

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Monday, 7 July, 1980

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this time I should like to introduce to honourable members, Mr. Eugene Hiscock, a Member of the Newfoundland Assembly, a Member for Eagle River. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister, in view of the fact that last year when the Central Bank interest rate was being increased, the chartered banks hurriedly followed along the increase in the Central Bank rate. Now we witness a situation by which the Central Bank rate is decreased to some 10. some percent but at the same time the chartered banks appear to be having a great deal of difficulty in following the Central Bank rate downward. My question to the First Minister is, whether or not any representations have been made on behalf of the government of the province of Manitoba to Ottawa, pertaining to this situation by which the interest rates on the part of the chartered banks appear to not be following at the same rate as they increased, during the period of Central Bank rate increases.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that we're all aware of what has been happening with respect to the bank rate over the last several weeks and months, and it seems a short time ago in this Chamber, that honourable members on all sides of the House were concerned about the high bank rates in the country and what was going to be done about them. Since that time we have seen on the floating basis, the Central Bank rate decreasing, and as the Leader of the Opposition correctly points out, the gap between the Central Bank rate and the prime lending rate to commercial customers of the banks, the gap is larger than one would wish it to see.

I'm sure that the Leader of the Opposition would be the first to agree with me, however, and I think it's fortunate in this respect, governments neither federal nor provincial, set lending rates. I would think that the function of the apparatus of establishing of

lending rates is something that all governments should be aware of and should be monitoring from time to time, but I am not aware of any power, other than the power of persuasion, that either federal or provincial governments would have with respect to the commercial banks and credit unions of this country, unless of course they were to return to the form of statutory ceiling that was placed on bank lending rates, away back in those long lost days, before we had had too many free-spending governments, when it was easy for the Parliament of Canada or at least it was within the realm of possibility for the Parliament of Canada to legislate that a rate should not exceed a certain percentage point because historically it had never done so. So I can say to my honourable friend that, of course, along with all other jurisdictions and along with the private sector, we're watching the developments of the chartered banks and the credit unions with respect to lending rates and we would hope that the gap between the established bank rate and the commercial rate would decrease.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in relationship to the First Minister's response and by way of a further supplementary, the increase in the interest rates have not come about as a result of so-called free-spending on the part of government, but we've noticed in the second quarter of this year that the Royal Bank of Canada's profits have increased by some 40 percent and there have been similar increases by way of profits by the Bank of Montreal and by other chartered banks. My question to the First Minister is whether or not the First Minister does not favour some form of ceiling or control being imposed insofar as interest rates being charged by the chartered banks, some form of control which is comparable, indeed, the form of control that existed a number of years back.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, probably the Leader of the Opposition and I would never agree precisely, although I would think that the burden of evidence would rather support the position that I have just enunciated, namely that one of the large contributors to the inflation rate, which in turn is a contributor to the bank interest rate that we have been experiencing at the present time, is the profligate spending by all levels of government and the former Minister of Finance, the Member for Seven Oaks, chuckles to himself and that I suppose is really a measure of the understanding of his job that he attained while he was in that position. But, all other commentators that I have read, with the exception of one or two who are still holding to the unholdable, agree that one of the great contributors to the situation that many parts of the western world, not just Canada, find themselves in today is that governments have been spending money at a rate beyond that which the people of the country can produce, and we're in that situation right now.

Mr. Speaker, whether my honourable friends opposite like it or not, they helped to contribute to that situation and we, every time we run a deficit, are

helping to contribute to that situation in this country. So I merely to say to my honourable friend, that desirable as it might be and simplistic as the idea is, that government should move and establish some statutory lending rate, it just doesn't work in a free market economy and we do, even though my honourable friends opposite may not like it, we still do function, thank God, for this country, in a free market economy.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further by way of a question to the First Minister, the First Minister seems to be intent on blaming the bank interest rates upon government spending and inflation. I point out to the First Minister, despite inflation, despite the fact that there has been government spending, the central bank interest rate has decreased steadily over the last number of months till the central bank interest rate is now 10.5 percent, while the private chartered banks are 15 and 16 and 17, and in some cases, 18 percent because of exorbitant profits that are being realized by the chartered banking system. So again to the First Minister, what proposals is he prepared to make to Ottawa, besides lambasting supposed heavy government spending, in order to ensure that the chartered banks do reduce their interest rates in order to give Canadians a better break from the present grip that the chartered banks appear to be imposing upon the people, not only of Manitoba but throughout Canada?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I heard a comment not so long ago by a well-known left winger in the United States by the name of Max Lerner, who, in his mature years, has come to realize the folly of his early ways, and he has made the comment that people such as the Leader of the Opposition and the party that he represents and people such, I suppose, as myself and the party that I represent, do have a different view of the world. People such as the party that I have the honour to represent and lead in this House, Mr. Speaker, tend to see the world as it is. We tend to see the realities of life as they are. People, says Mr. Lerner, such as my honourable friend opposite — and I mean this in no discourteous way because it's a philosophical statement that he was making — tend to see the world as they would want the world to be, and they make policies based upon the world as they would want it to be, whereas the poor pragmatic Conservatives or Tories or whatever, of this world, have to deal with life as it is.

I merely say to my honourable friend that in the course of dealing with life as it is, you have to face up to the fact that there are many many factors that go into the creation of bank rates such as we have at the present time. I don't like those rates any more than my honourable friend, and so he can't say that he is monopolizing all the protection that he would like to see for the public of Canada. But there are certain immutable facts in life, and one of the immutable facts in life that we haven't even touched on in the course of this brief discussion is of course the fact that the Central Bank of the United States of America has decided that it is going to hold the supply, the M1 rate of money supply in the United States. Similarly, the Bank of Canada embarked

upon the same program in Canada some two to three years ago for the very good reason that they realize —(Interjection)— Yes, I'm sorry my honourable friend doesn't understand it but it's not the only topic in this House that has sailed beyond his comprehension. The M1 rate has to be held down, Mr. Speaker, because practically all authorities now have come to realize that the undue expansion of the money supply, which is really being printed to pay off these deficits that my honourable friend doesn't worry so much about, that expansion had to be curtailed, and that is taking place in the United States; it's taking place in Canada and one of the effects of it has been the bank rate.

Now I'm not here to defend the profits that are made by banks, by credit unions or by any other individual or associations who lend money. They're the ones who must answer to their own clientele. I do know, however, Mr. Speaker, that if the banks are making the profits as alleged by my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, then of course there is a means whereby those profits can be further taxed, and that is exactly, I presume, what the federal government is doing, it's taking a bigger slice by way of taxation.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague suggests I adjourn the debate, but I would sooner pose another question to the First Minister. — (Interjection)—

The First Minister suggests that there is a difference between his party's philosophy and ours, and that his party is prepared to accept the world as it is. Mr. Speaker, we are not prepared to just accept the world as is. We feel there's room for improvement and betterment, and one of the areas of betterment could be by way of the banking system as it presently exists. My question to the Minister, does this mean that with his laissez-faire philosophy in accepting the world as is and that some way or another it's unrealistic to expect or to anticipate the world could be changed for the better, does the First Minister then imply by that, that he will be making no submission — which was my original question — no submission, no proposals to the federal government in order to ensure that the Canadian consumer, the Manitoba consumer to whom he has a responsibility, realizes some protection from the exorbitant interest rates unfairly, Mr. Speaker, being charged by the chartered banks now, July, 1980?

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can merely say to my honourable friend that dealing with the world realistically as it is, submissions made by the government of Manitoba, whether headed by myself, the Leader of the Opposition or any other politician that I can think of, would have no effect whatsoever upon the commercial bank rates in this country. My honourable friend, in the particular kind of cloud cuckoo-land world that he lives in, might think otherwise, but that is not the case.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up with the First Minister in his answer to the Leader of the Opposition. He indicated that it's obvious that government spending being somewhat out of control over a period of time, has resulted in inflation and therefore high interest rates. I wonder if he would supply to members of this House, some documentation to support that, because it's my impression and understanding that in fact, governments have taken less out of GNP since about 1964 in Canada. So that we have had a declining rate of participation on the part of government in terms of the GNP in Canada, not an increasing scale as a percentage of GNP and, therefore, I ask the First Minister whether he would be willing to supply us with his information, which we are not able to obtain obviously, Mr. Speaker. Since all of the economists and people that are authorities in this field have argued the reverse, perhaps the First Minister would give us some supporting evidence to substantiate that position.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has greater access to socialist reading rooms than I do but I can refer him to one of his own patron saints, namely the former Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain, who in the 1976 or 1977 budget, when the proportion of the GNP being taken by the two levels of government in Britain and by the Crown Corps in Britain had reached something like 62 percent, he came out in his budget and stated that the prime aim of the Labour government of Great Britain was to reduce the proportion of the GNP being taken up by government, so as to have a positive effect upon decreasing the inflation rate in Great Britain and in fact, he wanted to move the proportion of government spending of the GNP from 62 down into the mid-50's, and that's only one source. Mr. Speaker, history is replete with a thousand sources. If my honourable friends would only read and understand the world as it is, and the realities of the world that we deal with, then they would realize that some of the particular balloons that seem to sustain them through their lives and their particular creed just don't hold anything except hot air.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to all members that they read Citation 359 of Beauchesne, probably sub. 11, "The question which seeks an opinion about government policy is probably out of order, in that it asks for an opinion and not information. A question asking for a general statement of government policy may be out of order, in that it requires a long answer. Other questions inevitably deal with government policy and the general restrictions regarding such questions, have never been applied." So I would ask all members to temper their questions considerably, and try and seek information.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I happen to concur wholeheartedly with your suggestion, Mr. Speaker. I did ask the First Minister whether he would table with members of the Assembly a document which

would support his theory or analysis on what is causing high inflation rates, some authoritative body that would have presented him with that information. Because my information was just the contrary. It's my understanding and the First Minister can correct me, Mr. Speaker, if he wishes, that in Canada the government's share of GNP had been steadily declining since about the mid-1960s and if the First Minister has evidence otherwise, I would ask him to table that evidence so that we might peruse it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt, as usual, to obey your admonition and merely suggest to my honourable friend that he avail himself of the latest statistics that are available on that topic. I must confess to him, however, that I haven't looked at them recently, but as recently as a year ago, the statement that he made was not the case, namely that the proportion of GNP being taken by the three levels of government in Canada was still on the increase. Now there has been, because of the Economic Conference in 1978-79 where all provinces in Canada, including Saskatchewan, agreed, number one, that the private sector was the main engine that fueled our economy. No. 2, that government spending had to be restricted in order to make sure that more jobs could be created by the private sector; and No. 3, that the rate of growth in government spending should not exceed the rate of growth in the total economy. There has been some slowing down, as my honourable friend suggests. I'll be happy to take a look at the more recent evidences of this, but I would suggest that Stats Can can probably provide them for him.

MR. USKIW: I have one final question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the First Minister, whether or not, in his opinion, where this is excessive profiteering, whether that in itself is not a major contributor to inflationary pressure on our economy.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, let it be clearly understood that — and I hope my honourable friend would accept this — that I have never been heard to say that excessive government spending is the only cause of inflation. It's one of the principal causes, and it's the one over which we, in this House and the Parliament of Canada, have some control, and if we were doing a better job collectively as legislators and politicians in Canada, the people of Canada would not be facing the kinds of inflationary rates that they are.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the First Minister a question or two based on his remarks and obsession with deficits and inflation. I wanted to ask him whether he now regrets his government's decision to introduce a program to counter the drought in Manitoba, because of the fact that it has led to a deficit budget.

MR. SPEAKER: the Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we may have to advance further moneys out of the pockets of the taxpayers of Manitoba if the weather conditions do not improve dramatically, in order to augment that very program, and I would hope that we would enjoy the support of all members on all sides of the House for that drought abatement program.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I assume that there is support on this side for a drought abatement program, but the First Minister has his eyes firmly fixed on inflation, and I ask him, whether he is not now making a public admission that his government is contributing to inflation and will contribute to inflation, by running a series of deficit budgets.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have said before, all governments that run deficit budgets contribute in some way to the inflationary spectre that afflicts this country, all governments, including this one, yes.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I also ask the First Minister, since he first and foremost criticizes governments, including his own and himself, for contributing to inflation, whether he doesn't also recognize that the public sector corporations and individuals also significantly contribute to inflation in the economy? Or does he think it's only government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. Order please. Questions are supposed to seek information, not create arguments. I would have to rule that question out of order.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, maybe I could rephrase it, and ask the First Minister whether he is in fact, saying that only governments contribute to inflation. Is that his understanding of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. Again I must say the question is out of order. You cannot put words in somebody else's mouth.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to question the First Minister, and seek some information in regard to the situation what I believe to be a serious situation at the Port of Churchill. I had asked a question earlier this morning of the Deputy First Minister and he had undertaken to provide some information. I would ask the First Minister now if he can indicate to us what action the government of Manitoba is taking in regard to the announcement by the Canadian Wheat Board that grain shipments from Churchill might be greatly reduced or in fact, may even be cancelled entirely, due to the drought situation. I'd ask the Minister if he can inform us as to the actions that his government is taking to convince the Canadian Wheat Board of the importance of the Port of Churchill and further, to convince him of the negative and disastrous impact such action as they have outlined in Friday would have on that particular port.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to take that question as notice on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, and merely to say to my honourable friend, that we all share concern about the announcement of the Wheat Board, but as my honourable friend should be one of the earliest to realize, that when you have a drought affecting the granary of Canada, which is Saskatchewan and Manitoba principally, that has a number of domino effects, one of which is that grain does not grow and if grain doesn't grow, and if grain is not in stock on farms, then there obviously is going to be a shortage of supply to go to all delivery points, and governments can do many things, Mr. Speaker, but governments cannot create moisture and governments cannot make grain grow.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the Minister's comments, but if my understanding of the situation is correct, the problem is in that grain on the CPR line is not accessible to CNR to ship to Churchill because Churchill does not have an interchange agreement. The Port of Churchill is not part of an interchange agreement between CN and CPR. I would ask the First Minister if his government has made representations to the federal government and to the Canadian Wheat Board, following up upon the recommendations of the Hall Commission a number of years ago, that an interchange agreement be implemented for the Port of Churchill, and that in fact would have a significant impact on the shipping that could be done out of port this year. I'd ask the First Minister as to his government's position on that interchange agreement and also as to what action they have taken to implement such an agreement.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, since Manitoba took the initiative in convening the first national meeting on grain transportation in Canada in this province in January of 1979, there have been a number of initiatives taken by the various participants, the government, the grain trade, the farm organizations and so on, with respect not only to interchange agreements but with respect to all other aspects that affect the delivery of grain, and may I say the revalidation in the minds of the three western provinces of the importance of the Port of Churchill to our whole delivery system. I will be happy to take as notice the question on that particular that my honourable friend has asked; I can merely assure him that since that conference, there has been a great deal of progress made with respect to a number of items that affect the Port of Churchill, Prince Rupert and other areas, to enhance the whole grain delivery system in Canada.

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

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the First Minister again, I have been informed that during the question period in the federal House today, the Minister of Transport, the Honourable Jean-Luc Pepin, announced that the Horner Committee is currently discussing the concept of an interchange agreement for the Port of Churchill. I would ask the Minister if his government is prepared, due to the

urgency and the seriousness of the situation that confronts that port now and confronts indeed, as the Minister says, all the people of the three western provinces, I'd ask the Minister if he is prepared to made a special representation to that committee so as to facilitate and to speed-up any decision they may make in regard to the interchange agreement, so that there can be grain provided for the port of Churchill for this shipping season.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in the interests of accuracy, I've already said that I would take my honourable friend's question as notice. Of course there was no need, it is axiomatic that the government of Manitoba would take any action that is required with respect to interchange agreements or anything else for the enhancement of the Port of Churchill. The reason I say for the purpose of accuracy, is that I'm relatively confident that those discussions have already taken place, if not in the light of the present emergency, which I agree with the Member for Churchill is an emergency, than in preliminary discussions that have already been held with the grain co-ordinator and with other people involved in that problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister responsible for Communications in Manitoba, and ask the Minister, in view of the fact that the residents of Winnipeg in eastern Manitoba have had a third Canadian television choice available to them since 1975, when CKND TV began broadcasting, is the government of Manitoba prepared to give moral support to the citizens of Brandon and western Manitoba, who are currently pressing for an extension of the CKND Television signal to service that large section of the province.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure which Minister is responsible for Communications. I thought it was the Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs, but if not, I would address it to whoever is the responsible Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, the Communications Branch does come under my department, but matters dealing with that particular subject have been handled by the Minister of Government Services.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the whole question of extension of cable and other services, entertainment services, within the television field, is one of intense negotiating currently under way. The particular question that the honourable member poses is, as I understand it, merely the extension of another TV

outlet in the community of Brandon and, that has not as such come across my desk, but it could certainly receive the support of this government.

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

MR. EVANS: I'd like to ask the Minister if he would undertake to write either to the federal Communications Minister or to the Chairman of the CRTC in Ottawa, asking them or pressing them for such an extension of CKND Television in the interests of creating greater equality of opportunity for our citizens throughout Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would be advised best to take that question as notice. I'm not aware of whether or not CKND has made specific application to CRTC for a licensure. If that is the case, then I would be pleased to support it in the manner and the way in which the member suggests. But I would have to take that question as notice and determine whether or not an actual application for a licensure has been made by the carrier involved.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, when the Minister investigates this, he'll find that there has been attempts by CKND TV to get into that area for some time. I'd like to ask him if he would also look into the matter of getting CKND, if not as a signal through the air, the possibility of getting CKND on the cable system which is now being expanded throughout western Manitoba, which apparently is now prohibited. CKND is apparently now prohibited from carrying on that cable system, whereas we can have various American imports come on to the cable there, so I think, Mr. Speaker, my question is, in view of the importance of having maximum Canadian content which the availability of CKND through the cable system could provide, does he not agree that it would be in the interests of Canadian programming

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Questions of agreement are not permissible in this Chamber. If the member is seeking information, I wish he would pose his question.

MR. EVANS: Would the Minister, Mr. Speaker, look into the matter of putting CKND on the cable system, in addition to the matter of allowing that television station to be broadcast over the air?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, what I can advise the honourable member and the House is that the question of jurisdiction on matters such as this may well be changing, in that some of that jurisdiction, as a result of constitutional talks, could be coming to the provinces. I will be introducing legislation in this House during this session that will anticipate some of those changes and make it possible for the province, through a provincial regulator, to deal with the kind of applications that the honourable member refers to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Minister responsible for the Economic Development Fund. Has the Minister received a letter from the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood suspending their participation on the board of directors?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Yes, Mr. Speaker, this question was posed to me last week one day, I believe, and was answered at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Government Services responsible for MTS and, apparently, communications. In light of his answers and his desire for greater equality amongst citizens, I wonder if the Minister could give us some indication of what he can do or is willing to do, in terms of assisting some of the remote communities to get their second TV channel.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important thing that government can do in this area is the kind of support in the supply and in billing the distribution network through MTS is one way that provincial policies can broaden viewing opportunities of northern residents. The honourable member is well aware that's precisely the kind of activity, however, which, with the current situation, leads us into jurisdictional difficulties with CRTC. It's my hope that these jurisdictional problems will be resolved within a reasonable period of time and that MTS will be in a position to encourage the building of the network required, in some instances, for the provision of extra channel capacity, extra viewing opportunities for northern residents.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to remote communities which are probably not possible to service by cable systems. I wonder though, if the Minister could bring us up to date in terms of the application of Norlite Cable Television, for which Manitoba Telephone System has installed a cable system and is now operating it illegally, and although the people of the north appreciate this, the citizens of Manitoba have stuck their neck out a long way with public money. I wonder if the Minister could bring us up to date in terms of that application and whether it looks like MTS will soon start recovering their funds, or their investment?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, without accepting the suggestion that the people of Manitoba have stuck their neck out to any particular extent, I can indicate to the honourable member that the hearings were scheduled initially, by CRTC, for May, then delayed to June 25 to be held in Hull, then cancelled again;

now there's suggestion from Ottawa that the hearings will be held perhaps in Thompson. There has been a specific request for that but a specific date, as yet, has not been set.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the First Minister in view of the fact that he's been answering questions dealing with the transportation of grain. I'd like to ask the First Minister what his government's policy is with respect to the interchange of rail lines between the CN and the CP and if his policy is that the rail beds should become a public utility; I ask him whether his government has corresponded with the federal government to direct the Canadian National railways to move grain on the CP lines and vice versa, so that the orders can be filled and the Port of Churchill operate?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, that's hardly a question that admits of answer in question period, because, for the reasons that I've previously given in responding to the Member for Churchill, there have been many many initiatives taken by the government of Manitoba, the government of Saskatchewan, Alberta and other parties with respect to this precise problem. I can tell my honourable friend, by way of example of what I've just said, that it was at the national conference on grain handling and transportation here in this building, in January of 1979, that the CN and the CP, after an overnight parley, the presidents of the two railways agreed that there would thereafter be the possibility of car interchanges on their lines to permit a greater usage of the Port of Prince Rupert. Therefore, I merely say in the interests of accuracy that I would have to find out all of the ongoing discussions that have been taking place in that regard, with respect not only to Churchill but Rupert, and other things that have been happening in that field.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the First Minister's answer that there has been general agreement, as he recalls, between the two railways to interchange and it appears that the role of the grain transportation co-ordinator has not worked out, I wonder what the provincial government's position is with respect to the inability of the grain transport commissioner to get the railways moving and get the grain moving into the ports; whether he has corresponded or telexed Ottawa to find out whether or not the grain transportation co-ordinator should be removed from his position and the Wheat Board resume its sole authority with respect to the scheduling of grain cars.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend was even in the same House, if not the same province, when I answered a few seconds ago, his first question. What I said bore no relationship to his interpretation to what he alleges I just said. What I said was that there have been initiatives taken, starting with the conference, where interchange on the one port was agreed too by the railways, or thought to be a feasible exercise. My

honourable friend has somehow or other got the transportation or Dr. Horner's office into the discussion; the creation of that office and the appointment of Dr. Horner is one of the best things that has been done for grain transportation in this country in a long time.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, my last question to the First Minister, I asked the First Minister, in view of the fact that the co-ordinator's inability to get the railways moving and the grain moving to the Port Churchill for the first time in Canadian history, can he indicate what his government's position will be in the event that a week from now that there is now grain moving to that port, with respect to the role of the co-ordinator?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered that question earlier in today's proceedings. I reiterate, however, for the benefit of my honourable friend opposite, governments, grain co-ordinators and so on don't create moisture, don't cause grain to grow and can't force farmers to sell it off their farms.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call second reading of Bill Nos. 100 and 101, then adjourned debate on Bills 82 and 94; and then the balance of the adjourned debates on second reading.

BILL NO. 100 — AN ACT RESPECTING THE ASSESSMENT OF PROPERTY FOR TAXATION IN MUNICIPALITIES IN 1981 and 1982

HON. DOUG GOURLAY presented Bill No. 100, An Act respecting the Assessment of Property for Taxation in Municipalities in 1981 and 1982 for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Assessment Review Committee has in its interim report noted that assessment values are at such a low level compared to any current level of value as to be almost meaningless.

The studies and hearings to date have convinced the committee that, because inflation and rapidly escalating prices have affected different classes of property in varying degrees, no sudden introduction

of updated assessments at 1975 levels should take place in the 1981 or 1982 taxation years.

Existing levels of value and present inequities are preferable to any significant shift in the relationship of property values from class to class without legislative review and reform following the completion of the committee studies, hearings and recommendations.

Without legislative restriction, the provincial municipal assessor and the city of Winnipeg assessor would be obligated to introduce updated assessments in accordance with existing legislation. The effect of such changes would be significant in terms of shifts between classes of properties and in the distribution of school and municipal costs.

The Assessment Review Committee has recommended that legislation be introduced at the 1980 session of the Manitoba Legislature to maintain the existing levels of assessment until December 31, 1982, in order to provide an opportunity for the committee to carry out its mandate and report the results of its research and deliberations.

Retention of those levels of value used by the provincial-municipal assessor and the assessor for the city of Winnipeg in preparing assessment rolls for the year 1980 is provided in the subject legislation. Changes are permitted only to maintain relationships between adjacent municipal taxation jurisdictions or to reflect altered values resulting from changes in circumstances, such as new local improvements, zoning or subdivision approvals or registrations, significant improvement or alteration, new construction not recorded for the previous year, or demolition damage or destruction. Any such changes will be recorded at those levels of value which have been applied for the assessment roll of the year 1980.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend this bill to the House.

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

MR. USKIW: I wonder if the member would permit a question, Mr. Speaker.

My question is whether the Minister is in a position to indicate to us just how he intends to deal with those municipalities or jurisdictions that have just completed a reassessment and therefore their new tax bills will reflect the most latest values as per the latest assessment; and whether that isn't a problem vis-a-vis that group having been reassessed and, immediately after, another group due for assessment being held back for another two years, a discrimination in tax policy, in essence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I believe that subject is not one that is seeking clarification of anything the member said.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to know, since the Minister didn't allude to it in his comments, how he is going to deal with the question of those that have been most recently reassessed?

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, this does create some concerns, of course. There are a number of

municipalities that have been reassessed and there's still quite a few that will have to be undertaken.

The situation, I feel, most of the municipalities that are up for reassessment are requesting that this proceed. The only other alternative would be to freeze the assessment completely and this would probably be less desirable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just would like the Minister — if this bill gets to committee, which at the moment I assume it will — to be more explicit as to what happens here. To me it is not a great problem as except between individual property owners. If the property, for instance, in Winnipeg were not reassessed and stayed exactly the same, the only inequity that would result was where a property either deteriorated or, more probably, a property was built and didn't pay its fair share of taxes. Otherwise, the failure to assess is not going to do anything because if you double the assessment within Winnipeg and everything else stayed the same, the people would pay the same amount of tax vis-a-vis Winnipeg. That is my impression and the same is true in any other municipality.

But it's complicated, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the assessment for school levy purposes, which is provincial-wide, in the balanced assessment and other such things, and I would think that the Minister should tell us who is going to gain and who is going to lose. Because what the Member for Lac du Bonnet raised is a practical question. If a municipality has not been assessed since 1977 — (Interjection)— even 1977, that's three years ago, and one has been assessed in 1979 or 1980, then insofar as that group's responsibility to provincial levies, etc. — and I think that there is and if they're not then I stand corrected — the one that was most recently assessed will, for the period of this sort of hiatus, have a ride which is less onerous. For instance, if Winnipeg was assessed in 1979 and the municipality was not assessed after 1976 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. On a point of clarification, is the member speaking or is . . . ?

MR. GREEN: I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. GREEN: I think that the Minister should tell us in addition to what his intention is here, tell us how it will affect taxes within the municipality and as between municipalities, which is I think more important. Within the municipalities is very important, but as between municipalities and any contribution not that they make, that they are paid in terms of provincial grants, etc., for education, what will be the effect of it? The Minister should be prepared to bring that in fairly explicit details with the names of municipalities involved as to who are going to be the gainers and who are going to be losers, if there are gainers and losers, as a result of this freeze.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister will be closing debate.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 101 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PLANNING ACT

MR. GOURLAY presented Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Planning Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The 1980 amendments to The Planning Act are primarily concerned with clarification of existing procedures or extension of local authority. A new subsection is being added to provide that, where an additional zone municipality joins a planning district, certain restrictions will apply between the city of Winnipeg boundary and the Perimeter Highway. Any amendment to the Greater Winnipeg Development Plan, any existing zoning by-law, conditional use or subdivision, and any amendment to a new development, the zoning by-law, application for subdivision or conditional use order in the area described will be subject to the city of Winnipeg's approval. The administration of this procedure will be established by regulation.

Another amendment to differentiate more clearly between the purposes to be accomplished by a development plan and those to be accomplished by a basic planning statement, a rewording of the present provision respecting approval by the Minister for the format of a basic planning statement is indicated. An additional subsection outlines the minimum contents of a basic planning statement.

Another amendment would be to permit the Minister to establish interim development control over a planning district, a municipality or any part thereof. It further provides that during the period between the adoption of a development plan or a basic planning statement and the adoption of the zoning by-law, a development permit will be required from the board or the council. At present such controls are only possible while a development plan or a basic planning statement is being prepared. This will prevent uncontrolled activity between the adoption of a development plan and a zoning by-law.

Another area would be to permit an extension of the 90-day time limit for a decision to follow a hearing by council. This period may be extended by the Minister at the request of the council. Amendments are also being provided for the decision of council to be final, and this requirement is necessary to avoid uncertainty or reconsideration which might operate to the detriment of an applicant.

Another amendment permits a transfer of land to be registered pursuant to a device in a will executed prior to the effective date of The Planning Act, January 1, 1976. It further permits registration of a

caveat or easement in Land Titles which relates only to structural encroachment.

A further amendment to permit the Municipal Board to interpret the content of provincial land-use policies, development plans, basic planning statements or zoning by-laws.

I also wish to include permission of the Minister of Northern Affairs to approve subdivisions and to delegate powers to community councils or local committees so that they may make variation orders, conditional use orders and they will also have the power to enter into development agreements. Mr. Speaker, I recommend this bill to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

BILL NO. 82 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CLEAN ENVIRONMENT ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Logan adjourned the debate for myself. I would like to begin by advising the House that I have been chosen by my caucus and my leader to be the designated critic in this regard, and thereby may be going a slight bit over the 40-minute time limit, if necessary, although I don't foresee that occurring.

When addressing ourselves to Bill No. 82, Mr. Speaker, An Act to amend The Clean Environment Act, I think it is important that we first understand fully and completely the nature and the extent of the problem that confronts us as citizens of a modern industrial society, as citizens of a province whereby we have a great deal of industrial activity, as well as a great deal of agricultural activity, both of which bring with them a certain degree of environmental pollution, although that need not be. Unfortunately, that is the case, as it has been historically in the past. So we must examine this problem in that perspective. We must examine the significance of it as well as the extent of it. Most importantly, and this is something that, as legislators and as citizens of such a society, we far too often fail to do, and that is we must look at the problem in the seriousness which it demands, because it is probably one of the most serious problems, one of the most all-pervasive problems, one of the most critical problems that face us today as individuals. There is no one who is immune from this particular problem, whether it be the child in the home, the worker in the workplace, the farmer on the farm, the trapper in the bush up north; no-one is immune, because the contamination, the pollution, the environmental problems that we all have to confront are all pervasive and extend throughout our society.

We must also look at what this Act pretends to do and intends to do from three perspectives, the past, the present and the future. We must complement our analysis with perspectives from all three different periods in order to understand the bill before us.

Finally, we must also examine the situation that this bill seeks to address in the province that this bill attempts to redress. It is a difficult task, because it's hard to pinpoint the specifics, the details, the data that we need. We're talking about, in many instances, a problem that is put into scientific terms, a problem that is approached from a scientific perspective, whether it be by the environmentalists, whether it be by the legislator, whether it be by the toxicologist, whether it be by the scientist who is concerned with the general well-being of our society. I'm certain that the Minister will second my thoughts in this regard, when I say that the knowledge that we have today is fairly limited, because if we look at it from the three perspectives which I mentioned briefly before, we know that in the past there has been a lack of concern about environmental problems. We have been far too often, too easy on polluters. We have been far too often, too quick to allow pollution to continue. I want to talk about that a bit later in my speech. And our present commitment, and I address these remarks directly to the Minister, I believe our present commitment, the commitment of that Minister and the commitment of his government, is also inadequate. That is not to say there is no commitment; that is not to say that they don't care about the problem; that is not to say that they do not want to do something about the problem, but I believe that their actions, their concerns, their cares, as well as their knowledge, is inadequate. And this present bill is included in that statement. I believe that this present bill is, in fact, inadequate in what it attempts to do.

I'd like to read a quote into the record, if I may, and the quote is from the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council, in a document entitled "Exotoxicity Responsibility and Opportunities", and it's of recent vintage, it's dated August 1979.

Before reading the quote into the record, I'd just like to present you with a picture of whom and what the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council is. It was first established in 1972, by the federal government, to advise the federal Minister of the Environment on a number of items. These included the state of the environment. In other words, what is the status of the environment as it exists today; what sort of environment do we have; the threats to that environment; what can negatively impact upon the environment that we have to day, and the priorities that the federal government, jointly with the provinces — and that's part of their mandate, that they work jointly with the provinces — the priorities that the federal government should put in place to deal with the threat. So again, we're talking about the past, present and future, which is what we will talk about consistently as we go through this bill, as we go through environmental issues: The past, the present, the future, because you cannot separate either one of those, or any one of those from each other. It's a package that you have to deal with. Also it was to determine the effectiveness of the departments, the innovations of the federal Department of the Environment, the actions of the

federal Department of the Environment in trying to deal with some of the threats that face the environment, in trying to protect the environment as it is today and, in many instances, trying to bring it back to the state in which it existed previously. That, by the way, would not be a bad suggestion for our own provincial Department of the Environment, and that is to have an advisory council or body to assess their effectiveness, because I believe it would add some creditability to what I believe is becoming a less and less credible department. The Council, finally, is comprised of 16 members, distinguished persons of the scientific community and the educational community, representing a number of the provinces and the federal government.

The quote, now that I've finally gotten to it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is "The essence of an eco-system is one of constant transformation. One species becomes food for the next in the food chain. The molecules of all our cells are constantly turned over. Even our bones are constantly being renewed. Nothing is static in the way in which foreign chemicals invade the biotransformations of the eco-system, in fact, becoming part of them. They move through the eco-system in strange and unpredictable ways."

I'm skipping a bit of the body of the text here. It goes on in a later paragraph to say, "The problem for society is that once a chemical enters the environment it is impossible to control or contain." And how we have come to learn that lesson, the hard way, I might add, the tragic way in many instances, but it is a lesson that we have learned, although it is a lesson that we have not been able to develop strategies around.

But I'll get back to the quote at hand "It is changed, accumulated," and again we're talking about chemicals that enter environment, "and transported indiscriminately by water and air. It may interact synergistically, with other contaminants and natural components of the eco-system, it may become integrated into the molecular process of each living organism. Laboratory approaches are unable to predict the fate and the effects of a chemical once unleashed into the environment." And that is sadly the case; that laboratory analysis cannot predict the fate of a chemical once it is released into the environment.

Further to that, even more frightening, is past experience can not always predict. I need only point to a very recent example in the province of Manitoba, and that was the spill of vinyl chloride at MacGregor, where we had every scientific authority telling us right from the start that this vinyl chloride was going to dissipate — and I'm using their words, not my own — nicely into the atmosphere, and that it was going to be gone in a matter of hours, and it was going to be gone from the atmosphere in a matter of days. And the fact is that it lingered; the fact is that it made its way into the soil; the fact is that it stayed as a contaminant far longer than any knowledgeable person had anticipated. We don't have the knowledge. We have the knowledge to put vinyl chloride into production. We have the knowledge to protect workplaces as well as we do, and I'm not saying that we do that fully either, but I am saying that we do that much better than we do for our environment. But we don't have the

knowledge of what happens to that once it escapes in the environment. We don't have the knowledge of how to deal with it, and this bill does nothing to give us that knowledge. Let there be no mistake about this: This bill has very limited functions. But to go back to the quote, it is important to underscore that once a contaminant enters the eco-system it is impossible to contain and it reacts in numerous ways. Some of them synergistic, most of them negative. That is what happens every day. Every day of our lives, every minute of our lives, the Member for The Pas says, and he's accurate in that; he's accurate in that. All the time, I don't stand here right now without some sort of pollutant being discharged into our environment, somewhere.

The Minister of Cultural Affairs, who is well known for her sympathy with health problems and occupational health problems that face workers, as well as environmental problems, has told me to sit down. I'm going to paraphrase her and she can stand and correct me if she so wishes. There'll be less, she says, there'll be less referring to pollution, I can only assume. Well, that is exactly the kind of attitude that has kept us in the Dark Ages in regard to environmental law and environmental responsibility for far too long. And it is a type of attitude that will continue to keep us in the Dark Ages, and she does not have that attitude alone. She's not alone in her disregard for the environmental problems that confront us; she is not alone in her lack of knowledge; she is not alone in those smart aleck responses. The fact is that many many share that particular short-sightedness and that particular destructive attitude that is going to ensure that we are never able to fully protect our workers and our environment.

So, to get back to the point at hand, and that is that the environmental accidents that this particular bill attempts to deal with happen every day, every minute, consistently and constantly. There's an old saying among the union movement and that is "An injury to one is an injury to all". That saying can be transposed to fit the situation of the environment also, that if you injure the environment in Winnipeg, you have injured the environment in northern Manitoba; if you injure the environment in Germany, you have injured the environment in Sweden. Let me clarify that point a bit more, if I may. Sweden is now confronted with a situation where thousands, literally thousands of its lakes are dying. Let's look at a dying lake for a moment. What does that mean? That means that the fish are dying in that lake; that means that the plankton are dying in that lake; that means that all the food that is used as part of a comprehensive and overall food change that survive in that lake, is dying, or dead. A dead lake, exactly, and that's what we have in Sweden and we have it because of a particular phenomena called acid rain. Now I know we've all heard about acid rain. We all know the consequences of acid rain. I'm not certain that we know the extent of acid rain in our own province but I do know that we have been, as a society and as members of a culture, been subjected to a tremendous amount of information and concern in regard to acid rain in the past number of months. That's not to say acid rain hasn't been around for a long long time, that's to say, our concern is of the last number of months.

The reason we are becoming concerned is because steps that were put in motion years ago, literally decades ago, are beginning to come to bear. They're beginning to come to the forefront, that pollution that was created 10, 20 years ago has been reacting and has been complemented by — perhaps that's the wrong word, but it's the one that came first to mind — by more pollution of the same sort, and finally we've gotten to the point where we're starting to kill off entire lakes. And it does not stop there. It does not stop there because when you destroy one part of the eco system, an injury to one is an injury to all, you destroy other parts of the eco system. So the animals that feed upon the animal life in that particular pond or lake that is now dead, find that they have been impacted upon, even though the acid rain falling upon them may have no effect whatsoever, they do find that they are negatively impacted upon because environmental contamination and pollution works its way through the system invariably. The bio-transformations that we talked about 'on ecotox acidity'. The bio-transformation from a fish into food for an animal. The bio-transformation of the smaller fish into food for the larger fish. It all has an effect.

We're the highest ones in the food chain. We're the highest level of the food chain as human beings. So as the effect works its way up, it will work its way up to us. Now I said I wanted to relate that example to you to show how pollution does not remain confined to a specific area. The acid rain that is falling and killing those lakes in Sweden does not come from Sweden. It comes from the industrial valley of Europe, Germany being uppermost in that area; that's where it comes from. As a matter of fact there is a study done recently by the federal government of Canada and the government of the United States called "Long-Range Transportation of Air Pollutants", which shows that pollutants that originate in Sudbury may have an effect throughout western Canada; that pollutants that originate in Manitoba do have an effect in areas of Saskatchewan; and that is the major problem that we are able to deal with. We are only able to determine the major problems because we lack the scientific knowledge and ability to determine all the subtle interactions, all the subtle bio-transformations that are impacted negatively by pollution and contamination of the environment. So you cannot have localized pollution and contamination. Let's make that point very clear. And you will see why I want that point to be so clear, as I continue further on the analysis of this particular bill, because this bill does not take into account this segment that you can't have, localized pollution or contamination of the environment.

I want to talk about our limits of our knowledge a bit more if I can. I mentioned previously that the human being is the highest level, the last link in the food chain. Let's see how that affects someone here in Manitoba. In my constituency, as well as other northern constituencies, there is becoming more and more prevalent a danger of eating fish that have been contaminated by mercury. Let's follow that through a bit more, because it's a very difficult and complex problem, and it is exactly the type of problem that this bill should be addressing itself — but this bill does not address itself — to.

We know that the organic mercury is getting into the water system somehow, and it was always a common belief — and some share it today — that organic mercury can't be picked up by the organisms. But somehow — we don't know how, we don't even know how it's getting in there in the first place, let's make that point clear — but somehow once it's in there, it is turning itself into a different substance, a different form of mercury which can be picked up by the fish. So the fish pick up this mercury, especially the predator fish who feed on other fish who feed off the bottom; the fish off the bottom pick it up, but they don't get the high levels, the predator fish that feed off those fish as we move our way up the food chain, they get the high levels. Then of course, man or woman comes along and eats those fish, and we are the last stomping ground; that mercury gets in our system and stays in our system, and we don't even know how it got there much less how to get it out, much less what effect it's having on us. You would think that we would be so concerned about that, that we would have a bill before this House that would direct its attention to that subject, and yet we don't. We have an Act to amend The Clean Environment Act, but it in no way addresses itself to that problem; it in no way confronts the many problems that face us. Again, the limitations of knowledge.

So, these accidents which are happening every day — intentionally? Some are intentional. We had an example during the estimates of the Environment, where we talked about a company that was pouring sulphuric acid down a drain into the city sewage system, that contained not only sulphuric acid but also lead, because it was coming out of lead batteries. Is that an accident? Well, perhaps it's an accident in this sense, in that I believe that the person who was responsible for doing that, may not have known the full consequences of their act. Maybe they have done it all the life of that company. It was just standard operating procedures, when you're done with the sulphuric acid, when you're emptying the battery, you pour it down this drain, the drain goes into the city sewer system, and lead with it. Okay, that's all it was. So, some accidents while intentional, are done out of ignorance, and this bill does nothing to address that situation.

Other accidents are unintentional. The spill at McGregor was an unintentional accident. There are numerous examples. Three Mile Island was an unintentional accident. Hydrogen Sulphide contamination on the train going from INCO and Thompson to The Pas was an unintentional accident. But when you get to INCO and you dip the emission from that stack, exceeding the limits, that's an accident according to the definition, that's an intentional accident, and that's the worst kind of intentional accident. It doesn't happen just at INCO. I don't want to single them out. It happens all over the place, all the time, and that, as the company says, well, we've been pretty good, we haven't exceeded the limits now for maybe even a year, maybe even a month, maybe even a day, so we're going to let an extra little bit go and it's not going to be that major a problem. But it is an accident according to this Act, and yet they don't perceive it to be. It is intentional but not perceived to be. So we come back to the problem of ignorance, a problem which

we have to come back to time and time again when we talk about environmental matters, because the extent of our scientific knowledge is, in fact, limited.

Those accidents affect all of us, and once they do they are impossible to undo. Once they occur, it is impossible to bring the environment back to the state to which it existed before that accident occurred, and you can't tell me otherwise. Not only me you can't tell, but you can't tell the scientists and the experts that have reviewed this subject. The greatest failing of Bill 82 of the Act that we have before us, is that it looks through the wrong end of the telescope. It kicks in after the fact, after the accident has occurred, after the damage is done, after the environment has been insulted and injured, after the wheels are in motion. When there is nothing that can undo that accident entirely, that's when the Minister's great new bill, a great step forward, comes into effect, and only after the accident occurs. He will have to agree with that.

Now, that is to say we cannot amend it so that it will step in beforehand. That is not to say that we cannot provide input and suggestions to the Minister to enable this bill to deal with that, but the fact is it addresses itself primarily to an accident. A definition of an accident, and I'll have to read from my bill here, Mr. Speaker, is that an environmental accident means "The release of a contaminant into the environment, otherwise than in accordance with regulations or an order of the commission which having regard to the environment in which a release takes place, and to the nature of the contaminant released creates or may create a hazard to human life or health, to other living organisms or to the physical environment." Let's analyse that a bit more carefully. An environmental hazard means a release of something that may or does create a hazard to human life or health, to other living organisms or to the physical environment. That is the main import of this bill. That it addresses itself to what to do after that accident occurs and not before.

There is also another fallacy in that definition, and it's one which I am not certain that we, as a society — and for this reason I don't fault the Minister, because I'm not certain that anyone could do better — have to deal with though, and that is that it is not an accident if it is done in accordance with the regulations. There is something wrong with that, because the regulations don't mean that it does not impact negatively on the environment. The regulations can't stop that environmental pollution from having a harmful effect. The regulations or legislation cannot in any way ameliorate the effect of that pollutant on human health or living organisms or the environment. Now the regulations can minimize it in some way, but they can't stop it. So we have a fallacy there which society as a whole has to learn to deal with, and I don't fault the Minister for falling prey to it because I'm not certain that even if we did understand it more fully that we would be able to do anything about it.

There are numerous other fallacies inherent to this approach, to the approach of cleaning up an environmental accident or to the approach of allowing pollution to exist within certain confines. One of the fallacies of this — or the failings in the fallacies of this particular bill — is that it creates the expectation that accidents can be dealt with in that

way, otherwise why have the bill? But the empirical evidence proves conclusively the reverse, and I've read you the quotes. I can read you a 100 more from a 100 difference sources if you so wish, because it is a commonly accepted fact that once a contaminant enters the environment, the damage is already starting to occur.

The proper approach, if I might be so pompous as to suggest it to the Minister, is that we prevent the accidents, that we not put a bill forward and spend the time of this House on a bill that is not going to have any great impact on the problem, but that we put forth a bill that causes these accidents to be prevented. That we not have to wait to clean up, but that we start right now in trying to avoid a situation where that clean-up is necessitated. The fact that we don't have that sort of legislation before us, and the fact that we do have this sort of legislation before us, can be attributed to two basic common conceptual legacies. Remember in the beginning, I said we'd have to talk about this issue in regard to the past. Well, that's important, because the past perception of the problem in fact does have some effect on our present perception. Our two legacies that we have been left, two fallacies by previous experts in this field that bring us to this type of legislation rather than the type of legislation that works before the fact instead of after the fact — the one is that trace amounts are insignificant — and anyone who listened to the debates in this House on lead, or anyone who listened to the debates in this House on vinyl chloride, or anyone who is listening now to the debates of this House on 2,4,5,-T will recognize that argument called the "Insignificance of Trace Amounts".

There is another fallacy, and that fallacy is that there is a threshold level below which no harm to the environment or to the living organization or to the human health or the human being exists. Again, those of you who have sat through the debates on lead, who have sat through the debates on vinyl chloride, who have sat through the debates on 2,4,5,-T, asbestos — we can include asbestos in that — a whole number of other subjects — (Interjection)— the Member for Rossmere says to tell them about smoking. Certainly, I mean this fallacy isn't a fallacy that is only attributable to politicians and environmentalists. People believe, in many respects, many of the conceptual legacies that they have no reason not to believe, so we can't really fault them. But the fact is that there is no threshold level for some substances.

I want to talk in a bit more detail about that. First, the insignificance of trace quantities, this argument in light of the latest best available evidence does not work. As a matter of fact, it has never worked, but sometimes we believe it to have worked, and the more enlightened persons in this field have stopped believing that trace amounts or trace quantities are insignificant. They may be small — no one is denying that — but they are important, nonetheless. Let's talk about a figure that has been commonly bandied about in the Legislature from time to time when dealing with subjects in regard to occupational exposures or environmental exposures, to hazards, toxins, contaminants, carcinogens, and that is, one part per million. One part per million. How small is one part per million? Well, one part per million, to

use some analogies which may put it in the proper perspective, is one inch in 16 miles. Now a person walking a journey of 16 miles does not think much of that inch. As a matter of fact, there's probably 30 or 36 of those inches in one step. Insignificant, by comparison, very insignificant. It's one large mouthful in a lifetime. One large mouthful of food in a lifetime of eating. One part per million. It is one minute in two years. Again, when put into comparative perspective it seems insignificant; it does not seem like much. It's insignificant in relative terms and it's small by comparison, but those insignificant amounts, those trace amounts can be extremely important, both in a positive sense, in a negative sense, to the lives that we want to live, to our own health.

Let me give you one example. While they may be small by comparison, they are extremely important unto themselves. B-12, vitamin B-12: The human body cannot live without the daily complement, or spread out over a period of time, a daily requirement of vitamin B-12. If we do not have it in our system, we will die. How much vitamin B-12 do we need? Well, when compared to the total body liquid, we need one part per billion of vitamin B-12. How insignificant, how small, how minor. Yet, without it, we can't live, and that is the significance of trace amounts. And yet this bill, this amendment, does nothing to take into account the significance and trace amounts. As a matter of fact, it does exactly the opposite. It continues the legacy that trace amounts are insignificant, which brings us to the concept of threshold, which assumes that for every toxic or hazardous chemical, there is a level below which there is no apparent effect on the body. This has been an argument that has been ongoing now, basically in public terms, since the 1930s when the petrochemical explosion occurred. But it is more a bureaucratic argument than a scientific argument, and it has been consistently proven wrong.

Again, we'll go back to an example that is familiar to most Manitobans, and that is the recent derailment at MacGregor. The Minister along with several other Ministers in this House stood up and said, "You know, one part per million is an extremely low level in comparison to the threshold levels that were in place before." They started with the history of the TLVs, occupational TLVs, for vinyl chloride. They all started with the figure of 500 parts per million; they said it was reduced to another figure and then down to 50 parts per million and then five parts per million and, finally, down to one part per million. It went throughout several steps, and one can only assume that the reason behind that sort of an argument, that sort of a presentation, was to point out that in fact that if it had a TLV of 500 at one time, a TLV of five is that much safer and therefore we should not worry about exposures of five parts per million.

The case is exactly the opposite. Indeed, it did have a TLV of 500 at one time, but the reason that was lowered was because, as they gathered more and more evidence, they found that TLV of 500 was resulting in cancer. So they lowered it, and they found that as they lowered it by steps, by increment, each time it resulted in cancer. They may even find that one part per million, which is the figure in the States now, that it will result in cancer.

Let me read a quote into the record from an article in Canadian Business, April 1979, entitled, Does Progress Cause Cancer? And it's a quote by Paul Falkowski. I've met Mr. Falkowski; he works for the steel workers. He's a very able gentleman in the field of occupational health and in the field of exposure to occupational toxins and hazards, as well as carcinogens. And this is what Mr. Falkowski has to say about the present method of determining TLVs. First he says it's not acceptable. And the quote is, Paul Falkowski of the United Steel Workers of America says, "It's a numbers game. At one time, they said 12 working months was acceptable for exposure to radiation. Then there were some bodies. They said, eight working months was acceptable. Then there were some more bodies. Then then said, six, and then four, and that's where it's at today. It's the same thing with asbestos. I think the working environment should be such that it causes no ill effects. Why should we adopt figures produced by 12 wise men who are basically representing the management point of view. Standards should be developed by a tripartite body of unions, government and industry." Notwithstanding the philosophy of the last part of the quote, what Mr. Falkowski is saying is that we have worked our way through a series of threshold limit values, each time finding more bodies. And what this bill says, by implication, is that we can continue to do that, that we can continue to allow pollution to occur because we have levels and limits, and I think they add in this bill, terms and conditions by which we can gauge the effect of that contaminant on our environment and on our health, and thereby be safe ourselves and make a safer world for others to follow. And the empirical evidence is exactly the opposite. The empirical evidence has proven that sort of approach wrong, time and time and time again. How long do we have to keep doing so? How long do we have to keep allowing our environment to be subjected to such abuse before we finally smarten up and throw bills like this out the door and bring in amendments and Acts that deal with the problems before they happen? I suggest, unless we get a change in government, it's going to be a long, long time.

So, threshold limit values, MACs, TLVs, whatever you want to call them, have not been proven theoretically, but they have been proven incorrect by dying workers and by an abuse of environment.

And again, this is especially the case with carcinogens. The Minister himself came forward with the statement during the debate on MacGregor, that we have a five-part per million TLV here in the province, and there's a one-part per million TLV in other provinces and in the United States, and we have all these different TLVs, but of course, he said — and I'm paraphrasing it, but I think I have the intent of his statement correct — of course the best exposure to a carcinogen is no exposure. I think he said the only safe exposure to a carcinogen is no exposure at all, and that is indeed the case. When we talk about the contaminants that are released in these environmental accidents and released by regulations, according to The Clean Environment Act and its amendments, we are talking in many instances about carcinogens. There is an assumption when dealing with carcinogens that there is a dose response relationship. In other words, a certain dose

will cause a certain response in a human being or in the environment. It doesn't work. We've always assumed that and that is why we have legislation that says that we can have a release of contaminants into the environment in accordance with regulations or an order of the Commission.

I have to inform the Attorney-General that I have excellent peripheral vision and that I enjoy his involvement in the debate but I wish it would be on the other side because I enjoy watching his reactions to what I say. He gives me a fair amount of feedback and keeps me going perhaps longer than I should and, in this case, that may be a problem. But nonetheless, I have enjoyed whatever went on behind me, some of which I caught and some of which I didn't.

Let's talk about those response relationships. The fact is that there is no safe level of exposure, that one asbestos fibre — and we have those response relationships with asbestos that is on the books; we have TLV's that are on the books — but the fact is one asbestos fibre can cause cancer, and it may cause cancer, so indeed, as the Minister said, there is no safe level of exposure, yet there are regulated levels of exposure. There are regulated levels of release; again, another fallacy.

One of the other problems that is facing all of us is that the statistics in regard to environmental contamination and pollution are frightening, frightening as well as enlightening. The World Health Organization, which is a fairly august body made of scientific experts which the Minister is so fond upon quoting and relying upon, has stated that anywhere from 75 to 85 percent of all cancers are environmentally created. What they mean by that is they are created by actions, events, and substances outside of the own body; they're not internal cancers, they are external cancers. Now that of course includes smoking, and that, the Member for Rossmore talked about just briefly while I was beginning my speech, and so we have to take that into account. But smoking is only one factor.

This is a recent publication that Health and Welfare Canada put out through Statistics Canada on a mortality atlas of Canada, and Volume I is on cancer. If you peruse this to any significant extent, you will find that the cancers — I will just very briefly, the red is very high levels of cancer and the orange is the next high — that the cancers are situated and localized around industrial centres where we have a great deal of environmental pollution. That is the case in almost every instance. It even goes further than that, and that is that you can pinpoint certain types of cancers to certain areas and, when you carry the extrapolation further, what you find is that there are certain products that are being produced in those areas that are known to cause cancer among the workforce, because that's where we see it first, and that these cancer sites are directly attributable to those workplaces in those production processes that are ongoing, mostly in the urban areas and mostly in the industrial areas, although sometimes we can find them in agricultural areas when dealing with pesticides and herbicides. We do find generally that many cancers are site specific, that they are attributable to a specific process, a specific industry, a specific contamination, a specific pollution, and also to a specific compound

or contaminant. Certain industries have certain cancers. Nickel industry; they're doing a study now in Sudbury to try to document what they believe to be a relationship between nickel dust and nasal cancer. There have been many more that have been done.

But these cancers exhibit themselves among the workers in those industries first, because they are exposed to highest levels of it, then among the workers families, because they get exposed to the contaminant and as the worker brings it home on his or her clothes, on his or her equipment. There are many instances of mesothelioma, which is a cancer specific to asbestos exposure, that in fact are among children, who were exposed to their fathers or mothers who came home from the plant with asbestos on their clothing. Sometimes they brought them home some of the stuff that they made at the plant, and allowed them to play with that. That is a sad fact but it indeed did happen, because workers are proud of what they do at work, and they bring it home to show their family and you've got some asbestos and the kid draws on it or plays on it, and before they knew — and I'm not talking about the scientific community here, I'm talking about the individual worker — before the individual worker knew of the problems and the cancer attributable to asbestos, they would do so, and maybe some are still doing so today out of ignorance. That's an environmental attitude of a different nature. But this is to a bystanders disease, bystanders cancer, in Quebec. Samuel Epstein found this out, that when the workers came home from the asbestos factory, and there's a tremendous amount of asbestos in the air as a pollutant in the Quebec area in the asbestos towns, but as they came home, the wife or the husband would stand at the door and shake their clothes off, sort of hit them about a bit to make the dust fly and of course, they'd breath that right in, and 20 years down the road we saw significant instances of mesothelioma among the bystanders, among the spouses of workers, just from that action of shaking them off. So no one is immune, including the general population, because what goes into the workplace, comes out of the workplace. That is a fact that we cannot deny. The workplace is a conduit for environmental pollution and contamination into our environment, and that results in many instances of cancer. That's what we're talking about specifically in this particular Act.

Although there are other diseases and other ramifications of pollution that we could talk about, I'd like to talk about cancer because I believe it to be one of the more significant examples of the results of pollution and contamination. We all know someone with cancer. That's a tragic fact of living in today's society. One out of four persons will contact cancer and one out of five will die of cancer and I'll bring that right into the bill, Mr. Speaker, because I know you've allowed me some latitude and I do appreciate it, and we'll try to be more specific to the bill now that I've gone through the general background of it.

Let's say that there are 60 people in here now, which would mean 15 of the people who are in these Chambers will die of cancer statistically and one out of five, which would mean 12 of us . . . Excuse me, one out of four will contact cancer and one out of five will die of it. And about one-fifth of one-third of those are workplace related, but the rest of that 75

percent are environmentally created. If you take away smoking, you'll find that many of them are created by the type of accidents that this bill is going to allow and that this bill in fact is going to do nothing to stop.

While these specific percentages are recent vintage, and carcinogen appears to be increasing, the general observations are nothing new. Two hundred years ago, in 1775, a British surgeon, Dr. Percival Pott contributed a specific cancer to the occupational exposure to chimney dust by chimney sweeps, who as children would be lowered into the chimneys and they would come in contact with this dust and as men they contacted cancer. The fact is that the general environment also had increased levels of cancer because of the type of pollutants that were contained in that chimney dust. So the problem is not new but it appears to be increasing.

I mentioned Dr. Samuel Epstein before; I'll go back to Dr. Samuel Epstein and the article that I had read, if I can find it before me, called, "Does Progress Cause Cancer?" Dr. Samuel Epstein says, and we are talking about environmental cancers as well as workplace cancers here, "The issues are not scientific, they are political, he said in a recent conversation. We have more than enough information which, if implemented, would achieve a massive decrease in the rate of incidence of cancer; not now, because whatever we do is not going to effect us for 30 or 40 years, but we need more information like we need a hole in the head. You've got powerful, massive, economic interests that manipulate decision-making bodies and produce massive confusion on one hand and, on the other hand, you have the scientists who are totally uninterested in protection because they are wrapped up in diagnosis and treatment. There are broader issues of the political impact of these things, of how the game is played, how the experiments and data are manipulated, how decisions are made." And that's what we have. We have cancer epidemic. We have it here in Manitoba. We have it all over and it's as a result of much of the pollution in the environment, to which this bill should address itself but does not.

Epstein concurs with the World Health Organization that most cancers are environmental and therefore, by that very fact, preventable, and Epstein of course believes that prevention is lacking. He believes it's lacking not because of medical reasons, not because of scientific reasons, but because of political considerations, and that is exactly why we have this type of piece of legislation before us, because the political considerations are more important to the Minister than the scientific considerations or the medical considerations.

This bill is worse than a sham. This bill is worse than hypocritical. This bill is typical. It is typical of the type of attitudes that have been allowed to flourish for far too long. The government knows the challenge. The government knows what they must face. They partially understand the problems, I'm certain, and they are even informed of some of the solutions but, instead of putting that all together in a package which gives us some good progressive environmental legislation, we are given an amendment to a bill which is ineffectual, which is

inappropriate, and which in many instances is incompetent.

I've spoken longer than I had anticipated, Mr. Speaker. I could probably speak a great deal longer, if I believed it to be necessary, on the general subject because we are so well versed in this, as a society, that it is almost impossible not to continue speaking. When we see headlines like, "Province Uses Risky Chemical", and I want to make a point of that if I can. The other day we talked about the chemical Fenitrothion. I'm not even suggesting I pronounce it correctly, but it is a pesticide that was being sprayed in Manitoba and it is also a pesticide that has been linked in New Brunswick and the down east provinces to Rhye's syndrome and to some other very serious medical complications, directly linked, and therefore a number of provinces have banned the use of it and stopped using it. When I brought this to the attention of the Minister — and I don't have a list before me — he said we are using it because it's approved by the federal government and because the federal government has sent it through all these tests.

I would just like to read to the Minister and put on the record, at this point, a June 23rd, 1980, news release from the Health and Welfare Department of Canada, and it says, "Health and Welfare Minister, Monique Begin, today commented on recent news reports questioning the safety of some pesticides registered for use in Canada. The pesticides involved were tested for safety by Industrial Biotech Laboratories, IBT, a US firm that conducts safety evaluations for pesticide manufacturers in many countries. When irregularities in a firm's data were discovered in 1977, the Canadian and American governments began joint investigations to re-examine the studies of all pesticides whose registration was supported by IBT data." And guess what one of those pesticides was? Fenitrothion, or however it's pronounced.

The Minister assured us that because this had been tested that it was safe to use in the province and now we find out the laboratory that was testing it, in many instances, has been providing fraudulent as well as incomplete results. It is those type of assurances, that sort of blind faith that allows us to have this sort of a bill before us. So the province uses risky chemicals. They are talking about 2,4,5-T. We have the same arguments used for that: That it's been tested. Well, they tested Thalidomide, and they've tested numerous other chemicals that have turned out to be dangerous to use and hazardous to health. And I'm not opposed to all chemicals. The Minister said that one day. He said, do you know what the Member for Churchill would like? He would like all chemicals banned. I wouldn't put forth a piece of legislation, amendment to The Clean Environment Act that bans all chemicals, Mr. Speaker. Some chemicals are good. As a matter of fact, chemicals are divided into two different categories. They are the nutrients or poisons, and the nutrients, we must encourage their use, and the poisons, we must discourage their use.

This Act does not do anything to discourage that particular use. What this Act says, is that when there is an environmental accident, the environmental officer will be able to perform certain functions. The environmental officer will be able to go in, will be

able to review the situation, will be able to make such changes as are necessary to try to reduce the impact of the accident; and also has a number of other powers to make installations, to drill holes to determine the extent of the accident, as well as to try to do something to avoid that accident having any more of a negative impact on the environment. But the environmental officer is not enabled to do anything before the accident occurs, only after the accident occurs, and that's the type of amendment that we will be suggesting to the Minister when this reaches the committee phase, to specifically empower the environmental officer to take those sorts of actions to avoid an accident, rather than just to deal with a particular accident.

I'll go through a couple of other points in the bill very briefly, Mr. Speaker. I thank you for your patience and your time in this regard. I think it is an important subject and therefore have addressed myself to it in some detail. But the bill itself does a number of things. One is, it takes power away from the Clean Environment Commission, strips it of some power that it already has and, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to that, because I believe the Clean Environment Commission is a vehicle that we must support and we must encourage the use of.

But what happens now in dealing with an abatement project. A municipality may wish to, by resolution, call for an abatement project, and that resolution — and I have to just find my notes here for a minute — what happens now is, the council authorizes an abatement project by resolution. Within 30 days it applies to the Clean Environment Commission for an order declaring that the abatement project is in the public interest — so far, so good — and that it may be proceeded with. Now the order by the Clean Environment Commission may be that it may not be proceeded with, also. Upon receipt of that request the Commission sets a hearing, after which it decides whether or not to grant the abatement project. Each party to the hearing, receives a copy of the order. The municipality may proceed to acquire the land within the abatement project by purchase or expropriation, and this order is binding on anyone who acquires the industry from thereafter. In other words, if the industry were to be sold and a new owner were to come along, that it would be binding on that new owner.

Under the amendments, this procedure is changed. What happens now is the municipality approves the proposal for an abatement project. They then do not submit that to the Clean Environment Commission but they submit it to the Minister, directly to the Minister. The Minister must then, if I read the amendment correctly, refer to to the Clean Environment Commission, but not for an order; there's a hearing, but there's no order; refers it to the Clean Environment Commission for advice and recommendations. So the hearing is held in the same way. The Commission deals with the proposal in the same manner as previously, only instead of issuing an order which is binding and has some authority, it issues advice to the Minister, and the Minister may approve the recommendations in full or in part, or he may vary them as he sees fit. He may do whatever he wants to them as long as he deems they have to be in the public interest. Then the Minister may also

refuse to approve the abatement project. If the Minister does approve the abatement project the municipality may, by by-law, authorize a project. If the Ministerial decision included approval for acquisition, the municipality can acquire by purchase or expropriation or otherwise.

So what we have here is a situation where the Clean Environment Commission is no longer empowered to make that decision and thereby there's no appeal. There was an appeal in the old legislation. If the Clean Environment Commission made a decision, they could appeal either to the Minister or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, but there was an appeal mechanism — I'm not certain exactly who received that appeal — but there was an appeal mechanism. Now there is no appeal mechanism. The previous Minister of Environment informs me that it was to the Minister. Perhaps he can also enlighten me on this point. Was that appeal procedure used in instances known to the Minister? It certainly was. So it's not the type of procedure that's on the books for looks only; it's the type of procedure that's on the books because it's necessary and because it's used. —(Interjection)— The Minister goes back to the Clean Environment Commission. Well, certainly. The difference here is in some instances, a subtle difference, but it is a difference nonetheless, and that difference is, that it puts all the power in the Minister's hands and takes it out of the Clean Environment Commission's hands, and there's no appeal mechanism. So it centralizes power in the Minister's hands. I don't think we should be doing that in regard to environmental matters.

The Minister has said time and time again that we must get the public involved in the environment. They must know what's happening. They must have faith, otherwise our projects and our proposals and our actions are not going to work. And he's given us specific examples. One example was of trash collection on a certain day that was never explained to the people of Manitoba, and thereby never worked. And what he is doing is, he's taking power out of the hands of the Commission, and when you take power out of the hands of a body like that, you reduce the effectiveness of such a body, and when you reduce the effectiveness of such a body, you also take away from that body the public confidence that they can and should have in that particular body. And so we are opposed to that specific section totally, I believe, because of the changes that the Minister has brought forth in this particular amendment.

As to the section dealing with environmental accidents, there are some good points and there are some bad points. The bad points are mostly the failings of the government. The powers that are given to the environmental officer — and we want to talk about them in more detail later during the committee and during third reading, perhaps — but the powers that are given to them, in many instances are appropriate powers and necessary powers, and we commend the Minister for providing those powers to environmental officers at this time. But they are not enough, and they will not in any way provide the environmental officer, nor his department, with the type of power that is necessary to deal with what will be an increasing number of environmental accidents,

because as we increase the use of contaminants, we also increase their release into the environment.

We are not going to vote against this particular bill on second reading, because we want to see it proceed to committee, but we are not going to vote against it for that reason only. We want to see it proceed to committee for a number of specific reasons. One is, we believe that the public should have the opportunity, whether they exercise it or not, to make representations on all matters of the environment; we believe that they should have this opportunity to deal with this particular bill in a public committee, so that we can hear their voice, because their voice is the voice that we should listen to to the most degree.

We also want to be able to provide input and suggestion and amendments to the Minister to try to strengthen this particular Act, to take away some of the more negative points of it and to provide positive input as to how to make this Act a better Act. We do so, knowing that we are building on a very thin base, but that the base and the mechanism is there upon which we can build. So we will be voting in favour of this particular bill going to the committee after, I am certain, a number of other persons in the Chamber have had an opportunity to speak to it. I know I haven't said everything there is to say, even though I've said a lot, and I know that there will be cause for more speeches on this particular subject.

Having said that, I believe that I can finish up my contribution to this debate very briefly and allow others to speak if they so wish. I want to do so by reverting back to the general for about five minutes. It's a story I've told before, and it's a story I tell at every occasion, because I believe it is a story that symbolizes and points out the tragic circumstances that modern industrial societies find themselves involved in, and that is about the proliferation of petro chemicals, the proliferation of contaminants, toxins and carcinogens into our environment. I hesitate to use specific figures because — (Interjection)— well, the Minister of Highways says I will, but I won't. I hesitate to use specific figures, because I have found that every time I have used those figures, somebody has come along behind me and revised them upwards, and so I find myself in a bit of a research lag between the time that I get the figures and have gone through the research to be able to document them, then there are new figures out and they are invariably revised upwards. So I will use sets of figures to outline the general problems, and just one aspect of the problem, and that is the problem that has faced us as a result of the petro chemical explosion since the early 1930s.

There are literally millions of chemicals in use today; there are literally millions of different compounds in use today. There are hundreds of new ones, and the figures range anywhere from 500 to 1,000 new ones, introduced each year without any significant degree of pretesting, without any great deal of consideration as to the long-term effects on the environment. Tens of thousands — the last figure I heard was 36,000 of these are known toxins, in other words, they are harmful to human health, and thousands are suspected carcinogens. And they are entering the workplace and they are entering the environment in unprecedented and unparalleled numbers, and we eating, drinking and breathing

them, Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt in my mind or any other educated person's mind that we are eating, drinking and breathing far too many of them. And they are reacting in our environment and in our body, both singly and synergistically, and they are having a profound impact.

And this innovative new legislation that was promised throughout the debates this year as a solution, does not prevent one single spill. And it can't, because it's a political decision, not a technical decision, and I believe the government lacks will to do that. And if we don't prevent the spills, this is what I suggest may well happen. It's a story about a lily pond. Those of us who have seen a lily pond develop know that the lily pads grow geometrically. The first day there is one, the second day there is two, the third day there's four, then there's eight, then there's 16, then there's 32, then there's 64, then there's 132, and so on and so on. Each day it doubles. —(Interjection)— 128? Thank you very much. It's 128 and 356, that's right. 256? Whatever it is — here's a calculator. If I knew how to use a calculator I would know how to give you the figures. The point is that it doubles each day. —(Interjection)— The Minister who is responsible for spreading 2,4,5-T along the roadways in northern Manitoba tells me I'm loose with facts. I may make the odd error in arithmetic, I may do that Mr. Speaker, but I believe that Minister is playing fast and loose with the future, when he allows 2,4,5-T — and we'll hear more about that later — to be used in the manner in which it's being used in this province today.

But that's an aside. I don't mean to be sidetracked by the Minister of Highways. I wanted to finish the story, and then by doing so, finish my contribution to this debate. —(Interjection)— Eh? Right. It was about lily ponds. I'm glad he jogged my memory, he's exactly right. I think he's heard the story before. I don't think it sunk in; I don't think the impact or the importance of the story has sunk in, but I think he's heard it before, Mr. Speaker.

We are now confronted with a lily pond that is becoming choked by the lily pads which are meant to sustain it. And if we were to entirely cover that lily pond with lily pads, we would have a dead lake. The type of lake we talked about before, only instead of acid rain being the problem, the lily pads would eventually choke off the entire lake. The fish would die; the animals that needed those fish to survive would die; it would have an impact upon the whole eco-system. Remember, an insult to one is an injury to all in regards to environmental contamination. —(Interjections)— They are providing me with input into my speech and unfortunately I can't hear it all the time. —(Interjection)— Who is spraying the lily pads with 2,4,5-T? Are they doing that? Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, what is happening, and I read this into the record not too long ago, is our water system in Manitoba is being contaminated by 2,4,5-T and I just found out the Minister is spraying the lily pads. The fact is, I shouldn't make light of it; our water system has been contaminated by 2,4,5-T. They found it in numerous instances and it just shouldn't be there, but again someone else will address themselves to those remarks more fully, I hope, in the future.

Back to the lily pond, which is developing more slowly than usually, Mr. Speaker, what we have in the end is a dead lily pond; it died because it has been choked off. If you were an innocent bystander or passerby along the path that runs along that lily pad, and on the day before that lily pad was entirely choked off, what would you see? Let say it took 20 days to entirely choke that lily pad off and destroy that pond. On the 19th day you would walk by that pond and you would see a very scenic sight. You would see little lily pads bobbing here and bobbing there, and you would see water, and it would be very aesthetically pleasing; there would be half water and half lily pads, and the pond would be alive and vibrant and beautiful to see, nice to smell, and that is what you would see. If you sat down and waited until the next day, you would see a dead pond, just like that, a destroyed pond just that quick. The rate at which we are putting chemicals into our environment and the rate at which we are injecting toxins and contaminants and carcinogens into our eco-system, I am concerned that we may now be reached the day where we so totally contaminate our environment that is unable to sustain life. It may be in your and my lifetime. We may be on the 19th day, and so if by speaking here today I can encourage the Minister to do more than just to call upon polluters to report their spills and do more than to provide a few cursory, but important nonetheless, powers to an environmental officer, then I have indeed perhaps among the many voices — because there is a multitude of voices that are concerned with this issue — I have then indeed perhaps been able to move us farther away from that 20th day, because it may not be too late. We may still be able to undo much of the damage that we have already done, and we may still be able to stop, from occurring in the future, much of the damage that is occurring as I stand here and talk today and will be occurring as I stand here and talk years from now if better legislation than this is not brought forward by the Minister of the Environment.

We look forward to the conversations on second reading; I look forward also to hearing from members opposite, from this side, as well as the public, in regard to how we can move away from Day 20, as to how we can bring the world back a little bit closer to sanity and a little bit closer to an environment that sustains the life for which it was intended to sustain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I won't delay the debate on this bill. I do want to direct the House's attention to one portion thereof, namely, that which deals with an abatement project. Now, Mr. Speaker, the legislation with regard to an abatement project has its history, I believe, only in the province of Manitoba. I do not know of any Legislature that had such legislation in force prior to it being enacted in the province, and I am not certain, but the Minister can probably tell us whether it has been followed in other provinces.

The reason for the abatement legislation, Mr. Speaker, was because of the fact that in certain municipalities, due to either the fact that there was

no zoning, or due to the fact that planning legislation or planning bylaws resulted in anomalous situations where borders of two different districts met with one another, that you had throughout the province a series of situations where you had residential areas side by side with nuisance industries, and I use that word without criticism. I, Mr. Speaker, know that there was one residential area that was co-existent with a pig farm, and the residents were not happy and the pig farm was a nuisance industry, although the farm did everything as well as it could be done, and there were no real environmental practices which were complained of, and both facilities were zoned for the purposes for which they were being used. Because they were both lawful and yet acknowledged to interfere with one another, the province enacted legislation which said that, where there is a problem of that kind, the municipality could apply for an abatement project — and now I am going from memory. I know that the municipality had a major role in it, and at the time, Mr. Speaker, there was no question in our minds that the people in the municipality wanted to alleviate this problem, and if they applied for an abatement project and got the Clean Environment Commission to acknowledge that there was a nuisance industry side by side with an incompatible use or that there were two incompatible uses, that the province would pay 15 percent of the cost or relocating and that was considered to be the incentive for the municipality to undo this problem.

It didn't dawn on us, Mr. Speaker, that the municipality might be quite willing to live with the problem, that the people who complained were the people in the immediate vicinity and to ask all of the other residents to be party to this program by paying half the costs of changing it. By the way, it wasn't mandatory; if the costs were exorbitant the province wouldn't get into it, and therefore the municipality would not have to get into it. But at that time it did not dawn on us.

The former Minister has said that there was a defect in the Act. I don't regard it as a defect. It is something that did not enter our minds in what was then revolutionary legislation to do away with this problem. We did it, and from my impression, Mr. Speaker, it worked, that there certain municipalities who applied for abatement programs as a result of problems that were being experienced by their residents and the province participated to the extent of 50 percent and either the nuisance was moved or the other people were moved, but the incompatible situation was changed.

Then a situation arose, Mr. Speaker, which came to my attention, which I brought to the attention of the House last year, where everybody agreed that there was a nuisance; everybody agreed that there should be an abatement, but the municipality did not do anything about it and indeed did not want to do anything about it. I brought legislation to the House last year in an effort to help the Minister, which would have made such a program possible without necessarily the concurrence of the municipality.

Mr. Speaker, let's realize that the municipality in many cases is the one that is to blame, because they have set up the situation whereby these two conflicting uses are side by side. But in the particular case that came to my attention there was definitely a

nuisance; nobody argued that there wasn't. There was a gentleman who wanted an abatement; there was argument about how much, which I say that he could not win that argument, because unless there was an agreement it wouldn't go ahead, but the municipality refused to do anything.

Now, I note, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation is back here; that the abatement procedures are somewhat amended, but that there is nothing to make it more amenable to use if the municipality doesn't happen to want to correct the situation. I urge the Minister to look at this situation and, when we get to second reading, I urge him to have something in there as to the relief that is available when the municipality refuses to participate, because the municipality refuses to participate because they don't want to pay their share of the abatement. The other residents may not be concerned with the trouble that is being experienced by certain residents, and I think that under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, that there should be more teeth in the legislation; that it should be available to help a citizen on proper terms; and that where there is a proof that these terms do exist, that there should be a requirement on the part of the municipality to participate in an abatement program. I ask the Minister to review that section and see whether what I am saying does not have some merit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 94 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE HEALTH SCIENCES CENTRE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 94, An Act to Amend the Health Sciences Centre Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Logan adjourned the debate on my behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I have looked at the bill, and as the Minister indicated when he introduced it, it was a streamlining of the Act that was passed, I think, in 1972, and to a great extent that is so. Many sections of the previous Act had to be there because it was an Act initially establishing a new corporation, a new entity, Health Sciences Centre, and it required in that original bill the various mechanisms to meld together the various components that existed separately at that time — the Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, the General Hospital, the Children's Hospital — and so those sections have run their course, they are no longer needed, and I can certainly appreciate that.

However, he did do something which I think requires some comment. The board, as we envisaged it at that time, consisted of 25, 27 actually, two to be appointed by the City of Winnipeg or two to be named from the City of Winnipeg Council. All would be named by the Lieutenant-Governor-In-Council but

with names submitted by various groupings within the Health Sciences Centre community; that is, the Committee on Child Health Care, the Standing Committee of the cancer people, by the San Board, etc., and that has been somewhat scaled down. I believe in this case there are still representatives from the Cancer Treatment, one instead of two; one from the Children's Hospital, but the big change is — there is two aspects of it. We had, as I say, a board of 27, 11 of which would be named directly through the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. In other words, we were seeking a broad base, a broad representation.

The Health Sciences Center is unique in Manitoba. It is the only facility of its kind. It doesn't just cater to the city of Winnipeg needs; it caters as well to the needs of all Manitobans, because it is the largest referral centre in Manitoba.

What we have now is a decrease in the size of the board to 19. I suppose the Minister can say, well, the smaller the board the easier it is to get consensus, and that may be. I believe that the goal is always to improve administrative efficiency. In this case, I believe, it is essential that the board try to represent as large a cross-section of Manitobans as possible, and that was done through the device of having 11 appointed directly by the Lieutenant-Governor-In-Council, that is by the Cabinet . . . by the City of Winnipeg or from the City of Winnipeg Council, so you had out of 27, you had 13; there were 13 out of 27, which in a sense came from the community as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, my concern is that what we are witnessing is an attempt to restrict general input into the facility to, under the guise of greater efficiency, a smaller board, a sort of a board of directors almost as a private company; and this is borne out by the fact that eight of the members, eight of the nineteen, are going to be appointed in a very self-perpetuating way. They'll be appointed and named by the existing members of the board. The nominating committee of the board itself will then come up with new names to recommend to sit as board members, and I can see this as becoming a very inbred, self-perpetuating kind of thing. It's inevitable that it will happen and so the institution, I fear, will become captive of a certain element within the city. Not that these people don't mean well, not that they're not best intentioned, but the broad base which we hoped would develop and which did in fact come about is now being cut back. You have it by the fact that eight people are going to be named by the board, through their own nominating committee and, as I say, that becomes a self-perpetuating body, and only five will be named by the Cabinet which means that you are losing that particular input that I think the Health Sciences Centre requires, because it is, as I say, a unique facility. It's the only teaching hospital in Manitoba; although St. Boniface carries out some functions, it is the major university teaching hospital in Manitoba. It's the largest referral centre in Manitoba and it should have an input not just from a small group of people who are dedicated to it, as well they might be, but they should have an input from the population as a whole. That could be achieved by the Cabinet making appointments as they have in the past and not just five, but as we had, eleven. As well,

we had asked the City of Winnipeg Council to submit names.

One can ask why the City of Winnipeg Council, why not some other municipality and you could make that argument valid because, as I say, it is a referral centre; nonetheless, it is within the City of Winnipeg and, by having Winnipeg councillors on the board again, it infuses a different perspective. It brings a fresh look and a new look very often to the proceedings of a board of directors. It is very easy for a board which has been working with the best of intentions on this kind of health facility to become very inward looking and, as I said, certainly they will become self-perpetuating.

Another factor which I see, another point that's been done here, the question of the Chief Executive Officer. In the old Act the Chairman of the Board was considered the Chief Executive Officer. He would sign all the bylaws, the resolutions, the orders or directions which were issued by or authorized by the board. Now as I understand it, the President, who in fact is a paid employee, he's the Chief Administrator, he is now going to be the Chief Executive Officer. He'll attend all board meetings and, as I read it, although his attending all board meetings is certainly valid and I think he always could do that, I think being designated as Chief Executive Officer, he will now assume the responsibility of signing all the bylaws, the resolutions, the orders, etc., etc. Now, I hope I'm wrong, but that's as I read it and the Minister can correct me if I am wrong. But if not, if in fact that is what's happening, then what you are seeing again is an attempt to make this enterprise, make the facility a closed shop with the Chief Administrator, the President — he's called the President under their act — the top man, assuming not just the chief administrative powers, but as chief executive officer also assuming a role which only the Chairman of the Board played before. As I say, if I'm wrong in that the Minister, I'm sure, will correct me.

So just those few points that I wanted to bring to the Minister's attention and ask for his comments on and certainly when we get to Law Amendments they can be explored further. Otherwise, I am pleased to see that despite stories in the press that occurred in the last year about the dissatisfaction at the Health Sciences Centre with some components of the Health Sciences Centre, that the Minister has not moved, as had been desired, to sort of split the facility up as it had been in the past and to go back to the days when there was a separate General Hospital, and separate Children's Hospital and so on.

I think the Minister has now recognized that in fact the need for a unified board to deal with the entire Health Sciences Centre is essential and that this is too big an establishment and facility to break it up into components and try to make it work, each one sort of independent of the other. It was that independence, if you want to call it that, in the past, which hamstrung the redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre and it was only after we introduced The Health Sciences Centre Act that we could with some rationale approach the whole problem of redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre, which was done and it was announced in 1976, and which is now being carried on by the present government.

I was pleased that the Minister, after reviewing and looking at the existing act, didn't scrap it as some

press stories may have led me to believe. But I am concerned, as I say, with the lack of or the diminution of greater public participation in the activities of the board, or in the appointment to the board, and the net result will be that the input of the public will be reduced accordingly. It is, I think, a retrogressive step and one which I don't think in the long run will benefit the Health Sciences Centre. It may benefit the administration; they may be happy with it. It won't benefit, I think, the public at large, and I think it will diminish the value of the Health Sciences Centre in the long run.

However, as I say, those are just the three points that I wanted to bring to the Minister's attention, and certainly the bill should go to the Law Amendments Committee and can be discussed in greater detail at that time.

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

The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank members opposite, particularly the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, for their contributions to Bill No. 94.

The concerns expressed by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks are certainly legitimately expressed and sincerely expressed. I would hope, however, that we can lay them, Mr. Speaker, with the explanation of the rationale for restructuring the board in this manner and assure him that there is certainly no intention whatsoever of reducing or diminishing public participation in the board of this fundamental and fundamentally necessary health facility.

The feeling, as I explained in speaking to the bill when it was introduced, has been that the board as become anachronistic to a certain extent, in view of the distance that the Health Sciences Centre has travelled through the growing pains of the past seven or eight years of its consolidated experience, and it is time to provide a board and administrative structure that is more contemporary and that recognizes the evolution of the Health Sciences Centre as a consolidated entity.

The city of Winnipeg, for example — and here I am not being critical in any way and I hope remarks are not misconstrued — had certainly indicated tacitly, if not overtly, that it did not feel constrained in the future to participate regularly through appointments to the board, and some of the constituent representatives who have been deleted from board membership were deleted for reasons of modernization and I think the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks has acknowledged that. The former board consisted of representatives from seven different constituency groups, plus the 11 appointees by Order-in-Council, plus the two nominees from the city of Winnipeg. The seven different constituent groups embraced a number of component constituencies which required recognition at the time of the consolidation and formation of the Health Sciences Centre as such, but which through the evolutionary process no longer requires such.

I'm concerned though, Sir, that there are two or three major component constituency groups which still, for purposes of input, recognition, status, call it

what you will, deserve and require individual representation on the board and, for that reason, I take full responsibility for having insisted that the Children's Centre, now happily renamed the Children's Hospital, is represented with a specific appointment, and the Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation is similarly represented.

The reduction in the number of appointees by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-council and the decision to provide for the appointment of eight members of a 19-member board by nominating committee was one that was not arrived at easily, and I appreciate, as I said earlier, the sincerity of the expression of concern by the Member for Seven Oaks. Considerable discussion and assessment of that idea was undertaken by my office, by my colleagues in government, by the existing board of the Health Sciences Centre and by other advisors, but the feeling has been, Sir, that in order to attract and continue to attract those contributory or potentially contributory members of society to the board that a new cast, a new tenor and tone to the board is desirable.

There's a feeling that there is a discouragement for some persons to seek or acknowledge or accept appointment to the board of the Health Sciences Centre when it seems to be so thoroughly linked to and, if you like, controlled by government. The overriding impression that seemed to come through from discussions of this kind was that there would be a more attractive opportunity for service among members of the public if there were more of an arms-length relationship with government, in terms of appointments to the board, and if there were an opportunity for those serving on the board to seek out and recommend, through their nominating committee, to government others whom they identified and whom the government of the day may not have identified as worthwhile contributors.

That's the rationale for the change. The nominating committee will work in close liaison with the Minister's office. In fact, it's our intention, Mr. Speaker, that the regulations will provide that the Minister's office will be represented on the nominating committee so that the necessary protection will be put in place to ensure that the self-perpetuating inbreeding danger that the Member for Seven Oaks has referred to is minimized, in fact eliminated insofar as possible.

I would also just point out that with respect to other hospitals, the government of the province does not make direct board appointments in the manner as has been done with respect to the Health Sciences Centre. I appreciate why it has been done with respect to the Health Sciences Centre. The Member for Seven Oaks has already touched on the uniqueness and the importance and the size of the institution. Nonetheless it is a discouragement, Sir, to some serving on that board, to observe that other hospital boards are appointed in a freer manner than has been the case in the past for the Health Sciences Centre. With that thinking in mind, the bill has been developed along these lines. I'm prepared certainly to discuss this and other aspects of it more fully with the Member for Seven Oaks and others at committee stage. I appreciate the support given to this point.

QUESTION put MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JIM FERGUSON: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 47, An Act to amend The Land Acquisition Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 56, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. FOX: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 72, The Securities Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. (Stand)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 77 — THE FAMILY LAW ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Having, Mr. Speaker, already had the opportunity to engage the attention of the House for some 20 or 25 minutes last week, I will cede the floor to any other member who wishes to participate in this particular debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there are two sections of this bill that I'm particularly interested in, one in which I'm in agreement with and one that I'm opposed to. I think the one that all of us probably support is the section which in effect, I understand, would mean that a woman who has a maintenance order, or who has through the courts obtained the right to a certain monthly payment in support of herself or her children, will now have a more likely possibility of collecting that monthly maintenance, even if her husband is out of the province. I think all of us are aware of individual cases where somebody has a family that they are supporting and that they are not obtaining support from their marital partner. This of course places an undue burden on the individual and I guess in some cases, Mr. Speaker, probably results in support that is forthcoming from the public purse as opposed to the responsible party.

The section in the bill that I'm opposed to and already has been opposed by my colleague, the Member for Wellington, is the section which in effect indicates that a child may be responsible for the parents. This seems to me a new thrust on the part

of the government, but one that is going in the wrong direction. I don't know what the logic of the Attorney-General is in this particular regard. I don't know what has motivated him to move in this direction, but it has been suggested — and I'm not sure this is the reason; this may be a possible reason or one of the reasons — that in implementing this legislation, the ultimate result might be to take some of the burden off of the government and place it onto the shoulders of certain individuals, but in a very peculiar way. I assume that this is basically the philosophy of the members opposite, that they want individuals to be responsible as opposed to the government, but I think in this case, Mr. Speaker, they are clearly mistaken. I think they are getting hung up on philosophical matters once again.

I would just like to elaborate on this a bit. I think it's obviously understood by tradition and common practice and common obligation that a person should be responsible for their children. I think that any parent believes that they have a moral obligation as well as a legal obligation to their offspring, because they presumably made a decision — and I won't expound on that point — they presumably made a decision to have one or more children, and as a result they feel some obligation to this chip or chips-off-the-old-block.

In the other instance where you start saying that the children must ultimately be responsible for the maintenance of their parents, I think what the government is doing here in effect, is legislating a moral obligation, is taking what most people would understand as a moral obligation and turning it into a legal obligation.

I'm not totally hung-up on that point. Their argument is philosophical, about whether you can legislate morality. Obviously you cannot legislate morality, but you can indicate or outline to people what you think moral behaviour is in a particular instance. You cannot make people moral, however. You can maybe suggest to them or tell them or lecture them as to what is moral and what isn't, assuming they don't know, and you can throw them into jail or you can punish them in various ways to try to back up that system of obligations — (Interjection)— My friend from Rock Lake says, make them pay for their pleasures. I'm afraid to touch that, so I will pass the opportunity. Some people do pay for their pleasures and others obtain it free, so it's a case of what pleasures you are referring to.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with this new exercise, this new policy on the part of the government, is I think that it has not been thought through. I think it is very simple that they have simply not thought through the significance of what they're doing, and I believe, in effect, they should withdraw this particular proposal.

And I'll give you a couple of examples. If a person has — and I believe that in law or in practice, people have obligations to their children — of course some people don't even honour that. Well, not after they're eighteen, but of course when they are eighteen they are not children any more, so let's just say their children who are minors or some such qualification. But in addition to having parents who are of course blood relatives, people have brothers and sisters, uncles and aunts, cousins, grandparents and so on and so on; neices and nephews like in Gilbert and

Sullivan, sisters, cousins and aunts. You will notice the sexist connotation, all female preferences, in that particular instance.

Mr. Speaker, I am simply saying that the Attorney-General may as well stand up and say that you are responsible legally. He will stand up apparently, and say that one should be legally responsible for one's relatives, and I mean by that brothers and sisters and other relatives. It can get even more complicated when you start getting into step-brothers and step-sisters, and when you get into adopted children, the parents of adopted children, and foster parents and so on. I think the Attorney-General really in fact does have to explain why he has limited his suggestion to parents as opposed to other relatives. I think he must in fact explain and defend that particular provision.

The easiest thing to say, however, is this, Mr. Speaker, that whereas I feel it is completely different dealing with children, what happens where you have a child who has parents that that child never got along with in the sense of — let's take a hypothetical instance of a father who beat the child, or beat the child's mother or whatever, but for whatever reasons had a strong emotional dislike of one or both parents, and now you are going to say in effect that that child is now in his 30s or 40s, those parents are in their 60s, or 70s or 80s, and now you are saying at this point in time, in spite of rancor and hatred and no communication, that now you are going to inform that child of that parent, that they have an obligation to pay X 100s of dollars per month. I don't know what word you would use to apply to a person in that situation, whether you would call them ungrateful, ingrate or what, but it just strikes me that person could have a pretty powerful argument in favour of why they feel no moral obligation to that parent and how they do not recognize a legal obligation to that particular person.

These are my thoughts on the matter, Mr. Speaker. I did have only one phone call in this regard. A constituent of mine phoned and was very upset about this fact. He didn't give me a complete explanation of why he thought this was bad legislation. I will have to talk to him on this matter and ask for his reasons, but he certainly conveyed to me that he was very taken aback at this proposal and was completely opposed to it. We are going to run into a real can of worms if this is proceeded with, and it should not be, but if it's proceeded with, you are going to get into a situation of what? — garnishing wages; throwing people into jail because they are failing to provide for an elderly parent that they do not like, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I think that most of us can support the general notion about being your brother's keeper and, well, the Minister of Government Services is not so sure about that; he has so many brothers, Mr. Speaker, that he's worried about the prospect of supporting the rest of the family, but they all seem to be doing well, so we won't worry about them too much.

I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that one part of this bill in particular is definitely a step in the right direction, that is to help enforce court orders of people who have been married and who are not paying for the support of their children. Notice the

principle that is at work there, that it is an adult who has an obligation, usually, to a minor offspring, but I do not believe that the opposite should be legislated. I think most of us, if we think about it, will say, well this is a hard point to understand because most people like their parents, most people feel an obligation toward their parents. I would have no hesitation in supporting my parents; I would do anything possible to provide them with economic or any other support. I wouldn't feel hard pressed to do that.

But when the Court comes in and says to everybody that regardless of your attitude toward your parents, regardless of your relationship to your parents, you are now legally bound to support them, I think that this should not be done, and so I say to the Attorney-General, he should withdraw this provision and he should not attempt, in this particular instance, to legislate what is normally felt as a moral obligation and not convert it into a legal obligation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll add a few remarks to this bill. I don't pretend to have anything much more profound to say than has been said by some of the honourable members, but I do have some observations to make.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the fact that there exists, in Manitoba, or that there could exist in Manitoba, a statute making a legal obligation on the part of children to support their parents may be astonishing to some, and indeed I think that that astonishment is honestly come by, but it has been a statute as long as I can remember. The fact is that there was a statute called the Parents Maintenance Act which was a statute when I entered the law profession in 1951. I don't know when it was first enacted — my friend says 1930. As a matter of fact, I am aware of at least one case where an information was laid under that statute. I cannot tell you how many orders were made; I am aware of at least one case where an information was laid, and the laying of the information probably resulted in the settlement of the obligation.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I don't pretend, by those remarks, to say that what is there is right and should not be changed. As a matter of fact, in speaking on a bill today, I was of the impression that part of it was new, and the important part, the part upon which I based my substantial remarks, was new, but there is a part of it that existed . . . In correcting myself, I made an incorrection; I said, since 1968, because that's what it said on the statute book, but actually it is in the 1954 legislation, and probably preceded the 1954 legislation. None of that, Mr. Speaker, changes one word about what I had to say about that particular section and certainly doesn't detract from the remarks that I made on the major change that the Attorney-General is bringing. So what about this section, Mr. Chairman? I gather this is the Attorney-General's attempt to legislate one of the commandments, I've got the Bible here and I don't have the number but it says something about, Honour thy father and thy mother, and this translates into you shall have a legal obligation to make

maintenance payments, which I would assume results from the fact that somebody has not honoured their mother or their father, or the Attorney-General has presumed such.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with this legislation because, in my view, this legislation is intended to make a lot of otherwise decent people feel guilty that their . . . Mr. Speaker, it's a hard world and many, many people have difficulty in getting through the world and look for a little bit of happiness, they look for a little bit of having some of the better things, and some of them may have just come to the verge of being into the upper middle class. In other words, they're not the working poor, they've probably got good jobs like steel workers or packing house workers; they have jobs which enable them, if they put some money away, to buy a beach cottage. They have jobs which enable them, if they put some money away and live carefully and repair their own houses, to maybe make a trip to Disneyland. And what the Attorney-General is saying is that, you shouldn't be in that position, you should be supporting your father and your mother. And instead of doing those things which you worked very hard to accomplish, you are a guilty person, Mr. Speaker — and I'm not being facetious — because your parents are receiving social assistance. Because that's all that this legislation has really affect on.

Mr. Speaker, we've seen the Attorney-General, or the Minister in charge of Corrections, come in with a piece of legislation that is intended to make sure that a person on social assistance can't get somebody to make life a little happier for them by saying that they're going to give them the charity of a trip to the Bahamas. The effective feature of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is that if an older person is on social assistance, which we have tried to indicate is something that one should not be ashamed of, that the elderly people in our society who are on old age pension or on the supplementary income, which is the area of social assistance, are entitled to think that they have made their contribution, they have worked very hard, and all of us together are going to say that we are going to see to it that your senior years — I won't even say declining years, because Mr. Speaker, in Yiddish we have an expression which my friend, the Member for Lakeside will understand, and my friend, the Member for La Verendrye, we say, biz hundert zwanzig, because we don't want to recognize the declining years, so we say that you should live till 120, and everybody knows that that means that you should live a long, long time.

This Act is intended to say to those who are on social assistance, that really there is an obligation on your children to support you, and if you don't get that support for them, we, the state, can regard that as being part of your available means. Isn't that what it says? That these are a part of your available means, and if you're not getting it, if you don't sue your children for that, we can deduct that from your social assistance. Isn't that correct?

Mr. Speaker, that's what it says. And that being what it says, that this is part of their available means, there is this two-edged sword, not that it cuts both ways but that it cuts both the parent and the child, that says that we are going to regard as available means part of the money that you, by law, are

entitled to get from your children and which you are not getting.

Mr. Speaker, why are we doing this thing? There has been such an Act in existence since, my friend says, 1930. There may have been one or two prosecutions under it. We have developed different attitudes now. A person, Mr. Speaker, should not feel guilty because his father and his mother, or both, are that category which are listed as people who are entitled to some degree of assistance from the state. He should not feel guilty about that. That is something that he should know is available, just as it is available to other members of his or her family, and that it is available because everybody is entitled to the benefit of it. And nobody who takes the benefit of it should be deemed to be any less a worthy citizen than somebody else.

How far would you go, Mr. Speaker? It is true that some families will say, and it's in every way to be admired, that we are not concerned with this and we are going to see to it that our family is looked after as a total family unit, father, mother, children, etc., but I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we should tell other families that the utilization of a legitimate form of social responsibility makes them any worse than the others. And this legislation, Mr. Speaker, implies that. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I'm looking at what the legislation can do. What is the purpose of the legislation? The purpose of the legislation is that there is a right of a child to make an application to have a parent support them and also, by virtue of that — excuse me, the other way around, my friend the Member for Wellington says, why not the reverse? Why not, if there is a rich adult, maybe 75 years of age and he's got an indigent son who is 50 years of age, why not the reverse, because the Children's Maintenance Act now merely says children. That's right, people who have not received the age of being considered adult. Why should not a man, I don't want to use names, but who is very well-to-do, support his son who happens to be an indigent? If one works, why not the other? Why should not a brother be required to support his sister? Why should not a friend be required to support his bosom buddy? I mean, love thy neighbour as thyself. Why not translate that into a legal obligation? Because we have done it, Mr. Speaker. We have transferred it into a legal obligation for all of us. We say that all of society is going to regard their fellow man as their neighbour, and as a person whom they have social responsibility for, and that when a person is in a position of having reached his senior years, we are going to see to it, together, not just the individual children but all of the children of all of these adults, are going to have a responsibility to support those parents. And we do it.

We do it through the old age security program, which was not a contributory program; it was not a contributory program, Mr. Speaker. The old age security program was a program which took the philosophy of this bill and said, all of the children are going to support all of the parents. And we are not going to identify a particular group of children and a particular group of parents because we believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should not make a child feel that the parent is a burden to him. And we do not feel that a particular family, whose parents are in greater difficulty, should be in a position where they and

their happiness becomes a feature of how much they are giving to their parents, or how much of an obligation they are giving to their parents. We took the philosophy of this bill and we did something far more civilized. We passed an Act, Mr. Speaker, which the Attorney-General can style if he wishes to, The Parents Maintenance Act, and we said that there will be a law that all parents upon reaching a certain age will be entitled to be maintained by all of the children in society. We supplemented that, and I am not for certain — as a matter of act, Mr. Speaker, I have to be more candid, I am certain that I don't agree with the supplemental part of it, because as far as I am concerned, the amount that is given should be given universally, and that what a person has been able to achieve for himself should not be used to deduct from what they are able to get out of this mass Parents Maintenance Act that I have said we apply.

I am worried — the honourable member says that I have interpreted it in a certain way, that I say that it is an attempt by the government to make people feel guilty about the fact that they are not supporting their children. Does the honourable Minister say that that is a false statement? The Minister nods his head, Mr. Speaker. I was hoping he would that. He says it is a false statement. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is legislation before the House that now says that me having made that false statement, I can be prosecuted, I can be found to be committing an election offence if I repeat that false statement during an election campaign, and if the Minister gets some judge to agree that it is a false statement, I can lose my seat having made that statement. The Minister nods and says it is a false statement.

You can just see, Mr. Speaker, what becomes a false statement. In my opinion, I say that this Act is an attempt by the Conservative Government to make people feel guilty about the fact that they are not supporting their parents. That is a program of the Conservative Party. I am making what the Minister says is a false material statement reflecting that program. I could be guilty of an election offence, and if I get elected, if a lot of people agree with me, I can have my election declared void by virtue of having made that statement. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I haven't got an argument against this bill, at least I have got a better argument against the other bill, merely by virtue of the Minister nodding his head.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is ill-conceived. It reflects a holier-than-thou attitude on the part of some with regard to their family obligations. The state should not involve itself in those family obligations. Those people themselves know how to maintain them, and to the extent that the state involves itself, then let us regard ourselves as one big family, and say, we, the children, have a legal obligation to support our parents, and if the Minister came in, as we indeed have come in over the years with progressively doing that type of thing, I would be entirely at sympathy with his sentiments; zeroing in on an individual child and an individual parent will not correct the situation, Mr. Speaker, it will lead to worse family feelings, worse relationships, not better ones.

MRS. WESTBURY: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that debate be adjourned, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I need some guidance as to what is the next bill to be called.

Bill No. 78, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Stand)

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Again I just ask the House Leader as to what is the order? Go down the line here?

Bill No. 79, in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Stand)

**BILL NO. 80 — AN ACT TO AMEND
THE PAYMENT OF WAGES ACT
AND THE REAL PROPERTY ACT**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 80, standing in the name of the Member for Logan. The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Logan had stood this bill for myself.

I hesitate to tell you that my Leader has designated me —(Interjection)— no, no, it is 21 minutes. My Leader has not designated me on this bill, Mr. Speaker. As the Member for Elmwood said, he heard my last speech and refuses to designate me again for quite some time. I had warned him previous to that that I might go over the time limit, but I guess he had not taken my advice to heart.

To address ourselves to this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, I must put on the record right from the start that we intend to vote against it; that we do not find any redeeming feature whatsoever in this particular bill. As a matter of fact, we find it to be a step backwards and a step that will have a negative impact on persons who are forced to work for a living, and find themselves in the uncomfortable position of being employed by an employer who cannot meet their wages and finds himself or herself in bankruptcy.

The Honourable Minister for Highways said that because we are opposed to this bill, it is a step in the right direction. Well, I would hope that he would peruse this bill a bit more carefully and analyse it, as to not only the intent of it, but also the effect of it, and would thereby, I believe, withdraw that statement that this bill is in the right direction, unless he is opposed to seeing people who must labour for a living get what is due to them.

I, for one, am not opposed to that. I believe that a person sells their labour for very specific wages, for specific purposes, and if they are entitled to those wages, come hell or high water, that they should be the first to have lien on the assets of the business and first to be provided with what is due them in the sad event that such a business should go bankrupt. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this is going to be a matter of growing concern. As a matter of fact, it has been a matter of growing concern over the past number of years since we have had a Progressive-Conservative Government, and since we have had more and more and more bankruptcies. That is a

fact that they can't deny, the statistics are plain. The bankruptcies, and I don't have the exact figures, but I know the Member for Inkster has investigated quite thoroughly in the past and I recall him suggesting that we are now in this province at record high levels for bankruptcies among businesses; that is mostly small businesses, but does include other businesses; although it wasn't a bankruptcy, we saw Swift's go out of business and leave, and although it does not apply directly to this bill, I believe it is part of the whole economic environment in which we find ourselves today, primarily due to the sorts of actions by this government. —(Interjection)—

The Minister for Government Services has informed me that Swift's didn't go bankrupt. I said that when I brought Swift's into the debate. I said that although they did not go bankrupt they do, in fact, signal much of what is happening to the economy as a whole. They are symptomatic of the problems in which all businesses find themselves today, problems not only of this government's creating, although we have to admit that this government has played an influential and perhaps inordinate role in creating the type of economic environment that drives businesses from the province, that drives businesses into bankruptcy.

But it is not all of their making, there is a recession that is ongoing now; there is a drought that is ongoing now; there are a number of other factors beyond their control. That is not to absolve them from fault, because I don't believe that they are putting in place the type of mechanisms that should be put in place in order to deal with these problems, but the fact is that the problems are created outside of their realm and if we fault them, we fault them for not dealing with them, rather than for creating them. We can also fault them for this type of a bill. This bill is going to take away from the working person the advantage that person now has in regard to wages that are owed them.

Let's review the situation as it exists today. If a firm or an employer should not be able to continue employing a person, should go bankrupt, or should go out of business, and they owe that person wages, that person has first rights to any assets; they have first priority to any other claim or right, including those of the Crown and the right of Manitoba, and without limiting the generality of the foregoing that priority extends over every encumbrance, assignment, including an assignment of book debts, whether absolute or otherwise, debenture, and other security, whether registered or not made, given, accepted, or issued before or after the coming into force of this Act.

That is the situation as it exists today, with one minor modification. That does not read exactly the way that particular section of Act reads before this amendment will come into force. Encumbrance has been added, and I am not certain for what reason, but I know when we get to Committee stage we can ask the Minister who has introduced this bill, the Honourable Attorney-General, as to why they felt it necessary to add that particular definition. But something is taken away also, and what is taken away is the words "every mortgage or real or personal property", that is taken out of that particular section of the Act, which was in it before.

The effect of that, of course, is to place the wage earners second to those who hold mortgages and those who hold purchase money security interests on equipment and facilities of the plant. The Attorney-General can correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that is the intent. Why would they want to do that? Why should they want to say to the wage earner that you are in fact now second place to other persons. —(Interjection)— The Member for Kildonan says that their friends have gotten to them. I would suggest that their friends have gotten to them, and this is one instance where they have not turned their back on their friends, although there are many other instances in the past number of years where they have appeared from this side at least to have unalienated some of their support. This is one particular instance where they have held true.

Someone mentioned the banks. Anyone want to raise their hand on the banks? Maybe it was on this side, that now the banks have first priority. No, that is a fact. The banks, as we saw today during the Question Period, the banks are indeed the friends. They scratch each other's back from time to time. —(Interjection)— The thrifty person is now first. Well, will you listen to that? What he is saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the worker is not a thrifty person. No, no, no, no. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope all remarks would be addressed to the Chair. In that way, we can cut out a lot of this chit-chat that goes back and forth.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I know you have a role to play and I support you in that, but if you cut that chit-chat out from under me, it is going to be difficult from time to time to continue my speech, but I will try to do so. Although I do appreciate it, but I don't want to make your job any harder for you than I know it already is with some of the more vocal members on the opposite side.

To go back to the chit-chat of just a moment ago, what the Minister for Highways was telling us is that the working person, the wage earner . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the honourable member would address his remarks to the Chair I would appreciate it.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My remarks, and I think they are pertinent and germane to the bill, are that the working person is in fact a thrifty person, and that the working person does deserve some protection under the law, and the government in their wisdom has seen fit to remove some of that protection.

I shouldn't refer to comments made by others that weren't made to the Chair, but I have been informed that it is their lack of wisdom, and I think that is correct. The government in their lack of wisdom have seen fit, for whatever reason, to remove from the workers, protection which was afforded to them under the previous legislation, and they will tell you that, well, it is just a minor change, all we are putting in front now of the wage earner is every mortgage or purchase money security interest. And therefore the

wage earner now becomes third instead of first, so in fact it's a minor change; they're not taking the wage earner out of the Act altogether but they are just making minor modifications, which they will try to convince us are necessary. I would imagine they will use these arguments, although I don't want to put words in their mouths or ideas into their head, I will suggest that the argument they'll use is that a person lends money or an institution lends money to a business owner to start up that business, and that if they do not have some security for that money, that they will be hesitant to lend that money to that business operator and thereby, we will, by the Payment of Wages Act as it came in a number of years ago, would have a negative impact on employment opportunities and business opportunities in the province of Manitoba.

It's the type of argument that we have heard time and time and time again. It's a philosophical argument. It's one that we will probably argue when the sides again reverse themselves very shortly in this House and we sit on that side and they sit on this side. It's the type of argument that we will probably never resolve. It is philosophical in nature and it is one where it points out very specifically the difference between them and us.

But I would like to read into the record some of the statements that were made when this bill, the Payment of Wages Act, which contains the clause as it is being amended, was introduced by the Honourable Minister of Labour, the then Honourable Russ Paulley, on June 3, 1975, and during his remarks to the debate he says, and I quote, "Experience has shown that wage claims have sometimes not been satisfied because of the higher priority given to claims of secured creditors. Therefore, the new provision," and that's a provision that they're taking out, or changes, or amending actually, "stipulates that claims for unpaid wages have priority over claims of all other creditors, including those of the Crown and secured creditors." So what this amendment is attempting to do, and what this amendment will in fact do, if it is passed, is bring us back to the good old days where experience has shown us that wage claims have sometimes not been satisfied because of higher priorities given other secured forms of creditors.

Now, I, for one, do not want to return to those good old days. I can assure you that the working people of this province do not want to return to those good old days, because they know full well what the effect of this particular amendment is intended to be, and they know that it is not an amendment that was suggested by themselves or suggested by their organizations, the labour unions, or suggested by other representatives of them, associations, it was an amendment suggested by those who hold the mortgages and those who hold the purchase money security interest. It was the type of amendment that was whispered in the ear of the government by the economic elite, and it is the type of amendment that takes away from the working person. And it can only do that, and it is a serious concern as we said, due to the fact that many, many, many more bankruptcies are going to result as a symbol of this government's inability to interact and interface positively and in an activist way with the economy, an economy that is failing for any number

of reasons, some of their own creating, some not of their own creating.

This new particular amendment places mortgage before wages. So let's look at what's going to happen in a bankruptcy. Most businesses are mortgaged, because it takes a fair amount of capital to start a business nowadays and most people do not have that type of capital available to them and, even if they do, there are economic considerations which would encourage them to take out a mortgage rather than spend cash. So most businesses are mortgaged and those mortgages are long term mortgages and there are sometimes second mortgages, and sometimes even mortgages beyond that on a particular business. And if I understand the purchase money security interest correctly, and I'm not saying that I do, but my brief reading of the definition leads me to believe that, say they had purchased 100,000 worth of equipment for 10,000 down, they had 90,000 owing on it, that that money would come before the wages also.

So in fact, the two major investments in the business come before wages: The mortgage, and the purchase money security interest. Business goes bankrupt, the mortgagors are there, Johnny on the spot, right away, there's no hesitancy on their part to come forward and collect their money, and they collect whatever they can. There would be very little left over, I would suggest, for the purchase money security interest. I think what would have to happen is the suppliers of that equipment and the goods that were paid for on that sort of a basis would have to thereby play second to the mortgage and not get their full amount of money back, probably repossess their equipment, which leaves nothing, which leaves nothing. We've taken care of the building, the land, and the equipment and there are no assets left, and there is the worker, with their palms outstretched, saying, where are my wages?

We can talk about some fairly significant sums in this regard, and we can talk very easily about hundreds of dollars, and in some instances, we can talk about thousands of dollars, because I know of the example where a working person has worked for an employer, knew that that employer was in bad economic straits yet continued to work for that employer, taking a reduction in their wages over a long period of time so as to try to help that employer through a tough period. And they can build up quite a debt, or the employer can build up quite a debt to that employee because of that particular practice, and it's not an uncommon practice. The employee, even though they know full well it is a gamble and a risk, will take that risk to protect the job, to protect what they have. We have instances of employees taking reduced wages all the time.

The Minister of Labour, the other day, talked — actually, I had asked the question first in regard to Ray-O-Vac, and asked him if there had been layoffs at Ray-O-Vac, and he informed me that yes, there have been layoffs at Ray-O-Vac but the workers were back at work. What he didn't inform the House, and I know why he didn't inform the House because it was a bit of an embarrassment, but what he didn't inform the House was that they were back at work on a four-day schedule, that they had given up one day a week in order to keep that business going. Now, they're not working for free for one day a

week, they're not losing any wages for their time, but they are in fact, losing one day's wages a week in order to help that company out, not only to help the company out, because their motives are more altruistic than that, they are doing so to help their fellow workers out, their co-workers out. They're not saying that you have to lay off a specific number for a long period of time or a short period of time; what they are saying is, we will all share some of the burden in this regard, we will all share some of the impact.

Many times what happens, especially with smaller employers, is instead of saying, we won't work for one day a week, they actually do work the extra day a week, they just don't take their pay for it. And they say to the employer, pay me when you get a chance. They don't want to bankrupt their own employer, it's not in their best interests to do so. Neither an individual worker nor a union, irrespective of the fallacies and the propaganda that's thrown out about workers and unions, want to bankrupt their employers. They want to do a fair day's work for a fair day's wage, but they want that fair day's wage that is due to them, and this bill takes it away from them. This bill will put before them, the person who holds a mortgage on the operation, and anyone who holds a purchase money security interest. So we're talking about some fairly substantial sums of money from time to time. And it can be built to such a substantial level because of the goodwill of the employee, and we are penalizing or what this bill will be doing is penalizing that employee for trying to enable their employer to continue.

So in fact, what they will suggest is a bill that will encourage more employment, that will encourage employers to enter into the field, may in effect have the opposite impact and that would mean that workers, not being afforded this protection under the law anymore, would be less enthusiastic about supporting an employer through the tough times, and may just say, that's it, we make a categorical statement, we're not going to work because we know we no longer can get our wages under the law, and it's unfortunate and it's sad that we're going to have to, because of that, lose our employment, but at least that way we'll be able to look for other employment. So this may have exactly the opposite effect for which it was intended and for which the government anticipates it to have.

I would suggest that they should look very carefully at that particular aspect of the bill . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. It is Committee of Law Amendments tonight.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn, I would like to make an announcement in respect to a change on the Law Amendments, Mr. Uruski for Mr. Bostrom.

Monday, 7 July, 1980

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed) The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. (Tuesday).