

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, July 17, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go on to Oral Questions I would like to indicate we have in the loge to my right some distinguished guests from the Province of Saskatchewan.

We have the Honourable John Brockelbank, Minister of Government Services, Minister of Telephones for the Saskatchewan Government.

We also have the Honourable Len Werry, Minister of Telephones and Utilities, Alberta.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can he confirm whether or not the Federal Government this morning announced the granting of some \$400,000 plus to Pioneer Electric by the way of grants for industrial expansion?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable Jean Marchand, the Federal Minister in charge of DREE made the announcement last Friday. I think the amount was \$411,000.00.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I would like to ask the House Leader when he intends to call the Utilities Committee as he promised last week?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to request that the - there is only one bill that is before the Public Utilities Committee, namely Bill 53. It is my intention to ask that this particular bill be referred to Law Amendments Committee and I want to announce to the House a little later that the Law Amendments Committee will be meeting tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock. My honourable friend is a little premature. Of course he would not know what I have in my mind. I thought that I would await the Orders of the Day before announcing procedures within the House. So I wonder whether my honourable friend the distinguished Member for Churchill would await that announcement.

MR. BEARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm interested in seeing the Utilities Committee meet because I've just been ejected from a meeting between Hydro and University professors . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please?

MR. BEARD: . . . in respect to South Indian Lake and I would like to hear what is being discussed in respect to that particular project, and I think Utilities Committee is the only place in which I can place my questions.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't know who is competent, Mr. Speaker, of ejecting my honourable friend from any committee, and I suggest that insofar as the meeting of the Utilities Committee that he may await my suggestion as to when that committee will meet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, with regards to the calling of the Public Utilities Committee it's our impression that the Bill 53 referred to by the House Leader should be referred to the Public Utilities Committee and that the Public Utilities Committee at its discretion should deal as it always has in the past with the receiving of the report of Manitoba Hydro and with the resolution that is still tabled, or deferred in that committee, but which was to be dealt with at this session before the final sitting of the Public Utilities Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, my responsibility as the House Leader of this Legislative Assembly is to see that bills are processed to the various committees. And

MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to make an announcement now if this is the desire of the Honourable Member for Riel to call a meeting of the Public Utilities Committee at midnight tonight to consider Bill No. 53. This, Sir, is the only bill as far as I am concerned as House Leader that is before the House. Any other matters that my honourable friend may consider should be placed before the Utility Committee is beyond my jurisdiction. I was, Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may be informed, I was prepared to suggest to the House that Bill No. 53, an important bill no doubt, should be referred to a committee of Law Amendments which I intended as House Leader to suggest I should meet tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock. If my honourable friend the Member for Riel is insistent notwithstanding my inclinations as House Leader, if my honourable friend from Riel is insisting on calling a meeting of the Committee on Public Utilities as House Leader I am prepared to call a meeting of that committee at midnight this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, it really surprised me that the Honourable Minister of Labour, the House Leader, would have the audacity to suggest the calling of the Public Utilities Committee meeting at midnight. At midnight, Mr. Speaker, at midnight, at the hour of midnight in this province and this Legislature is going to discuss the important affairs having to do with multi-millions of dollars of this province's concerns. --(Interjection)-- among them a Minister of Finance's bills having to do with the taxation of mineral acreage. Mr. Speaker, I was prepared to have the Minister of Labour, the House Leader make another suggestion, suggestion that I think that the Minister of Labour was well aware was open to him that this bill, and he has the power and the direction of that bill; he could refer it, Mr. Speaker, as he himself suggested and intimated just a little while ago, to the Law Amendments Committee at 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. But, Mr. Speaker, let me once again point out the dereliction and the refusal to accept the responsibility of leadership on that side opposite, Mr. Speaker, they know that there is good cause and good reason why that bill should appear before a Public Utilities Committee meeting. Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking about the Public Utilities Committee meeting which the Minister of Labour, the House Leader said this bill was going to go to. And my argument is that there would have been a disposition, a disposition perhaps on the part of the opposition to make other considerations . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: . . . but to have the House Leader exercise his dictatorship over the House and to call that meeting at the 12:00 o'clock midnight hour is a repugnant, Sir, is . . . offensive to the . . . of most Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. --(Interjection)-- Order, please. Order, please. We are in the question period. I allowed a certain amount of digression because the Minister of Labour was asked a question. I don't believe that it would be normal to have the procedure of debating this issue at this time. Statements can be made under Ministerial Statements and can be replied to. If you gentlemen wish we can revert to that order but under the oral question period I'm afraid debate is out. I have allowed an answer in reply to the statement of the Minister of Labour for a spokesman of the opposition and I think that should clarify the matter. We are under oral questions. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: In all deference to you, Sir, I think the question was directed to me as the House Leader under oral questions as to when this particular bill would be given consideration. And I don't think, in all deference, Sir, that there is any real differences of opinion. The question as I understand it directed to me as to when the Committee of Public Utilities will be called. My reply, Sir, was that there is only one bill, namely Bill 53, for the consideration of the . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside state his point of order?

MR. ENNS: For the purposes of clarification, Mr. Speaker, you undoubtedly noticed how quickly and how properly I assumed my seat when you suggested, Sir, that I may have been out of order in my earlier remarks. I now wish to ascertain just on what point of order, on what part of legislative business the House Leader is speaking on. If he is continuing his statement with respect to how we are to deal with a particular matter before us, namely the Mineral Acreage Taxation Bill, that's fine. I would then assume that we the opposition have the rights to continue in the debate. Is the Minister giving us direction or is he engaging in a new debate? That is my point or order, Mr. Speaker, simply because we would like to reserve for ourselves on the opposition rights naturally a position to respond.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour wish to speak on the same point?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . my honourable friend and I respect him for his competence in procedure of the House. There is only one bill may I say, Mr. Speaker, in all deference to my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, that has been referred to the Committee on Public Utilities, namely Bill No. 53. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I trust that my honourable friends opposite would agree with me that informally I suggested that Bill No. 53 be reserved for consideration to the calling of the Law Amendments Committee tomorrow morning which I have not announced.

All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Member for Riel that if he asked me when Bill No. 53 and the calling of the Committee on Public Utilities will be called that I am saying as of midnight this evening. I do want, as I have had consultation with the official opposition I do want, Sir, to suggest that this bill be referred to the Committee on Law Amendments. If this is not acceptable to my honourable friend then I will propose that Bill No. 53 be considered by the Committee on Public Utilities at midnight tonight. Now that is the proposition. If my friend --(Interjection)-- Yes, I would like to tell you, if you give me the opportunity, to ask as to the disposition of Bill 53. I don't care a continental whether we're here until 4:00 o'clock tomorrow morning, Mr. Speaker, but I do hope and trust that the opposition and even, and I'm stretching a point, that even the Member for Riel, will --(Interjection)-- Oh yes, hell, yes. I do trust and hope that the Member for Riel will have some confidence in my integrity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak not as a question but on a matter of House privilege. This is extending the absurdities of this session and of the history of this House to the extreme by asking a committee to sit at midnight. Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no reason. We've had other committees sit simultaneously. The Municipal Affairs Committee sat simultaneously with the Industrial Relations Committee just this past week. There's no good reason why the committees could not be called simultaneously tomorrow for the consideration of this bill and such other matters, Mr. Speaker, as was indicated by the First Minister during the initial months of this session in reply to a written question in the Votes and Proceedings in which he said that the matters to be referred to the Public Utilities Committee would be at the discretion of the committee. Mr. Speaker, by calling this committee at midnight, it's a deliberate refutation of the undertaking given by the First Minister earlier in this session and it is a complete absurdity beyond comparison in the history of this Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker. And it's little wonder that the credibility of the House Leader has sunk to the low, abysmally low position that it's in now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I find most of this procedure irregular. It is not a matter or privilege as to what the routine is; it is a matter of consensus and agreement amongst the members as to when committees will meet. I have no jurisdiction in that regard so therefore it is not a matter of privilege as far as the Chair is concerned. We are under the oral question period at the present time. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): May I ask leave of the House to make a response to the statement by the First Minister. This will be the only way under the rules which I could proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: The First Minister has made no response to anything that I'm aware of. What statement is the honourable member speaking about?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the manner in which Bill 53 is to be heard in Committee. I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister has not spoken on this particular matter this afternoon. --(Interjection)-- The House Leader? The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, our party had given tentative agreement to hear that particular bill in the Law Amendments Committee but we gave the agreement with some feeling that there would be some give and take and that agreement wouldn't be abused. Now we find in the give and take of the out of order question period that because the official Opposition is not going to agree to my friend the House Leader to his method of taking the bill out to committee, we find that because we try to be reasonable that we're going to be called back here at midnight, and we damn well don't like it. We don't like it; we're working in this House from 10 in the morning till midnight five and a half days a week and I don't consider this a reasonable way to carry on the business of this province; to call members back at midnight is nonsensical, it makes us the laughingstock of Canada, it makes for sure that there's not going to be cool

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . consideration of this most important bill. And I would ask through you, Mr. Speaker, that the House Leader do one of two things. One, that he name a more reasonable time of day. Let us sit simultaneously with another committee; or, if there's some way that a vote can be held as to whether or not it should go to Law Amendments or go to the Public Utilities Committee - but for goodness sake let us not take petty revenge because someone has not agreed to a course of action, and put the House in the awkward position that we will be put in if this committee meets at midnight.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: If on the point raised by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie - and I agree with him, there's no differences of opinion in this, Mr. Speaker. I have approached my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie, I have approached the official Opposition and asked them whether or not they would be prepared to have Bill 53 referred to Law Amendments Committee, which I would recommend to the House would be heard tomorrow morning. I've no desire at all as the House Leader that the Committee on Public Utilities would meet tonight at midnight - I thought that I was only being fair and reasonable, I thought that I did have agreement I know that I had agreement with the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie; I thought that I had agreement with the official Opposition that Bill No. 53 would be referred, Mr. Speaker, for consideration of Law Amendments Committee tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock. I did not receive the assurance of the members of the Conservative Party, there was some reservations as to whether or not the Member for Riel would be reasonable and allow this bill to be considered tomorrow morning in Law Amendments. Mr. Speaker, I'm charged with the responsibility as House Leader as to the processing of bills in this House. All that I did say, Sir, was that if there is not an inclination by members of this House to refer Bill 53 to Law Amendments Committee, I have no alternative then of calling the Committee on Public Utilities to meet and my suggestion and my responsibility is that if I haven't got concurrence for the referral of Bill 53 to Law Amendments tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock - and this I trust will be agreeable - then my only alternative is because of the opposition of the Member for Riel to call the Committee to meet at some other time. And I say - and I'm sure that my friend from Portage would agree with me - that if I have disagreement, then the onus falls on me as to when the Committee on Public Utilities shall meet.

All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, if I can have the co-operation of the Opposition, and in particular the Member for Riel, to refer this bill to Law Amendments Committee tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock - and I intend to call it, which is my responsibility, for 10:00 o'clock tomorrow - surely to goodness it should not be necessary to call a Committee of Public Utilities for midnight tonight which is, Mr. Speaker - and I say this to you, and I say it to the members of the House - which is my prerogative as House Leader charged according to Beauchesne with the conduct of the House. All I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, is for members of the House to agree that Bill 53 be referred to Law Amendments Committee tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock. The only alternative that I have in accordance with my responsibility is to --(Interjection)-- oh, sit down. What's that my darling? The only responsibilities I have as the Leader of this House is to conduct the business of this House in a proper manner. If my honourable friend from Riel would agree then the proposition contained in Bill 53 will be heard at Law Amendments Committee tomorrow morning. The alternative is that in my capacity as House Leader that the Committee will be called at midnight tonight. I leave it to this House.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A question for clarification? Assuming that there's enough agreement to send Bill 53 to Law Amendments Committee, would it be understood then that any delegations would be heard who wish to speak?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In view of the fact that I shared the fate of the Member for Churchill half an hour ago when I got kicked out of a meeting between Hydro officials and University professors and a great many other experts on Hydro, would he undertake to see to it that whatever transpired at this meeting be available to this House or to Utilities Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat nonplused to know just what the nature of this meeting was and why it was deemed necessary in anybody's opinion to exclude from the meeting two members of the Assembly, and all I can do at the

MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . moment is to undertake later today to inquire as to just why it was found necessary to do so. Information that is brought together at public expense and which if it doesn't bear on something that is under current negotiation which doesn't involve personnel relations - my honourable friend knows what the criteria are - we have tried as much as possible to make such information available for public scrutiny. All I can do is sort of tender a tentative, a very tentative note of regret and make inquiry as to why that course of action was followed - and offhand, and it's only offhand, it would seem as though it wasn't necessary but I don't know for certain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. A supplementary by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland?

MR. ALLARD: Well then, am I to understand that any expert . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. ALLARD: . . . will be available. Will expert testimony or knowledge that transpired between these university people in ecology and water resources, etc., and Hydro will be available either to Public Utilities or to this House or public?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, one would assume so. I can't imagine what there could be as between Manitoba Hydro and university professional staff that ought to remain an unrevealed mystery. One would assume, just as a matter of common sense, that material information was exchanged at a meeting of that kind would ultimately be made available to the public, and all I can do is undertake to make further inquiry. Certainly nothing in it would seem to be of such a nature that it could not be made public.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Colleges and Universities Affairs, and it's based on the announcement several weeks ago by the Federal Government that they would pay up to a dollar per hen for chickens slaughtered in Canada, up to a million hens; and I would like to ask the Minister if he could confirm whether or not the Poultry or the Egg Producers Association have offered to contribute a substantial amount of money for the development of a three-headed chicken in order to be able to cash in on this government largess.

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

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I can only assure the honourable member that his little red hen will be untouched.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could he indicate on what grounds and on what basis money was given to this, I believe English electric plant that's going to be built in Brandon in his home town?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the same question was asked this morning and I answered it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the answer.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I was asked a similar question this morning and I provided an answer at that time.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Could he indicate when charges will be laid at Headingly Jail as a result of the \$10,000 worth of damage that was done in a riot?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member had been reading the media he would have noted that there are some people who have been charged with offences which really precipitated the altercation in the Headingley institution. I think three people are charged: these three people may well have been the key people in much of the damage - that is a difficult area to assess. It is my understanding that charges will not be laid in respect to the damage those who might be found to have been causing the damage, because it is very confusing to get a certainty of evidence there - but certainly there will be prosecutions in respect to the assaults which occurred.

MR. BOROWSKI: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the House to understand that there will be no charges and no recovery of the 10,000 damage at the Headingley Jail? In other words, is the public going to have to pick up the tab for this destruction?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, contained in the question is an assumption of fact which I don't agree with. It's my understanding from my staff that the evaluation of damages is much closer to about two and a half thousand dollars. It's presupposed of course that this covers cost of materials involved in any repairs, because there's no reason to expect that the repairs will not be effected by the members of the institutions themselves. As I indicated, I believe it is two or three persons who are being charged with offences, but they're related to the alteration in the institution itself and an alleged assault that took place or assaults that took place there rather than the damage to public property that took place as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Some time ago he took a question as notice, a question asking him to confirm in this House the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation's statements before the committee that where the government owns more than two-thirds percentage of equity, there would be an undertaking by the government that all creditors would be paid in the event of a winding up or in the event of a receivership of one of those companies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear whether the honourable member was assuming that such a statement was made or was asking whether in fact such a statement was made.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I know that the statement was made. I asked the First Minister to confirm in the House the representations made by the Chairman before the Standing Committee on Economic Development, that where the government has purchased two-thirds equity in a company that the creditors would be entitled to know that in the event of liquidation or in the event of receivership, they would be paid one hundred cents on the dollar. And he took that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe the honourable gentleman is referring to something that took place before a committee. I am not aware that that committee has reported, so therefore I don't think it's pertinent to our procedure to entertain a discussion on that particular point at this time. Now I'm not aware of which committee, but I would assume it's the Public Utilities Committee, consequently I say there is no report of that committee here. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: To save time and also to avert a possible point of order, I would simply reply to my honourable friend and tell him that the matter he raises can be checked out and hopefully a reply provided in 24, 48 hours from now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. (ZZY) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In view of the fact that the government has been reported on a number of occasions to have closed the door or made the final decision on the regulation of Lake Winnipeg, how does the government justify the spending of another million dollars on a Lake Winnipeg-Nelson River study?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is argumentative in its form. I wonder if the honourable member would rephrase it.

MR. ASPER: The question, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister is, why is the government proceeding with the second study or another study of Lake Winnipeg and the Nelson River when its position seems to have been settled?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party is under some disadvantage here in that he was not in the same position as other members in knowing what has transpired in this House in as much detail as those who have been here on both sides of this House. The purpose of the study that the honourable member refers to is entirely within the parameters of Lake Winnipeg regulation and it is being carried out for the purpose of further refinement, greater precision of the application of Lake Winnipeg regulation within the parameters that already have been established. So it is my assumption and I would think that the honourable member would not disagree that even though a decision has been taken on the basis of satisfactory enough knowledge relative to general parameters that there is still need for greater precision and refinement and that's the purpose of the joint federal-provincial study.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would it be fair then to take it from your answer, Mr. First Minister, that on the basis of information that the new study yields, changes may be made in the detail or the specifics of the plan.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the precise internal pattern of regulation may be altered depending on the results and recommendations of that study, but I cannot anticipate what that might be. There are certain basic parameters however which have been already established and these can hardly be impinged upon. Furthermore, as the honourable member knows, there is relating to Lake Winnipeg regulation a multi-use concept and considerations - tourism and recreation, wildlife habitat protection and enhancement, and hydro use - and these have to be reconciled with as great a degree of precision and refinement as it is possible and that's the purpose of incurring these additional expenditures and studies.

MR. ASPER: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the First Minister satisfied or does he have evidence that would indicate that none of the work currently being done and the money being spent would be adversely jeopardized by changes recommended by the new study?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, am I satisfied that the work already been carried out will not in any way preclude following a course of action that might be recommended by this study of additional refinement, I can only reasonably assume so, I cannot be certain. On the other hand as to the advisability and desirability of proceeding with Lake Winnipeg regulation within the parameters already agreed to, I am confident, Mr. Speaker, serenely confident.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs relating to his announcement that the head office of Autopac will be transferred to Brandon in September of this year, could he tell the House the approximate number of personnel that will be transferred to Brandon as a result of this change.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I think that the announcement itself indicated the number that would be located in Brandon as of September 1. The amount indicated was 45 that would be there as of September 1, that would include some present staff within Brandon.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does this number include senior management personnel?

MR. PAWLEY: It includes some senior management personnel.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary. Will Mr. Dutton be transferred to Brandon?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that is certainly the intention that Mr. Dutton will be transferred to Brandon. It's a question as to the timing and the practicality of the transfer itself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development. In view of the serious and increasing attacks in our penal institutions and a near mass breakout over the weekend, is he considering putting a competent person in charge at Headingley Jail?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I can see that we haven't got the same opinion so far as the Superintendent of Headingley. I feel that I have one of the best in North America.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate if he has altered his weekend and day parole system since the Federal Government has had some changes as a result of it being unsuccessful on the Federal level?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm informed by the Attorney-General, and I rely on his opinion, that we haven't got the type of prisoner that the Federal Government dealt with, and that we have altered only those that have not merited the day parole. We had no reason at this stage to alter the decision taken quite some time ago by this government pertaining to day parole. It's working tremendously well considering the amount of inmates that are being given this privilege that have earned it.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is indicating to the House that there are no serious sex offenders in the provincial jails?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member ask the question?

MR. BOROWSKI: I have a question, I stated it.

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

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate if it's not true that he does have sex offenders in provincial jails serving less than two years?

MR. TOUPIN: I didn't say that, Mr. Speaker, you said it.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether it's federal or provincial regulations that allow a person living common-law to collect full welfare

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is asking for a legal opinion. Would he rephrase his question?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm asking is it the policy of the government to allow - whether it's a provincial or federal policy - to allow people to collect full welfare while they're living common-law with someone who may be making as much as a \$1,000 a month which is the case in Manitoba?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Thompson well knows that it is a joint responsibility under provincial legislation and federal legislation; we operate under the Canada Assistance Plan and we have an obligation, the government, to give financial assistance to those that are in need. We equally have a responsibility to see that the funds are collected from those who are made responsible by the courts, pertaining to maintaining financial responsibility of those that are responsible to those individuals, and in those cases the honourable member is equally aware that the Department of Health and Social Development make use of all available resources that we have at our disposal including the Attorney-General when so required.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether his department is respecting the new Human Rights Act which was passed regarding the assistance of parents to children who have left home over 18.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure that I heard the last part of the question correctly. Is the honourable member making reference to children over 18. They're not children, they're adults.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Is he considering any amendments to the bills that will be coming before the Agricultural Committee, and if so are they available?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, it's my opinion that the amendments had been distributed this morning - or one bill, The Farm Machinery Act, I may be wrong --(Interjection)-- to the members of the committee, they have been, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: May I raise a point of order then on that particular issue that I think all groups in this House should have copies of the amendments that will be considered.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Is it not a fact that in cases as described by the Honourable Member from Thompson, in cases of common-law being supported by someone with whom the welfare recipient is living, that your department has the total discretion as to whether to grant welfare or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, if an individual is unemployed employable, he is at the responsibility of the municipality. If the individual who is in financial need is unemployed but not employable, he becomes the responsibility of the Department of Health and Social Development, and if that person is in need of financial assistance, we must give him financial assistance.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of -- oh, in the absence of the Minister of Colleges and Universities Affairs, my question would be to the Minister of Health and Social Development. In view of the widespread interest in the White Paper on health services, what technique does the government propose to follow in permitting dialogue and debate within the Legislature on the White Paper?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.



MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the White Paper on health was actually tabled in this House on Friday and I'm quite sure that all honourable members have at their discretion the possibility of asking questions in this House to either member of this side of the House.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister take under advisement or consider the advisability of referring it to a committee in-between sessions for discussion in a Legislative Committee.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is definitely a question for government to decide as a future policy to be taken, and the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party is quite aware that a lot of the topics discussed and presented within the White Paper on health can be discussed in either the Estimates of the Department of Education or Health and Social Development at the next session.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker to the same Minister. Is it then a statement of government policy that no action to implement the White Paper will be taken prior to the next session when it's discussed in the Estimates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Finance. The grant that is to be made to the Convention Centre, will that come from capital?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member would no doubt remember the bills that I presented to the House, I believe it is out of capital and was shown as part of the capital supply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to give notice that the Committee on Law Amendments will meet tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock. As indicated earlier I had hoped that I might have agreement that Bill No. 53, an Act to amend The Mines Act might be transferred from the Committee on Public Utilities to Law Amendments for its consideration. It seems to me that this is not agreeable and in the absence of such agreement, it is my intention and within my jurisdiction to call a meeting of the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources for the hour of 12:01 tomorrow --(Interjection)-- It's not a question of shame it's in --(Interjection)-- Yes, it is disgraceful that members of your party have not agreed that this should be considered in Law Amendments tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock which I asked for agreement.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is not in the way of a threat at all, I am prepared to reconsider my position that the Committee on Public Utilities be called for 12:01 tomorrow, if I can have some semblance of agreement from the Opposition that instead thereof that this Bill 53 will be considered in Law Amendments tomorrow. I have no desire to be --(Interjection)-- Have I an alternative, Mr. Speaker? If I have no alternative after due discussion with members of the Opposition so to do, then the Committee on Public Utilities will be called --(Interjection)-- My Member for Lakeside, you know, sometimes I question whether -- oh, hell, I'm not even going to say it.

Mr. Speaker, all I want to say to my honourable friends, that Bill No. 53 can be called tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock in conjunction with Law Amendments and I am prepared, despite the interference with the Member for Lakeside, I am prepared not to call that meeting at 12:01 tomorrow morning in order that this bill which is the only bill before Public Utilities, to call that tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock. If my honourable friends insist on a meeting of the Public Utilities Committee, Mr. Speaker, then that committee will be called at 12:01 tomorrow morning. I leave it to my honourable friends because I am most amiable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could address myself to the First Minister. I wonder if I can prevail on him, to prevail on the House Leader to call Public Utilities at 10:00 o'clock simultaneously with Law Amendments so the matter can be discussed at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Without calling on the First Minister, according to Beauchesne, the conduct of the House is within the premise of the House Leader, notwithstanding the authority of the Speaker of the Assembly or anybody else. Until I am relieved of my responsibilities,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . Mr. Speaker, as House Leader, then I will control in that capacity the conduct of this House and the only, in answer to the question posed by the Leader of the Opposition, the only alternative that the First Minister might have is to replace me as House Leader. If he has that inclination that is up to him but while I am the House Leader of this government; not this government, Mr. Speaker, while I am the House Leader of this Assembly as appointed then I will decide in accordance with Beauchesne the conduct of this House. Now then I give the alternative in that capacity to the Leader of the Opposition and even indeed, Mr. Speaker, to my leader. Are you prepared, and I do this in a spirit of co-operation, for Bill No. 53 to be considered in Law Amendments or are you prepared to meet tomorrow morning at 12:01 in the conduct and the consideration of 53. I am being most amiable, most co-operative. The decision then, Mr. Speaker, is the decision of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, the House Leader has taken great pains to explain to the House that he has the responsibility for the administration of the affairs of this House. If that is the case, and I don't quarrel with that, then he and not us makes the decision as to where that particular bill will go. And instead of attempting to blame the Opposition for his inability to manage the affairs of the House, I wish he would assume that responsibility, make a decision and let it go at that.

MR. PAULLEY: Then, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 53 will be considered tomorrow morning in Law Amendments Committee which I call for 10:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I think you know in view of the remarks that have been made by the House Leader specifically directed to Her Majesty's Official Opposition, as different to the other members of the opposition, and I make this remark pointedly because on this particular issue having to do with the matters before . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member state his point of order?

MR. ENNS: The point of order is, the point of order is, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister of Labour, the House Leader's continued references, innuendos and suggestions as to why we are insisting about the calling of the Public Utilities Committee meeting, and why we cannot be so amiable and so understandable to let this bill -- which has after all been before us for two months could have been dealt with for a long time -- why we do now insist that on this particular matter of technicality we have the Public Utilities Committee meeting called. Mr. Speaker, there have been specific suggestions made to us by the government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I would suggest to the Honourable Member for Lakeside he has no point of order. The matter has been discussed by the House Leaders. It's been settled, it's gone, it's done with. Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I understand then that Bill No. 53 without question of doubt . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: May I ask the House Leader when the Public Utilities Committee is going to be called?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know, we have a public utilities committee and that committee decides when it is going to meet. All the House Leader's responsibility is for the conduct of the House. I did think, if you don't mind, Mr. Beard, I did think that in a spirit of comradery that I should discuss this with the honourable members opposite. I think that I got agreement with the Liberal Party, I don't think that I got agreement with the Member for Riel who seems to be rather obstinate. --(Interjection)-- Yes, and I think in accordance with the majority of your caucus. But rather than go into details of it, I thought, Mr. Speaker, that it would be proper for me to do it this way.

Now then the Honourable Member for Churchill asked me when the meeting of Public Utilities will next meet. I don't know. I haven't any jurisdiction as House Leader over the internal operation of the committees, be it public utilities or any other committee. I thought that I might have had co-operation from all members of this House in respect to Bill 53; the Member for Riel apparently is not prepared to give that co-operation, but that doesn't matter the way he stands, we're used to that. So therefore . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Churchill state his point of order.

MR. BEARD: I rather get confused because the House Leader said that he isn't in control of the Public Utilities Committee and yet the other day with Bill 81 he gave us a commitment that the committee would meet for two or three days. He was in control of that committee and he could foresee the days that committee would be sitting, without consulting with the Chairman or the members of that committee because I was a member. Consequently I say, Mr. Speaker, that as House Leader and the government controls the committee and the Chairman, that they can advise us and assure us that the Public Utilities Committee will meet before the House is prorogued.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point raised by my honourable friend for Churchill I want to say that there has been consultations between the House Leader and the Chairman of Industrial Relations, there has been no conflict, and every representation that has been made to the House Leader by the Industrial Relations Committee and its Chairman has been considered. So I think, Mr. Speaker, it's improper and unusual for the Member for Churchill to raise the point that he did because of the lack of consultation in respect of the Public Utilities Committee. All that I am asking basically, Mr. Speaker, is that one particular bill, No. 53 be considered. The committee itself I suggest, Sir, has its disposition, as indeed the committee on Industrial Relations has in respect of 81 or any other bill that's been there before us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, now there is a legitimate point of order or privilege before the House. Just a moment ago the Minister of Labour told us when the Public Utilities Committee was going to meet; you know it's indelible in our minds, 12:01 midnight. Now in response to the Honourable Member for Churchill he said that he is in no power and control of deciding when the Minister of Public Utilities should meet, that that's the subject matter open to the committee and it'll decide when it will meet. Now which is which, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, which brings me to my real point of order, and I suggest it is a point of order about what all the politics is about at this particular point. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this government does not want to recall the Public Utilities Committee; doesn't want to, and is prepared to set a precedent of having the Manitoba Hydro Report not being received, of not calling back Mr. Cass-Beggs to the stand, not having to answer for further questioning on their Hydro Development Program; and yet, Mr. Speaker, allow that situation to somehow be pushed onto the Opposition because the Honourable Member for Riel now is being entirely unrealistic for asking for the Public Utilities Committee to be called. What is his option? Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, the option is we'll concede to the Opposition, we'll call the meeting at 12 midnight. That's open government, Mr. Speaker, that's New Democratic Party Government, Mr. Speaker, and it stinks, it stinks to high heaven.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside was ostensibly speaking to a point of order and I would ask you, Sir, to indicate on reflection whether there was anything in that harangue which constituted a point of order. If there were it would be the first time to my recollection that rhetoric was allowed during the putting of a point of order.

The simple fact of the matter is, the fact of the matter is, Sir, that the Minister of Labour was referring to the possibility of the necessity of the Utilities Committee being called at a given time with respect to a bill that was referred to a committee from this Chamber. On the other hand what the Member for Churchill is referring to is not Utilities Committee with respect to a bill but with respect to subject matter that has already been before the Utilities Committee and which has been dealt with there. What complicates the fact is that the Committee on Utilities has been convened and has met quite a number of times, perhaps more than any other committee of this House, that all members had ample opportunity to ask a series of questions and were given repeated opportunity to follow lines of questioning and that at the last time that this committee met the Chairman did not have any further names of members still wishing to follow lines of questioning with the possible exception of one or two.

The House Leader has not said that the Utilities Committee would or would not be convened with respect to finalizing, if indeed there is anything left to finalize, of matters already referred to it exclusive of Bill 53 which I understand is now resolved. So therefore in the total order of priorities of the business of this House I must say in all candor to the Member for Churchill that there has been no decision taken with respect to the necessity of Utilities Committee to deal, not with 53 because that's been dealt with, but with respect to any remaining subject matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. There is no matter before the House at the present time. I have extended the courtesy of the Honourable House Leader making a statement and the Honourable House Leader of the Official Opposition in reply thereto. One or two points of order have been raised in respect to the statements but they are all irregular because none of them have really been points of orders as was indicated. Now there is nothing before the House except Orders of the Day and it's up to the House Leader to indicate where we go from here. The Honourable House Leader. --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member for Riel state his matter of privilege.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, my matter of privilege is a misstatement of fact by the First Minister. There was a motion placed before the Public Utilities Committee in advance of the receiving of any of the information from Hydro. That's the first matter or privilege. That motion was a motion that was deferred in the committee until after the hearings from Manitoba Hydro were received and was then to be put. The motion, Mr. Speaker, I say is a matter of privilege because it is an extremely important motion, it was extremely important to the deliberations of the committee. That motion was there despite what the First Minister has now said.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, there is also the matter now of precedence that I think as a matter of House privileges you ought to consider. And that is to see a bill deliberately pulled away from one committee to be thrust into another committee to deliberately avoid calling that committee.

MR. SPEAKER: On the latter point first. I do believe that it is the House itself that decides where matters will go and it is reiterated through the House Leader as to what will take place. On the first question the honourable member raised on his matter of privilege, I cannot consider it either as a matter of privilege simply because it is still before the committee, has not been reported to this House and consequently it cannot be part of our procedures for me to take into consideration. Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there was agreement earlier that at approximately 3:00 o'clock or 3:30 that the House would adjourn and go into consideration of matters presented to the Committee on Agricultural Affairs. I further understand that there is agreement that the House will meet this evening at 8:00 o'clock and following that to go in -- and the Mace remain on the table -- to go into consideration of matters before the Industrial Relations Committee and also the Committee on Municipal Affairs. I also understand that now there has been recognition that the Committee on Law Amendments will meet tomorrow morning to consider bills referred to it including, I want to emphasize, including Bill No. 53, an Act to Amend the Mines Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that we will now adjourn the House. The Committee on Agriculture will meet at 8:00 o'clock, the House will be reconvened until the routine procedures are followed; that Industrial Relations and the Committee on Municipal Affairs will meet, and that you, Sir, will be requested to leave your Chair with the Mace remaining in its position until the House will be recalled, be it this evening, tomorrow or when it will be; and then tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock, if you, Sir, have adjourned the House prior to that time, that the Committee on Law Amendments will meet to consider the bills before it.

So if that is clearly understood, and I believe it so to be, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Finance that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8:00 p. m. tonight.