

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, June 6, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my right, where we have 30 students of Grade 11 standing from St. Johns School, under the direction of Mr. Margolis. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster. On behalf of the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

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 Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an Address for Papers No. 1, a request from the Member for Churchill in relationship to the lead-in-air samples in the province.

I'd like to make a Ministerial Statement, Mr. Speaker. I wish to announce to the House that I have now reviewed the recommendations and findings of Judge Baryluk concerning the fatal accident at Imperial Place Apartments, 246 Roslyn Road. We are prepared to give consideration to some of these recommendations; we're prepared to give consideration to legislation that would require building owners to contract or employ reputable servicemen, familiar with the maintenance and repairs of elevators, to assure proper operation of all elevators on their premises.

We are prepared to give consideration to legislation requiring servicemen to keep a maintenance and repair logbook for each elevator. Our inspectors would review the logbook on an annual basis. If the inspections do not meet the requirements of the department, the permit to operate the elevator will be subject to withdrawal.

We are further giving consideration to implementing legislation similar to that of Ontario, which provides for an extended elevator apron. It is our intention in the upcoming weeks to have our Director of Mechanical Engineering receive submissions from interested parties regarding the foregoing proposals.

It's also our intention to move, as soon as possible, on a program involving the placing of suitable signs in all elevators providing instructions for passengers to follow in the event of an elevator stopping between floors or any other malfunction.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish to thank the Minister for his statement and indicate that I agree that there needs to be more tightening in respect to the inspection that has been taking place. In respect to his statement that they are prepared to let the elevators have licensing, I should only like to say that I would hope before the approval just in respect to a logbook, that there would be some stringent inspection by the inspectors to make sure that there are just not pencil entries, there is real inspections so that the public will have safe elevator operation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: 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 First Minister. Is the First Minister in a position this afternoon to table the copy of the speech which he apparently presented last evening to the final banquet of the Canadian Manufacturers Association?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I believe the final text is in my papers somewhere. It is not customary to table speeches, but I'll be very happy to ensure that my honourable friend gets a copy of it in the usual way.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I note that the First Minister has done some breast-beating in respect to the success of his policies in Manitoba at this banquet in Toronto. I wonder if the First Minister took the occasion to advise the banquet that Mr. Fred Eaton, the President of Eaton's, noted only the day before yesterday that despite increased economic activity everywhere in Canada, he expressed grave concern about the lack of retail output and expansion in the province of Manitoba. Did the First Minister advise the banquet of the concern being expressed by such personage as Mr. Eaton?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I took the opportunity to advise that association, as I have all sectors of the public in Canada, and in our province from time to time, that the alternative to letting the private sector create the jobs and the opportunity in our mixed economy is more status government interference, such as my honourable friends opposite espouse, which has never worked in any jurisdiction in the world.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the First Minister. In view of the economic policies which the First Minister has espoused, doctrinaire and extreme laissez-faire policies that are outdated some 50 years, and as evidenced by the statements by the President of the Winnipeg Real Estate Board who emphasized yesterday that in fact housing sales had dipped radically in Manitoba because of outmigration of people from Manitoba, I'm wondering if the First Minister now, after 19 months of being in office, is prepared to propose any policies to halt the outmigration of jobs under his government, under his political philosophy from the province of Manitoba?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend — which is always the way with socialists — my honourable friends always try to make the eccentric appear to be normal. Their's, Mr. Speaker, is the philosophy of eccentricity; ours is the philosophy of common sense, which the majority of people in Canada share.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, by way of definition of "common sense", is the First Minister describing common sense the fact that last year, 1978, in Manitoba, we have had the highest outmigration of jobs in any year since 1966, another famous Tory year in the history of Manitoba?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid my honourable friend, as is usual with his group, have a penchant for mixing up facts, sometimes unwittingly, sometimes I'm afraid wittingly.

What my honourable friend is referring to is the net difference between persons coming into the province and those leaving the province. What my honourable friend is conveniently overlooking when he speaks about jobs, is that there was an increase on average last year of 11,000 to 12,000 jobs in Manitoba and' indeed, that the population according to the Manitoba Health Services Commission has gone up in Manitoba at the same time — the same population figures that my honourable friends used to refer to when they were in government.

So, I'm not in the least concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the distortions that honourable friends and some of their sycophants who write on their behalf try to make about the economic condition in this province. We're doing much better than they did in 1977 and we stand to do much better provided we don't continue to fritter away the public's money as they were doing in the eight years they were in office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: I refer this supplementary to the First Minister. In view of the fact last year that, according to today's reports, immigration declined by 30 percent into the Province of Manitoba, is the First Minister not, at least at this point, prepared to accept the fact that in view of his government's economic policies involving increased lack of opportunity for our young people to obtain jobs, that there is less incentive for those outside of Manitoba to come to Manitoba and

to make their homes and their future livelihoods in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I suggest to the honourable members that the question period is the time for eliciting information from Cabinet Ministers, and it's not primarily designed as a debating forum? I would hope that the honourable members would use the time of the question period wisely.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, two days ago and again yesterday, the Member for Wellington asked me a question with respect to the availability of the transcript for proceedings in an inquest involving the unfortunate death of Mr. Chenier.

With respect to that inquest, Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that the inquest which I ordered and was held on May 31, the presiding judge found that death did not result in whole or in part from the unlawful act or culpable negligence of any person. The Crown Attorney has ordered a transcript of the remarks of the trial judge presiding, and his findings; that should be available to me shortly, and I will provide the Member for Wellington with a copy of the judge's remarks. The Crown Attorney has advised me that the judge found no unlawful act or culpable negligence on anyone's part, nor is there any criminal negligence. The accused met his death as the result of misadventure, and the judge made no recommendations, and the Crown Attorney involved sees no need for any further departmental action.

I'm advised, Mr. Speaker, that counsel for the family appeared at the inquest and was permitted wide latitude in cross-examining the nine witnesses called by the Crown Attorney; I'm sure that if there is any basis for any civil action, the private counsel to the family will be advising the family.

With respect to a transcript of the complete evidence, I'm advised that that would cost \$200.00 if it was to be made available within 60 days; if it was to be expedited, it would cost \$225.00.

My reply to the Member for Wellington would be, Mr. Speaker, that he or any other member of the public could order a copy of the transcript if they wished to pay that amount of moneys, but under the circumstances, it doesn't seem advisable for the department to order a transcript of the whole proceedings. But I will, Mr. Speaker, provide him with a copy of the transcript of the judge's remarks and findings.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the First Minister which is supplementary to the questions asked by the Leader of the Official Opposition. In the Premier's answer to a question by the Leader of the Official Opposition, he made reference to the population data of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Is the First Minister now implying that we should ignore the population figures of Statistics Canada and use the statistics produced by the Manitoba Health Services Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I was making reference to the fact that according to my information, my honourable friends opposite when they held responsibility on the treasury benches, constantly made reference to the figures of population that were produced by the Manitoba Health Services Commission as being more accurate than those of Stats Canada. I make no judgment myself as between one or the other except according to the information that has been given to me.

No. 2 — in the light of recent press reports about certain statistics that Stats Canada turned about the situation of the dollar in Canada and the trade imbalance in the month before the election, I leave it to my honourable friend to raise whatever questions he wishes with the new government of Canada about the integrity of Stats Canada figures.

MR. EVANS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the First Minister now prepared to acknowledge that Stats Canada figures on population levels in Manitoba last year, for 1978, showed an absolute decline in the provincial population levels from the previous year, which is of course in contradiction of what he is referring to by way of Manitoba Health Services Commission data? Is he prepared to acknowledge that Stats Canada reports show an absolute drop in Manitoba's population in 1978, the first drop in population since the middle of the 1960s?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I do not have those figures in front of me. I'll take a look at them and

respond to my honourable friend in due course.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Finance and ask him in relation to the projected million dollar reduction in revenue due to the expansion of the exemption on children's clothing, whether he is now able to give us the formula and the calculation which was used to arrive at that figure?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, the estimate of the million dollars was produced by the department; as to the specifics of the formula, I cannot advise him of that. I have to advise the member though that it is an estimate based on the experience of the people in the department and I would have to assume that it is the most reliable source that one could use.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, since in my view it is extravagantly unrealistic to imagine that children wearing oversize clothing, under 15, would be spending \$20 million on clothing, may I ask the Minister if he could possibly take under notice the number of children who are oversize under age 15 and the amount it is estimated is being spent per annum by children of that size and age?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that on these matters on taxes where the tax return or the tax loss, depending on which way the decision goes, are somewhat speculative, that you can only rely on the best information available through the people that have experience in the taxation business and will probably be able to tell within the first month or two as to the actual impact after the adjustment period has been gone through. I can do a check for the member from the department to see whether they have any second guesses on the original estimate, which I would be very surprised if they did have at this point, and in due course, as soon as I've done that, will get the member a reply, but as to whether or not there's an exact formula, I would doubt it very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with the questions that I put yesterday, which unfortunately did not get on the record. I'd like to ask the Minister of Finance whether it is the position of the Manitoba Government to support the Conservative Government's position in Ottawa that all Canadians should pay for oil produced in Saskatchewan and Alberta at the world price, that is, that the oil that was being sold for \$2.75 in 1973 should be sold for whatever it could be obtained on the world price, which is established by a cartel of oil producers in the Middle East.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the answer is the same as it was yesterday, which I think is on the record.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask my honourable friend, and this question did not get on the record, whether it is his intention to support the position of the Conservative Government, to take the public interest out of PetroCan, which is now owned by all of the people of this country, and to allow oil producers in the Province of Alberta and in Saskatchewan, to charge whatever they can, namely, the world price set by Middle Eastern cartel to the citizens of the Province of Manitoba, which is a reversal of what the Minister was pursuing when he was on the opposition side of the House?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, again, that question was dealt with yesterday. Whether his question is on the record, the answer is certainly on the record, and I stated yesterday and repeated, apart from that — I believe outside the House — the same answer, that the main concern would be that the Canadian Government retain its presence in the Pan-Arctic activities, but as far as the government owning an interest in a distribution system, it makes no more sense, Mr. Speaker, than owning an Eaton's or a Bay or a Woolworth's or a blue jeans' manufacturing organization in Canada.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as a final supplementary. Then do I take it that it is the Minister's

intention that the people of the Province of Manitoba pay millions of dollars to the people of the Province of Alberta, on the basis of paying the world price for oil, based on the Minister's statement that the price should be what they could get for Tar Sands oil, even though we are not buying Tar Sands oil, thereby putting the people of the province into a position of pay now, and pay later, at the price of oil which is not being produced at the present time?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I believe that Canada is in the very fortunate position of having those Tar Sands reserves available, and I think that the only way that they're going to become economic, and thank goodness, Mr. Speaker, that there was some foresight a few years ago by some governments, Canadian and Provincial, to the exclusion of Manitoba at that time, who had the foresight to see that Syncrude was going to be required, and is now coming on stream and is available to us. Mr. Speaker, compare our position in Canada to our the position of our neighbours to the south, the United States, and almost every other country in the western world, and you see what a fortunate position we are in. And the only way that those Tar Sands would become economic at this point in time, is at approximately world price. Mr. Speaker, when that point is reached we'll cross another bridge and in due course the next question will be addressed. At this point in time, thank God some governments had foresight a few years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Highways, responsible for EMO. Considering that most farmers are busy trying to seed in the flood areas, I might not have enough time to file claims for compensation at this time, could the minister indicate whether there is a time limit imposed as to how long they can file their claim damages?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Well, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there is not a time limit. There may be one imposed at a later date, as we attempt to wind up the overall flood assistance program, but at this time I would have to advise him that there is no time limit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Corrections. In view of the recent revelations about drug problems at Stony Mountain, can the minister assure us that there are no similar problems at Headingley?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I can assure my honourable friend that there are no similar problems at Headingley, but certainly the security staff is alert to the potential dangers that can exist with the reman population in particular, that includes many persons who are remanded in connection with allegedly very serious crimes.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, the onourable H Member for Winnipeg Centre asked me the other day for a report on the escapes from Headingley over the weekend, in which 13 inmates made their way to freedom, relatively short-lived freedom for 12 of them. I cannot give the honourable member a full and detailed report as to why the escapes occurred, or whether or not there was any laxness in terms of security or protective measures. I will attempt to obtain that information as quickly as possible, but I'm awaiting that kind of a detailed report from my own staff officials. I can tell him that the escapes both took place, and there were two of them — oe involved two inmates on Saturday night, the other involved 11 on Sunday morning — both took place after regular routines had been carried out, regular rounds had been performed, bed checks and cell checks had been made. They were the result, in each case, either of windows being pushed out, mesh being cut or bars being cut. Of the 13 escapees, 12 of them are back in custody now. One, at last report, was still at large, Sir.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I assume then, that the minister is indicating that there is some drug trafficking in Headingley Jail, and I would ask him whether he is going to undertake any special measures to either eliminate or contain that problem?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have no concrete knowledge or evidence of drug trafficking in Headingley Jail, but I would assume from my experience in life, and that of the Honourable Member

for Elmwood and everybody in this Chamber, that there is drug trafficking in a penal institution like Headingley Jail. Our security staff attempts to be on the alert, to take all precautionary measures to ensure that it is eliminated, if possible, at least kept to a minimum, and that the potential dangers arising from it are anticipated.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister provide the House with information on the size of the prison population at the time of the break-out, the break-outs in the last week or so, and also the size of the correctional force at that time?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, I can do that, Mr. Speaker. I would take the question as notice for the time being.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Finance. I'd like to know when it is the Minister's intention to table Order for Return No. 55, dealing with bids for the Lord Selkirk II?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll check into that.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister would also check on the government's reluctance to produce this document. It's now taken over one year. Can he tell the House why the government is being so coy about this matter?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, based on the traditional pattern of these things that's about the half life of a normal Order for Return.

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

MR. WALDING: No, it's a question to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister when it's his intention to table copies of the White Paper on Tax Credits?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, we have indicated that we would hope to have the White Paper produced by this summer, and that still applies.

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

MR. WALDING: A supplementary.

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

MR. LEN DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, my question's for the Attorney-General. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that recently this House passed a Resolution which recommends to the Government of Canada that Section 218(1) of the Criminal Code be amended to provide for the death penalty upon conviction for first degree murder, in light of that fact, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney-General could indicate to the House how the recommendations of this Assembly will be transmitted to the Federal Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would assume that they're transmitted by an officer of the Assembly, either the Clerk or yourself, or perhaps the Government House Leader, but I would have to check into that and confirm that.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Finance, subsequent to an earlier question that I asked him, having to do with the government's White Paper on Tax

Credits. I would like to ask the Minister whether it's the government's intention to refer that Tax Paper, the White Paper, to an intersessional committee so that members of the public might have some input into the matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the intention of the White Paper and the procedure was to have it open to widespread public examination prior to any legislative changes that might be required as a result of any changes to the different programs that it would be involved in. The intention was to provide for that distribution so that people would have a chance to respond to it over the course of time between now and the next sitting of the Legislature, but it was not the intent to set up a special Legislative Committee to hear representation on it. I would presume that the representation would come back through the means of the general interest groups that may have a particular interest in looking at it in the various areas, either elected or otherwise, and then at the time any legislative change was contemplated and drafted, at that point in time there would be a chance for direct input to the members of the Legislature, through the normal Legislative Committees, during a Session.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Minister told the House that this Paper was not tabled prior to his Budget because of the uncertainty at that time of the Federal Election. Is the Minister saying to us that the tabling, or any action, on that White Paper would be contingent upon the Federal Government's Budget, which we are told would be brought down in the fall?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker. The timing would probably work out okay in that regard. It's helpful at this point in time to have an indication from the Federal Government, as they've already indicated, that they intend to proceed on the mortgage program, and that will be helpful. If they act on it that rapidly and contain it in a fall Budget the timing would probably be about right to get down to final numbers that may be required in any action that may be taken here in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister indicate if there's been any change in policy regarding the notification and inspection requirements at work sites where an explosion or serious fire has occurred?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that there was an explosion in a foundry here in the city some time ago, and that there was uncalled for delays in reporting to our particular department. We're in the midst of investigating the accident further to the investigation that the company took, and that the Workplace Safety in that particular foundry are aware of. They've jointly agreed to some recommendations, but to attempt to more specifically answer the question we're going to have to, in light of the delay for what appears to be reasonable cause, and I think our procedure should be tightened up in notifying major industries of the type of procedures that they should follow.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour, just so we're certain that we're discussing the same explosion, because it is my knowledge that there have been a series, or a number of them, can the Minister confirm that this explosion occurred at Bell Foundry in the City of Winnipeg, which is represented by Local 8552 of the United Steel Workers of America; and can the Minister further confirm that the explosion occurred on April 27th and seriously injured five workers, some of whom required extensive hospitalization; and can the Minister undertake to make the results of his investigation, which I would infer that he has undertaken, would he undertake to make those results public to the Legislature?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, most of what the member has said is correct, Mr. Speaker. It did take place in Bell Foundry, and it was the following working day that it was reported, which is the part that concerns us, amongst other issues, and we are in fact investigating the particular situation. There has been a substantial investigation taken place by the company, which has been sorted through, sifted through, and well discussed with the Workplace Safety Committee, and we're reviewing those findings of the company and investigating the situation ourselves.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I must thank the Minister for tabling the results of the Lead -in-air Surveys this afternoon. Yesterday the Minister indicated that his department would not make public the results of recent lead-in-blood testing done on students at Weston and Lord Nelson Schools until such a time as, and I quote his answer, "parents of children that we" — and by that he means his department, I assume — "have determined that there is a problem, have been informed first." In other words, that these results would not be made public until parents of children who did display high levels of lead in their blood have been informed first.

And it is widely assume that these tests have been completed for a number of days now, and there has been this subsequent delay, can the Minister confirm that there have been high levels of lead found in a number of those students, can he confirm or deny that, and that the delay that we are experiencing is being caused by his commitment to notify specifically those parents first?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I think, Mr. Speaker, my statement to notify the parents was an appropriate one and I don't wish to sensationalize the situation in any way, shape or form, except to stick to that specific position that I had. The parents, be it 2, 20, or 200, will be notified first, and that's where the obligation lies and that's what we intend to do.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. For clarification on that last answer from the Minister, can the Minister indicate if he is speaking in specific as to parents whose children have exhibited high levels of lead, or is he speaking in specific to all the parents of all the children who underwent testing?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, all the parents that were involved in having children tested in those schools will be notified before anybody else.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture when we might expect the tabling of the Orders that are shown on Pages 4 and 5 of today's Order Paper?

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, as soon as they are available to me.

MR. USKIW: Yes, a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister explain what is holding up the one from the previous Session?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure, I'll check on that Order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the Honourable the Member for Flin Flon asked me about a construction timetable for the hospital at Snow Lake. I'm advised that it's the weather that's been holding construction back at the present time because the hospital will be built on a cement slab, and two weeks of compacting and levelling of the site is required before the cement can be poured. It's expected, Sir, that construction will begin approximately July 1st.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I addressed a question to the Acting Minister of Health. With the Minister of Health in the Chamber today, perhaps I can repeat that question, with your indulgence. I would ask the Minister to confirm that the Benito Nursing Medical Unit in Benito was being forced to close as of June 27th, I believe, of this month; and if the Minister could confirm that 16 employees would be forced out of work because of that closure; and could he further confirm that the community of Benito will be without what would be considered a very vital health service because of that closure; and can he indicate as to why that action is being taken by his government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Benito Health Unit is indeed closing, or scheduled to close on the 27th of June, and the reason is not related in any way to any actions of this government, or any government. The hospital and the health unit there are losing their doctor, the doctor is pregnant and is quitting and there's nothing much that I can do about that, Mr. Speaker. There might be some proposed facilities that could handle that situation, Mr. Speaker, but we haven't given any endorsement or sanction of them yet. In any event, the community will be covered off by Swan River, and the hospital and professional personnel from Swan River. Not all of the staff at Benito have found positions as yet, but some of them, I believe have found positions, Mr. Speaker, and we will be working with them to try to ensure that loss of jobs is kept to an absolute minimum.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I also asked the Acting Minister if he could confirm that the sterilization unit at the Thompson hospital has been broken down since at least early May, and there are reports that it's been broken down for a longer period than that, and that many surgeries which would normally be performed in northern Manitoba at that hospital are being forced to be performed in Winnipeg at greater cost to the individual and greater cost to the taxpayer. Can the Minister indicate what is the delay in repairing the sterilization unit at the Thompson medical unit?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the breakdown was a result of anti-freeze getting into the pipes and damaging them. The service is supposed to be back to normal within approximately a week, and I'm advised by the Health Services Commission that the officials and professionals at Thompson themselves do not know of any cases transferred to Winnipeg for surgery, and that service was only reduced in a minimal way as a result of the breakdown and will be resumed, as I say, within approximately a week.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, that would beg the question, Mr. Speaker, if surgery is being done at Thompson without the proper sterilization procedures? would ask the Minister to then confirm or deny, and I think you will have to confirm that a reduced level of surgical procedures are taking place at the Thompson hospital and that many northern residents who are in need of surgery are being forced to wait, or seek surgery in other areas because of the breakdown and what I would consider to be unduly long delay in repairing the sterilization unit at that hospital?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, I'm advised that the doctors at Thompson have been sending their instruments to Lynn Lake for sterilization, there has been no surgery performed with unsterilized or unsterile instruments or equipment, and I most definitely cannot confirm the suggestion of the honourable member that Thompson residents are either being forced to wait or being transferred for surgery.

The surgery that is required is being performed with instruments sterilized in Lynn Lake. We still need the equipment repaired, and it's being repaired, but its damage came about as a result of weather conditions over which none of us obviously had any control.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. DOUG GOURLAY: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. In view of the very limited number of radiologists that are practising in the rural part of Manitoba, I was wondering if he could tell us if officials from his department have recently had any discussions with the Canadian Radiologists Association to see if they are prepared to relax their licensing requirements so that radiologists that are trained outside of Canada and want to come to this country to practice may be able to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba is investigating that possibility right now, the possibility of licensing radiologists on a two-year training basis, rather than a five-year basis. That would not qualify them to perform radiology in a therapeutic treatment sense, it would only qualify them as diagnostic radiologists, but that is being examined by the College

as a means of getting around the shortage. They don't have a recommendation from the College yet, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour for question period having expired, proceed with Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. By leave of the House, I would like to make a non-political statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 35th anniversary of the memorable and historical day, June 6th, 1944 which was known as D-Day when allied troops stormed the beaches of Normandy to begin the last phase of the defeat of the Nazi tyranny.

In this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, we have a number of persons who participated in that gallant venture and live.

I believe I speak for them and all others who have benefitted from the service in asking that we honour those who did not survive and who, in their sacrifice, left us to deliberate in peace.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, that we honour our fallen comrades in the traditional manner with a minute of silence. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I point out to the honourable member that we do have traditional days in the Province of Manitoba and indeed in Canada for such honour to be carried out. I don't think that it would be in keeping with the tradition of our House to suddenly change the accepted manner in which we carry out those commemoration services. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the statement that has been made by the honourable member with respect to this anniversary date of D-Day and, while concurring with the remarks that you have just made, Sir, as to the formal acknowledgment that is made on Remembrance Day and on other suitable occasions, merely add from this side of the House that we share in full measure the feelings of respect and honour for those who made that sacrifice 35 years ago today and thereby liberated vast portions of Europe from the heel of one of the worst forms of subjugation that the world has certainly seen in the last number of generations.

So we do pay that tribute and thank the honourable member for bringing it to our attention today, and to wish well and long and happy lives to all of those who survived that particular day, and who live on to see the fruits and, sometimes I suppose, the disappointments of what resulted from the great victory that took place after that invasion of June 6, 1944.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before calling the Orders of the Day, I want to announce that Public Accounts will be meeting tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m.

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to utilize my one grievance opportunity in this Session to register a grievance against the type of Agreement which the Manitoba Government has signed with a company in Manitoba, the Abitibi Paper Company.

Mr. Speaker, a number of questions have been raised in this House by myself and other Members of the Legislature regarding this Agreement. We have not, to date, received satisfactory responses from the government, or satisfactory answers to many of the concerns that are raised by the terms

and conditions of the Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline some of the concerns that have been brought to my attention by people who will be affected directly by the signing of this Agreement. Mr. Speaker, this includes a very great number of people in the Province of Manitoba. First of all on the royalty side, it affects all the taxpayers in Manitoba; on the side of the harvesters of the resource, Mr. Speaker, it affects the communities that are located within the boundaries of the Forest Management Licence Area that has been awarded to the company and the further area called the Integrated Wood Supply Area.

Mr. Speaker, we know it from the government press release, which the minister handed out in the House after we pressed him to make a statement on this, rather than just simply the press release to the press without making a statement in the Legislature.

For obvious reasons, Mr. Speaker, the government appears to want to down-play the signing of this Agreement as much as possible because of the potential embarrassment to the government for the very favourable terms and conditions which they gave to the Abitibi Paper Company.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, they increased the area which the company had under its jurisdiction, which had been awarded to them by the Manitoba New Democratic Government in 1975; they increased their area by 4,000 square miles to a total of 10,400 square miles.

They made the Agreement for a 20-year period with a further term of 20 years, renewable in 5 year segments. Mr. Speaker, they state in their press release that the rights of existing timber quota holders operating in the areas will remain protected. And, Mr. Speaker, I intend to point out in my comments on this that they definitely do not protect the rights of the existing timber quota holders if one reads the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

And the other thing, Mr. Speaker, is they claim they protect the rights for other timber operators to continue throughout the Agreement area. And Mr. Speaker, it is clear from reading the Terms of this Agreement that other timber operators' rights will not continue.

Mr. Speaker, in quoting from the press release, Mr. Speaker, it claims and I quote, "in addition to timber needs of communities in the licence and wood supply areas have been provided for." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is an absolutely incorrect statement as I shall point out in the discussion.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Agreement is one which I believe represents a policy of the Progressive Conservative Government of giving over control to other groups than the government, in terms of the administration and management of the affairs of the Province of Manitoba, as we will see as I point out the Terms of this Agreement.

If we look at the very letter that was sent to the Abitibi Paper Company in Toronto, signed by the Minister of Mines and Resources indicating that they were in agreement with this proposed Agreement, I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the government of the day, the Progressive Conservative Government, had Abitibi draw up the ideal Agreement that they would want for themselves and then simply signed it without any negotiation.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this Agreement is not one which was drawn up by the people of Manitoba and their government representatives, but rather, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this document, by looking at it very carefully, Mr. Speaker, is obviously one which has been drafted by the company and signed by the government. Because Mr. Speaker, it gives all the pluses, all the benefits to the Abitibi Paper Company, and provides no protection for the people of Manitoba, whether it be the taxpayers or the other potential users of the forest resource. Mr. Speaker, I can point out specific examples where the government of Manitoba, the Progressive Conservative government has abdicated its responsibility clearly through the signing of this agreement. I think I can best outline this by going through the specifics of the agreement and point out all of the things which obviously are in favour of the company, in every case they benefit the company and not the people of Manitoba.

For example, Mr. Speaker, on Page 2 of the agreement, it states that Manitoba desires the maximization of the net financial returns to the province of Manitoba, resulting from the use of the forest resource. Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously from the other terms of this agreement this should read that the Progressive Conservative government desires the minimization of the financial returns to the province from the forest resource, because, Mr. Speaker, they reduced the royalties to this company from \$9 to \$3 in the integrated wood supply area, and the net effect of forestry management grants and renewal grants which they award to the company have reduced the royalty to the company in the other area of the agreement from \$9 to \$2.90, which, Mr. Speaker, represents a reduction in potential revenue to the province of Manitoba of almost \$1 million a year. To be specific, Mr. Speaker, if they were to produce the total 150,000 volume of timber which they require for their plant in the forest management license area of the agreement, they would pay \$900,000 less in taxation by way of royalties than they paid before this agreement was signed. Mr. Speaker, this is, I believe, a sell-out to the Abitibi Paper Company by the PC government in Manitoba, and Mr.

Speaker, this is very ironic when one considers the restraint program that this government claims to require of every other Manitoban in every other service that they provide.

Mr. Speaker, the area given to Abitibi, if you look at the integrated wood supply area and the forest management license area, would represent a forest base which would provide enough timber to supply two plants the size of Abitibi. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Resources, in a document that was published several years ago indicated that the east side of Lake Winnipeg alone had enough timber to supply two plants the size of Abitibi. So why, Mr. Speaker, is it necessary for the government to award the Abitibi Paper Company virtually complete control over that area of resource which would supply the needs of two plants, not one but two plants?

Mr. Speaker, we look at other areas of the agreement. The clause in this agreement for the province of Manitoba is on only outPage 4 of this agreement, which indicates that if the agreement is to be terminated, the province of Manitoba must pay to the company an indemnity equal to the depreciated value of the company's capital assets and investments in the plant. Mr. Speaker, if the company decides to pull out of Manitoba, the only payment they have to make to the people and the government of Manitoba, is to pay an amount equal to the depreciated value of the company's capital assets and investments. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it provides virtually no penalty for the company if the company were to pull out of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in the press release, the government claims that they have protected the rights of the existing timber quota holders operating in the area. Mr. Speaker, these are small businessmen. These are people that require an area to cut timber which will give them an average level of income for themselves and their families for the year. And, Mr. Speaker, they claim that they are protecting these ' rights and yet in their agreement, it's obvious that they're not protecting the rights.

For example, Mr. Speaker, it states in the agreement that Manitoba agrees that existing quota volumes shall not be increased except as the company may otherwise agree, and, Mr. Speaker, this refers to the forest management license area, which extends from the Winnipeg River north to almost the Bloodvein River. So, Mr. Speaker, for an area which is, I believe by terms of the agreement, 6400 square miles, they are saying that the existing quota volumes shall not be increased except as the company may otherwise agree. In other words, Mr. Speaker, there will be no new operators because the company would not agree to having new operators go into that area. There will be no increase in volumes for the small businessman operator who harvests timber in that area and depends on that volume for his annual income.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the government is prepared to allow Abitibi to choke out the small operator, to choke him out. And, Mr. Speaker, it only refers to the timber quota holders. What it means, Mr. Speaker, when I say there will be no new operators, is that there will be no new companies being able to establish in that area. That means, Mr. Speaker, if there is an individual or a group in one of the communities right now on the east side of Lake Winnipeg that wishes to undertake a new venture in the wood industry, Mr. Speaker, there will be no opportunity for them — no opportunity. Mr. Speaker —(interjection)— yes, I'm reading the agreement, and I suggest to the Honourable Minister of Economic Development that he read this agreement. Mr. Speaker, further on in this agreement it states that Manitoba agrees that in respect of surplus spruce timber it may make no commitment to a third party for a period which is greater than one year in duration and it may make no commitment in respect of surplus of other species for a period greater than five years.

So, Mr. Speaker, what they are saying here is contradictory to that which they said in their press release that quota timber holders in the area will remain protected, because the quota timber holders at the present time enjoy rights which they've had over a number of years, rights which they expect to have renewed in 1980 when their present agreement expires. But, Mr. Speaker this agreement states that the government may make no commitment to them that's over one year's duration on spruce, and no more than five years on any other timber. And it further states, Mr. Speaker, that in respect to these timbers that may be cut in the area, they must be sold to Abitibi. Abitibi has the first right of refusal on all timber cut in the area under terms of the agreement.

And what it essentially means for the lumber production operators in that area, which I say are small operators who depend on this for an annual income, it means that there will be no more spruce for lumber production because all of the operators will be required to sell their spruce to the Abitibi Paper Company. It means that they will be put at the mercy of the company in terms of their being able to negotiate favourable prices for their production, that is even if they are allowed to operate, and they may under the conditions of this agreement, may not even be allowed to continue to operate in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking to one of those small timber operators on the weekend who claimed that he just felt sick to the stomach at the very terms of this agreement which had been signed. And I believe that he is representing the feelings of the other small operators in that area who

feel that they have been sold out — their interests, their livelihood had been sold out by the Progressive Conservative government in this province.

Mr. Speaker, they claim in their press release that the timber needs of communities in licence and wood supply areas have been provided for. Well, Mr. Speaker, the only clause I can find in here requires that the company shall give due consideration to the needs of local communities. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the government can no longer respond to the needs of the local communities; that the communities come to the government and ask for timber rights to cut in their area around their community; the government has abdicated its responsibility. They must now send these people to the Abitibi Paper Company, and they don't require the Abitibi Paper Company to give them any cutting rights. All they say is: the company shall give due consideration to the needs of the local communities. Do they call this protection? Protection for whom? It's protection for the Abitibi Paper Company, not for the communities.

And the other thing, Mr. Speaker, the only other clause is: that area will be made available to local residents for personal domestic use — big deal. So somebody can go out and cut a few cords of fuel wood for the winter, but that's it. He will not be able to go out and employ himself in the forest industry by producing lumber, fence posts or whatever, unless he gets the okay from the Abitibi Paper Company. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's simply not fair. It's an abdication of responsibility by the Provincial Government.

And going on further in this agreement, Mr. Speaker, it's clear that Manitoba, while it has reduced the payable royalties to the Abitibi Paper Company from a possible \$1,350,000 a year to a total of \$450,000 a year, a possible total of \$450,000, a maximum of \$450,000, a potential reduction, as I explained, of \$900,000 a year, the Manitoba Government still agrees to provide services to the Abitibi Paper Company, and these services include maintaining at no cost to the company, a forest inventory, calculating the annual allowable cut, at no cost to the company; providing forest protection services, at no cost to the company. In other words, Mr. Speaker, besides reducing their royalties by \$900,000 a year, they're still agreeing to provide services to the company which the company could be providing for themselves. On other words, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of Manitoba may not only be not receiving the \$1,350,000 for the forestry resource as an income from the exploitation of the forest in Manitoba but, Mr. Speaker, given that the taxpayers have to pay these things, the net result may be, when all the figures are tallied up, that the people of Manitoba, the taxpayers of Manitoba, are paying the Abitibi Paper Company to exploit the forest resource.

Because when you add up the costs to the government of maintaining a forest inventory, all of the flying work and detailed mapping work that has to be done to keep up the inventory; when you tally up the calculation, or the amount that's required for the administrators to calculate the annual allowable cut from that information; and also the cost to the province of providing forest protection services in any one year, Mr. Speaker, those forest protection services could exceed this \$450,000 in potential revenue from the company.

So, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of Manitoba may not only be not receiving any income for the exploitation of the resource, but they may be having to pay the company to exploit the resource in Manitoba.

Further in this agreement, Mr. Speaker, it states that Manitoba may, by agreement with the company, designate any roadway or section of roadway as a provincial trunk highway, provincial road or other designation indicating provincial jurisdiction over the care and maintenance of the roadway for public use. In other words, Mr. Speaker, before the Minister of Highways can go out and give the public access on a roadway which is in the Abitibi area he has to get the agreement of the company.

Well, Mr. Speaker, who is the government in Manitoba? Is it the people that are sitting across the way, or is it the Abitibi Paper Company? Here the government cannot even make a decision to allow for public use of a roadway without getting the agreement of the company. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is giving the right and power of the government in Manitoba to a private company.

And if we look at the Crown charges, the royalty charges which the company is now required to pay under this agreement, \$3.00 a cord in the integrated wood supply area, and a net of \$2.90 a cord after the Forest Renewal and Management Grant, which the government gives to them of \$6.10 in the forest management licence area. We find out that, Mr. Speaker, this amount is a very small proportion of the value of the timber that is produced. If one takes an average cost of a cord of pulpwood in the raw, delivered to the Abitibi Paper Company, of approximately \$60.00 a cord — \$3.00 a cord only represents a 5 percent tax. And I ask honourable members, Mr. Speaker, what other individual, or what other small company in Canada or in Manitoba, has that kind of a favourable tax rate? 5 percent — which one?

Mr. Speaker, the government is even limited in its right to increase the royalties to the company over an extended period of time. There's one clause in the agreement, on Page 9, which allows for the government to review the Crown charges every five years. But, Mr. Speaker, it says that

they shall be based on the changes in the forest products indexes as hereinafter defined, and/or the performance of newsprint as a commodity in comparison to the wholesale price index during the previous five-year period. So, Mr. Speaker, even this is deceptive because on one hand they say it can be reviewed every five years, but in the same clause they limit the way in which it can be reviewed and limit the government's right to increase the royalties to the Abitibi Paper Company, even if there should be a government inclination to review these charges.

And I may point out, Mr. Speaker, that another area, on Page 10, where there's more government aid to the Abitibi Paper Company, it says that Manitoba agrees to make available to the company nursery stock for the purpose of implementing reforestation practises. So, in other words, Mr. Speaker, here is another grant, which the government must provide to the Abitibi Paper Company.

Overall, Mr. Speaker, this is a very poor agreement from the point of view of the taxpayers of Manitoba, and I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, how different the Progressive Conservative government's treatment of this company is, from the way in which we would have handled this if we were the government. Mr. Speaker, we can refer to our own negotiations with this company, to indicate how we would have handled this agreement.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I say that if we were the government, we would have, first of all, assured the long-term supply of the Abitibi Plant at Pine Falls, without giving Abitibi complete control of the management of the forest resource, and we did that in our first initial interim agreement with them signed in 1975. We guaranteed them enough timber from the forests of Manitoba to supply the needs of the Abitibi Plant, in order to maintain the employment potential that was available in that area.

Mr. Speaker, in contrast, the Progressive Conservative government have given complete control of the management and the reforestation to the Abitibi Paper Company, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is an abdication of the responsibilities of a government. The government should be responsible for the management of the forest resource, and they should also be responsible for the reforestation to make sure that proper methods are used.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I say that we would have maximized the net financial returns to the province of Manitoba, and we would have maintained the royalty rate at the \$9.00 level which we had established when we were in the government. By contrast, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party have reduced the royalty rate from \$9.00 to \$3.00, thereby reducing the income to the taxpayers of Manitoba by almost a million dollars a year, or well over \$20 million in 20 years, if one considers the interest factor on this money.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, as the first requirement for any long-term agreement with the Abitibi Paper Company, we would have required Abitibi to up-grade their plant at Pine Falls to bring it up to standards. And when I say standards, I'm talking about environmental standards that have not been met to date by that company, where they're spewing their sewer directly into the Winnipeg River system; overflow from the town of Pine Falls and/or the plant goes directly into the Winnipeg River system and directly into Lake Winnipeg, which, Mr. Speaker, many people in this province depend on for their water supply.

Mr. Speaker, the present plant at Pine Falls is 50 years old; it's outdated; it requires extensive renovation; it requires extensive investment if it is to be brought up to date. Mr. Speaker, in this agreement, there is no provision, no requirement, for Abitibi to upgrade its plant. None. In other words, Mr. Speaker, they're allowing the exploitation of the forest with no new commitment of investment.

Mr. Speaker, usually Progressive Conservative governments at least excuse their giveaway of the resources and taxpayers' money to big companies by saying that this will create new economic activity. In fact, the Minister of Resources, when I asked him this question in the House, could not refer to any new economic activity, because Mr. Speaker, they're not requiring any new investment, they're not requiring any expanded activity of this company, simply this same activity. So Mr. Speaker, what is the reason for reducing the royalties to the people of Manitoba by almost a million dollars a year?

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, I say that the day-to-day management of the forest resource would have remained a provincial government responsibility, including reforestation. We would not have handed that over to the private domain in the hands of the Abitibi Paper Company, and I accuse the Progressive Conservative government of abdicating their responsibility in this area because the company has virtual control in that area at the present time, in what we call the forest management licence area in this agreement.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we would have assured that there was some protection for the province of Manitoba in the event that the company decided to move their plant out of Manitoba. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we would have provided protection for Manitoba, and the bottom line in any negotiations with Abitibi would be, from a New Democratic government, that the plant must remain

operating in the province of Manitoba. There would be no way that plant would move out of Manitoba, and we would guarantee the people of Pine Falls, the people of Manitoba, people that are employed in the plant, the taxpayers of Manitoba, that that plant would remain here and remain operating, because, Mr. Speaker, the resources are here, and it is possible to make that guarantee.

The way in which the Progressive Conservative Party has written up this agreement, Mr. Speaker, the company can move out of Manitoba and just abandon their plant and virtually pay nothing to the province of Manitoba for the over 50 years that they have been allowed to exploit the resource in the eastern part of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the management of their resource, we would have maintained a board of management which would have had Abitibi representatives, it would have had government representatives, and these people would have been responsible for allocating the cutting areas on an annual basis, taking into account the needs of all the other potential users of the resource as well as Abitibi. And Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about the small entrepreneur, the individual quota holder who operates in that area; I'm talking about the communities that require a resource base, an economic base from which to provide employment opportunities for the residents; I'm talking about park use; I'm talking about all the other uses of the forest, which must be taken into consideration by any responsible government in the management of a resource.

A resource is not simply managed for a single use, Mr. Speaker. That concept of resource management is a dark ages' concept. The concept of resource use that's common accepted today is multi-use resource management. In other words, Mr. Speaker, governments manage resources, not for one use, but for all the uses. And here, Mr. Speaker, the government is telling the people of Manitoba, as far as the east side of Lake Winnipeg is concerned, and a very big portion of the west side of Lake Winnipeg, the resource will be managed for only one use, for the Abitibi Paper Company. The other uses can go to hell. That's what they're saying.

Mr. Speaker, a New Democratic government would have protected the other uses and the other users of this resource. Mr. Speaker, I quoted from the agreement to substantiate my accusation that this government has sold out the other users because they're giving the company the right of first refusal on one area, and they're giving them virtual complete management control over the other. The agreement states that the government may not increase the volumes in any case, and in the case of spruce timber, it may not make any commitment to anybody for more than one year and it may not make any commitment to anybody else for any other resource, any other forest resource for a period of more than five years, while existing quota holders, Mr. Speaker, enjoy their right of harvesting their resource in that area for at least a 15-year period.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's that kind of a resource allocation that the quota holder, small entrepreneur, has to have in order to be able to plan and manage his own small business in order to maintain his livelihood and income from that resource. I talked to the small businessmen in that area, Mr. Speaker, and they tell me if they can only get a one-year commitment on spruce you may as well forget it. They can't go into any kind of investment in their own plant and equipment in order to harvest that resource if that's the only allocation they can get, the only commitment they can get. And Mr. Speaker, even here the government has to go to the company and get the company to agree to this. Who's the government here?

And Mr. Speaker, when you look at the other areas in which they have given virtual complete control over to the company, as I indicated, the roadways where they have abdicated their responsibility by stating that Manitoba may only, by agreement with a company, designate a roadway as public. Mr. Speaker, it's only common sense and good government for the government to maintain that right and that responsibility of maintaining public access to Crown lands in Manitoba. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the PC Government of Manitoba is telling the people of Manitoba they cannot go on Crown land, which they own, which belongs to them, unless they can get agreement from the Abitibi Paper Company to allow them to go on it. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is just simply unacceptable. It's an absolute abdication of government responsibility, and it's unfair, it's unjust, to the people of Manitoba.

And Mr. Speaker, we would have maintained —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, if there's a lessee of Crown lands — let's say we take a hypothetical case — if there's a lessee of Crown lands somewhere up one of the roads that belongs to Abitibi under this agreement, the Minister of Highways wouldn't even be able to allow that individual to use the roadway to get to his Crown land unless the Minister of Highways was able to get agreement, unless he was able to get agreement from the company to go over that road. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not nonsense. Mr. Speaker, I refer the Honourable Minister of Highways to the agreement where it states, and I quote directly so that there can be no question that I am misinterpreting it. The Minister of Highways can interpret it for himself. "Manitoba may, by agreement with the company, designate any roadway or section of roadway as a Provincial Trunk Highway, Provincial Road, or other designation, indicating provincial jurisdiction over the care and maintenance of the roadway for public use." Mr. Speaker,

if a leaseholder were on one of those roadways . . .

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

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Highways obviously doesn't know what his other Ministers are doing, or what his First Minister is doing, because they're certainly limiting his responsibility and they're certainly limiting his opportunity to serve the people of Manitoba as the Minister of Highways, because he's going to require the agreement of the Abitibi Paper Company to allow public use of a roadway in Manitoba.

And Mr. Speaker, I state here and now that if we were the government we would have provided a minimum resource base for the communities that exist in this area, that have been in this area, Mr. Speaker, longer than the Abitibi Paper Company in Manitoba; that have people living in them that require and need an economic base so that they can have useful, productive work in the Province of Manitoba. And Mr. Speaker, we would have allowed them to have a minimum economic base. We would not have allocated the area directly around the communities to the Abitibi Paper Company.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this agreement gives every stick of wood, every standing piece of timber on the east side of Lake Winnipeg, over to the control and jurisdiction of the Abitibi Paper Company so that the communities and individuals have to go to them hat in hat to get any kind of cutting rights at all. And Mr. Speaker, even the Park, the Nopiming Park, is included in the Abitibi Paper Company berth now. We had excluded it because, Mr. Speaker, we saw that a Park is something separate and certainly should be administered in a separate way from a wood supply area. Mr. Speaker, they have included it.

So Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I can only speculate on the reasons for the particular agreement which this government has signed with the Abitibi Paper Company, and that speculation, Mr. Speaker, leads me to make the following accusations: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this government, the Progressive Conservative Government of Manitoba, has sold out resources, very important significant resources, to the Abitibi Paper Company; and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a payoff for the financial support which the Abitibi Paper Company provided, and continues to provide, to the Progressive Conservative Party. I can only assume that, Mr. Speaker, from the obvious payoff that is evident in this agreement. Mr. Speaker, one only has to read through this agreement to be absolutely completely convinced of that statement because, Mr. Speaker, this agreement reduces the royalties, the potential royalties to the Province of Manitoba, by \$900,000 a year, over \$20 million gift over 20 years to the Abitibi Paper Company.

And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it gives the Abitibi Paper Company something which they were desiring when we were in government but we refused to give them, and that was absolute and complete control over the timber resources on the east side of Lake Winnipeg, including this area, and it's a very big area, on the west side of Lake Winnipeg. And Mr. Speaker, that's an abdication of government responsibility, and I can only assume that it's motivated by a need to pay off a very significant election debt which the Progressive Conservative Party owes to the Abitibi Paper Company.

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

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): The Committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members to Page 5 of the Main Estimates, Executive Council, Resolution No. 5, Item 3, Registration and Elections—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to have the opportunity of following my colleague from Rupertsland because I think some of the remarks that he made are relevant to this Section of the Estimates, and I also am pleased on occasion, on this occasion, to see the First Minister in the House because too often he isn't in the House and I think that we're pleased to the extent that he is present, that we have an opportunity to debate with him and exchange opinions.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to deal with the situation in Manitoba. This is a general Section which deals with the cost of registering voters, running elections, legal fees, etc. etc., and I want to put to the First Minister what I consider to be a fundamental reform of the whole electoral process that is not in evidence in Manitoba, and that is the fact that in half the provinces of Canada, and in the nation as a whole, there is some public funding of campaign expenses.

When our administration was in office we dealt with one-half of the problem, namely, the problem

of limiting election expenses, but I felt that that was only a faltering step in the direction of the basic reform. There should certainly be maximum allowable expenditures by candidates and political parties, and there is. But at the same time I believe there should also be a floor in the form of some appreciation for the dangers of the old system of funding political parties, and so on. And we've seen, of course, problems all throughout Canadian history, with problems of kickbacks and coercion, and we have seen people who have studied the matter make recommendations. I would like to quote to members of the Committee the 1966 report of the Committee on Election Expenses, which is a lengthy document, but I only intend to read one short paragraph, and it is on the basis of this study that a committee studied the practices in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, other European countries, and other special studies about the need for some reform in regard to election expenses.

I quote from Page 33, which I think is the summary, which said, "that these people argued that parties and candidates should not be alone in bearing responsibility for the costs of a process which is for everybody's benefit, but that the State should allocate more free radio and television time than is now the case, and should subsidize the cost of the newspaper advertisements. This argument is a weighty one, and the committee agrees that the State might help parties and candidates through specific subventions, such as, free use of the mails for sending out election literature, more free radio and television time, and a basic subsidy to cover information printed in newspapers and hand bills."

And a final comment in their recommendations on Page 37, namely, "that a degree of financial equality should be established among candidates and among political parties by the extension of certain services and subsidies to all who qualify."

It is normal, Mr. Chairman, when one deals with this type of public support for campaign expenditures, that there are minimum requirements, such as a minimum of 15 percent of the total votes cast, or 20 percent of the votes cast, but in short, the Federal Government now has substantial support for political parties. The CRTC has made the following kind of provisions, which I think is only equitable and fair, namely, that each of the political parties must be sold the same amount of time on a radio or television network. So you can no longer have one party grabbing several hundred spots and only a few dozen available to the remainder. They have to indicate how many spots are available, and if the three parties can afford them, etc. etc., they are then split up. Similarly with free time. If there's free time space it must be equally allocated between the recognized political parties.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the other provinces, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Saskatchewan, Ontario, and Alberta all have provisions to help political parties and candidates. In Manitoba the present limitation would indicate that a central political party can spend 15 cents per eligible voter, in aggregate of electoral districts in which parties have nominated. And in terms of candidates expenses are limited to 65 cents per eligible voter in the constituency.

So Mr. Chairman, if you were to take what might be a typical urban riding with 10,000 or so eligible voters in the city of Winnipeg, then you would have a limitation of \$6,500 per riding.

In Manitoba there is no support from the general population through the government of the province, but in Nova Scotia, for example, somebody who had 10,000 eligible voters would receive, assuming they received the minimum qualification of voting, 15 percent, a typical member in Nova Scotia would receive about \$2,500 support from the province, out of a maximum possible expenditure of \$6,500.00. In Quebec, if I understand their system correctly, they would receive from between \$1,500 to \$4,000, depending on the number of voters. In Saskatchewan, it would be now up to \$5,000 or 50 percent of actual audited allowable expenses, so I guess we would say the actual allowable, if they were \$6,500, that would mean \$3,250.00. In Ontario, it would be around \$1,500 plus, and in Alberta there is a tax deduction in relation to contributions similar to what is done for the federal contributions, which is now in effect.

So Mr. Chairman, I put this to the First Minister. The First Minister gave us quite an unusual speech when he spoke on the Budget, in which he was quite negative to this kind of a proposal and as indicated, he basically attacked the new election laws which were in place in the last election. Then he went on to make other bizarre suggestions, I assume in a facetious manner, about truth squads and other things which Judy Judy LaMarsh came out with, I guess in the Diefenbaker years with disastrous consequences. She was absolutely demolished by the Prime Minister of the day for that type of a suggestion.

So I simply say to the First Minister in this first instance, would he be receptive to considering either introducing legislation or studying the systems in the other provinces and in the national scene, with a view to introducing similar legislation in the province of Manitoba?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the points that the honourable member has raised have been, for some time, receiving consideration, if my memory serves me, by the Law Reform Commission. They did

make an interim report some time ago, and I believe that other matters are still under consideration by them. I think it would be preferable for all members of the House to take a look at that report when we receive it, and then collectively apply our intelligence, wisdom, or common sense to that report and see what we can come up with.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I think that all of us have probably had that report, and it's been around for awhile. I have a copy of a draft report, this may be the same one that was introduced or released in 1976, so I'm assuming that that report has been made public several years ago, and that there has been no action on it. So I ask the First Minister if that is the problem, if he is going to study the Law Reform Commission's report on election funding and whether or not, I still ask him, whether or not, if there is a recommendation to provide some public support to political parties and candidates, whether he is receptive to that type of a suggestion?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I am advised, if my honourable friend will refer to the annual report of the Law Reform Commission, he will see that they still have that study under way, and that was what my recollection told me. I expect we should be receiving it before too long, and then we'll all have an opportunity to look at it.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I assume that the First Minister is adopting a wait-and-see attitude. I simply reiterate that this type of system is now in effect in five provinces, and in the national scene, and I think that it should be introduced in some form, there should be some measure of support, some reform, in the province of Manitoba. The reason I say this is that I believe that the present system of election funding is full of flaws, and I take as one example the speech of my colleague, the Member for Rupertsland, who indicates that the Abitibi Pulp and Paper Company has now been given concessions by the provincial government amounting to a million dollars a year, and that is for a term of up to 20 years, and I say, Mr. Chairman, that that type of a concession, I think, is full of dynamite, in the sense that when concessions are given to corporations of some size, that it is all too easy for the bag men of that political party to then approach the representatives of that corporation for donations.

I suppose it works the other way around as well, that when a corporation is doing a lot of business with the government, it's all too easy to approach a corporation and ask for a contribution. Mr. Chairman, we saw, not too long ago, suggestions made by one of the candidates in the federal election, a Richard Mercier, who claimed that one of his supporters was threatened by a provincial backbencher, and told that his firm would not receive any government contracts, or if it had any, would not have them extended unless he, in effect, dropped his support of a Liberal candidate.

So we know that there is this danger in the present system.

Mr. Chairman, I also say that there is a strong case to be made for the support of political parties and candidates, in that when we look at the media, we can see that the media, which plays a key role and is one of the major factors in electoral expenses, often has long-standing biases and preferences which affect the news that transmits from this Chamber out into the public, I suppose with the single exception of cable television where you can see precisely what is going on in this Chamber. I have to relate to you, Mr. Chairman, a sort of an amusing incident which happened on the night of the 85 minute bell ringing in this Chamber, when our group went into the Caucus room, the phone rang and I picked up the phone, a gentleman phoned and wanted to know what was going on in the Chamber because he was listening to cable television and there was a buzzing sound on his TV set. He wanted to know what was happening, so I informed him what was happening so that he wouldn't rush out and buy a new TV set or assume that there was some interference or bugging of the debates of the Assembly.

But given that, coming here and seeing the debate, given the cable-carrying of the Question Period, which has now elicited a new crop of backbench questions on the government side, and given the reporting of sound on cable television, the rest is in the hands of the media, and I do not fault the working press in the Legislative Chamber. But we know, Mr. Chairman, that some of the editors and publishers have a different slant on the news. I look at the Free Press today alone and see their new policy of supporting this government in terms of its actions. There are two editorials supporting the government, saying what a wonderful job they are doing, first of all on freezing the hydro rates, secondly on the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I have been following the debate very very closely, and it has wandered quite a bit from what is under discussion, which is Registrations and Elections. It's a \$7,000 appropriation here, and provides for cost of registering voters, running elections, and legal fees for controverted election petitions. I would ask the honourable members if they would direct

their remarks to the item under discussion, rather than wandering. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I have to say to you, Sir, in passing, that this deals with the whole running of elections, and I believe that part of the item that is not included should be the support of candidates and political parties by the government, and I am trying to make that case as to what the advantages and disadvantages of that is. This is not a narrow item only dealing with pencils and paper, it is the actual item in the entire book of Estimates, dealing with the manner in which elections are run, and if there was a line in here dealing with what I am suggesting, which is found in other provinces, it would be contained in this section. It's the only section that it could be contained in. I'm attempting to make that case to the First Minister and to the government, that the political process today, as we now know it, is incomplete. The actual participation by people in putting a ballot in a ballot box is only one part of a whole story, and the manner in which political parties and candidates are provided with funds or allowed to raise funds is a vital and essential part of the whole political process. A political party that has vast sums of money to fight elections with has a considerable advantage over other parties and other candidates who have only limited forms of funding.

All through Canadian history, Mr. Chairman, there have been problems in this regard. There have been various scandals in regard to kickbacks on a vast scale, all through Canadian history, back to the early railroad days and so on.

I want to ask again, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister, what his personal views are on the federal funding whereby a formula is in place so that people, say, who donate \$100 or several hundred dollars to a political party, are given deductions by the federal government from their income tax. Some other provinces have that type of system in place, the one that most readily springs to mind being Alberta. That seems to be the only thing they have in place, the other provinces have other forms of support. But I would ask the First Minister whether he would be receptive to allowing contributions to political parties in the province of Manitoba as a deduction of income tax, comparable to the federal system, deductions off of provincial income tax, as we now have deductions from federal income tax.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, my memory is now refreshed with respect to the Law Reform Commission. If my honourable friend will turn to Page 8, Item 2, of the 8th Annual Report, 1979, he will see that under The Election Act: "Reference from the Attorney-General: Mr. Peter J. E. Cole has been retained to assist us on this project. He will be directing his efforts to producing a report for consideration by the commission in the area of political financing and election contributions." So I presume that that report is still under consideration and will be available to all of the honourable members shortly.

With respect to the question that he just concluded, I believe it's Alberta, Ontario, and there may be one or two other provinces that have followed the federal authority in permitting direct deductions to citizens, corporations, etc. who wish to make direct contributions to political parties in Canada. It's obviously an idea that has found favour with, I would imagine, all political parties in the country, and it's one that I think should be given serious consideration.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the First Minister could repeat the last part of his statement, I didn't hear the last half a dozen words.

MR. LYON: . . . one that should be given consideration. I would imagine that we may be looking at a recommendation from the Law Reform Commission in that regard. I don't know that though.

MR. DOERN: Well then I would ask, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister if he can get those reports brought forward as opposed to them being lost somewhere between the government and the Law Reform Commission, because there have been studies going on for a number of years and I don't know whether we're talking about four or five years in total, but there has been no action taken on those reports. They've been around and I hope that the First Minister isn't just using that as a delaying tactic, but is seriously interested in the possibility of electoral reform.

Mr. Chairman, in short I argue that the adoption of a system similar to the other provinces or the national government will be a fundamental and long overdue reform which will be beneficial to the general public, because the problem is that it is all too easy to say that a step like that would cost money. If we had such a system in place in Manitoba there would probably be an expenditure required by the provincial treasury of several hundred thousand dollars. I suppose depending on the system, it might be a quarter of a million, might be a half million. But I say,

Mr. Chairman, that that in effect is not a cost to the taxpayer but it is in effect a benefit because the present system has its cost as well. And all one has to do is read the daily papers and read the history books about some of the problems associated with election funding and contributions made in this country and the United States. We all know about the American scandals which are given major play in the media and we know as well that there are suspicions of similar practises taking place in this country.

Another question I ask the Minister is in regard to the reporting of political contributions in the province, whether the First Minister is satisfied with the present system? All the head offices are supposed to report their contributions, but it's all too easy to get around that. I suppose one would expect, given the requirements of Manitoba legislation, to see a list of contributions — so many dozen, or so many hundred contributors. What has happened on occasion in Manitoba is that a single line has appeared, namely that, and I believe if memory serves correctly, that in terms of the Liberal and the Conservative Party that one of the parties produced the following report as to their contributors. I believe the Conservative Party line read that all their funding came from the federal Conservative Party of Canada, X 100,000's of dollars. The Liberal Party, their line, I believe came from a trust fund. The New Democratic Party, I believe submitted a list. So I ask the First Minister whether he believes that the present legislation is adequate in this regard — whether that in effect, those disclosure provisions, give the type of information that was drawn in legislation, or whether those political parties are violating the intent of the law? Because that is what we see today, Mr. Chairman; one line, one contributor, a trust fund, or a political party. I ask the First Minister if he is satisfied with that type of reporting?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, as I said before, the Law Reform Commission is looking at precisely the point that my honourable friend has raised. My honourable friends opposite, when they were in office, attempted to put into place some reporting procedures. They are in as good a position as I am to judge the validity of those procedures. I think on all sides of the House we would agree that improvements could be made, and I trust that the report that we are getting — it's not lost or anything of that nature, it's being worked on as the report of the Law Reform Commission tells us, that report should be instructive to all sides of the House with respect to all of the issues that he has raised.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would leave this point then with this request. I would ask the First Minister if he would specifically ask the Law Reform Commission if they could submit their report in this year, 1979, with a view to introducing legislation based on their report at the next annual session of the Legislature in 1980?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, we will certainly ask the Attorney-General who is in touch with the Law Reform Commission to pass along that request. I think, again, on all sides of the House we'd like to see an early report and consideration of it.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would also ask the First Minister whether any study will be made of problems associated with the last federal election. Now I realize the difference between a federal and a provincial election, but I want to underline this one point: that the compilation of eligible electors for the 1979 federal election was a disaster. There were thousands upon thousands of Canadians left off that list, and I'm not sure how many Manitobans, but it was, I think, one of the worst put together elections in Canadian history in terms of omissions, and I was just wondering if the First Minister has any intention of studying the conduct of the 1979 federal election with a view to learning from it, and with a view to avoiding some of the terrible errors that were made?,

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has correctly pointed out we have our own system of providing voters lists. From my faint knowledge of the present federal system I think it is a superior system to the one that the federal people are presently operating under. I would think that we would be looking in the report that we are to receive from the Law Reform Commission at that aspect as well because that involves the whole question of elections. I imagine they may even treat such subjects as full-time voters lists and so on, which has always been a matter of consideration.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the First Minister if the \$8,600 approved under this appropriation last year was fully expended?

MR. LYON: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that the estimate by the person responsible for that is that full amount was not expended. We can get the exact amounts if the honourable member wishes.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that was to be my next question — that was requesting a breakdown of the amounts that were spent during the year ending March 31st, 1979. If the Honourable, the First Minister does not have it immediately, perhaps he would undertake to produce it for me?

I would then like to ask him if he would give the committee a breakdown on the proposed expenditure of the \$7,000 that is being asked for approval for this year?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, that's miscellaneous for travel, for advice, for general operations of the office of the Chief Electoral Officer of an administrative nature.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, can I ask the First Minister if there is any of this amount of \$7,000 which will go for salaries or fees to other persons outside of the Chief Electoral Officer's office?

MR. LYON: Only if the Chief Electoral Officer were to have someone come in to assist on some special study of some sort. This is a guesstimate amount that was put in last year. It was \$8,600 this year. It's \$7,000, that's a guesstimate because it's meant to cover only small outlays that his office requires.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can I assume then from the Honourable, the First Minister's answer that there will be no payments out of this \$7,000 made to returning officers in this year?

MR. LYON: Not out of this amount, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, if such payments should be found necessary I would like to ask the honourable Minister under which appropriation they would be found?

MR. LYON: . . . Mr. Chairman, by special warrant.

MR. WALDING: I would also like to ask the Honourable Minister whether it is intended that an enumeration be done in three constituencies in this fiscal year?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the advice of the Chief Electoral Officer would be accepted in that regard. It would be up to him. My expectation would be that there would be. That of course depends on the date of the calling of the by-elections.

MR. WALDING: I believe I heard the Honourable First Minister say that he expected that there would be an enumeration done in the three constituencies where by-elections are expected. Can I ask him if I can infer from that statement that the writs for those by-elections in those three constituencies would not be issued until after the first week in September?

MR. LYON: My honourable friend of course is free to make whatever speculation he wishes. He will recall of course that when the estimates were drawn up and presented to the House, there was only one by-election facing the House at that time. Since that time two of our members have seen fit to take leave of us, so any expenditures that would be required for by-elections would be done by way of special warrant.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'm referring to the statement made by the First Minister about the necessity for an enumeration. He said that he expected that there would be, and he is probably aware of the provision in the Elections Act, which says that where writs are issued within two years of the previous election, that an enumeration is not necessary. I believe that two years from the date of the last writs being issued would bring us to the first week in September, since he is now saying that an enumeration will be necessary we would surely deduce from that statement that the writs would not be issued for the by-elections until after the first week in September.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend can make whatever speculation he wishes. All I say to him is that the likelihood because of past precedent is that notwithstanding the provision in the Act that enumerations would be held, particularly to avoid the kind of situations that the

Member for Elmwood was speaking about. The concern of the Chief Electoral Officer, and indeed of all members of the House, would be that all people possible get onto the Voter's List so that they can exercise their franchise. The best way of assuring that is to have an enumeration.

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

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree entirely with the last remarks of the First Minister. I agree with his concern about people having the opportunity to vote, and enumeration being probably the best way of ensuring that. I would hope that an enumeration would be conducted in those three constituencies, even if the writs were issued before the first week in September.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.—pass; Resolution 5—pass; Resolution No. 4, Item 1. (a)—pass — the Honourable Opposition Leader. The Honourable Member for St. Vital on a point of order.

MR. WALDING: My point of order is that although there is no appropriation under this heading for the coming year, there was an amount approved for the last year, and the government and the First Minister are accountable for the spending of it. I think that you should call that item in case there are any questions on the accountability of that amount for the last year.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, my honourable friend is quite free to deal with that under 1.(a), the invariable rule of the House being where there is no vote, there is no debate, but that does not preclude my honourable friend from asking the self-same question under 1.(a).

WALDING: I do concur with the First Minister's observation, that questions can be asked under his salary of course. I do seem to recall from other occasions when something like this has occurred, that it has been called for debate by the Chair for those members who might have questions on the conduct of the government in administering that amount for the past year.

MR. LYON: On the same point of order, there's nothing to prohibit my honourable friend from asking that question under the item we are now under, 1.(a). If he wants to ask the question, I'll get the information right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable members Clause 3 is now complete, and if there's any questions on Clause 4, even though there's no appropriation, it will not be discussed under Resolution 5; it will be discussed under the Minister's Salary, and you will have an opportunity to discuss it at that point. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, my question to the First Minister is whether or not it is the intention of his government to bring forth for implementation the report of the Boundaries Commission Report.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I think I answered that question only the other day, saying that there would be a bill brought before the House this session.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, then I believe I can assume from the First Minister's answer that we will deal with the Boundaries Commission Report this session. Can I also assume that there'll be no changes to the recommendations of the report?

MR. LYON: My honourable friend would be making a fairly sound assumption. All I can say to my honourable friend is that he must read the bill himself, but when the bill is brought in he will see that the bill deals with the question of the Report of the Boundaries Commission.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe I would like to place clearly the position of the opposition on record pertaining to the Boundaries Commission Report. I believe that all parties, since the date of the inception of the Independent Boundaries Commission, have supported the principle of the arranging of constituencies every 10 years according to a population basis by an independent committee. I believe that much credit must, in fact, go to those that originally developed this legislation, so that Manitoba is in the lead in that respect.

Inssofar as we are concerned, Mr. Chairman, we support unequivocally the Report of the Boundaries Commission. We feel that the work was done in a fair manner by an independent group,

and though each and every member in this House may have particular disappointments, in the overall basis, the report was fair and, I believe, is good preparation or assessment of the Manitoba map insofar as boundaries as could reasonably be expected.

So that, Mr. Chairman, we support on our side the implementation of the map as proposed, without any tinkering the clear impression from the or tampering. I am pleased to receive First Minister that in fact that will be the case, and I believe for that very reason that Manitoba is much better off, that unlike so many other provinces, we are able to keep the question of boundaries and redistribution of constituencies on a level which is above the realm of partisan politics. And so for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear that the opposition firmly support the map as proposed. Despite the fact there may be smme individual disappointments on both sides of the Chamber, there is on our side unequivocal of 100 percent support insofar as the proposed boundary is concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to mention to the First Minister, that I just doulle-checked a working paper on Political Financing Election Expenses from the Law Reform Commission — something I hadn't looked at prior to this debate — and I want to point out that in their list of recommendations, which is now, I guess, some two-and-a-half years old, that it was suggested that there be tax incentives given against income tax in exactly the same manner as is given by the Federal Government; that there also is a suggestion here that candidates' subsidies should be payable up to the amount of the candidates' campaign expenses, not to exceed a maximum — and of course there'd be a minimum requirement; that there should be party subsidies.

So the very points I was attempting to make based on a variety of sources including federal studies, that these are in fact specific recommendations of the Law Reform Commission.

There, of course, has been no action to date and it would seem to me that there would be nothing to prevent the present administration from introducing legislation based on studies of the Law Reform Commission and I again urge the First Minister to examine what has been recommended and to introduce legislation based on those recommendations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; 1.—pass. Resolution No. 4—pass. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. What I will start with, of characterizing is a picayune point, but it has to be raised because of the attitude of members opposite with regard to something that I had said, Mr. Chairman, during the Budget Debate, and was described by various members in various terms. I think the Member for St. James said "rubbish." — I agree. The First Minister said, "You can't count that way," — I agree.

Because I said, Mr. Chairman, that taxation revenue in the Province of Manitoba, in two years of Conservative Government, has gone up by some \$180 million, or \$130 million; that taxation revenue has gone up \$130 million; that the people are paying \$130 million more in taxes. And the First Minister said, "But the rate hasn't changed," and I said, "I'm glad you've learned that. If it took 8 years to learn that, I'm glad you have learned it," because I sat on that side of the House and heard member after member on this side say, "You've double taxation."

Well, Mr. Chairman, not the First Minister, fortunately not him, but I indicated that I was using Conservative mathematics — Conservative mathematics of none other, Mr. Chairman, than the Minister of Finance of the present government. What did the Minister of Finance say when he was talking about tax revenues increasing in the Province of Manitoba? I'm going to read you a statement which I am now happy to have characteristically described as "rubbish", because it was rubbish at the time. I introduced it as rubbish, and the honourable members suddenly realized that it was correct.

This statement was made on April 15th, 1967: "There was no change in the rate; the government just sat still and collected the money as it came in, — more than triple the amount, Mr. Chairman, without ever making a motion.

"So, without changing the level of taxation, revenue has more than tripled. That same kind of massive increase has shown in every yield of every other provincial tax, including the income tax, where the progressive feature magnified government's share most dramatically, as people not only pay income tax on higher incomes, but pay at higher rates as their incomes increase."

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance, and he was then the financial critic, was talking rubbish by the definition of all honourable members opposite, and by the definition of the First Minister opposite, because they kept saying that the provincial government has more than doubled taxation in the Province of Manitoba, even though the rate has stayed the same.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't like that type of definition, I said so at the time, but I assume that you believe in your own definitions. And by your definitions, Mr. Chairman, the rate, the amount of tax revenue in the Province of Manitoba, the amount of taxation that the people are paying has increased this year by \$132 million. I give you the figures, and the figures are indisputable; they are on your records, and using Conservative mathematics, and I admit that that is a bad thing to do, and that we have never accepted that type of mathematics. But surely you will accept it, you are willing surely to measure yourself by your own standards, by your own measuring rods.

And when you say that a deficit of \$230 million is unbearable, is a mess, is impossible, that one cannot govern with that kind of mess, then accept your own definition.

In two years you have increased the deficit of the province by \$230 million — more than the amount of deficit that you said made it unbearable to you to govern.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Finance who now introduces a Budget on that basis, and the First Minister commented on it and says, "Well, I didn't say that, I didn't say that. "Well, I didn't say it either. I said that this is Conservative figures, \$132 million more taxes being collected from the people of the Province of Manitoba than was collected last year. Or if we will go back to Conservative figures, \$132.00 for every man, woman and child in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. Mark those figures. How did I get that? Because they said that if they had an \$83 million tax reduction it represented \$83.00 for every man, woman and child in the province. If you have a \$132 million collected more, by the same mathematics, \$132.00 for every man, woman and child in the Province of Manitoba.

Put that in your literature; put it in the same literature that came to my house and said that taxes for every man, woman and child had been reduced by \$83.00. Now, the Member for St. Matthews surely, who's a school teacher, will say that the same rules apply both ways.

Mr. Chairman, let's talk about revenues. Suppose I had got up in the Budget Speech, and I said, "Let's talk about revenues." Individual income tax this coming year will rise by \$20 million. The Minister of Finance — that's the Minister over there; the First Minister — that's the Member for Charleswood, would all like to say that it's intellectually dishonest to make the following statement. Listen to this — it's intellectually dishonest to make the following statement, but I'm going to make it. More and more people in Manitoba are paying more and more tax to the Province of Manitoba — the rise in income tax is 16 percent. No increase in the tax rate, but \$20 million more collected. Now, isn't that rubbish? Don't you agree that that's rubbish? Doesn't the Member for St. James say that that's rubbish? Doesn't the First Minister say that that's rubbish? But that, Mr. Chairman, is the criticism of the Conservative administration of the New Democratic Party Government based on exactly those figures, made by the Leader of the Opposition on April 10, 1972.

Now, I realize that a lot of members over there would like to forget that the former Leader of the Opposition ever existed, you know, and as a matter of fact, I have a problem, Mr. Chairman, because I said earlier in the year that when you say that we have no opposition and that we are ineffective and we don't know what to say, I said, "Yes, but we still have Spivak." I can't say that, any more — he's gone. I mean, now I have a problem, but I've still got the Member for Riel. He sits to the right hand of the First Minister, and he said, Mr. Chairman, "There was no change in the rate; the government just sat still and collected the money as it came in," more than triple the amount, Mr. Chairman, without ever making a motion. —(Interjection)— Rubbish is right. —(Interjection)— Rubbish is right. And I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that the First Minister, that the Member for St. James and the others on that side who carried on that kind of diatribe in previous years — and there are many more of them, I've just taken two — the Minister of Finance's remarks are particularly important because he now says "you can't count that way." He taught me how to count that way, but now he says you can't count that way.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the honourable members that I intend to proceed somewhat differently, and there will be different kinds of attack directed against the opposition, against the government by the opposition, but I will judge you by your standards. I will continue to do so, because it's by your own standards that you're going to be broken, by your own standard of saying that you can't govern with deficits — and you have two deficits higher now than the one that you came in and said was unbearable; that you have increased spending in this province each year by 5 percent, not the figures that you bring in, and by a total which is higher than the separate amounts that you have brought in each year, Mr. Chairman, that's what you've done.

If you look at the two deficits that were outlined, they are smaller than the amount of spending that has been increased in the two years. Somehow, there was \$32 million, and it's like under which cup is the \$32 million? You have to find it. You have three cups and where is the \$32 million? It wasn't in the '78 Estimates; it wasn't in the '79 Estimates. But it's there in the total. And that kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, is going to hurt the Conservative Party more than anything, and if anything has hurt them, and I tell this to the First Minister, it's what they thought was their greatest coup,

the Hydro rate freeze, which turned out, Mr. Speaker, to be a cuckoo, which turned out to be a cuckoo. —(Interjection)— No, that doesn't bother me at all, Mr. Speaker

You know, a member yesterday, the Member for Pembina got up in the House and didn't even understand what he was saying. He said, the Crowsnest Pass Rates — I want to tell the Minister what he said, and you'll find it in Hansard. He said, "You know, there is even some suggestion made by Otto Lang," and he characterized it, or seemed to be characterizing it, as like an insane suggestion, "that consolidated revenue keep the rates the same." And he said, "Have you ever heard of anything so stupid?" Now, he didn't use those words. Mr. Chairman, he said, "The farmers know that that's not going to help them. They know if the consolidated revenues is used to keep the rates the same they're going to have to contribute to the consolidated revenues." He said, "They know, that if you keep the Crowsnest Pass rates the same, that other rates will go up and they'll have to pay it another way."

And Mr. Chairman, the people of the Province of Manitoba know, and you know within a week, this step was taken by them on Tuesday, one week before the election, and they hoped that the Conservative Administration would thereby give a tremendous impetus to its candidates in the Province of Manitoba. One week later, Mr. Chairman, Manitoba was the only province in Canada where Conservatives lost to the New Democrats, three seats, Mr. Chairman —(Interjection)— No, it's because of your cuckoo. Mr. Chairman, you know —(Interjection)— who's sensitive now?

Mr. Chairman, you know, I'm building up to my climax. That's right. Because losing to New Democrats when you are fighting the government, it hurts but it's tolerable. Mr. Chairman, they lost to Liberals. Horror of horror. They lost to Liberals. The Conservatives didn't lose to Liberals in any other place. Nobody lost to Liberals. It's true there were a couple of trade-offs in Ottawa, and one can understand that, but nobody lost to Liberals, the humiliation of all humiliations is losing to Liberals. They lost two seats. The Member for River Heights lost to Axworthy, the Member for Fort Rouge, in a seat which should have been assured to a Conservative; and of course Jack Hare lost to Bockstael. Mr. Chairman, I said it was a picayune point, and I really think it is, but obviously it has more substance than I thought it had. I merely got up to say that in the Budget debate I said that if we will measure by Conservative standards, and I used Conservative standards because apparently you should be judged by your own standards, the people of Manitoba are paying \$130 million in taxes more this year, \$130 for each man, woman, and child in the Province of Manitoba than they paid last year; and if that's rubbish, it's the rubbish I learned from the Minister of Finance who presented that garbage Budget, which is all of rubbish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, earlier the Member for St. Vital asked for a breakdown of the amount expended last year under the \$8,600 item. The breakdown is as follows: The total amount expended was \$5,200; Telephones, \$210,000; Printing, \$3,700; Photocopying, \$190; Conference, \$800; Office space, \$300.00. There was also a query about the \$30,000 that was voted last year for the Boundaries Commission. The total amount expended was \$18,600; Honoraria is \$7,200; Maps, \$1,860; Advertising, \$5,200; Printing, \$1,175; Travel and Hearings, \$1,770; Courier, \$25.00; Office Equipment, \$50.00; Salary, \$2,320; for a total of \$18,600.00.

A final point, I agree, as I usually do with my honourable friend from Inkster, the point was picayune.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I just wanted the First Minister to indicate to us how many Cabinet Committees he's got operating. —(Interjection)— Come on, Len, put up or shut up. —(Interjection)— Does the Member for St. Matthews want the floor to respond to that challenge, or is he going to be quiet now? Is he backing down, or does he want the floor?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. I would hope that the honourable members on both sides would allow the member who was recognized to speak the courtesy of listening. The Honourable Member for Transcona. —(Interjection)—

MR. PARASIUK: No, I'm not. I'd like the First Minister . . . We've got some time left, and if the Member for Minnedosa wants to go home he can feel free to do so, we wouldn't miss him. But I'd like to ask the First Minister a legitimate question, and that is, what are the number of Cabinet Committees he's got operating right now?

MR. LYON: Three major Committees, Mr. Chairman, are the Treasury Board, which is chaired by

the Minister of Finance; the Economic Development Committee, which is chaired by myself; and the Health and Social Action Committee, chaired by the Minister of Health and Social Welfare. If I might add, Mr. Chairman, there are, of course, ad hoc committees that are formed from time to time on various topics, as there are in any government.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes. I'd like to ask a few questions about the ad hoc committees. At present does the Minister have any idea of how many he has operating, and what are they dealing with?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, my Latin is a little rusty, but ad hoc means ad hoc. It means temporary, on special topics from time to time that are formed. That's a matter of Cabinet deliberation or determination.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, I'd like to ask the First Minister then if he's still got a Cabinet Committee operating on the whole issue of Indian Land claims? One was established last year, and civil servants were attached to it. Some of them have now departed to work for other provinces where perhaps they have a better scope for their talents, and I'm wondering whether in fact that Cabinet Committee still exists or not, or does the Minister's memory, which is known to be very rusty from time to time, is it so rusty that he doesn't remember that Cabinet Committee existing, or is it not working?

MR. LYON: Indeed, Mr. Chairman, that Committee was formed. It came out with certain pronouncements. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the Environment is dealing with matters in connection with that under his department. As and when he needs assistance from other members of Cabinet, that assistance is called in in quite the normal way in which a normal government is operated.

MR. PARASIUK: The Minister still hasn't answered the question of whether in fact that Committee, which was highlighted by a Press release, whether in fact that Committee still exists; and having sent out a Press release to Manitobans indicating that this Committee was established, that it was composed of X, Y, Z members, and that it was staffed by a number of civil servants. Does the minister now say that that was just a facade, that that committee was really an ad hoc aberration from normalcy and that it doesn't exist anymore, and that that item is not an important item anymore, and that it's being dealt with by the minister? If that's the case, fine; but at the same time I think there should probably be some indication to Manitobans, especially Treaty Indians, that that committee doesn't exist anymore.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the committee is in existence. My honourable friend may find this a revelation, but leaving matters for determination by ministers in this government is not putting them down to second grade at all.

The committee does exist, as does the Provincial Land Use Committee to carry on the functions that are necessary. The major terms of reference of the Indian Lands Committee, however, have been made public and are being negotiated and discussed with the minister who is the Chairman of the Committee and it's called into meetings as and when required.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. We can see that the rust is wearing off the minister's memory — we have another Cabinet Committee that he's mentioned — the Provincial Land Use Committee and I'm glad that he remembered that. Obviously he's on top of his department. That committee is established by legislation and I expect that it will continue to exist. I think it's been doing a fairly good job and I think in this respect, that the staff has been fairly well established coming from the Department of Municipal Affairs.

I'd like to ask the minister who staffs the Economic Development Committee and how that Committee relates to the other departments, especially in terms of negotiating the agreements with DREE?

MR. LYON: The Economic Development Committee is staffed internally by a staff member from my office, from the Department of Economic Development and any other departments as they are required from time to time. It does not have full-time staff of its own.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, does that mean then that the minister's personal staff is now being used

to do staff work for the Cabinet Committees themselves? This would be a departure from the operations of normal governments in Ottawa — we have a separation between the Prime Minister's office and Privy Council — I'm just wondering whether in fact that distinction is being changed by this administration?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, again I think I said today that what to some honourable members are normality are to other normal people eccentricities.

There is nothing at all unusual, in my experience in government to have a member of the Premier's staff serving on a committee — in fact it saves on manpower — it's the rather prudent thing to do. That is the situation with respect to the Economic Development Committee as I have outlined it and there is nothing untoward about that at all. In fact in normal governments that's a practice that is followed.

MR. PARASUIK: Mr. Chairperson, obviously the last statements by the First Minister indicate that he really doesn't know very much about public administration and that's true, that's the amazing thing. I think that the First Minister really is going back to a day that existed probably before 1950 and I think he should take a look and see what the Leader of the Conservative Party is doing, because the Leader of the Conservative Party at the national level is doing something a bit different with respect to public administration than this government did.

I think that they probably aren't taking the advice of Dave Young; I think they're probably taking their time in trying to establish a sound public service that doesn't exist right now in Manitoba, because of the hatchet job conducted by this particular administration.

Mr. Chairperson, it is very unusual. It's incredibly unusual for a political appointment within the Premier's staff to be conducting that type of work.

When the Minister of Economic Development presented his Estimates, we were told that the staff support for the Economic Development Committee came from the Department of Economic Development; that the secretary to that committee was the Deputy Minister of Economic Development; and that as a result central staff weren't required. Indeed the minister has been saying that his operations are reducing the number of central staff, and that's not so. If you look at the number of people relating to the Treasury Board, which are now coming out of the Department of Finance, if you look at the number of people who are relating to the Department of Economic Development, or the Economic Development Committee — again that's a very large number — and if you look at the number of people relating to the Committee on Health and Social Development, you would find that this great attempt at central organization, destruction, which supposedly occurred in the Fall of 1977 was really fraudulent; that what really took place was that the previous bodies were disbanded as a device for having those civil servants fired, and the device was that you said by Order-in-Council that the position didn't exist anymore. It gave you a fair degree of freedom to get rid of a number of civil servants, most of whom had gone through Public Service competitions and most of whom were bona fide civil servants from many other administrations who came to Manitoba to work for those central agencies.

Indeed, many of these people have been able to get work with other administrations in Ottawa, Ontario, Alberta, a whole bunch of other provinces because they were very good effective civil servants. And what we've had replace it have been almost the same institutions entirely again. We have an Economic Development Cabinet Committee which was necessary — and I'm glad that the government did see the light of day and appointed it again — having said that they didn't want to have central agencies. They've appointed a central Health and Social Development Cabinet Committee and again I'm glad that the government saw the light of day and acted in this respect, because government nowadays is a lot more complicated than it was when the First Minister was a minister, was the last minister of the Crown, namely before the introduction of Medicare in 1968-69; because the introduction of Medicare did change the way in which government operated very significantly and I think the minister, when he was lolling about in private enterprise, assumed that the way in which to govern is to turn back the clock and go back to 1966, or go back to 1950 preferably.

And what he's found after making an initial set of mistakes, and what he found after determining that there was a lack of co-ordination after he disbanded the central groups, was that government needs to establish central bodies to establish objectives and programs in those areas where it doesn't nicely fall into a departmental niche.

A case in point is DREE. You can't have the Economic Development Department acting as the sole department to negotiate because you've got sub-agreements dealing with Tourism, you have sub-agreements dealing with Northern Affairs, you've got sub-agreements dealing with Human Resource Development, and all of these problem areas which don't neatly fall into departmental compartmentalizations.

What they require is some problem analysis — some definition of the problem, some definition of alternative ways in which solutions might be derived to deal with these problems — and then it's important to determine which departments might be able to carry out some of the tasks of implementation.

So we see that after a few months of experience that the government has indeed, despite its posturing, come full circle and established central groups. Frankly, I think that's a wise decision on their part.

I don't think it takes away from ministerial responsibility. I think it can add to the way in which a minister can operate, and that's a matter of style. Indeed' what I've been witnessing over the last 19 months have been attempts by ministers to duck their responsibility, to duck their accountability.

You know, we have the small item of the Bird Surveys. Remember the Minister of Economic Development on that one? He said it was a staff thing, I didn't have anything to do with it. —(Interjection)— No, I'm pointing out that in that instance, if we're going to follow what the First Minister is saying, we have to then hold those ministers accountable, and then we say, well, if they're accountable and those silly type of things are happening, then maybe that system is breaking down; maybe Treasury Board should be doing more work in the way of cheques and balances within the administration of this Conservative Government.

It is appalling for example, it is horribly appalling for example, that \$2,300 did go from the government to the Conservative Party. Now, given that, the minister is responsible and the minister is accountable and the minister when he got up in the House said, "I'm not accountable, that was a staff decision. It was done by the staff." Well what kind of a system does this government have in place to check out those types of expenditures?

Obviously their public administration system isn't working particularly well. It isn't working particularly well. And that means that Treasury Board, which is the central government replacement for Management ommittee, and basically performs the same functions of Management Committee, isn't doing as good a job now as it used to do, and that is because the best and the brightest staff of that body were fired. Planning Secretariat was just abolished entirely, but the best staff in Management Committee were let go. They are the best and the brightest — I won't name their names. I think the First Minister knows who they were. They had no affiliation with any political party; they were career civil servants; they knew the departments very well, and they could distinguish between normalcy and aberration.

And something like a \$2,300 grant, even though it is petty, is a very stupid type of expenditure for a government to make. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairperson, that that expenditure wouldn't have been made if we had that staff place performing the normal task in public administration of cheques and balances.

Now, I think there are some problems that arise when we have someone from the Premier's staff, someone from the Premier's office, mixing in directly with what the Civil Service does. And, you know, you take a look at what Joe Clark is doing — he will have two groups. He will have a group of executive assistants in his office, who will be headed up by Bill Neville, and that will really be performing a political function. Then he's going to have a group of civil servants in the Privy Council office, headed up by Marcel Masse, a Conservative appointment, nevertheless a civil servant, replacing Michael Pitfield, who was a Liberal appointment. I think it's wise that Mr. Clark replaced Mr. Pitfield with Mr. Masse — he has more confidence in him; he should be able to relate more fully to Mr. Masse. But I think it's very important to public administration that the jobs of Bill Neville and Marcel Masse be separated.

And what seems to be taking place in this administration is that the political and the Civil Service tasks are being mixed together — mixed together in a way that the rest of the Civil Service won't be able to relate to. I think that's dangerous, and I would think that it would be wise for the First Minister to think carefully as to how he administers his staff, that he should clearly designate to us those people who are political appointments, outside of the realm of the Civil Service. And he's brought some of them in. He's brought one person in from the Conservative office, the party office, and no one's complained about that really. He's got some other people that he's bringing in. I don't know if the legal counsellor is in as a special legal counsellor to himself, or whether in fact he's performing other legal duties that the minister feels he doesn't have sufficient staff in the Attorney-General's Department to handle.

But there is this uncertainty that exists with respect to the Premier's office. To what extent is it carrying out the central tasks of a Civil Service nature, and to what extent is it really carrying out tasks which are much more political, relating to the political activities of the Premier, as leader of a political party has to undertake? Not only in Manitoba, but I see that this Premier as other premiers, have carried out political activities outside the province, and I would expect that his political staff are involved in helping him out in that respect. I would expect that his political staff, for example,

wrote notes for his speech that he made last night. I would hope that the Civil Service staff aren't doing that type of work. But again we don't have that clarity, I think we have a few minutes left and I'd like to invite the minister to clarify what are the tasks of his staff. And we are talking about a fairly large staff complement here and we're talking about salaries in the order of about \$360,000, \$370,000, so I think it's important for the minister to clarify what his staff are actually doing. Are they performing political work or are they undertaking Civil Service jobs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend having had experience in government at the Deputy Minister's level, and I presume that he's one of those that he refers as having been a non-political appointment, he will understand the workings of the Premier's office, and of the government generally. I will undertake to give all of the concern and all of the attention that his remarks deserve to his comments about how a government should be operated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, Mr. Chairperson, the First Minister doesn't quite appreciate what I was trying to raise with respect to the distinction between political appointments and Civil Service tasks, and I think it's very important to the way in which any administration operates. I have said before at other times in this Chamber that Deputy Minister appointments are political. Those are appointments made by the Cabinet, but there are functions carried out in the centre of the government which are of a Civil Service public service nature — those will be headed up by a Deputy Minister who is appointed by Cabinet — and that there will also be tasks carried out in the centre which are purely political, which are partisanly political in that they really relate to party matters; they relate to activities of the member of the Legislature, who happens to be the leader of the Conservative party, who is also First Minister. There are a number of political tasks involved at that level and I just want it made clear that there should be a difference in personnel between people carrying out Civil Service tasks and people carrying out political tasks.

The minister doesn't think that's that important. I think we will run into very bad difficulties. I think it would be very improper, for example, for someone from the Premier's staff to be involved in the committee that allocates money for the employment programs. Was there a person from the Premier's staff involved? Was it a Civil Service person? Or was it a political person? Because a political person may turn a blind eye to a grant of \$2,300 to the Conservative party, whereas a Civil Service person wouldn't. And it is that difference that I'm stressing. The First Minister wants to pooh-pooh it, that's his prerogative, but at the same time I think it'll harm the way in which the public service operates if he doesn't make that distinction clear to the rest of the public service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; 1.—pass; Resolution 4—pass. That completes the Estimates of the Executive Council. To the honourable members, Supplementary Supply, Resolution No. 1, Item (10), Hydro Rates Stabilization—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, I asked that the Committee Rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry I didn't hear, I just took the next item that came up.
Committee Rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have two changes on the Public Accounts

the Honourable Member for Roblin for the Honourable Member for St. James; and the Honourable Member for Swan River for the Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: As I indicated earlier the Committee on Public Accounts will be meeting tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock. The House will meet at 2:30 in the afternoon, and it is my intention tomorrow night to have a Committee on Law Amendments meet to hear representations on the bills that are referred.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: If I might just request that we be given a list of the bills, say by tomorrow morning or could we pick up . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the clerk will be giving a list of those bills tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any inclination to call it 5:30?

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I might just add it will be not the intention to proceed with clause by clause consideration of those bills tomorrow night if representations are concluded. All we will do is hear the representations. It seems to me that that will be a full evening in any case.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon (Thursday).