year.

On April 9, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. The Auditor's Report wasn't dated until December 20, 1973, and upon the completion of it, the report was prepared in the fashion that the Minister chose to do, and tabled the report.

The Ombudsman's Report, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection)— The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce says "poor management," yes, of course, and we have seen evidence of it for the past three and a half years, Mr. Speaker, poor management. If the Honourable the First Minister is so concerned about what the law says, let him check The Ombudsman's Act. The Act simply says that the Ombudsman must report annually. There isn't even a deadline date set for it. For the calendar year ending December 31, 1973, we tabled our report on April 9.

On April 15, Mr. Speaker, the report of the Department of Industry and Commerce — and I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that it was a package deal including three other reports, those of the Research Council, the Export Corporation, and the Design Institute — and the three reports, which constituted part of the Industry and Commerce report, had been previously tabled on February 15, which the Honourable Minister of Finance had overlooked.

On April 30, the report of the Public Schools Finance Board. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to your attention the law that the First Minister is so concerned about. The law that the First Minister

claims to be such an expert in gives the chairman of the Public Schools Finance Board four months after the end of the fiscal year to report to the Minister, which takes you down to the 30th of April to report to the Minister, and the report was tabled on April 30, within the time that is allowed to the chairman to report to the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I cited all these breaches of personal privilege, of Privilege of the House, and, Mr. Speaker, as you have always reminded us on other occasions, that matters of privilege should be rarely raised and if they are raised, they should be concluded by a motion. Mr. Speaker, if you wish a motion, I am prepared to move the motion and if I move it, I would hope that the Honourable the Government House Leader seconds it, because I am sure that the Government House Leader wouldn't want to condone actions that would tend to mislead the House.

However, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, if you wish a motion, I am prepared to move it. On the other hand, if the Honourable Minister of Finance, who is not in his seat at this time, but if he at the first opportune moment should rise in his place and retract the misleading statements which he had made and offer his apology to the House, I and my colleagues would be quite prepared to accept that.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has raised many points, points which I believe the House must of necessity realize that the Speaker is not capable of checking at this particular time. I will take the matter under advisement to see whether or not a point of privilege was actually raised by the Honourable Member for Burrows.

Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Flyer Industries.

Further to the Minister's response on December 22, 1980 to questions pertaining to Flyer Industries, can the Minister advise whether or not he has now received a report from Woods Gordon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, Flyer Industries comes under the Manitoba Development Corporation, which I report for in the House. The Leader of the Opposition, I believe, is asking a question that dates back to December, when it reported through a different Minister.

But in answer to his question, the Woods Gordon people, as was indicated to him at that time, have been engaged for a period of time looking at the operations and at various aspects of the government interest in those operations. There is nothing further to report at this time. There is no formal report from that group which I can indicate to the member. There are ongoing discussions and further negotiations with them with regard to the operation.

MR. PAWLEY: A further supplementary. Can the Minister advise whether at the present time there is any proposal to purchase Western Flyer?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I can neither confirm nor deny that there may be proposals with regard to Flyer at this point in time. There have from time to time been interested parties. There is nothing of a nature that is sufficiently firm or affirmative that I could indicate at this time, though.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Minister advise whether or not the recent replacement of the former president by the newly-appointed president just recently announced rose as a result of any recommendations from Woods?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps to paint the picture correctly, when a former general manager left, one of the very capable staff people at Flyer were promoted on an acting basis while a new one was recruited. It took several months for that recruitment to be completed, then it was completed and that was announced about two weeks ago and that replacement person is there. But that is not replacing a person who was in the position in the last several months, it replaces Mr. Killinger, who left the organization perhaps about a year ago, and it took several months for his replacement to be recruited. Woods Gordon, to answer the other part of the question, was not involved in that search; that was a decision by the board of Flyer.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Minister advise, if Woods Gordon were not involved in the search, who was involved in the search over the past several months on behalf of the board?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it was undertaken by the board of Flyer Industries. If there was a professional search organization involved, I will take that question as notice and find out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Highways, I would like to direct a question to the Acting Highways Minister and ask whether the government intends to introduce compulsory helmet legislation for motorcycle drivers and operators in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to take that question as notice on behalf of the Minister of Highways.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering whether the Minister might give us some indication of government policy, in view of the fact that the Minister has recently issued a government information release indicating that four fatalities might have been prevented, in terms of snowmobile accidents, four of the five, had they been wearing safety helmets, and also in view of the fact that nine out of ten provinces in Canada now have compulsory legislation on motorcycle helmets.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the Acting Minister of Highways, who I am sure has

followed this debate for some time, whether the government intends to introduce mandatory seat belt legislation in Manitoba during this session of the Legislature?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, again, on behalf of the Minister of Highways, who has a considerable interest in the subjects raised by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, I am sure that he will have ample opportunity to discuss them with members in this House and certainly during the course of his Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health. As the Minister has been advised recently that the Thompson General Hospital has decided to remove all special representatives from their board, and as the board is a self-perpetuating board and this effectively eliminates much of the community-based input into that board, can the Minister advise us as to what action he is going to take in regard to the strong protests which have been forwarded to him by at least one party, the city council in Thompson, in regard to this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Yes, Mr. Speaker, that request is being discussed with the Manitoba Health Services Commission at the present time. As the honourable member may know regulations and by-laws of that nature, having to do with the composition of boards such as the hospital board, come totally under the aegis of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, not directly under the aegis of the office of the Minister of Health. I am not suggesting that there can be no conversation, discussion or even suggestions proffered by the Minister of Health, but those decisions rest with and are vested in the Health Services Commission.

As a consequence, the Commission responded to the request for the reform or the restructuring of the board at the Thompson General Hospital and, subsequent to that, the discussions referred to by the Honourable Member for Churchill have commenced and that particular request is being looked at.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the Minister is if he can advise us as to government policy in this regard or if he can provide us with some insight into representations that he may be making as Minister of Health in regard to the encouragement of a hospital board which doesn't that accurately reflect the needs and the aspirations of the community.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the only thing I could say is that government policy in this regard is that the boards and the authority for the administration of the operations and policy of hospitals in the province should be constituted and operated, insofar as is possible, according to the wishes of the community. Certainly a very strong representation came forward from the board, which

is representative of the community, for this restructuring process. Now, if there are one or two groups or sectors of the community that feel themselves now lacking in representation, the Commission, in discussion with me, has agreed to re-examine it, but we have no policy beyond that they should be constituted and should operate in such a way which meets the majority interests of the community.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if he can indicate what other hospital boards in the province are so constituted? In other words, are there any other hospital boards which are not elected from the general public and, if there are, can he indicate which ones they may be?

MR. SHERMAN: I can't so indicate without checking the list, Mr. Speaker, but I can assure the Honourable Member for Churchill that there are other boards so constituted. There are boards that, in the main, are made up of representatives, trustees, elected from the community and that, in one degree or another, have constituent interest groups represented and the authorization for that is written into their by-laws. But it is rather a mixed system and I would have to review the list and discuss it with the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to either the Minister of Consumer Affairs or the Minister of Health, whoever feels best qualified to answer it. I would like to preface my remarks, if I may, by congratulating the Minister of Consumer Affairs on his new responsibilities.

Is one of these Ministers prepared to say that they will disclose the names of restaurants outside of the inner city which fail to comply with clean-up orders from health inspectors?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the question comes under the aegis of my colleague the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Environment. The subject certainly is under discussion between the city and my office and his office. I would ask that for the moment my colleague and I be permitted to take that question as notice.

MRS. WESTBURY: In considering the matter, Mr. Speaker, I would request that they become familiar with the practice in the City of Edmonton where there is full disclosure on these matters.

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

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure if I should address my question to the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport, or the Minister of Agriculture, but I'll ask the question anyway and whichever Minister, whose responsibility it comes under, he can rise.

My question is: Does the province have any involvement in the ladder plant at St. Laurent?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): It is no longer within the Department of Agriculture Estimates and the member could get that information later during our Estimates but the Department of Agriculture no longer funds a ladder factory at St. Laurent.

MR. ADAM: I am seeking information, Mr. Speaker. I wonder then if I could direct a question to the Deputy Premier and perhaps he could enlighten us as to whose department it comes under.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.
The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: May I address my question then to the First Minister, if none of his Ministers are able to stand up and answer my question. Is the government negotiating with any private individual to sell the ladder plant at St. Laurent?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to take that question as notice and get the information on what the exact status of the ladder plant is at St. Laurent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the question that was posed to the Minister of Health by the Member for Fort Rouge. In view of the fact that health inspections within the City of Winnipeg take place under provincial jurisdictions in some areas and under the City of Winnipeg jurisdiction in other areas of the city, can the Minister advise whether or not he has taken any position or made any recommendations pertaining to rationalization of the health inspections within the City of Winnipeg so that the type of conflicts referred to by the Member for Fort Rouge are reduced?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is asking if I have made any recommendations to the Executive Council, the answer is no. But certainly at the working level, at the level of my office and the Environment Committee of the City of Winnipeg, and at the level of senior management, both in my department and the Department of the Environment and the City of Winnipeg, we have been working very strenuously to try to sort out the anomalies in those fields of responsibility and to bring that kind of rationalization about. I don't have a final answer to that question as yet, but we are at work on it.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Minister advise whether or not he has received any recommendations from senior management, both in his department and at the city level?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have received recommendations but it's a process of the

participation of three constituent groups, in effect, the City of Winnipeg, the Provincial Department of Health, and the Provincial Department of the Environment. There have been recommendations proposed by each constituent group that have not necessarily been satisfactory to the other one or two; that is the process we are in.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, has he received a recommendation from within his own department?

MR. SHERMAN: I think the answer to that question would be no, Mr. Speaker, there has not been an exclusive set of recommendations that have come forward from my own department. These three interest groups and responsibility area groups that I have referred to have worked collectively on this.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, then in view of the fact that the various interested groups have been working and have indeed presented some recommendations to the Minister, but not apparently the Minister's department, my question to the Minister is can he ask his department for a recommendation?

MR. SHERMAN: I suppose the answer to a question of that type, Mr. Speaker, is yes. I can ask my department for a recommendation but it is not necessarily going to produce the kind of co-operation and the kind of rationalized approach that we want. There are conflicting interests in this field as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition well knows. There are philosophical questions as to whether or not those areas of responsibility should be vested, for example, in arms of government, or agencies of government, which purely operate in the health field; or whether that confines their sphere of expertise and their perception to too narrow an area. It is these kinds of questions that are being addressed right now and we think we are fairly close to a solution but it is not immediately at hand.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health has indicated that there are conflicting interests and certainly we recognize the various conflicting interests. At the same time we must look to the Minister as being paramount in regard to responsibilities pertaining to health in the Province of Manitoba. We must, therefore, ask the Minister if he intends to ask his department to bring forth to him recommendations so that he can act upon, in view of the various obviously conflicting recommendations that the Minister has received from other sources.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the question is repetitive and out of order.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. My question related to a request to the Minister if he would. The earlier question related to, has he received a recommendation? The Minister responded to that. My present question relates to, can the Minister undertake to obtain a recommendation?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think if the Honourable Member would check his Hansard he would find that his question is repetitive.

Order please. Order please. I have ruled the question to be repetitive. If the honourable member

wishes to challenge that he knows the methods of doing it.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised because this is a prime instance of an effort to obtain information. I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister himself, if he felt the question was repetitive, would have so indicated and I believe the Minister himself would concur that the question is not repetitive. It is a question if he would undertake certain action?

A MEMBER: Rephrase it.

MR. PAWLEY: And, Mr. Speaker, I am going to attempt to do that though I really, with all due respect, feel it not necessary.

Is the Minister prepared . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. In the opinion of the Chair the question is repetitive and I rule it out of order.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, then with all due respect I challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? All those in favour of the Motion please say Aye. Those opposed please say Nay. In my opinion the Ayes have it.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.
Order please, the ruling of the Chair has been challenged.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

AYES

Messrs. Banman, Blake, Brown, Craik, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Filmon, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Kovnats, Lyon, MacMaster, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Sherman, Steen, Mrs. Westbury.

NAYS

Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Bostrom, Boyce, Cherniak, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Malinowski, Miller, Parasiuk, Pawley, Schroeder, Uruski, Walding.

MR. CLERK, Jack Reeves: Yeas 27, Nays 20.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): My question is to the Honourable Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro. In view of the fact that the contract between Hydro and Inco at Thompson is due to expire on March 31st, and negotiations are under way for a new contract, can the Minister inform the House what involvement he or his department have in those negotiations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, first of all negotiations are under way. They are principally with Manitoba Hydro although I believe some members of the Energy and Mines Department have been involved in the discussions as well.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. I would like to ask whether the government has any policy regarding the negotiation of a rate for Inco different from that which other companies are paying under Hydro's general rate?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that's under discussion.

MR. WALDING: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to ask the Minister whether the government is prepared to negotiate a rate for Inco that is different from the rate being asked and negotiated for with Alcan?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that's really part of the second question the member asked. The matter is under discussion; while it is under discussion and negotiation it would be hardly appropriate to bring it up in the House here.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. I did not ask the Minister for details of negotiations, I only asked him whether the government was prepared as a matter of policy to agree to a rate different for Alcan than it will do for Inco.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think again that question has been answered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, in response to a question from the Member for Fort Rouge two days ago with respect to violations of the Human Rights Act, Mr. Speaker, I indicated that it would appear under the legislation that the Human Rights Commission did not have jurisdiction in that matter.

I can now advise her, Mr. Speaker, that the Human Rights Commission have received complaints concerning two girls who were banned from teams connected with the Greater Winnipeg Minor Hockey Association, and under Section 13 of the Act, which gives them general power they have written to the president of the Greater Winnipeg Minor Hockey Association with a copy to the president of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association appealing to those two bodies to reinstate the players who have been banned at least until the end of the season which would give them an opportunity to further study the implications of the actions that have been taken.

Mr. Speaker, also in response to a question from the Member for Transcona, at the end of last week regarding a number of matters, firstly the investigation of the Boyanisky accidental death. Mr. Speaker, an inquest is scheduled for tomorrow at the Provincial Judges Court Building and as soon as that report is issued I will endeavour to make a copy available to the Member for Transcona.

He referred also to a previous accident some three years ago at the CNR reclamation yards. I remind him of a copy of a letter I sent to him which was addressed to the CNR referring to the problem of CNR property in federal jurisdiction which complicated the matter but advising that in my opinion and other members of the Legislature we recommended a physical search of the scrap iron pile. In addition, the inquest at that time recommended that all railways and construction companies survey periodically all of their scrap metal dumps in search for explosive material.

He also asked, Mr. Speaker, what procedures the Armed Forces are using to ensure that live shells do not get into circulation. I expect that that will be a matter dealt with tomorrow and during the course of the inquest. If it is not, I will undertake to make enquiries directly of the Armed Services, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Honourable Government House Leader.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, firstly if I might indicate the committee meetings for the next short while. On Tuesday, February 17 in the morning, we will be calling the Committee on Economic Development to deal with C.E.D.F.; on Thursday, February 19, the same committee to deal with the Manitoba Development Corporation; on Tuesday, February 24 in the morning, the same committee to deal with Moose Lake Loggers and Channel Area Loggers; on Thursday, February 26 in the morning, Public Accounts Committee will be called.

Inasmuch, Mr. Speaker, as I anticipate the House will be adjourned, as I have discussed with the Opposition House Leader, for Friday, February 27, the Public Accounts Committee would be called for the morning and afternoon of Friday, February 27, and then to meet every Tuesday and Thursday morning thereafter until Public Accounts is completed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 2.

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL NO. 2 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood) presented Bill No. 2, An Act to Amend the Legislative Assembly Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with a number of separate issues and because of the nature of them, I would ask that the House bear with me

while I refer to the notes explaining the different elements of the bill.

Three of the separate issues dealt with in Sections 3, 4 and 5 arise because of the Session opening in December of last year, rather than after the beginning of this current calendar year. The other three dealt with in Sections 1, 2 and 6 are three separate matters arising from diverse causes. I think it's readily understood by all members that the Legislative Assembly Act is fashioned in such a way as to anticipate that the Legislature would meet after the beginning of the new year, January, February, March, or whatever the case would be. Unlike most other jurisdictions which have been having split sessions for some time, our legislation has remained in this form even though we have suggested from time to time that we would like to try what we are doing this year and see if it results in more efficient use of the time of the honourable members as well as the appropriate consideration being given to all of the matters that are before the House.

So it is necessary, if we are to follow this procedure in the future, that the nature of the Act be changed to contemplate the fact that the House might sit in a new session toward the end of a calendar year and that new session then carry on after the new year of the next succeeding calendar year.

I'll deal with the separate issues first, Mr. Speaker, if that's agreeable to the House. During last year a dental insurance scheme of a group nature has been entered into by the government for the purposes of providing dental insurance for all employees of the Government of Manitoba. It was anticipated that that same insurance, and those benefits should be available to members of the Assembly as well, and Section 1 of the bill makes it clear that any member may join and receive benefits under the dental insurance scheme and any other similar group type insurance scheme which may be entered into in the future without, of course, resulting in any disqualification under the general sections that apply to all honourable members of this House.

Section 2 of the bill deals with a problem arising from committees sitting for special purposes during a session of the Legislature. Occasionally these committees sit while the House has been adjourned for a lengthy period. The existing authority for paying members of the committee an indemnity or expenses for attending the meetings of committee applies only for meetings of the committee when the House is not in session. The amendment is intended to take account of the fact that when the House is not in session, but is merely adjourned for a period longer than four days, that members who are attending to their responsibilities as members of a committee are entitled to receive the usual indemnification as though the committee were meeting when the House was in a period of adjournment.

It's intended to allow these indemnities and expenses to be paid for members of the committee when the committee meets during the session but on days when the House itself is not sitting and has, in fact, been adjourned for four or more continuous days. During such periods the per diem allowance are not payable to members for attending the session because they do not apply to periods when the Assembly has been adjourned for four or more

continuous days. Therefore the power to pay indemnities and expenses for committees has been tied indirectly with those periods for which per diems are not payable to members.

I think it will be clearly understood by all of the honourable members, Mr. Speaker, that this does not represent any additional money that will be flowing to members but rather to take account of a calendar situation that arises when the House is in a period of adjournment longer than four days, such as we were precisely over the Christmas period this year and on into January when there was the necessity for a Standing Committee of the House to meet, and the members serving on that committee would not ordinarily be entitled to indemnification for that service merely because of this technicality which is now being cleared up.

Moving over to Section 6 of the bill, Mr. Speaker, this deals with a question raised by the auditors as to certain benefits which retired members of the Assembly had under Part II as it was prior to last year's amendments. Some of these members — I hasten to add it has no effect whatsoever on any member of the Legislature sitting in the House at the present time. Some of those members were entitled to purchase prior service as members of the Executive Council, or other categories that became eligible for pension purposes, and have the cost of this purchase offset by 50 percent of the addition to the pension which they would be entitled to by reason of this additional service. As this was a one-time benefit, it was not included in the new Part II of the Act which was enacted last year.

There are some peripheral benefits which apply to these members by reason of their being in this special situation, and they deal with increased pension after the total amount of the deductions equals the amount required to buy back the past service and the procedure in the event of the death of these members prior to the deductions having been fully made.

I'm sure that along with the Member for Seven Oaks everyone is just as confused as they were before when I make mention of this. That is why I am sticking very closely to the notes, Mr. Speaker, because it is a technical amendment that has been proposed by the auditors in order to deal with a drafting oversight which would otherwise have a prejudicial effect upon two former members of the House with respect to their pension benefits.

Section 6 of the bill is intended to make it clear that these benefits continue to accrue to those retired members, even though there is no specific mention of them in the new Part II that was enacted last year.

Now the other problems that are dealt with in Sections 3, 4 and 5 arise because of the Session opening in December rather than after the end of the numerical year, as we were discussing before. As you are aware, there is a special provision in the Legislative Assembly Act that deals with indemnities for what are known as Special Sessions. There has never been any specific definition for a special session, and therefore the provision dealing with these indemnities for special sessions depends upon a description of a session which begins in the same year as the previous session.

The present session did begin in the same year as the last session, which opened on February 21, 1980.

If the present provisions of the Legislative Assembly Act were followed precisely, this is because the Act was set up to accommodate a session starting into a calendar year, then it would be necessary to vote a special indemnity for members for attendance at the current session. That's as the law presently stands. As it is intended that this is to be a regular session dealing with all of the business which is normally dealt with at a regular session of the Assembly, Section 3 of the Bill provides that for the purposes of paying regular indemnities to members, the current session will be deemed not to have opened in the same year as the last session.

Having said all of that, it merely means that we started the session in December but we're presuming in the law that it started in the new calendar year in 1981 for purposes of payment of the indemnities. This will mean that the ordinary sessional indemnities will be paid for the current session, as of course was the intention and the expectation, I am sure, of all of the honourable members.

Under another provision of the Legislative Assembly Act, the cost-of-living allowance increases on indemnities payable to members is calculated on the basis of the increase in the consumer price index in the numerical year preceding the year in which the session begins. And because we opened in December, we fell afoul of that particular formula as well because again, I stress, the Act is drawn in a way to contemplate the House only sitting in January, February, March, or whatever. We confounded our predecessors by doing what we did this year and we're merely setting the Act straight so that we can do this in succeeding years.

As the current session, as we all know, began in 1980, and the members have already received a cost-of-living allowance for 1980 by virtue of the session which ended in July of 1980, no further cost-of-living allowance increase would be payable to honourable members unless this amendment were put forward on the indemnities under the present Act as it's drawn. So it's intended that the present session of the Legislature is the normal, regular session of the Legislature which in the past has almost always been opened in the new year, January, February, March or as the case may be; there is no reason why the cost-of-living allowance should not be allowed for members' indemnities and computed as though the session had opened in 1981 instead of 1980.

Section 4 of the bill provides that for the purposes of these cost-of-living allowance calculations, the present session will be deemed to have opened in 1981 rather than 1980.

There is another provision in the Act which requires the first instalment of members' indemnities to be paid at the end of the second week of the session. This would, of course, have meant that the first instalment of indemnities for the current session would have had to have been paid back in December of 1980.

Section 5 of the bill is intended to make it clear that for the purposes of paying the first instalment of the members' indemnities, the session will be deemed to have opened on the first sitting day in 1981 which was February 3rd.

Now, having mentioned all of those legal technicalities . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Say that again.

MR. LYON: I suppose I could indicate in simple terms, as I've tried to do throughout the piece, that this is really remolding the Legislative Assembly Act to take account of the fact that the House should be able to start a second session in the same year without getting a special indemnity and that honourable members should be able to receive, in the ordinary course of events, the numerical year fractional increase that is provided for their indemnities as though the session had begun in the next numerical year. It means no extra indemnity or extra emolument for any of the honourable members, it merely sets the legislation in accordance with the new calendar of sittings that we have adopted for this session.

So Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in recommending this bill to the House. There is a second bill that has just been distributed today and I'm not sure what arrangements the House Leader has made with respect to it but it also deals with the Legislative Assembly Act and if it is the will of the House that leave be given to introduce that bill, the two of them might proceed at the same time, but that's entirely up to honourable members.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to, this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, address only one particular aspect of the bill before us. I want to deal with Section 1 of the bill, Mr. Speaker, having perused the other sections and concluded that they were, by and large, satisfactory to myself.

Section 1, Mr. Speaker, deals with exemptions from the classes of activity which render a member disqualified from the Legislative Assembly. We have, for years, been dealing with this particular question in a rather haphazard and ad hoc manner. If one looks at Section 19 as it is currently constituted in the Legislative Assembly Act, one sees a whole series of amendments and sub-amendments and sub sub-amendments, all of which are basically addressing the subject of conflict of interest and all of which, Mr. Speaker, have been drafted in response to particular circumstances which have been presumed to have possibly breached the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in all the years in this province, deplorably, we have not ever come down and got to grips with the question of drafting decent, enforceable conflict of interest legislation, the type of legislation that many other jurisdictions around the world have adopted and are now enforcing.

Mr. Speaker, I know that in addressing this question one does not expect to win any points with respect to popularity within the Chamber. I recognize and I respect, Mr. Speaker, that there are a variety of reasons for members to be opposed to this sort of approach to this question. I have read, Mr. Speaker, the debates in 1975 relative to a bill that was then before the House introduced by the then First Minister, Mr. Schreyer, and which I note, Mr. Speaker, was indeed withdrawn after considerable debate, and I would indicate that having perused the commentary in the debates, I am familiar with a

variety of different arguments that have been presented both in support, and cogently sometimes, Mr. Speaker, in opposition, to the concept of conflict of interest legislation.

So Mr. Speaker, I respect the positions that have been taken in this Chamber and that indeed will probably once again be taken when and if this subject once again receives a full airing and an opportunity for all-member debate. And I hope that will be very, very soon. I can indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I regard this as a priority matter, I regard it on a personal basis as being very important, one that I think must be acted upon, so I will do whatever I can as an individual to promote this sort of legislation in the Manitoba Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I want to address myself again to the method that we have utilized. Rather than establish precise definitions, objective definitions of what constitute conflict, we have always tried to give effect to special exceptions. We sort of work counter logically against the current, Mr. Speaker, and we say, well, somebody has done something which they didn't think constituted a breach, that they didn't think was a conflict. But now, Mr. Speaker, someone concludes, perhaps counsel, or somebody thinks that it may have been and as a result in order to protect that member, in order to protect that member's continuing right to sit in the Legislature, we introduce another amendment to Section 19, another exclusion.

Mr. Speaker, it only serves to illustrate the need for some objective definition of what is a conflict, because virtually none of these classes and sub-classes have arisen as a result of something that happened that was a true premeditated conflict of interest, if I can use that phraseology. I would dare say virtually none of them have occurred in that manner. So what we have, Mr. Speaker, is basically a response to unculpable behaviour that is unblameworthy actions.

Mr. Speaker, I say that it would be far better to follow the course of action that has been taken by other legislative assemblies, other elected officials and objectively prescribe and define what a member cannot do. If we did that, Mr. Speaker, it would then only be necessary that we have adequate disclosure guidelines, which this Act, Mr. Speaker, doesn't even begin to address. I mean it's absolutely worthless insofar as not only is it illogical in its approach to what constitutes a conflict but it does nothing to talk about means of patrolling and policing conflicts through disclosure. Virtually every viable, every recognized and noteworthy piece of conflict legislation in the world has a disclosure mechanism. So, Mr. Speaker, as a result of those defects, I say that this piece of legislation is meaningless.

I suggest that we can never hope by simply enacting conflict-of-interest legislation to make people more honest, Mr. Speaker, and we are all aware that we all take an oath of office anyway, so there's a presumption of honesty. But, Mr. Speaker, we can give by example of acting on this subject and making disclosure, we can give the public reason to have confidence in the people they elect to govern their affairs. That, Mr. Speaker, is the essence of what I'm talking about, the need to restore confidence to the process of public affairs in this province, and indeed all around the world. Because,

Mr. Speaker, we've had ABCSCAM, we've had Watergate, we've had a mayor in Edmonton who doesn't know when to take his fingers out of the cookie jar — and he went to jail for it, Mr. Speaker, Mayor Hawryluk.

We have in our own Chamber, although it wasn't a conflict of interest, Mr. Speaker, we sadly and somewhat tragically have had to disqualify a member's privileges pending an appeal before the high court of this province. So, Mr. Speaker, I say that it's time to do something affirmative to restore confidence in the democratic process. I say that we can do that by having conflict-of-interest guidelines, having adequate disclosure mechanisms. Mr. Speaker, in doing so, we will also prevent unwitting conflicts of interest.

You know, I guess it was 1969, the newly appointed Minister of Mines in the Schreyer government indicated to the House that he was selling his shares in Sherritt-Gordon Mining Company. It was his judgment, Mr. Speaker. He felt that that among other things might constitute a conflict of interest in his position dealing with the question of mining and the question of his jurisdiction in the context of people doing business in the province, so he sold his shares, Mr. Speaker. No one has asked, and I think no one need ask because there is no legislation, but one might question whether or not it would be wise for all subsequent Ministers responsible for Mining in the province to do likewise. I think one can argue, Mr. Speaker, that it's rational to suggest that it would be prudent for an individual to do that. It would be reflective of cautious prudence and I think that a Minister who had done that would have done the right thing but, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for anybody to do that and there is no way to find out. There is no list of assets required by Ministers to be disclosed so that we can determine whether a Minister has such a holding.

We don't know, for instance, whether the Minister of Health, and I don't mean, Mr. Speaker, to be disrespectful or make a suggestion, but we don't know whether the Minister of Health owns shares in private nursing homes. Now, Mr. Speaker, members can scoff and members can laugh and say, well, it doesn't matter. It matters to us, it matters to the people of Manitoba who have something at stake. If the Minister of Health has a vested interest in the ongoing viability of proprietary nursing homes, I would say that that would very much colour his or her perception, as the case may be, from time to time, of the public policy issue of public versus private nursing homes and which might afford the public best delivery of this service.

I would submit respectfully to all members that the time has come for us to address this very important question. This is a very very large scale operation and some of the arguments — I'm just thinking, Mr. Speaker, in the past members have argued that we shouldn't have this sort of legislation because if we require disclosure we're going to perforce, disqualify certain virtuous, certain upright citizens from participating in the public process of government. We are going to discourage them from participating, because they don't want to reveal their assets, they feel that's an intrusion on their privacy, that that's an unnecessary burden — for all those reasons they

would therefore prefer not to become involved in this process.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there was many years ago some wisdom in that sort of position. I think when even Ministers of the Crown received very small remuneration, as they did in this province, Mr. Speaker, for many many decades and generations, there was reason to be concerned about that, because truly it was important that we give every bit of encouragement to get the best qualified people into the public process. But, Mr. Speaker, we're now talking about an Assembly that affords Cabinet salaries of approximately \$45,000, which is well beyond the average worker's wage in this province, free automobiles, automobile expense accounts, private and personal expense accounts for other things. We are well beyond those days, Mr. Speaker. The scale and scope of this operation is comparable to any such political forum I'm sure in the world. I'm sure that state legislators in the United States don't earn very much more relative to the salaries and emoluments enjoyed by members of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that we have indeed entered a new era. There is no reason to worry about the resistance of people entering the public process for this reason any more. I would say, on the contrary, that because the big stakes are likely to lure all kinds of people, Mr. Speaker, and I could point my finger but I won't do so. Mr. Speaker, I think we all know it can entice a variety of different people with different motivations, and types of people who maybe want to be loose in terms of their personal and public morality.

Mr. Speaker, I say that it's no sacrifice to meet contemporary needs by bringing this sort of legislation. Mr. Speaker, going on, I would indicate that it's very important that members of this Chamber be cognizant of the fact that we have perpetrated a hypocrisy on the people of Manitoba by calling — and I'm talking now about the government. This government, Mr. Speaker, has called upon the various municipal governments of this province to look into the question of conflict of interest; they have received reports, Mr. Speaker, on the question of conflict of interest in the municipal arena; they have last year, Mr. Speaker, had to deal with a very dicey question involving the behaviour and conduct of certain councillors in the City of Winnipeg Council. Mr. Speaker, they were motivated to indicate publicly in this Chamber that they were going to introduce conflict-of-interest legislation to deal with our brothers at the municipal level. As a matter of fact, they sent it off to the Law Reform Commission for detailed analysis, assessment and study. Having done all that, Mr. Speaker, four years into their term, we have nothing to deal with our own House and I say that if we're going to do anything let us first clean up our own House before we move to clean up the municipal chambers across the province. Because surely, Mr. Speaker, if there is a need for this sort of legislation to affect the City of Winnipeg Council, I think one can assume, Mr. Speaker, it's a fair presumption, that there is a need for this sort of legislation to deal with us too. I defy any member, Mr. Speaker, including the Premier of this province who encourages me to pass on. I'm sure he would encourage it if I were to accommodate

him in any way, Mr. Speaker. First we'll do a political passage and then we'll worry about mortality, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, getting away from the question of political survival and getting down to the question of political brass tacks, I say that we should deal with this matter on an immediate basis; it's critical, we should not allow our municipal brothers to call us hypocrits. This government should gird its loins, galvanize its will and get down to the business of doing something proper in the field of conflict of interest, get in line with a lot of other responsible Assemblies throughout Canada and the world. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, there is I think considerable doubt as to the relevance of what my honourable friend was talking about in relation to this bill. This bill is merely meant to be corrective of the number of situations that I referred to before. If he wants to make a speech about conflict of interest generally, he's entitled to do that really on his own time, not on the time of this bill. We would be receptive at any time, Mr. Speaker, to any suggestions that the honourable member, and other members of the House, might have with respect to conflict of interest but it's really not germane to this bill.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 3 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT (2)

MR. LYON, by leave, presented Bill No. 3, An Act to Amend The Legislative Assembly Act (2), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Has leave been given?
The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition gives leave to proceed on Bill 3 for introduction.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with two major matters although there is a small correction contained in Section 6. I'm sure I'm not breaching any confidence when I say that there has been some discussion between the members of the Official Opposition, or at least some and the House Leader, with respect to the contents of the bill. I'm not suggesting in any way that means that they approve of it but to indicate that, while the bill has just been circulated today, I believe some honourable members at least have had the opportunity to peruse the draft of it prior to today. We appreciate leave being given to deal with the two bills, The Legislative Assembly Act Bills because they do relate to somewhat similar matters.

The first major matter dealt with by this bill, Mr. Speaker, is the effect that a conviction for a serious offence will have on the eligibility of a member to sit or vote in the Assembly. This matter was debated earlier in this session and you will recall that

references were made at that time to Section 682 of the Criminal Code of Canada which purports to deal with the same matter. Some doubt has quite legitimately been raised as to whether or not the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction to enact provision such as 682 of the Criminal Code and make them applicable to a Legislative Assembly. In any event I think it was made crystal clear at the time of that debate in December that it was the intention of the government to move in this way to enact similar legislation in Manitoba to remove any doubt as to the ability of this Legislature to deal with its own eligibility rules.

Section 2 of this bill therefore, Mr. Speaker, enacts a principle similar to Section 682 of the Criminal Code, so that from now on matters of this kind can be dealt with under the legislation of Manitoba rather than a criminal code provision. It seems proper that the question of eligibility to sit in the Legislature of a province be dealt with by provincial legislation, rather than federal legislation. To a considerable extent, Mr. Speaker, the proposed provision of The Legislative Assembly Act is similar to the provisions in the Criminal Code; however, there are some difference that I will point out to the House.

To begin with the Criminal Code provision applies to convictions where the sentence was for a term of more than five years. The proposed provision in the bill before the House, Mr. Speaker, deals with a conviction where the sentence is for a term of five years or more. This may seem minor but, in view of the practice of courts, to fix penalties of terms of years, it was thought more practical to deal with the term of five years or more which would include sentences of five years imprisonment. In this day and age, it must surely be thought to be a serious offence for a court to impose a term of five years imprisonment. It does not seem necessary in that light to require a sentence of more than five years before the section would be applicable.

The first effect of a member being convicted of such an offence and sentenced to five years imprisonment would be that he become automatically ineligible to sit or vote as a member but his seat would not, at this stage, be vacated. He would have a right to appeal and it would seem unfair to cause him to vacate his seat until he had an opportunity to exercise that right through to the ultimate extent of that right as it applies in the law of the country and to exercise that right, if he chose to, and the Appeal Court had made a decision on the matter. In other words, that the process so far as the accused person wished to take it had been fully exhausted by him or her. This is the second way in which this proposal differs from the Criminal Code provision. The seat is not vacated under this proposal until after a member has had an opportunity to appeal and if he takes that opportunity and the Appeal Court has finally adjudicated on the matter, when the matter is complete, then the question of vacancy of the seat arises.

If on appeal a court sets aside the conviction, or reduces the sentence to less than five years, the member would be eligible to sit and to vote again as a member. In this respect also the section differs slightly from the Criminal Code provision which does not deal with the situation where the Appeal Court reduces the sentence to less than five years. We

think that the legislation should have that in contemplation because in fact that can sometimes happen.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, just by way of editorial comment on that provision because it relates to what has been said by me and by others in the House before, I think it is impossible for any draftsman to contemplate all of the myriad of situations that may arise with respect to convictions, with respect to the probity of members having to do with convictions of this kind. Therefore, what we're attempting to do here is to take into contemplation those things that come readily to mind which will meet the situation as we have seen examples of it. But I do not put this bill forward as being the total answer that contemplates all possible situations that might arise in the future, in fact, quite the opposite. I would be surprised if this bill would totally contemplate all future eventualities that might arise. But I think it's also important to note, Mr. Speaker, that seldom, if ever, in the long life of this Legislature has this kind of a section ever been called into force which I think in itself is a tribute to the quality of the men and the women who have been elected to this House down through the years since 1807. So it is a unique provision meant to deal with unique situations as and when they arise and we, of course, hope that they will arise very very seldom.

The proposal also deals with the payment of indemnities for periods during which a member is not eligible to sit or vote by reason of conviction for an indictable offence for which he is sentenced to a term of five years or more. During that period of ineligibility he will not be eligible for any indemnity or allowance. Because at the present time our indemnities are paid on a sessional basis, there is a provision which will deem them to be earned during the session and therefore a member in this situation would lose a pro rata portion of the indemnity for any part of the session during which, under the law, he was ineligible.

Because of these provisions, there is a possibility that a member might lose all or part of his indemnity because of a conviction which is subsequently set aside. To overcome this possible situation, another Subsection, 19.1(4), will permit the Assembly, that is the Legislative Assembly itself, to authorize, by resolution, the payment of forfeited indemnity of allowance if a circumstance arises where the Legislature feels that corrective action is required. This remedy, I think, Sir, seems to be sufficient in the circumstance. It is likely to be, as I've said, a rare occasion where a member becomes ineligible to sit because of a conviction for a serious offence. Therefore it seems unnecessary to enact a long section providing for repayment of past indemnities in various circumstances that can be contemplated. The Assembly should itself deal with these matters of repayment of forfeited indemnities and deal with each case. I suggest, with respect, Sir, on its individual merits having regard to the eventual outcome of the case.

Now the second major matter proposed in the bill is a complete change in the method of paying indemnities and allowances to members. I point out, as is apparent to members who have familiarized themselves with the bill, Mr. Speaker, that this does not take effect until after the present Legislative

Assembly is dissolved, so it will have effect for the succeeding Legislative Assembly to this one after the next general election is held. It will not change the method of payment that we have under way at the present time.

As members will be aware, Mr. Speaker, the present system of paying indemnities and allowances is on a sessional basis. It is proposed to change this basis to an annual indemnity and allowance payable throughout the year. In that regard, may I say that my information is that most legislative assemblies — I believe most, this is subject to correction, certainly the House of Commons for a long time has operated under this particular manner as is recommended in the amendments before the House. It is proposed to change this sessional indemnity basis to an annual indemnity payable throughout the year. Not only will the indemnities and allowances of all members be paid in this manner but also the constituency allowance and the special indemnities and allowances payable to the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House, the Government Whip, the House Leader of the Official Opposition and the Opposition Whip.

As a consequence, the provision for special indemnities for special session is proposed to be dropped. The sessional per diem allowance will of course remain on the basis of payment during the session only. This change in the method of payment necessitated some change in drafting for the cost-of-living increases. It was also thought advisable to include some interpretation provisions as to when a member is deemed to become eligible for certain indemnities and allowances and when he would cease to be eligible for them.

Because the new system is based on the fiscal year of the government, the definition section of the Act was redrafted. The definition of "Crown agency" remains unchanged but definitions of "fiscal year", "member" and "Speaker" are added. A definition of "fiscal year" was necessary and it is thought advisable to have the other two definitions added.

There is a slight change in the requirement for votes of the House for payment of indemnities and allowances. Under the present Act, Mr. Speaker, some indemnities and allowances are payable without vote but a vote is required for others. There is no rhyme or reason to that at all, it's just grown like "Topsy". Under the proposal before the House at the present time, all indemnities and allowances allowed and payable to members under the Act will be paid without any further appropriation by the Legislature. We will do it all one way. This will obviate the necessity to distinguish between the two categories of indemnities and allowances when preparing estimates of expenditure. In the past there has been almost no debate on payments requiring a House vote and it seems artificial to continue to make these distinctions which have been made in the past.

The indemnities and allowances, except for sessional per diem expense allowances, will be paid on the same basis as government employees. At the present time this means bi-weekly. If the practice of payment of government employees should change some day, then the method of payment of the members' indemnities and allowances would also

change to keep it in accordance with the general pay practices within the government service.

Because the pension provisions of the Act have in the past always related to sessional indemnities, the change to annual indemnities and allowances payable on a salary basis, required some changes in Part II of the Act. These changes are contained in Section 4 of the bill.

It is proposed that the new provisions for payment of indemnities will come into force, as I have mentioned, on the dissolution of the present Legislature. There is therefore a transitional provision to assist in the changeover from the sessional payment basis to the salary system of payments. This transitional provision is contained in Section 5. Essentially it will make the sessional indemnity payable for the last session of the present Legislature the basis of calculating the first annual indemnity payable to members of the next Assembly as though that sessional indemnity had been paid as an annual indemnity during the fiscal year in which the present Legislature is dissolved. That of course will have relevance only to those present members of the House who remain as members of the House after the next general election.

I mentioned that there is an interpretation provision respecting when members would become eligible to begin receiving this new type of indemnity and when they would cease to receive payment. For a member who is elected and serves out his full term, he would commence receiving his annual indemnity as of the day of general polling at the election in which he is elected and it would continue until the day immediately preceding the day of general polling at the next general election. Of course if before a general election is called, the member resigns or dies, or becomes disqualified for some other reason, his eligibility ceases as of the day he ceases to be a member.

In some circumstances, the eligibility of a person to receive the indemnities will not be determined until after the day as of which he becomes entitled to receive it. By way of example, this would of course create some considerable delays in instances such as the special indemnity for Mr. Speaker which cannot be paid until the Speaker is elected by this Chamber and this, after a general election, cannot be done until the House meets and makes that determination. As a result there will frequently be payments of back indemnities to members or to members holding various positions in the House or in the political parties for which special emolument is paid. So this merely means that provisions are in the Act in order to back date those payments so that the members who fill those positions in the House will have received payment for them from the time the election took place.

I mentioned that there was a correction of last year's bill in Section 6. It's merely to correct a typographical error where a line was left out and another line transposed into its place. Mr. Speaker, that I believe covers the main substance of the bill and I commend the bill to the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 9.

BILL NO. 9 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE SOCIAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION ACT

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James) presented Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Social Services Administration Act and to repeal The Blind Persons' Allowances Act and The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, initially it was thought that a regulation change under The Social Services Administration Act would handle the situation that has now occurred but our Legislative Solicitor indicated that the amendments before the House at the present time were necessary. Since 1952, there has been federal legislation allowing the Federal Government to share in the costs of allowances paid to blind persons and disabled persons and the federal contribution has been blind persons, 75 percent, and the disabled, 50 percent. In addition to that federal legislation there have been complementary Manitoba Acts; namely, The Blind Persons' Allowances Act and The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act.

The Federal Government served notice in 1971 that 10 years hence, being February 1, 1981, the cost-sharing agreements would terminate. Mr. Speaker, anticipating this date most of the recipients were transferred to the Social Allowance Program so that most of the blind and disabled persons cease to qualify for these two programs. However, Mr. Speaker, there are 49 persons still enrolled on these programs; 34 of whom are disabled and 15 whom are blind. Some of these meet the social allowance criteria but refuse to transfer.

It has been assumed that, as I said earlier, that a regulation under the Act would have corrected this problem; however, we've been advised otherwise. We would like to see these programs continue until such time that either by reasons of death or personal selection the rolls are reduced to zero. I would indicate to the House that the cost to continue this program is anticipated that it will be in the order of some \$47,000 per year which would be a diminishing amount until all those persons that receive the allowance at the present time ceased either through death or through personal selection to require them.

With these explanatory notes, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that the House support the bill and I understand the Opposition is in co-operation to having leave and to deal with the third reading as well, at the present time. If this does not take place then the payments for February may have to be withheld until the bill has got its third and final approval.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think we indicated in the absence of the Minister that we wanted to co-operate because we didn't want to see any of these people having to wait for their monthly pension, but before that I'd like to ask a couple of questions to the Minister. I think his explanation was very good; nevertheless, I want to make sure that I'm clear in everything.

My first question is, if someone who still qualifies decided that they would go ahead and willingly accepted to be on the Social Welfare Program instead, would the amount received be the same as they are getting now or would there be any reduction? Would they be assured that they would receive the same amount of money? That's number one.

Number two, the Minister suggests that there is an intent here of changing this because of the Federal Government. I believe that under the recipient of welfare, the Federal Government would still be paying a certain amount of money, whereas they are not paying anything under these programs because they've discontinued these programs? But especially if it's the same amount of money, the Minister is suggesting that the cost will be \$47,000 a year for the people that would sooner keep on receiving their pension as they are doing now.

Now has the Minister discussed that with the Federal Government? Certainly the same intent, it's not costing them any money and there should be some kind of a grandfather clause that they could go ahead and pay these payments providing that there would be only those that qualify for the program at this time and no new members. I wonder if the Minister could answer these two questions.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I presume, due to the rules of the House I will now be closing debate on second reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will be closing debate.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, to try and answer all of the questions, most blind and disabled persons due to the universal program, such as federal Old Age Security and Guaranteed Income Supplement, most of the blind and disabled persons cease to qualify for these two programs which I might say the maximum payment of \$75 per month is what we are talking about. However, there were still 49 persons enrolled on the programs that did qualify under the criteria but some of these will meet the social allowance criteria. There are some that possibly would not and the costs, if they went on to welfare, it's my understanding they would still receive the quantity that they would receive under this program and possibly more depending whether they chose to go on to welfare or not. I have not had correspondence with the Federal Government on this issue which as the member knows took place back in 1971 and I don't know what correspondence reaction there was at that time when the Federal Government took notice.

Our objective is that there is a commitment out there provincially to these people. The Federal Government has withdrawn their commitment and we would like to pick up that portion and to see that

these people get the allowance that they had prior to the decision of the Federal Government to discontinue their portion of it. I don't know whether I've answered all the questions; I believe I have. This is the reason for putting forward the bill at this time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, yes, I think, if I may, because I think it's understood before I said that I will indicate that we're giving leave to go ahead, to proceed with third reading at this time. So I would like to just leave this thought with the Minister that I agree with everything that's been done but \$47,000 is \$47,000.00. If we're going ahead with the intent of the Federal Government I think we should at least try, the Minister should at least try to have the Federal Government pick up what they would normally pick up, that's all I'm saying. So, having said that, the assurance of the Minister is indicating that he will do that, I, in the name of our party, I'd like to say that we give leave to have the second reading and third reading immediately to make sure these people are not kept waiting for their pay.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, by leave, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report of the bill referred for third reading.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to order. The bill before the Committee is Bill No. 9, An Act to Amend The Social Services Administration Act and to repeal The Blind Persons' Allowances Act and The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act. Are we ready to proceed? Page by Page? (Agreed)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 1 pass; Preamble pass; Title pass. Bill be reported Pass.
Committee rise.

Mr. Speaker, the committee has considered Bill No. 9 and asked me to report same without amendment.

IN SESSION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you very much.
The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Matthews that the report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READING

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER presented Bill No. 9, An Act to Amend The Social Services Administration Act and to repeal The Blind Persons' Allowances Act and The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development, 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 the Department of Agriculture, and the Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Economic Development and Tourism.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): Call the committee to order to consider (1)(a), the Minister's Salary.

The Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: I have one, I guess perhaps the last industrial complex that I'd like to ask a question on and that is the ManFor project up at The Pas. I appreciate the fact that it is a Crown corporation and that there is a Minister responsible but nevertheless my question is to what extent, if any, has the department been involved in looking at that complex? Because, as I understand, from reports of, I guess it's the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Mines and Energy I believe, who is now responsible for MDC, made some comment to the effect that the plant was under an optimum capacity that would enable it to be more profitable, and that in order for it to be profitable in the long run it would have to be a larger size and that there was some need to look at possible expansion and of course this was mentioned in the Throne Speech. So my question is, has the Department been involved in this at all and, if so, how has it been involved?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: The main involvement that the department has done is some work as to the problems that the plant would have with the new GATT Agreements that put the product of the plant into real problems to sell in the United States, though under those circumstances we had written the Federal Government informing them of this and had some discussions with them regarding special dispensation regarding that plant with the GATT Agreements. That basically has been our involvement

from the point of view that it certainly meant that the plant would have to have a larger capacity and been into more products. Since that time the discussions as to the expansion of the plant have been in the area of the Minister of Mines. He handles MDC now but he also worked with it from the point of view that it was Forestry. Our department did not handle the sales from the plant or anything but we did work very much with the GATT. Our department was the representative of the province in the GATT Agreement and that agreement did put the plant into problems of the selling of kraft paper in the North American Continent.

MR. EVANS: Has the Minister and his staff been successful in getting some federal response that would remove the problem created by the GATT arrangements?

MR. JOHNSTON: Not at this point. Mr. Murray Armstrong has been working with the Federal Government on that and not at this point. We've had support from the other western provinces. There was a GATT Committee generally set up with the western provinces that made recommendations to the Economic Development Ministers in Western Canada. Well, this is not to do with ManFor but it was in that area. It was presented to the Premiers; the problem has been presented to the Federal Government and we don't have any answer as yet on it but we're certainly hoping to get some consideration on that plant.

MR. EVANS: Has the Minister or staff any idea of what kind of money will be required to bring that plant up to a competitive standard? In other words, if an expansion is needed, approximately what sort of money would the government be looking at? Mind you, I'm making an assumption here that it would be a government expansion, I know there's the other option that it be sold or that the government go into some joint venture, so therefore it might involve private money. But whether it's private or public, then what sort of amounts would we be looking at to bring that plant up to a competitive standard?

MR. JOHNSTON: I don't have any figures at this time, Mr. Chairman, as to the amount of money it would take. That's being estimated and worked on by the department involved. My main concern and I certainly want to see expanded and I want to see the jobs there and I want to see Manitoba very much in that industry, whether it's by the government or private industry — it's presently government. But I don't think there is any secret and I think it's as far back as two years ago that the government announced that they would be interested in selling that plant, but that hasn't been done as yet.

MR. EVANS: Does the government have any timetable? The Minister is a member of the Economic Development Committee of Cabinet, is there any timetable or any deadline that the government has to meet in order to upgrade the plant? Because it's losing money at the present time, are you looking at some time limit when you're going to have to make a decision to have more investment dollars put into that facility, whether they be public or private, no matter? Is there some deadline or

some time constraints that the government is looking at?

MR. JOHNSTON: I would say that the timing has to be sometime during this coming year or during this year because the orders for equipment and everything that have to be placed have to be placed a long time in advance. It's that type of a project and I think that there has to be some decision made during the 1980-81 year so that all of these things can be put into motion so that they can be ordered. I don't think that you would accomplish a plant expansion on the ManFor plant and complete it in less than two-and-a-half to three years. So there has to be a move made or less we're going to be continuing to lose money up there.

MR. EVANS: It seems to me a very real constraint is the availability of forest product, in other words, availability of trees.

MR. JOHNSTON: According to the Mines and Energy and Resources the stand is up there and there is no problem that way. In fact, that's probably one of the most important things, that it is there. I don't think that anybody would be looking at its expansion if it wasn't.

MR. EVANS: Just to wrap up then because we've discussed some of the major items. We discussed yesterday the aluminum company; we discussed the possibility of a helicopter facility and we talked about the Hydro grid. We haven't discussed the potash but I believe that's more in the area of the Department of Mines, and now we've discussed ManFor. The Minister hinted yesterday that the government is looking at the possibility of some aircraft manufacturing in Manitoba but my question is more general than that. Can we expect any other major developments through the efforts of this Department? I know, having had some association with the department for some years, that there is always a possibility of some development; there are always inquiries being made; there are always certain development taking place. But in the nature and the order of large-scale projects, can we look forward to any developments other than the mega projects which were mentioned in the Throne Speech?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, we are working on some all the time. The one that just was finalized was CSB in Harrowby was the last one of a large size. When you say large size, you're talking of a \$35 billion expansion now. There has been a large list of new companies and expansion in 1980. We expect that we will have, hopefully, an increase in the investment and expansion this year. I'm repeating myself, we work with DREE. People come to Manitoba, if they're interested in Manitoba, our incentive is that we are a DREE province and we are working with people continually. We've just had Canada Wire and Cable make an announcement two days ago on an expansion in their plant; and R and D in Manitoba; we had the forging plant come into Manitoba; we had the Kitchen Craft Canada Limited, 1 million; Boeing of Canada expanded, they were here; the aluminum foundry, and we are working at all times with companies and we expect that we will have development in 1981 as good as 1980 was.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Arnold Brown (Rhineland): Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: I forgot one company, unless someone else asks about it, the one that's in the news quite frequently and that's Flyer Industries Limited. Is the department actively engaged in trying to help that company? It is a very important company; many jobs, it has to struggle along; it's very dependent on American markets, I know, but is there any effort by this department to help Flyer Industries Limited, or are they pretty well left on their own?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: No, we certainly work on Flyer Industries with the development officers at the Canadian Consuls at United States who put us in contact with cities and then we in turn put them in contact with the Flyer people. They make their presentations from there and they make their quotations from there. The Flyer business, the plant is booked very well. They're always needing more orders for the future but they're usually put out by tender by a city. But certainly we have been of some assistance to help them be on the tendering list. It looks like we have overcome the "Buy American" clause on buses at least for now, but we do that type of work for Flyer. But Flyer does have their own sales staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: Apart from the American market which is the natural market I believe for Flyer Industries, would there not be some possibility of selling these vehicles in Third World countries, and I'm thinking particularly of Latin America. Some years back, Flyer did make a bid on supplying the capital of Costa Rica, or is that Costa Rica? — at any rate, I forgot the name of the capital, in the country of Costa Rica, an entire electrical transit system, the country wanted to go electrical, and I believe Flyer made a bid. Unfortunately they were beat out by the Russians who were prepared to charge two or three percent interest on loan money. We just couldn't compete; it was impossible, although they liked the product.

What about the possibilities through your Mexican office and any other efforts by Manitrade, can we help Flyer sell buses or trolley equipment in some of those countries?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, most of the Third World companies you are speaking of doesn't need the type of bus, the specifications that Flyer has been building to on the orders that they presently have. They have taken a look at the quoting on buses in those particular areas but the capacity to do both at the present time to supply the orders that they have and change their production line — well they just can't change their production line; they'd have to have an expansion to the plant. They haven't been aggressively going after that type of business. Flyer is very busy at the present time.

They do need, in my opinion, and I have discussed this with the Minister in charge of Flyer, I do think

that they need research and development, R and D within the Flyer to keep up with the changes in the transportation industry and as the member mentioned, there is a move to electrical, the LT's and all of that type of equipment, and I think that they should be keeping abreast of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I think we've had a fairly good review of the Department and many people have participated in it. I'd like to repeat, I think it's an excellent department, it's well staffed with very dedicated people. I do feel a sense of frustration, however, when I look and see the answers that we've been given and perhaps the Minister himself feels a sense of frustration because there's only so much we can do through this Department to help in the industrialization of the province. There are many factors that are really beyond our control and we mentioned quite often the influence of DREE, that we are a DREE province and that is a factor of help.

As I said earlier on in the debate, I would like to see us go after Ottawa for more help than we are getting. I think we need a new formula; I don't think we should just be just content with the DREE situation that we presently have. I'm not talking about the sub-agreements, or Enterprise Manitoba, I'm talking about the industrial incentives for the major industrial developments that we could have. I think that DREE has done a lot to help industrialization of provinces like Nova Scotia, for example. I know Quebec has had a lot of money. I would simply like to see more assistance by the Federal Government through that department in helping industry come to Manitoba.

I think one of the most essential things that this Department can do is really effectively lobby with the Federal Government and it has done this over the years. We tried very hard to get the Federal Government to buy more Made in Manitoba products; we had the possibility of the Federal Government purchasing more products. There was a large meeting held some years back, five or six years ago, where we did have the Federal Department of Supply and Services, their major purchasing arm, actually come to Winnipeg. We used the Convention Centre, we had about 1000 Manitoba businessmen so that they could become acquainted with the possibilities and the greater opportunities to sell to that department. And I believe there were some display on as well at the same time of Made in Manitoba products that those officials could see.

Well okay, that's one effort, but it takes more than just that. I think the Minister and his department would do very well to even more effectively lobby with the Federal Government in order to get greater consideration. Too often DREE only looks at unemployment figures and I don't think that's a good enough criterion. We should look at other economic indicators to determine whether or not there should be more assistance. I'm a firm believer in a strong Canada but I'm also convinced that to have a strong Canada we have to have strong regions and it's just not good enough for the Province of Manitoba to suffer some economic decline that we have suffered, unfortunately, for a couple of years. And I repeat that those factors are sometimes many, many ways over

and above and beyond what this Minister or his department can do. They can work day and night, round the clock, seven days a week and there's limitation to what you can accomplish. So I say we have to look beyond the department to see whether we can bring about more economic development. I'm making this as a positive suggestion, as my concluding remark, and that is that one way is to convince Ottawa that they have to be more serious about helping us and it can be done, there are many things I believe that can be done. We don't have time to spell out the details, I don't have all the data to go into detail, but I'm convinced that this is one way that we can get more jobs in manufacturing and other industries in the province.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. McGregor.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, I've got two items, I probably will take the more favorable one and I would like certainly to complement the Minister in the support for the Firefighters' Rodeo at Virden. This is the only Firefighters' Rodeo and when you speak of rodeo you think of horses and cowboys. That's no such thing. And I think of the words last fall in sitting with the then Mayor of Russell, Art Kinney — I tried to get his permission but he's down holidaying in the South — that I know he doesn't vote with us but he's a good Manitoba promoter. And this was his words, he said, you don't know Morris how that has upgraded the Russell Fire Department because they are out practising to get that trophy because that's the whole rodeo, one brigade contesting against the other and I think whatever money the government puts in it's to a good cause and it makes a big weekend for any town that takes on this.

For example, there was a brigade from most of the western Manitoba towns like Russell, like my own little brigade, Saskatchewan and at least North Dakota and I think South Dakota and also a group from Southern Alberta that were looking at the program. If we could value lives and always have this thrown up to us when we're not putting in enough highways, the cost per life, and I'm sure if one was there and if any of the members haven't been there, I would certainly invite them because they're blindfolded, they go through house structures and they have to find their way out as though it was burning. It's just a real test; I guess I've never run up and down ladders with fire equipment on but that's a tremendous physical effort and they do that in timing.

So I say to this Minister and his predecessors, congratulate him for that kind of Treasury expenditure that promotes an area and promotes an industry, if indeed you consider firefighting brigades an industry. I guess you wouldn't. And also we are always happy to have the Winnipeg Firefighters' Band. All of that. I don't think the amount of money is a lot and I wouldn't want to promote that the Treasury should support all of Virden's expenditures. Everyone must put an effort in.

All right for that, now for maybe the little tougher. We've just got the Racing Report and I'm quickly looking over it and I do see in assessing it in a betting meet say at Virden, 1,000 people, you'd be looking at \$16.69 per nose. At the Downs, 1,000

people. you look at \$91.80 and being at a few rural tracks. I know some of the problem is getting from the stands into a little line-up and I'm wondering if the Minister has considered a mobile betting booth that could go in, and set it up quickly. They don't want to handle it, not that the local people don't do a very honest and decent job. It's just their cramped quarters; you have to line up. You make that rural program a little longer than really it needs to be. I know even at the Downs that's a common complaint, but it's all involved in betting and the track and the success of it is geared on the amount of money bet.

I'm just wondering if the Minister has considered testing out, renting one of these mobile betting booths. I know there is such a machine, to just hit a couple of spots, say one like Virden where it might have been averaging 50,000 or name whatever you want. Shoot one in, try it and see if that would double it because then the Agricultural Society makes money, more money in that. I haven't been at many tracks this year; I must be ashamed of myself. I've been to a couple out of the province and I know there are bigger places and they do run it somewhat like the Downs. I'm more of a standardbred; I know a little bit about that. I'm not quite as much on thoroughbreds but I do see, Mr. Chairman, that the government has their provincial sport programs, Purse Supplement, Breeder Awards, Sire Stakes, Cattle Grants for standardbreds . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30 . . .

MR. EVANS: A point of order.

MR. McGREGOR: I've just got a couple of minutes if . . .

MR. EVANS: We'd be prepared to give leave so we can finish the department because . . .

MR. McGREGOR: I'm sorry, I didn't mean to be so . . .

MR. EVANS: . . . there's no point to bringing the staff back and the Minister this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have leave?

MR. McGREGOR: I'm pleased to say that the standardbreds, the government assistance is up 44,000, a matter of 37 percent. If I'm assessing these figures right, thoroughbreds are up almost half-a-million, 48 percent. The question I asked the Minister the other day that the people come to me. In some provinces to the west of us, especially, the awards, Breeder Incentive Grants, Breeder Awards, Sire Stakes in many cases are dollar for dollar. We are not nearly that high so I close on that note. I think again it's good of the Treasury to be supporting those, especially the rural circuits, and I know your problem, Mr. Chairman, the Minister had here at the Downs and I think he concluded that dispute, if it was, correctly in the route he took to increase that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JOHNSON: Just to answer your question, the dollar for dollar, there is a representation made and I can supply the member with a copy of the representation made by the standardbred people

that we are looking at. We certainly know the portable betting facility would be something that would move people faster and probably increase the betting; it would, we've looked at it. So we're taking a look at both of those items and we'll be making a recommendation regarding the horse racing generally in the very near future.

MR. McGREGOR: When would the Minister be acting on that study or review that was done that I think he and some of the people that were interviewed have? When would the Minister be acting on that? I realize those kind of reviews or studies, the Minister could not possibly honour all of them, but when would he be maybe acting on them?

MR. JOHNSTON: We expect to be making recommendations on the horse racing because of the study that was completed and the representations on the study that have come to us by the end of February. The horse racing is going to start fairly soon and we have to have it all done because the track has to know the breeders have to know and the thoroughbred racing and the standardbreds have to know their purse structure and everything very soon.

MR. McGREGOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)(a) pass. That concludes the Committee on Economic Development and Tourism.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,250,900 for Economic Development and Tourism pass.
Committee rise.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you.

SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): The meeting will come to order. I would ask the honourable members to turn to Page 12 of the Main Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Resolution 13, Clause 7, Item is (d)(2), Agricultural Crown Lands, (2) Other Expenditures.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I can get my tongue to quit fighting with my teeth I have a few remarks I'd like to make here.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to make a few comments on the Crown Lands Section. In my constituency between the LGD of Piney . . . 80 percent of the land in the LGD of Piney is non-private owned. It's either owned by the local government district or by the Crown. And between 50 and 60 percent of the land in the LGD of Stuartburn is also non-private owned.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a strong supporter of the sale of agricultural lease Crown lands prior to the 1977 election and I still am a very strong supporter of that program; I'd like to compliment our Ministers, both of Resources and Agriculture on proceeding on it. However, I have a few concerns and unfortunately I am not totally happy with the way the program has been going. Many applications have been made, very few have been processed to date and I would like to

maybe make a few comments as to what I would like to see happen there. I'd like the program to be expanded. What has happened, Mr. Chairman, is that I think in the '60s, 1960, somewhere along that line certain surveys were done, aerial and otherwise, I think there was designation of lands that could be used for agriculture Crown land, I think it worked out to somewhere around 650,000 acres, I think a lot of money was spent at that time to establish this.

When we got into power in 1977 we had indicated that we would be selling Crown lands and we are proceeding on it but I would like to see the regulations of our PLUC Committee the Public Land Use Committee, and encourage the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Resources to maybe revise the regulations to some degree to get some of the red tape out of the way so that these people can go ahead and purchase this land. The interest has been expressed I think when we a year ago offered the people that were leasing land if they had interest in buying it they should forward \$50.00 and their application would be processed, the land would be assessed.

What has happened though there's been sort of a slowdown of the whole thing; it's taken a long time to get the proper appraisals done; there's been certain regulations through the PLUC Committee that have created a lot of red tape and as a result in my area I have many people that have applied, have been rejected on technicalities and I would want to see these regulations changed so that we can proceed to sell some of this land at a faster rate than we are doing right now.

Mr. Chairman, why am I concerned about selling Crown lands? Why am I concerned about having private ownership of land? —(Interjection)

MR. DRIEDGER: Okay we'll get around to this. Mr. Chairman, why would these farmers when they're leasing it at a reasonable rate, why would they want to buy the land?

MR. URUSKI: Buy it cheap enough.

MR. DRIEDGER: No, ownership. This is what it all boils down to. And not a policy between you people and us. You had no intentions of selling land. You bought land. I get a chuckle out of this, Mr. Chairman, when the Leader of the Opposition runs around and talks about foreign ownership — the biggest land owner that we have is our own government. They've been buying land. Why do people want to buy land? So that can clear it, they want the pride of ownership, for example members of the committee, the chairman himself who is not a farmer has land out in my area there. He doesn't do that much in terms of productive farming but he likes to have land. But I'm talking of guys that have agricultural leases, that want that land, need it for production, that want to expand their operations and in conjunction with that what is happening — (Interjection)— I'll get around to the Member for St. George in a little while.

Mr. Chairman, we need the expansion. What's finally happened under the present Minister of Agriculture, we are starting to open up the southeast. We have a limited tax base, as I mentioned before, with the LGD, with 80 percent of the land none owned, a small tax base, limited services that the

municipality can offer and what we're doing right now in conjunction with the Brushing Program that we have, hey, we're finally opening up the southeast instead of just giving tongue talk to it the way the previous Minister of Agriculture did, felt sorry for it, nothing was done. We're moving in the right direction. Only I want it speeded up.

We now have the Minister of Resources here and I would like to draw to his attention too that in his control and the control of the Minister of Resources, he has 650,000 approximate acres that are slated or designated as agricultural land. I personally would strongly recommend, this is a personal recommendation, that this land be transferred to the Agricultural Department to administer. It should be taken out of the Resource Department. A lot of money has been spent trying to establish that it could be used for agriculture to some degree.

Mr. Chairman, to me and my area and to my people it is vitally important that we proceed post-haste, that we streamline our operation and get this land into private ownership. The production right now in terms of agricultural production, a lot of the land is being cleared, new crops are being grown, we have a positive approach being taken by the people, and I want to the credit the Minister of Agriculture on that. Also I would like to encourage . . . work hard to see whether we can get some of this red tape out of the way, some of the regulations out of the way so we can proceed in an orderly fashion to sell the Crown lands.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one thing that I'd like to at this time mention is we've been listening to the criticisms and the comments from the members opposite regarding agriculture. —(Interjection)— Yes, the leader is there right now paying attention as usual. Mr. Chairman, what I would like to draw out from the members opposite and they only have three actually that we can call rural agricultural members, it will be less next time around, and two of them that are sitting there right now believe in the free enterprise system, they have made their living under the free enterprise system and speak socialism here, and they do. But one thing they haven't got, they haven't got the guts to say whether they'll continue with the sale of Crown lands or not. They talk storms around this issue but they will not commit themselves as to what they will do with the Crown Lands Program.

The Member for Ste. Rose the other day by talking around half a mile finally came down to the point where he indicated they would continue with the state farm program again, the commune program where the government will be buying land, that's what the member indicated at that time. But they refuse to come out and tell the public, and the reason why you only have three rural agricultural members sitting on that side is because you know what the people like, what they want in the rural areas but you refuse to make statements to that effect. I would beg the Member for St. George, make a commitment — are you going to continue selling Crown lands.

A MEMBER: He doesn't have to worry, he's not going to get over on the other side.

MR. DRIEDGER: Supposing that you would, would you continue selling Crown lands? No. But the

Member for Ste. Rose has indicated they would start buying agriculture land again, the state farm. These are the things. Mr. Chairman, that I want to draw out of them. I want a commitment from you people so that we can tell out there. You have your policy, we have ours. We say we sell Crown lands, we don't buy agricultural land; you say we will not sell Crown lands, we will buy agriculture land. But why don't you say it. Get up and say it. —(Interjection)— Anywhere you want to go in rural Manitoba I'll take you up. Make your statement, but you don't. The previous Minister of Agriculture has a fancy way of fudging around with words, saying many things but yet not making a point of it. None of the fellows there have made a statement. Are you going to sell Crown lands?

A MEMBER: They're not going to get a chance . . .

MR. DRIEDGER: No, but I want a statement from them. You're feeding right into them, the Minister of Agriculture. We know they won't get here; especially not with the rural seats. But they refuse to define their policy on these issues.

A. MEMBER: Albert are you worried?

MR. DRIEDGER: Not worried at all. But I'd like to have some of you people come out there and debate your position, if you ever establish a position. But you don't establish a position.

MR. DOERN: . . . during the election you'll find out.

MR. DRIEDGER: And then of course, Mr. Chairman, we have the Member for Elmwood who sort of feels a little lost. He has tried to be the champion of the polar bear, that didn't work out; he's trying to look for roots somewhere along the line in the Agriculture Department, the cowboy image, that doesn't work. Unfortunately I expect he'll be making his good-bye speech pretty soon. —(Interjection)— Rhinestone cowboy, yes.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make these comments and I hope that members opposite when they're debating this issue of Crown lands will tell us what their position is on it. And I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that they again will not make a statement as to what their position is on Crown lands, they'll hedge around it, they'll fudge around it but there will be no clear-cut statement coming from them. And I think it was probably by mistake as the Member for Ste. Rose indicated they're going to go back to the state farm, I think it was a slip of the tongue because they don't like to be that definite. It was vague at best but for them already it's a definite maybe.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, in closing I'd just like to encourage the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Resources, have a look at our regulations, foresee, post-haste to sell these lands, as sometimes the constituents are not sure whether we will be here again or not and they know, the constituents know that you will stop that program if you ever got in. That's why we should give them peace of mind, we should sell it to them and win the next election anyway.

Thank you very much.

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

MR. SAM USKIW: Mr. Chairman, yesterday when we were interrupted at 4:30 I was in the midst of some analysis of what is taking place, why the Minister of Agriculture had some difficulty in receiving approval for the sale of these lands that the Member for Emerson is so concerned about.

I don't know where the Member for Emerson was at the time but had he been here he would have learnt that the Minister said he was having some difficulty in getting the right kind of co-operation to process these transaction, part of it from the Department of Resources, part of it from the planning mechanism and land use, part of it from perhaps local authority and the process was bogged down, that was the message that we got from the Minister of Agriculture. He also went on to tell us, Mr. Chairman, that only 145 parcels of land all told in the whole Province of Manitoba have been transacted so that gives you an idea if the Member for Emerson is complaining about the fact that it isn't happening, I can understand his complaint, Mr. Chairman, because 145 transactions covering the geography of Manitoba is not a big thing; it's a very minute thing when you boil it down to a small part of the province such as the constituency of Emerson. It's not even obvious that it's occurring when you break it down to that small part of our geography. So I can understand what the Member for Emerson is suggesting.

What I would like to know from the . . . yes, what I was leading up to yesterday, Mr. Chairman, was that the perception of members opposite that the previous administration was somehow not willing to co-operate on that question is wrong to the extent, Mr. Chairman, that we were in the midst of negotiating with the LGDs on patriating, if you like, the LGD administered lands back to the LGDs for whatever purpose, for their use or for sale or for whatever. That was well under way, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister knows that.

I would like to ask the Minister, out of the 145 sales that have been completed, how many of those represent lands that were not provincial lands but were, in fact, LGD lands but which were administered by the province, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would take note of that question and give us the answer to that? Of the 1,200 applications that he has, I would like to know how many of those are situated on LGD lands rather than provincial lands, Mr. Chairman. These are statistics I think that would be somewhat of interest to our side.

I would also like to know how many quarters of land have been sold. The Minister talked about 145 transactions. Does he mean 145 quarters or does he mean 145 transactions which could involve two or three quarters per transaction or whatever? That would give us some idea as to the volume . . .

A MEMBER: Or the acreage.

MR. USKIW: . . . or the acreage involved in total would suffice, Mr. Chairman, if we could have that information. So, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much that the Minister is having some difficulty, not unexpected difficulty, given the fact that there are legitimate, very legitimate different interest groups that have something to say about how these resources ought to be utilized. I made minor reference to it in my remarks yesterday, Mr.

Chairman, when the time ran out, and that is that we do have to consider the environmental questions when we make these decisions; we have to consider the interests of the people that have recreation as a priority in a given area as opposed to converting to agricultural use; people who want to see the wild game with sufficient lands in which to sustain themselves and to provide for game hunting and so on.

All of these are conflicting interests with agriculture, Mr. Chairman, and I don't fault the Minister for processing these applications at a slow pace in the knowledge that I know that he has to face up to all of the other interest groups that want to have their input as to what the final decision is on any application, including the Land Use Committee and so on.

So it's understandable, Mr. Chairman, and I would hope that the Member for Emerson doesn't get overly exercised or at least that he doesn't hope, because he is overly exercised, that something spontaneous is going to emerge and that all of a sudden he will have all of his applicants satisfied in the constituency of Emerson. Because I don't believe that is the nature of the administration of government, Mr. Chairman, when you have a multiplicity of interest groups that have some input into the decision, at least that's the way it is structured, have some input into the decision for what is considered to be the best public interest in Manitoba.

That is not to detract from the fact that the people that are applying for agricultural use don't have a legitimate interest, that they don't have logic on their side, it's just that we recognize, Mr. Chairman, that there are other historical uses, there are other interest groups that do want to protect their particular interests as well. It becomes a trade-off in the end and I know it's difficult to make a decision to satisfy all of those interest groups, you ultimately have to decide in favour of one or the other. And the decisions that come out, Mr. Chairman, will be a mix of decisions; there will be some decisions favourable to the naturalists, to the people involved in the hunting of wild game, people involved in waterfowl activities, people involved in recreational activities, they will have won some of their arguments; agriculturalists will have won some of their arguments and we will end up, no matter who the government is, Mr. Chairman, on this issue with a split decision at best as to how all of these lands are going to be utilized. No one interest group is going to swallow up the whole is what I am saying and, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Resources is going to be arguing with the Minister of Agriculture and vice versa on the particular use and so will the environmentalists and so will the land use planners. All of this is part of the process of government. (Interjection)—

And, Mr. Chairman, again the Member for Emerson wasn't listening. I said that with respect to the lands that were lands of the LGD, the LGD, and which were administered by the Crown, there was no question as to the patriation of that decision back to the LGDs for whatever purpose. That was well under way in 1976-77 and I'm not sure, it's probably still under way with respect to some LGDs, or whether they've had an agreement. Perhaps the Minister can

update us as to where those negotiations are and how many agreements with the LGDs have been entered into. I suspect it's still ongoing. (Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think there are situations which one might consider that and there are situations which one would not. One would have to appraise the particular application to know and it would have to conform to general guidelines of land use. It would have to, Mr. Chairman, satisfy all of the questions surrounding what are the by-product decisions of that decision. This is something that the Member for Emerson has to take into account, Mr. Chairman. The idea of saying, yes, we will open up a new area and we allow people to purchase properties without any local amenities in the area, without roads, without drains and so on, and then we find out that as soon as they have acquired them we have immediate application for tens of millions of dollars worth of public works that have to be undertaken in order to make them viable. Mr. Chairman, that is the wrong approach.

One has to assess, Mr. Chairman, the value of agricultural production against the public input that has to be made in that particular area or on that particular application or a number of applications, to know whether it makes any sense. I want to in that connection remind the Minister and the Member for Emerson that a decision similar to that was made many times in this province and which has created many difficulties for people. We can go right back to the beginnings of the rural settlements in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, where the Immigration Department was dumping people off, people that came here from all over the world, into the sticks, into the bushes, into the swamps, not concerned about whether they are putting them into a viable environment.

We had disaster in the Interlake, Mr. Chairman; we had disaster in the northwestern part of our province. Human disaster, Mr. Chairman, because of the unplanned approach to the settlements of people. In the Pasquia area at The Pas, we let people to believe and I say "we" in the context of the government of this province, many many decades ago, to believe that there was an area for agricultural production that should be developed, Mr. Chairman, with all kinds of glowing statements which may have been good politically at the time, may have even elected a member up there, I don't know. They convinced a number of people to locate their production units in that area and then they abandoned them and then we find out that in order to have viable agricultural units there that we had to pour in tens of millions of dollars of drainage works and whatever else that had to go in to salvage what was already put in there unwisely to begin with, Mr. Chairman, or at least it was the cart before the horse, so to speak.

Those are the kinds of considerations that have to go in to making a decision as to whether or not you should convert an area from marginal agricultural use under a lease arrangement into a full agricultural productivity based on the environmental factors and the costs of making proper environmental conditions possible to make it a viable alternative, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to participating for a few moments in the debates on the Minister of Agriculture's Estimates and on this particular subject. I have the feeling that over the next period of time that I hold the portfolio that I now hold that I will have to in fact be working with the Minister of Agriculture from time to time as I will have to be working with a number of members in this House dealing on this question of Crown lands.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are some statements that the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet has made that really don't provide any room for division in this Chamber. He can from time to time speak with a reasonable amount of common sense although that's a quality usually lacking in honourable members opposite. But I have enough respect for the former Honourable Minister of Agriculture that he does that and I would remind him that of course things are not happening or going to happen in a spontaneous way, nor have they historically developed that way in this province. In fact, I would like to perhaps resume after the supper hour adjournment to give to the honourable members that are interested just the kind of course of action that different administrations have taken in this regard. They date back some decades as the Member for Lac du Bonnet has indicated, but that also show that the course of action that this government is on at present is not ill-conceived or something that is spontaneous or is born solely from an ideological point of view but in fact have its roots in some very sound government policies that is carried by . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is now 4:30, I am interrupting the proceeding for Private Members' Hour and will return to the Chair in committee at 8 o'clock this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RES. NO. 1 — RECOVERY OF ONE DEFAULTED PAY PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We're now under Private Members' Hour. The first item on the agenda today is Resolution No. 1, the motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Emerson, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan who has 16 minutes left.

The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The difficulties dealing with these private members' resolutions, when you get tacked on from one day to another, you kind of wonder where you left off. I believe I was saying the other day, Mr. Speaker, that while the Minister had stated that he had found that the previous Act which dealt with the payment of wages for people or recovering their wages from employers who have become bankrupt or insolvent had been found wanting and had been found wanting in the courts. I don't think there was any argument perhaps on that situation but the Minister was aware of this. He was aware of it last year when the legislation was brought in and I'm sure it was brought to his attention some time before that. Nowhere have we had any indication except by this

amendment that we see here before us that was moved by the Honourable Member for Emerson that the Minister has been taking any action whatsoever. He has been aware of this situation, the Minister of Labour, for some time and the fact is that he has waited and in the meantime there are people, I'm sure there are people who are having difficulties in recovering their wages.

It's all very well and good to repeal sections of The Payment of Wages Act and The Real Estate Brokers Act but at that time the Minister was aware of it, the Attorney-General was aware of it, because I believe when we were debating that bill last year that the Attorney-General told us that he'd had a report from the Law Reform Commission or the Law Society, I forget which one, one or the other groups. And he had a report. Now surely the government would have had ample time, they had ample time to make the decision to remove these people from any protection which was I agree maybe was found wanting.

The Member for Inkster has moved a resolution that my colleague, the Member for Churchill may have moved an amendment to which . . . well it wasn't the total answer maybe to the problem, it called upon the government to consider the advisability but I must say if the Act was found wanting then certainly this government has been found wanting in its lack of action on this very issue. The fact that people who own property or bought property where there may be a legal claim for wages against that property, they acted with great alacrity and I might emphasize that, Sir, with great alacrity, they acted in order to remove that possibility of people being penalized, and I can quite sympathize with it. Someone could quite innocently buy a piece of property where there was a legal encumbrance against it, a financial encumbrance and they would wind up having to pay the recovery of wages for the people, who in all innocence were those who were deprived of getting their remuneration for services rendered. The government acted very quickly, Sir, they decided for those people they would act, for the others who were caught on the other side of the coin, those who had legal claims for payment of wages were absolutely disregarded. So if you say that the Act was wanting then I say that your actions on this very matter were certainly wanting. I can quite understand that the government didn't want to accept the amendment that was moved by the Member for Churchill, but then you could have accepted at least what was proposed in the original motion. If you would have done that then at least there would have been some coverage. We're now waiting for the Manitoba Labour-Management Review Committee to give us consideration to this matter at the earliest possible time. As has been pointed out to any thorny questions that have been referred to this committee in the past, which was commonly referred to as the Woods Committee, there has never been I don't think in my recollection a speedy resolution of a problem. Now why does the Minister think, the Minister of Labour think that he's going to get a speedy resolution to this problem by referring it now?

I say that the government had the opportunity, they have had the opportunity to make some changes to make sure that these people, who through now fault of their own in many cases, the

company goes insolvent, wages aren't paid and they're just out of luck, tough luck, that is tough luck. But as I said before, Mr. Speaker, and I want to reiterate, if there's anything that has been found wanting in this matter it is the actions of this government in refusing to face up to their responsibilities when they changed the Act to take away the coverage that these people had under The Payment of Wages Act and The Real Estate Brokers Lien Act, whatever it was called I just don't recall, but I think you understand what I'm talking about. They removed that coverage. At the same time that they removed that coverage they should have had something else in place to cover those people who through no fault of their own are out of wages and they have to stand 10th, 11th maybe 12th down the line in trying to collect their money that is owing to them for services rendered and I say, Mr. Speaker, it's a shame. I think that the Member for Inkster when he spoke on this sub-amendment, he said it was a shameful sub-amendment and it is, Mr. Speaker, it is shameful and you should be really ashamed of yourselves for your lack of action on this and, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to vote for this sub-amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Is the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Emerson;

THAT the resolution be amended by striking out all the words after the words "pay" in the fourth line of the third paragraph of the Preamble and substitute therefore the following words:

AND WHEREAS the Minister of Labour and Manpower has requested that the Manitoba Labour-Management Review Committee give consideration to this matter at the earliest possible time with a view to recommending to the Minister procedures whereby employees can be offered reasonable protection from the loss of these wages.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government await the report and recommendations of the Manitoba Labour-Management Review Committee.

QUESTION put on the amendment, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: We are now dealing with the main motion as amended. The resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. Do you want it all read out?

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise and so that there be no misunderstanding, I rise because apparently everybody has said all they want to say on this issue and therefore I'm going to close debate and try to review, Mr. Speaker, what has happened in this Legislative Assembly with the first private members' resolution that was before it.

Mr. Speaker, there was a rather simply understood resolution before the Assembly. The resolution said briefly that there is a problem with regard to people who lose wages. We all seem to agree that a loss of wages should not merely afford the normal civil

remedies, after all, somebody could have got up and said that when a person loses wages it's the same thing as losing something else, he has a right to sue and if he can recover he can recover and if the person goes bankrupt it is a debt which is forgone like any other debt.

I was pleased, Mr. Speaker, that nobody articulated that position. In other words, it seemed that everybody in the House accepted the fact that there is a social responsibility to see to it that there is a reimbursement for loss of wages, that it offends the conscience of members of the Legislative Assembly that a person be at the disposal of another citizen, or corporate citizen or any other form of entity in our society for a period of time during which he will render the services of his body and of his mind for a period of time and at the end of that time that he would be cheated from recovering a remuneration that is due to him. That was offensive, Mr. Speaker, and everybody appeared to agree that it was offensive. We also knew that the previous government had passed laws which attempted to deal with this question by giving an employee a priority which was higher than normally enjoyed which, Mr. Speaker, is not so unusual.

The City of Winnipeg has a priority over mortgages, the Tax Department has a priority over mortgages. Other departments have a priority over unsecured creditors and therefore giving an employee a preference was not an unusual thing but there were problems, the main problem is that we could be dealing even hypothetically but nevertheless very really to the person concerned with an innocent third party. Secondly, the province doesn't have jurisdiction in the area of bankruptcy and our laws might not be as effective enough. Therefore the government saw fit to eliminate the protection, albeit a difficult protection to enforce, they sought to eliminate it and they eliminated it, Mr. Speaker, last year and therefore have known of the problem for a long time without offering a substitute.

A specific suggestion was put to the government, Mr. Speaker, and I really have to find fault with my friend, the Member for Lakeside, for suggesting arrogance on the part of myself in that I suggested that only my idea should be considered and no other idea. Of course if I had suggested that, my friend would have a point but either he knows I didn't suggest it or secondly, he can't read English or thirdly, he can't understand English or any combination of those three things, Mr. Speaker, because no such suggestion was made. We asked the government to consider the advisability of saying that there is presently an administrative agency in the Province of Manitoba which has the bureaucracy to deal with all employees, virtually 80 percent of the employees in the Province of Manitoba, that the bureaucracy is there, it would not require the hiring of a single new bureaucrat and I would think that that would have some —(Interjection)— yes, pizzazz in the eyes, particularly of those Conservatives who say that they are interested in restraint. To consider that this agency which wouldn't have to find out which employer employes which person that has already the mechanism for collecting the premiums if it was going to be done by a premium and it might better still be done by merely accepting a grant from consolidated revenues which is what they now do. Is

the member aware that the Workers' Compensation Board now does it for victims of crime? They conduct a hearing, they use their bureaucracy and then they get from consolidated revenue a certain amount of money which it costs them to operate.

Being one, Mr. Speaker, who likes things to be done simply, I said to the government, would you consider the advisability of seeing whether the Workers' Compensation Board could be used as a mechanism with which to reimburse an employee for one pay period. Mr. Speaker, despite what has been said by my friends to the right of me and I think they are to the right of me, Mr. Speaker, both figuratively and in other ways, Mr. Speaker, considering I don't agree that an employee should be encouraged or in any way acquiesced in by the state to continue working for a man who doesn't pay wages as was suggested by the Member for Churchill, that the employee is afraid that if he quits, as soon as he doesn't get paid he will lose his job and that he will carry his employer.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to employees carrying their employer. If an employee doesn't get paid he should immediately report that to the state, he should immediately be reimbursed, the state should then worry about whether they are going to collect from the employer or not collect from the employer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was put forward as "an" idea, not "the" idea. Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, but the point is that the Member for Lakeside may have expressed a truism which he has observed that it is a good idea, that it is the best idea and indeed, Mr. Speaker, I have not heard a better one. I am waiting; I am listening, I am sitting and watching but I have not heard a better one.

MR. ENNS: Actually it's a pretty good idea, Sid.

MR. GREEN: You see, the Member for Lakeside is now owning up that's it's a pretty good idea and all that was requested of my Conservative opponents — (Interjection)— No, opponents. I have friends amongst the Conservatives but they are my opponents and they know it. All that was expected of my Conservative opponents when they saw this Resolution was to say here is a practical suggestion. It is not the only suggestion but we are prepared to say "aye" to this suggestion. Now what will that hurt the Conservative Party to say, yes, we'll take this suggestion. They could even then do with it, although I would be disappointed what the Minister of Labour says he's going to do with the Resolution now. They could send it to the Employer-Employee Committee or the Employee-Management Committee and say, when you're considering these proposals, here's one that the Legislature heard and we ask you to consider it. But instead, Mr. Speaker, and to the advantage of the Opposition, as demonstrated by the results, we had the New Democrats saying, well, we can't support something that's being pushed by the Member for Inkster. On the other hand, you can't come out and say that you're against that. It has some appeal and we will look silly saying that we are against it.

What we have to do is go the Member for Inkster one better to show the New Democratic Party that they are better off without the Member for Inkster. So we will say, not the Workmens' Compensation Board, that may interfere with the integrity of

Workmens' Compensation. Mr. Speaker, I've been in politics for 18 years; I've been associated with working people for 18 years. Not a single one of them has said that they are worried about the integrity of the Workmens' Compensation Board. They are worried about collecting Workmens' Compensation but none of them have ever expressed that result.

But secondly, Mr. Speaker, they decided to get into an auction game. Green says one-pay period, we will tell the workers they are going to get a maximum of two months' wages. Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised that there isn't another group burst off from the New Democratic Party and say, the New Democrats are talking only about two months' wages. We will see to it that you get six months' wages. Well, what is the sense of that amendment, Mr. Speaker? The sense of that amendment is merely to try to disassociate from the proposal that was made? Because any of those other suggestions could have been spoken to in the debate and would be referred along with any other suggestion by the Minister of Labour. But that was what the New Democrats did and what do you think the Conservatives do? They follow suit, Mr. Speaker. They decide to reject that amendment and put another one of their own for fear that they will be accused of having followed the suggestions of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside knows better than anybody. Did that profit the Government of Manitoba, the political party that forms the Government of Manitoba or did it profit their opponent? One only has to read the newspapers to find out. What was it? Perhaps the Member for Lakeside will remember.

MR. ENNS: Tories scoff at . . .

MR. GREEN: That's right, Tories reject reimbursement for lost wages. Now, I could almost — and I use the word as I used it with the Minister of Industry — I could almost feel sorry for the Minister of Labour. I could almost feel sorry for the Conservatives because that's not exactly what happened. That's not exactly what happened, but they deserve everything that the press said; not because they're not going to consider the matter, but because of the stupidity which they showed in dealing with the question, because they had to try to object and put up amendments to a perfectly sensible proposal which none of them were bound by. So, Mr. Speaker, I don't feel sorry for them for two reasons; one, because you take your benefits as they come. You know, you get bad press sometime for things that you didn't do wrong. If one of the problems of the Conservative Party is that they happen to get a bit of bad press, that's the name of the game. We take the good with the bad.

But, Mr. Speaker, for more important reasons they deserved it. They deserved it for the way in which they dealt with the Resolution and you would think, Mr. Speaker, that if they did go about this thing of trying to show that they are smarter than the Opposition, you would think that they would do it in a more clever way.

One of the things for which one should not feel sorry for them is their stupidity. Why did they make a Resolution saying that they are going to await a report? Why did they not make a Resolution saying,

Resolved that all proposals regarding the payment of wages — I mean I'm going to write this out for you, if you got somebody with a pen — Therefore be it resolved that all and any proposals already submitted and those that members may wish to submit be immediately considered by the Management Review Committee and for immediate action to be dealt with. Why don't you try that? But, Mr. Speaker, they put a Resolution that they're going to refer something to the committee and they are going to await its report.

Now, who draws those things for you? It's like I said about the press managers, Mr. Speaker, and I'll have occasion to deal with this in a much more interesting way when I get to discuss one of the bills before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: Fire them all. Mr. Speaker, the First Minister the other day was asked by a member of the New Democratic Party, have you hired people to manage the news in the Province of Manitoba? And I think he owes me the credit for the answer. I said if they did it they are not very successful and the First Minister said, that's right. The Member for Inkster says, if we have, they should all be fired. I say fire the people who are drawing these Resolutions. (Interjection)— This made no sense from your point of view; it made sense from the Opposition's point of view. The Opposition will benefit, Mr. Speaker, by the way the Conservatives have dealt with this motion.

I really hope deep in my heart of hearts because I am much more interested that the wage earners, who do get cheated by defaulting employers, recover their wages. I'm hoping that in my heart of hearts, that you're not going to do what this Resolution says. That you're going to immediately go back to your department, tell the committee that you're not waiting for their report, if one is not already available, and that you're going to take some action, and then, if the committee comes out with a better suggestion then has been proposed, you can change it.

Mr. Speaker, it is unforgivable that a problem of this kind of which the government had notice over a year ago should be dealt with by a Resolution which says that we should sit and await a report of this committee. And the Member for Churchill did have a point, although I certainly wouldn't have worded it that way myself. He should have least put in a date. But you're going to sit and wait. The government operates on the proposition, "They also serve who only sit and wait." That's the story of the Conservative Government with regard to the defaulting of wages to employees in this province.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 4 — MINIMUM WAGE

MR. SPEAKER: We'll now proceed with Resolution No. 4, the motion of the Honourable Member for Churchill and the amendment by the Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Member for Logan has one minute.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it would be nice if you could

take what time you had on one to transfer to another, but unfortunately we are not able to do that. I certainly am opposed to this amendment. I certainly, under no circumstance want to compliment the government for its concern for the minimum wage earners in the Province of Manitoba, because I think they've shown a total lack of concern for these people over the last 3-1/2 years and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to vote for this motion as it has been amended.

QUESTION put on the Amendment, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Now the motion of the Honourable Member for Churchill as amended by the Honourable Member for Roblin.

QUESTION put on the MOTION as amended, MOTION carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 5 — ASSISTANCE TO NATIVE PEOPLE

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 5. The motion of The Honourable Member for St. Matthews, standing in the name of The Honourable Member for Inkster.

The Honourable Member has 5 minutes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I had started to discuss this very interesting Resolution yesterday and I believe that I dealt with the problems that are associated with the Resolution as presented by the Member for St. Matthews, which in my opinion, would not act as a solution to the problem, Mr. Speaker, but would act as an aggravation. The exacerbation of the problem — the Member for Winnipeg Centre is entitled to the credit for the correct word.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that it has been the special status of the Indian people in accordance with our Constitution and with respect to treaty rights, which has been the nub of the problem, and let's have no misunderstanding about my position in this respect, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the treaty rights should be honoured. I believe that the land which is presently occupied by the Indian people as reservations and the reservation rights should be honoured, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in all other respects our citizens of Indian origin should be treated in the same way as our citizens of Ukrainian origin, French origin, Jewish origin, Anglo-Saxon origin or whatever origin you want to pursue. And I believe that the main problem that have been experienced by the Indian people, has been the suggestion and my friend, the Member for Rupertsland, has also corrected me, because yesterday I mentioned sociologists, economists, and I did not include lawyers. It has been the suggestion on the part of white sociologists, economists, lawyers, that the Indians should pursue a position whereby they become a nation state within Canada and that some type of sovereignty is recognized on the part of these people.

Mr. Speaker, once that is suggested, then it only the militants and the people who take the most strong views that can speak for the Indian people and which in the last analysis, Mr. Speaker, will work to their disbenefits. Because there is a suggestion,

Mr. Speaker, that aboriginal rights are now contained in the Constitution, if the Federal proposal goes forward. What are aboriginal rights? There are many possibilities. Mr. Speaker, but I'll deal with two extremes.

The one possibility is that the court will say that there is no such things as our aboriginal rights which I happen to think is probably what they will say, in which case the Indian people who believe that they . . . or some of whom believe that there has been a tremendous victor in obtaining a decision that aboriginal rights are contained in the constitution will have been subjected to another cruel hoax and I say another one because many cruel hoaxes have been perpetrated on these people under the guise of being beneficial to them. That hoax, Mr. Speaker, will result again in a perpetuation of the problems that my friend, the Member for St. Matthews has raised.

But the second possibility, Mr. Speaker, and I don't consider it to be a real possibility but it's the one which has been held out at the plum for the Indian people — that the courts will say that certain territories in Canada are sovereign territories over which the people have aboriginal rights and over which they exercise sovereignty and this people, Mr. Speaker, which historically was a nomadic people and lived in rather a static society which did not involve commercial activities in the strict sense of the word but involved survival and feeding themselves and there has been much speculation as to just how well they did and what kind of a proud race they were, which I am not going to go into. But the courts could say, if they say what the sociologists and lawyers are telling the courts will say, is that they are a territory there and that over this territory, the aboriginal people . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Prder please. Unless the honourable member has unanimous consent, his time is up. (Agreed) The honourable member may continue.

MR. GREEN: Just two minutes. . . . that the aboriginal people have national status, or sovereign status to those areas, and therefore what goes on in those areas is subject to the veto power of those people. That's really what is attempted to be said, Mr. Speaker. What is attempted to be said is what the Northern Flood Committee and what the Federal Government tried to put over in the Province of Manitoba with regard to the development of hydro power. And the stakes are much bigger, Mr. Speaker. This is being held out as the way in which native people, who are innocent of most of this, are going to be able to hold the rest of the country up unless their consent is given with regard to development in the Northwest Territories and the development of mineral rights in the Northwest Territories, and that the 40,000 inhabitants of the Northwest Territories are the owners of all the oil and gas in that territory and that they will be the beneficiaries of.

Mr. Speaker, the chance of that being held by courts in our country is remote, but if it was held that way, do you suppose that would improve the condition for the native people? It wouldn't, Mr. Speaker. It would result in the most terrible animosity as between 25,000,000 Canadians and people who should be considered as their brother

citizen, and it will never occur, Mr. Speaker, because if it did, Mr. Speaker, then you would have the kind of letter that Mr. D'arcy McCaffrey sent to the Province of Manitoba when he was negotiating for the Northern Flood Committee, and the Member for Thompson knows something about it. He listed about 14 demands, royalties, taxes, free territory, three-to-one land rights, etc., and his last statement, Mr. Speaker, "The above list is not exhausted; you may add to it."

No, the people who think they have that benefit, Mr. Speaker, of extracting from the rest of Canadians don't really have a benefit. It becomes in the long run a much bigger problem than it is a benefit and nobody should wish that on our citizens of native Indian and Eskimo origin.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, this resolution, when it first appeared on our desks, I found very interesting and rather disturbing, Mr. Speaker. I don't think any Party in Canada can be very complacent on the matter of the urban Indian, the way that civilization in Canada has affected the Indian people of this country.

But this resolution is probably the most blatant example of stating the obvious that we have ever seen. It tells us that Indians are under-educated and unprepared for urban society. This is hardly a revelation. The unique thing about this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is the sight of a Conservative member showing concern for the urban Indian. He should be crying when he considers the record of his Party and I just hope that we are not seeing crocodile tears; I hope that this evidence is a real concern on the part of his Party, but if it did, I would be more impressed if it came from the front benches through the method of some positive policy.

I wonder why the Member for St. Matthews is concerning himself with the fate of the urban Indian, Mr. Speaker? Do they really deplore the socio-economic isolation that is the fate of most of the recent arrivals from the reserves, or are they using their plight to vent their spleen on the Federal Government. Would they exploit human misery in this way? I am afraid that one must confess that they might. I would like to believe that the Member for St. Matthews feels true compassion without paternalism.

There are a few things that show this resolution to be specious and an attempt to absolve the Provincial Government of its responsibility, both for the number and for the condition of the Indians who migrate to Winnipeg and other cities in Manitoba. The resolution lectures us on the implications of the B.N.A. Act. We are aware of the statutory relationship between status Indians and the Crown. We know that the Federal Government has administrative and financial responsibilities with regard to Indian bands. If we are going to have a history lesson, Mr. Speaker, let's not omit those recent historical facts which show that governments over the past 20 years, this government and its predecessors, have not shown themselves to be the friends of the Native people of this province.

The Member for St. Matthews goes to some length in outlining the effects of Native migration to urban areas. He speaks of the drain on society and the costs of supporting a segment of society which

cannot support itself and which is ill-prepared to compete in an urban environment, and he implies that these are the effects of uninhibited migration from reserves, and the Member for Wellington referred to the word "uninhibited" the other day in his remarks. I have to agree with what I think was his interpretation. By stating "uninhibited migration," Mr. Speaker, the mover is inferring that Indians should be inhibited. He is implying that uninhibited migration is undesirable, that the Indian people should in some way be inhibited from moving freely about the province and I wonder — I presume he is going to close debate on this — I wonder if he would tell us how he would so inhibit the Indians. By law? By some form of apartheid which restricts Native people to specific geographic areas of the province? How would he suggest that this undesirable, uninhibited migration should be corrected?

Why do the Indians and the Metis people flock to the larger centres, Mr. Speaker? I think perhaps this is something we could investigate. Do they think the streets are paved with gold in Winnipeg? Do they think employers are waiting to greet them with open arms and social acceptance and prosperity are theirs for the asking? I don't think the author of the resolution is so naive as to believe this. He knows that Native people gravitate to urban areas not out of a hope of grabbing the brass ring, as they say, but out of sheer desperation, desperation arising from the actions of governments, very often. They leave their reserves and their communities because their situations are so bleak that almost any alternative has become acceptable, even living out their lives in the ghettos of alcoholism, from which they may never escape, the ghettos of despair which await them in the urban areas, and which they know await them in the urban areas.

Why are they so desperate? Why are their communities so lacking in opportunities? Why are many of the Natives who remain in rural communities so dependent on social assistance, Mr. Speaker? It wasn't always like that. Many of the answers to my questions can be found in the policies of the present government and its predecessors over the past 20 years.

The mover suggests that the Government of Manitoba should urge the Federal Government to fully accept its constitutional responsibility to Indians, and this is a good suggestion; it is well taken. I can go along with that part of the resolution. It is rather complacent, you know, rather complacent. If he is going to investigate this as thoroughly as he would indicate in his opening remarks, he should consider the phrase, "physician heal thyself," and perhaps urge his Conservative colleagues to accept their share of responsibility for the state of the Native people in this province and in the city.

He expresses a familiarity with the B.N.A. Act and I wonder if he has ever heard of another agreement, one formulated by the Roblin Government in 1964, which provides a new perspective on the whole matter of Native migration. The agreement I am referring to is the Grand Rapids Forebay Agreement, which resulted in the uprooting of 400 Indians belonging to the Shanawan Band. The Roblin Government decreed that these people, these men, women and children with deep ties to their land, were standing in the way of progress. Manitoba

Hydro wanted a generating station on the Saskatchewan River and that was enough reason to disrupt these 400 lives, Mr. Speaker.

No one wants to stand in the way of progress and if that development, that forced exodus was justified, so be it. What was not justified was the tragic aftermath of the relocation. The consequences of that relocation are being felt to this very day by more than 800 Indian and Metis people living in the Easterville community.

The resolution offers a simplistic approach, to use a word with which the Conservatives seem to be happy, to a complex problem to which his Party has contributed greatly. We hear about the constitutional responsibility of providing Native people with opportunities to acquire marketable skills. What about the legal and moral responsibility of Provincial Governments which treat Native people like excess baggage, Mr. Speaker? What about the responsibility for relocating a once thriving band and condemning them to a life of welfare and degradation? It could be argued that Easterville was a mistake, a well-intentioned mistake, a social experiment. But the only people who suffered from that mistake were the Native people. They suffered the consequences there and they suffered the consequences when another Conservative Government perpetrated still another offence against the northern natives. This was called the flooding of South Indian Lake, Mr. Speaker. The government was beseeched at that time to call a halt to the project which was designed to destroy the livelihoods of 650 self-sufficient Indians.

The traditional pursuits of fishing and trapping that instilled the pride and self-reliance in those people, Mr. Speaker, ended, and what did they get for compensation — nothing much but promises, Mr. Speaker. The Native people received as compensation the kind of promises that led to their leaving their own communities and migrating to urban areas where they faced the kind of despair that's described in the resolution.

There is nothing wrong with the Member for St. Matthews who was a member of that particular government coming forward and trying to correct the situation that was contributed to by the predecessor of this government — by the Roblin government, I'm talking about, but he shouldn't introduce it in such a complacent way that it throws the whole responsibility for the fate, the present situation of the urban Indian into the lap of the Federal Government. I have already agreed with his first remark on the Federal Government. I don't stand here as an apologist for the Federal Government. Certainly I think, as I said at the very beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would dare if I thought it was appropriate —(Interjection)— Would the member like to have a turn at the microphone?

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, no party can feel very complacent about this. What I am objecting to is the complacency I see and hear in this Chamber. A former Conservative Cabinet Minister in 1969, the then Commissioner of Northern Affairs, thought he had the answer. It wasn't much better than the resolution we see before him, and with Grand Rapids, in the recent past, and South Indian Lake looming up, he stated, in reference to the Indian problem, the populations of these remote villages are increasing and the people

can no longer live off the natural resources. We have to encourage them to change their way of living and give them a desire to live in the city. That's a quote from the Winnipeg Free Press, February 1969, attributed to then Commissioner of Northern Affairs. Encourage them to change their way of living and give them a desire to live in the city.

The first part of his comments came pretty close to the mark when he said people can no longer live off the natural resources. What I regret is that he wasn't really a prophet. Governments made sure that the last part of the prophecy, the entire prophecy came true. He stressed the need to encourage Indians to live in the city and he succeeded in that. That's not surprising, when you destroy a person or a group's ancestral home, there is not much reason for him to stick around. Where is he going to go?

The Indians of Easterville, Grand Rapids and South Indian Lake didn't stick around. They came to the city in increasing numbers. The Tory wish as expressed by the Commissioner of Northern Affairs has come true.

If the mover finds fault with the uninhibited migration of Indians to the cities of the province and the subsequent drain on the public purse, perhaps he should first take it up with his caucus, people who brought us increased Hydro power at the expense of destroying proud self-reliant people. And I heard some comments from my right over here about some of my earlier remarks. I don't think the NDP can feel complacent about this any more than the Conservatives or the Liberals can feel complacent about it, Mr. Speaker.

The NDP government reaped its share of havoc on the Native people of the north. They should remember the Churchill Nelson Diversion Project and the five native communities that suffered the consequences. It's true that the impetus for this project came from an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Conservative Provincial Government. It's equally true that the NDP opposed it in 1969 and made it into one of the chief issues of that year's provincial election, but after they took office, Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats showed themselves to be as indifferent to the interests of the northern natives as they had shown the Conservatives to be —(Interjection)— All of a sudden I have friends, Mr. Speaker.

The New Democrats criticism of the project died when they, I think to their surprise and everyone else's, took office that fall, and they of course, it's history, they gave a green light to the diversion of the Churchill River into the Nelson to harness power.

Now as I said before there was no —(Interjection)— I don't say we should stand in the way of progress and that's not my party's position. There is no doubt that Hydro power is this province's greatest natural resource, Mr. Speaker, but the consequences of such progress must be considered and taken into account and the impact that it might have or will have on a segment of our society.

They claimed they had considered the consequences and the Premier at that time, in a 1975 statement of general policies, concluded that the Churchill Nelson Development was an integral part of the economic development of the Province of Manitoba. He stated that the benefits derived would provide an essential contribution to the economic

well being of the whole province and in particular of the north.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the positive contribution that's been made to the economy as a result of the Churchill Nelson Diversion, and we have seen the negative impact on the economies of the five native communities whose lands were flooded, whose livelihoods were impaired. We have seen the destruction of trap lines, the pollution of lakes and streams, the great quantities of debris in the water interfering with navigating and fishing, the loss of sporting grounds and wild fowl refuges and serious soil erosion. These are primary consequences. Secondary affects are in welfare statistics and skid row bars.

I know my time is up, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, maybe we could call it 5:30 as we prepared to, the next time around and maybe address the subject more favourably than I could with a two minute address.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hour 5:30? The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. (Friday)