

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Thursday, 27 March 1980

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions .
. . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and
Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make to the House. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that Manitoba has entered into a significant agreement concerning the development of a Western Electric Power Grid. My colleague, the Honourable Donald Craik, the Minister of Energy and Mines, is today in Edmonton, where an agreement has been signed between the three provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. The agreement provides for a final, all-encompassing study that will determine the feasibility of the supply, transmission and purchase of electrical energy, including a measurement of benefits for the three participating provinces.

The agreement signed today is the culmination of discussions between western provinces which began at the Western Premiers Conference in 1978, and which have continued since between Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Designated Ministers and officials of the three provinces will constitute committees to manage the necessary investigations and negotiations for the Grid and will report on or before September 30, 1980.

An agreement for the actual construction and operation of transmission lines and interconnections must await the results of this feasibility study. The study assumes an initial purchase by Alberta of 1,000 megawatts of hydro-electric energy commencing in 1987. It is also noteworthy and encouraging, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan has expressed an interest in purchasing power from Manitoba on a firm basis.

Mr. Speaker, a firm power sale of up to 1,000 megawatts of hydro-electric energy, and the potential for future sales and increased security of supply that a power grid would provide are of immense importance to the province of Manitoba. The revenue implications to our Crown corporation, Manitoba Hydro, are also significant. All three governments are optimistic about the outcome of the study. We expect the results will be positive, positive for all three partners. For Manitobans, this will mean the reactivation of construction on the Nelson River system, specifically at Limestone.

The construction of additional generating plants on the Nelson is another possibility, depending upon developments in Manitoba, and other negotiations. A Western Electric Power Grid and the resulting construction would allow our utility, Manitoba Hydro, to proceed with orderly and economic development of our hydro-electric resources, in concert with requirements in the western provinces and in conformity with the basic commitment to the people of Manitoba as set forth in The Manitoba Hydro Act.

Each of the prairie partners brings determination and the willingness to work together for our mutual benefit, Mr. Speaker, and recognizes our mutual interdependence. This study, and the significant successes expected to result is another important accomplishment as we strive for our common goal of energy self-sufficiency for Western Canada and for Canada as a nation. It further demonstrates what provinces can do when men and women have vision of what lies ahead and when they possess the will to translate their vision into action and deeds.

Thursday, 27 March 1980

In the past, Mr. Speaker, Canadians have undertaken the construction of a national railway, a Trans-Canada Highway, and the St. Lawrence Seaway. A Western Power Grid would be but another example of the activities and accomplishments which strengthen our region and bind our nation.

We are all aware of the need to conserve energy, and we are all aware of the benefits of substituting renewable energy for our non-renewable fossil fuels wherever possible. A Western Electric Power Grid would contribute to both of these goals. The wealth of our hydro-electric resource is an integral part of Manitoba's development and heritage. It was in 1966 the then Premier, Duff Roblin, committed the provincial government to developing our northern rivers for the long-term benefit of all Manitobans. This government, Mr. Speaker, remains committed to that goal.

I am proud that our government has re-established and continues the process of sound and prudent development of Manitoba's hydro-electric resources instituted in the 1960s. An abundance of hydro-electric power will continue to provide benefits to all Manitobans, as a secure and economic source of energy for all of our citizens and as an excellent attraction for all businesses expanding or locating in Manitoba. Exports prudently negotiated can assist in this process. All three governments are optimistic that the final study will result in transforming the concept of a grid into a reality.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a copy of the agreement signed today. I also wish to table the first of the studies examining the feasibility of a power grid undertaken for western provinces and titled, "Report on Western Electric Power Systems Study". I might add, Mr. Speaker, that considerable work and refinement of the figures has occurred since this latter study was completed, and the original concept, as described in that report, has of course been altered.

I should add, Mr. Speaker, that a statement is being made in the Legislatures of Saskatchewan and Alberta concurrently this afternoon with respect to this final feasibility study.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, we welcome the announcement by the First Minister that a study is being entered into. We hope that that study will lead to action on the part of all parties to the agreement to bring about the development of the Western Electric Power Grid. So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that all members share their support and encouragement of what will take place as a result of the study and anticipated action.

There are a number of comments, however, that I would like to undertake pertaining to the announcement by the First Minister. First, Mr. Speaker, how fortunate we are that, indeed, Manitoba has enjoyed the benefit of men and women of vision. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately those that were involved in the Tritschler Commission Report were not those of vision, for if we have followed the recommendations of Tritschler Commission Report the First Minister would not be in a position today to have undertaken this announcement.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, reference is made in the report to the vision of the former Premier, Duff Roblin, in 1966. Mr. Speaker, it was Premier Schreyer and the New Democratic Party Government from 1969-70 on that made it possible that Manitoba would enjoy the capacity to export surplus power and energy to Saskatchewan and to Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that although certainly it was former Premier Duff Roblin that entered into the agreement in 1966 that the First Minister might not for a moment have put aside his partisan prejudices and had paid tribute to another former Premier, that in the person of former Premier Ed Schreyer of this province, that made today possible.

So, Mr. Speaker, despite the Tritschler Commission Report, there have indeed been men and women of vision in Manitoba, men and women that have made today possible. We would welcome the announcement by the First Minister. We hope that the study will in fact translate itself into action and that there will indeed be benefits in the future for Manitoba, and we look forward and will monitor the developments with interest. I believe that in the future we will also be able to export our surplus energy to the United States, that we will indeed be able to undertake further developments in Northern Manitoba soon because of the initial

Thursday, 27 March 1980

work and undertaking and imagination that was provided principally during the period of leadership under the former Premier of this province, Ed Schreyer.

TABLING OF REPORTS

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

HON. WARNER JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Clean Environment Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. NORMA PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Legislative Library and the Provincial Archives for the year ending December 31st, 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Racing Commission for the year ending December 31st, 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to table the report of the Safety and Health in the Metallic Mining Industry of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne) introduced Bill No. 4, An Act to amend The Fatal Accidents Act and The Trustee Act and Bill No. 27, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question first is to the Minister of Economic Development. The Minister of Economic Development, some time in early February, indicated that a Montreal firm was being engaged to undertake a feasibility study pertaining to a \$50 million helicopter plant in Gimli. It was indicated that the report would be available on or before March 15th. Can the Minister advise (a) whether he has received the report, (b) if so, the recommendations within the feasibility study?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we have not received the report as yet. We are expecting it more towards the end of April.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further questions to the Minister of Environment. This past Thursday, in dealing with questions pertaining to the storage of PCBs at Werier Warehouse, the Minister had indicated that the containers were covered with plastic and were not leaking. Can the Minister confirm that in fact the containers had leaked prior to transfer from Warehouse No. 1 to Warehouse No. 2, and that Dr. Yee of his Department indeed had been advised of this in October of 1979?

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

Thursday, 27 March 1980

MR. JORGENSEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, then will the Minister undertake to check this out and to provide the House with information pertaining to leakage of one of the containers in October of 1979?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I will have to check what my honourable friend is saying. My understanding is that there was a piece of equipment that had been moved in there that was leaking but it did not contain PCBs; it contained just plain oil.

MR. PAWLEY: Further to the Minister of Environment. Can the Minister of Environment confirm that since notice of the existence of the PCBs, October of 1979, until their transfer in the latter part of February 1980, that no monitoring was done on the part of his department insofar as the storage of those PCBs?

MR. JORGENSEN: I am not sure what my honourable friend means by monitoring. The PCBs were contained in sealed containers and there was, to the best of my knowledge, no leakage upon inspection on periodic intervals.

MR. PAWLEY: Further to the Minister, is the Minister prepared to advise as to the number of inspections which take place between early October and the end of February on the part of his department?

MR. JORGENSEN: I am not in a position, Mr. Speaker, to advise as to the number of inspections during that period.

MR. PAWLEY: A final supplementary to the Minister. Is the Minister prepared to table the report received from his department pertaining to the PCBs at Werier Warehouse?

MR. JORGENSEN: I am prepared to table a report but that report will have to be compiled. I know of no formal report that has been made in connection with those PCBs, at least it has not come across my desk, but I will endeavour to check and find out if there was one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Could the Minister advise the House how many years the PCBs have been stored in that particular warehouse?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the PCBs were purchased by J. Werier and Company in 1973 and, I presume, have been stored on those premises since that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a questions to the First Minister. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the First Minister, in view of his statement as to previous development, could advise the House as to whether he could have made the announcement that he made today if we had followed the recommendations of Mr. Justice Tritschler of not building the Lake Winnipeg Regulation or the Churchill River Diversion in 1970, and instead have bought time and built a thermal plant and studied the matter further? Could we have done that and would that not have had disastrous - let me read these words - "disastrous results for the people of the province of Manitoba", and prevented him from making the announcement that he made today?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to set my honourable friend straight with respect to the whole sequence of development on the Nelson-Churchill System, with which I have some familiarity, regardless of the Tritschler Report.

Thursday, 27 March 1980

My honourable friend is well aware, Mr. Speaker, that the Tritschler Report merely confirms the indictment that was laid against my honourable friends when they were mishandling the affairs of Manitoba Hydro with their appointee, Mr. Cass-Beggs, whose overall administration, whose sequential development that took place under Mr. Cass-Beggs and the former Premier of this province, Mr. Speaker, cost the people of this province something on the order of \$500 million to \$800 million of lost money.

And, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend will stop yelping like a wild dog from his seat, because I know what I'm saying doesn't find favour with the Leader of the Opposition, and you know why, Mr. Speaker? Because it's true, and it's documented for all time, a record of mishandling and misappropriation of public funds and of public works, Mr. Speaker, that has never taken place in the history of any other province in the history of this country.

So if my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, wants to stand in his place today or at any other time from now till the turn of the century and try to say that the mishandling of Manitoba Hydro under his administration contributed to today's announcement, I can tell him that today's announcement was made possible in spite of all of the mishandling of my honourable friends and that we have been able to bring it around in the last two years with an idea that my honourable friends never even thought of.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, in view of the latitude provided to the First Minister in his response, is the same latitude going to be provided to members of the Opposition to provide responses to the answers that are being provided?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I point out to all honourable members, and I have read to you from Beauchesne before, if the honourable members want to listen, that the phrasing of a question that invites a lengthy detailed answer is the responsibility of the person that asked the question.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the answer had absolutely no relationship with the question, which was very predictable, Mr. Speaker, and since you have ruled on the point of order that the question should not invite a debate, Mr. Speaker, I will again ask the question, and you see, Mr. Speaker, whether it can be answered very quickly.

In view of the Minister's announcement and in view of the fact that past hydro development was referred to in his announcement, would he confirm exactly, would he confirm that if he followed the recommendations of the Tritschler Report which I am quoting, "Hydro was not ready in '70 to commit either Lake Winnipeg Regulation or Churchill River Diversion, it should have bought time to complete studies by purchase arrangements with adjacent utilities or by the building of a thermal plant. We should have bought power from other sources or built a thermal plant." I'm asking you, if we would have followed those recommendations, would the Minister have been able to make the announcement that he's making today?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that the question is argumentative. It is also hypothetical. It is based on a supposition that does not exist. Would the Honourable Member for Inkster care to rephrase his question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will rephrase the question. Mr. Speaker, would the first Minister, in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, which has always moved the Conservatives, in view of the fact that there is controversy over this subject, in view of the fact that there is controversy, would the First Minister consider appointing me as a one-man commissioner - and I offer to serve without fee - and to afford me \$3 million to show, Mr. Speaker, that the Tritschler Report would have resulted in disastrous results for the people of the province of Manitoba, and the First Minister would not have been able to make the announcement that he is making; would he do that?

Thursday, 27 March 1980

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have to thank my honourable friend for his very generous offer of his services to look into a charge and evidence and indictment and a finding of guilty that the proper commission has already passed upon. May I remind my honourable friend, however, Mr. Speaker, that the former distinguished leader of my honourable friend's party was the one who called for just such a commission in 1975, and then never proceeded to put it into place. If my honourable friends object to commission evidence of the kind that my honourable friend from Inkster is reading from, why didn't his government get around to fulfilling the promise of the former leader to have just such a commission?

Now, to answer him very shortly, Mr. Speaker, no, I wouldn't appoint him, because I say to my honourable friend that to anyone who wishes to read the report the evidence is irrefutable that my honourable friends did mismanage the affairs of Manitoba Hydro, did conceal from the Public Utilities Committee of this Legislature information that the committee should have had and, Mr. Speaker, that is in the report if my honourable friend would care to read that section to the people of Manitoba on television as well, Mr. Speaker. So I say, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend that he may not like either the report of the Tritschler Commission, and even worse, he and his leader may not like the answers they get to their questions but they are the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the member has said that the court has already ruled, I hereby give notice, Mr. Speaker, that an appeal will be launched against that rule. That appeal will be launched and the judge will be reversed. He has already been partially reversed in the federal election. He will be completely reversed in the future, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know whether the Honourable, the First Minister would have been able to make the announcement that he is making today, if the people of Manitoba had not had the initiative, the energy, the wisdom and the will to put into place the Churchill River Diversion, Lake Winnipeg Regulation and Jenpeg. Would he have been able to make that announcement?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, again I can hardly wait to answer my honourable friend. The answer to his question in short is, of course, yes, because Jenpeg and Lake Winnipeg Regulation should never have been built in the first place. Never in a month of Sundays should they have - \$330 million of the money of the people of Manitoba invested in one of the most useless power projects ever put in place in the history of this or any other province. Does my honourable friend want another answer?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister whether he considers as useless a facility which was put into place at a cost of \$180 million and produces power which is now selling at \$20 million a year, whether \$20 million a year in power produced and being sold shows that a facility on which you spent \$180 million, is worth zero. Is that Progressive Conservative economics?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, commonsense economics is that you don't build power plants that you don't need. Jenpeg was not ever part of the developmental system of the Nelson-Churchill system until Mr. Cass-Beggs came on the scene. My honourable friend knows that quite well too. It is the most expensive hydro generating facility ever put into place in the history of Manitoba. It is generating power at a cost per kilowatt hour away beyond the cost of any other facility in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and it should never have been built in the first place. So to reiterate my answer to the honourable member; Mr. Speaker, it is clearly and plainly this, that notwithstanding the fact that the NDP and their appointees saw fit to mishandle Manitoba Hydro, we have been able to overcome that and to enter into a Western Grid Feasibility Study notwithstanding all of the harm that they did, not only to Manitoba Hydro but to the ratepayers of this province for generations yet to come.

Thursday, 27 March 1980

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. If I sense there's a need for an urgent debate we could perhaps shorten the question period.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Honourable, the First Minister whether he will produce any hydro electric economist who has a sanity certificate who will say that a facility that produces and sells \$20 million worth of power a year is worth zero, whether any economist will confirm the position of the First Minister? Is it worth zero?

MR. LYON: I can only suggest to my honourable friend that in his moments of reflection, that in a moment of reflection that I hope will come to him shortly when he gets control of himself again, that he, Mr. Speaker, will take time to read the report of the Commission into Manitoba Hydro where he will find what I have just been saying to him documented, chapter, line and verse, by some of the most senior consultants on the North American continent who were assisting the Commission of Inquiry and who said that Jenpeg should never have been built, period, paragraph.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has said that I have not read the report. On a point of order I have read the report but like leading a horse to water, Mr. Speaker, you can lead both the Prime Minister and myself to read it, you cannot make one of them understand it, that's the First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to point out to the Honourable Member for Inkster that a disagreement on whether a person has read a report or not is not a point of order. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: It's not a disagreement. The Honourable First Minister has charged me with not reading the report. It's not a disagreement I'm telling him I read the report and I am entitled to put that on the record. I take it that he may get an 'A' in reading but he gets zero in understanding.

MR. SPEAKER: Again, I want to point out to the honourable member that every member in this Chamber has a right to stand up and correct a statement but it is not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture and I would like to ask the Minister if he or his office has received any information from the federal government, either from the Department of Agriculture or the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board, and my question pertains to information to find out whether or not it is the intention of the federal government to put all grains grown by farmers in western Canada completely under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, the only information I have received has been through the news media that in fact the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board made a comment that he thought the majority of farmers in western Canada were desirous of that taking place.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a supplementary question. I would like to ask the Minister if he will use his good offices to express the wishes, particularly of farmers of Manitoba, as to whether or not this would be in agreement, that they have all grains placed under the Canadian Wheat Board?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on the matter that is brought up by the Member for Rock Lake I would have to say that there would have to be a lot more consultation taken place between the grain producers of the province and the elected

Thursday, 27 March 1980

officials before a decision of this magnitude could be made and I would say that in fairness to them, they did have a plebiscite a few years ago on whether or not rapeseed would come under the control of the Canadian Wheat Board and at that particular time, Mr. Speaker, it was voted down by the farmers of western Canada.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the First Minister and ask him if he can confirm that Hydro will never be able to build or produce hydro power cheaper on a per kilowatt hour basis than they can presently produce from Jenpeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the plant that was commissioned last June, well in advance of when it needed to be commissioned, is producing power at a kilowatt charge cheaper than Jenpeg. Jenpeg is still the most expensive hydro electric power ever put into place in the history of Manitoba. It need never have been done.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister. Can he confirm that the present cost of Jenpeg power is 2.1 cents per kilowatt hour? The cost of producing power from Brandon and Selkirk thermal stations is 9 cents and 16 cents per kilowatt hour?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if My honourable friend wants to talk about apples and oranges he can go and juggle them. Mr. Speaker, the hydro-electric generating cost of Jenpeg is what I talked about. We all have thermal supplements. Every province has some thermal supplements. --(Interjection)-- No, I ask my honourable friend for Inkster to restrain himself, --(Interjection)-- I've never been more totally restrained or happy to answer questions in my life, Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to answer the questions of my honourable friend. Because, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends are on the worst losing wicket that they could ever hope to get on. The indictment that has been laid against and their maladministration during eight years when they tried to manage Manitoba Hydro redounds in infamy and will for all generations to come.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the First Minister whether it is true that when the turbines are spinning and all Manitobans have sufficient power for their use, that the cost of the next kilowatt hour is one-fifth of one cent per kilowatt hour because that is the cost of the water rental used to produce that kilowatt hour.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I don't know but I, of course, can suspect where my honourable friend learned his economics, and it wasn't in the school of common sense, I must say. All I can say to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, is that you don't put hundreds of millions of dollars into place in capital investments where you have no market for the product from the plant when it opens up. Manitoba stands today in a position of 40 percent overcapacity because of the maladministration of my honourable friends opposite. Against that background, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend wants to say, should we be selling interruptible power to the United States to salvage what we can, to salvage what we can out of that overbuilding, then I agree with him. And that is what Manitoba Hydro has been forced to do because of the overbuilding committed by my honourable friends who, today, Mr. Speaker, would like to say to everyone in Manitoba that black is white and up is down. What they did, stands in the report of the Commission and they were warned, Mr. Speaker, they were warned every foot of the way as they embarked upon this disastrous course. They were warned by a former Premier of Manitoba, Douglas Campbell, who had been appointed to the board; they were warned by Kris Kristjanson, who resigned from the board; and they still proceeded pig-headedly with the biggest misuse of public funds in the history of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

Thursday, 27 March 1980

MR. JIM FERGUSON: Yes, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Highways and ask him if he would reveal to the House the details of an accident that happened this morning, west of Carberry, involving two trucks and a train in which, I understand, that there is some more leakage of a substance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Well, Mr. Speaker, this morning there was a level crossing accident in foggy conditions on the Trans-Canada Highway, about a mile-and-a-half west of the junction of PTH No. 5 and the Trans-Canada Highway. The accident involved a collision with a train by a semi-trailer truck in which the driver, unfortunately, was killed in that accident. A second accident followed whereby a second truck collided with the train, also. That second truck, the driver was injured, he's in the Carberry Hospital; and the second truck was carrying a fertilizer product from Simplot Chemical in Brandon, Mr. Speaker. It was a nitrogen solution product and in collision with the train the transport truck and trailer, the transport trailer rolled over and there has been a certain amount of nitrogen solution spilled from that trailer as a result of the overturn.

Currently the carrier has engaged Paul's Hauling to be on the scene and as I understand it, they're on the scene right now pumping off the balance of the nitrogen solution that is still contained in the transport truck. The cleanup crew, or a cleanup crew, is on the site from Simplot Chemical to make sure that the spilled nitrogen solution, the fertilizer, is adequately contained in the immediate area where the accident and the roll-over occurred. We have a number of departments with personnel on the scene, Mr. Speaker, and it's my understand that the spill is contained. It's not considered to be a serious spill and everything, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. PETER FOX: I realize that the Honourable Minister is providing information, but I think he's stretching it. He's making a long story out of something he could have said, there is an accident and there was a spill, and that's it.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to thank the Honourable Member for Kildonan for the words of advice. I do realize that the answer does seem to be rather long. I just hope that all members take that into consideration when they're asking questions as well as when they're waiting for the answers.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: On a point of order. It may well be that the Minister has to do what he's doing, but can we revert to statements and have him do it, so that it can be treated as a proper statement. He had the impression it was finished.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources, and ask him whether . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order, the Minister for Highways had not finished completing his answer to that question, I don't believe.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. As far as I am concerned the Minister has finished his statement.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources, and ask him whether he would agree that the experiments conducted with the polar bears that he approved, in which two out of three of the

Thursday, 27 March 1980

animals died, were not necessary as indicated by Clive Roots, who is the Director of the Assiniboine Park Zoo, who said that they didn't prove a thing and, secondly, that if you make a living thing eat oil it will die. I ask him whether those experiments were not, in fact, a complete waste of time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to await the final report from the scientists involved in the project before I would be prepared to make that conclusion.

MR. DOERN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I might just add "a waste of time" and also, I believe, \$80,000.00. I would ask him whether he would also concede the complete failure of the Polar Bear Committee that he appointed to ensure the humane treatment and protection for the animals.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I first of all, should point out to the honourable member that if, in fact, it was \$80,000 involved that I would not want to leave the impression that was an expenditure by our government, but it was rather one undertaken by the federal government. Neither can I conclude that the committee did not carry out its responsibilities to see that the bears were not treated in an inhumane fashion. It was not expected, on the basis of information that was known, that one or more bears would die as a result of the experiment. If the honourable member will recall the original proposal for the study made in December of 1978, it was thought to be necessary at that time to sacrifice the bears in order to be able to conduct the post-mortem examinations to look for cellular damage and that sort of thing. So this was entirely unexpected and has nothing to do with the manner in which the committee carried out its responsibilities.

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

MR. DOERN: I would ask the Minister whether he can report on the condition of the third polar bear that survived.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: The latest information that I have, Mr. Speaker, is that the third bear is still alive and it is expected to live, but if the honourable member would be interested then we will be happy to keep him posted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. GARY FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not it is the intention of MHRC to sell off its senior citizens housing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to sell off the housing. There's been no recommendation by the board at any time.

MR. FILMON: Well in that case, Mr. Speaker, if MHRC has no intention of selling off its senior citizen housing, what does the Minister intend to do about rumours, or what is obviously a rumour that the government intends to sell them off?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have had calls from the MP, Mr. Bockstael, because he's had calls from senior citizen ladies who have been crying. There's

Thursday, 27 March 1980

been calls come into the MHRC office with people crying. It's been spread around through the whole of the senior citizens accommodation in Winnipeg that we are intending to sell them. Mr. Bockstael had one lady say to him that because we voted for you, Mr. Bockstael, the Conservatives are going to sell it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am checking at the present time, as much as possible, to find out where it came from but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, I will use every possible means to settle the minds of the senior citizens that are living in our accommodations.

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

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would address my question to whichever Minister is responsible for Transportation and ask that Minister if he could advise if he has met with the Federal Minister of Transportation, the Honourable Jean-Luc Pepin when he was in Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Transportation if the question of the Crow rate was discussed with the federal Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if he could confirm if this government has made a recommendation that the Crow rate be changed or abolished in favour of a compensatory rate.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, it seems as if the House is full of rumours today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Attorney-General. Would the Honourable Attorney-General explain how it would come about that the Clerk of the Court had issued a suspension of a driver's licence for a speeding ticket issued in 1976, that suspension ordered in March of 1980?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice. Perhaps if the Member for Fort Rouge would advise me as to the particulars and names I can look that matter up for her.

MRS. WESTBURY: While the Honourable Attorney-General is looking into that, could he also look into the fact that a registered letter informing a driver of a suspension was received on March 17, 1980, for a suspension taking effect on March 5, 1980, resulting in the fact that this driver was driving around unknowingly suspended for 12 days?

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that matter would relate more to the Minister of Highways, who is responsible for the Motor Vehicles Branch, Mr. Speaker, but unless the Member for Fort Rouge advises either myself or the Minister for Highways of the particulars, it will be impossible for us to look it up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Housing. I would ask whether the Minister, in view of last night's City Council decision to withdraw its support for 1980 from its own new Winnipeg Housing Rehabilitation Corporation, will be withdrawing provincial financial support from the project.

Thursday, 27 March 1980

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: The letter transmitted to the Mayor made no indication as to what the city would do, Mr. Speaker. The letter transmitted to the Mayor said the province would participate to the tune of \$200,000 a year for five years and that's a commitment we intend to keep if they want to use it.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister advise whether he is now satisfied in view of the shortfall of funding, whether there are sufficient funds being provided to the corporation in order to assure the viability of the new corporation?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't make the decisions for the city. We made a commitment as a provincial government to provide that money and we will do so. As the Member for West Kildonan mentioned, maybe it isn't necessary. Well, I have said that the money for the CMHC is booked for 1980. The money is used for the whole of Manitoba, the CMHC money. And, Mr. Speaker, maybe there'll be a time when they come across a good buy, or something of that nature, that they'll be able to move forward and do because we gave the assistance.

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

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in view of that response and that commitment on the part of the Minister and his government, we would ask whether or not the Minister would contemplate telescoping his provincial commitment of \$1 million in order to make up the shortfall that will be experienced by the Corporation as a result of last night's decision to reduce the city commitment by \$200,000.00.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister provide \$400,000 from the provincial commitment this year in order to bring the new Corporation's funding foundation up to its original commitment level? And I ask him that in view of the fact that he has assured us now that the Member for West Kildonan was correct and that CMHC funding will be available for the Housing Corporation next year.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I've never said that there wouldn't be possibly some money from CMHC last year, they look at every project individually. As far as telescoping, and making it \$400,000, that hasn't been discussed. The letter committed to the Mayor said that we were open for discussion. If something is good, it's good; we'll take a look at it, but it's not our intention to go running forward and say \$400,000 this year without discussion or the feasibility of doing it.

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

The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE - COMMITTEES

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I would like to make some changes on committees, and substitute the name of Mr. Filmon for Mr. Steen in Public Utilities; Mr. Filmon for Mr. Minaker in Public Accounts; Mr. Hyde for Mr. Gourlay in Agriculture; Mrs. Westbury for Mr. Green on Law Amendments; Mr. Kovnats for Mr. Steen in Rules; and Mr. McGregor for Mr. McGill on Rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, might I first advise members the Public Accounts Committee will meet on Tuesday, April 1st, at 10:00 a.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

Thursday, 27 March 1980

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - INTERIM SUPPLY

CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. Interim Supply--pass.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I had not intended to speak on Interim Supply but, Mr. Chairman, for what has been said in the House today and the kind of misrepresentation that has been made, longstanding dedicated civil servants have been dismissed on the basis of suggesting that something is contained in a document which is not contained in a document. You will all recall, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Batemen, who was a civil servant in this province of many years standing, was dismissed by the Progressive Conservative government, on the basis, Mr. Chairman, on this specious basis, that he had said that the Hydro Development Program was based on the recommendations and the Task Force Report. And under cross-examination, Mr. Chairman, he acknowledged that they weren't recommendations. But the report was there for anybody who wanted to see it. Mr. Bateman was not misrepresenting the report; he was indicating that that report was the basis upon which the Hydro Development Program proceeded.

And then some lawyer said to him: "There were no recommendations in the report." And he said, "Well, I guess they weren't recommendations." "So then, you were misleading the House". And he said, "Well, maybe that was misleading". "And you knew it to be misleading". And on that basis, Mr. Chairman, a long-standing civil servant employed by the Province of Manitoba, was fired. When in fact, Mr. Chairman, the Tritschler Commission Report itself says that the sequence, not the sequence, the program of Lake Winnipeg Regulation, the program of Churchill River Diversion, were programs which were based on the conclusions of the Task Force Report. And we are quibbling about the words "conclusions" or "recommendations". But they were all based on those things, and Mr. Batemen did not mislead.

But we have the First Minister get up today and say, Mr. Chairman, that the Tritschler Report confirms what Doug Campbell said; and confirms what Kristjanson said. Mr. Chairman, the First Minister should resign on the basis of the standards that he set for Mr. Bateman. Mr. Justice Tritschler doesn't confirm what Campbell said, nor does he confirm what Kristjanson said. Both of them said that he should proceed with Churchill River Diversion; right away.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Justice Tritschler said. . . and by the way, the First Minister then said that Tritscher finds that these people had been warning the government all along and that they were the ones who should have been listened to. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Tritschler Report says nothing of the kind. The interesting feature about the Tritschler Report, Mr. Chairman, is that it confirms none of the criticisms that were made by the honourable members when they were in opposition; none of them. The Tritscher Report, in fact, Mr. Chairman, is a finding against what was said by the members when they were in opposition because they said we should have proceeded with the Churchill River Diversion, and Mr. Tritschler, who admits that he has not evaluated what any of these changes has cost, and says that they cannot be evaluated. This is what he said, Mr. Chairman, he said that in 1970, when the New Democratic Party government came to power, they should have shelved the Churchill River Diversion; they should have shelved Lake Winnipeg Regulation; they should have built a thermal plant; and they should have engaged in studies. And the result of those studies remains a mystery as to what would have happened.

Mr. Chairman, that would have been a disaster for the people of the Province of Manitoba. We would have been defeated in 1973, and rightly so, if we built the thermal plant and delayed construction of the Churchill River Diversion and Lake Winnipeg Regulation. And maybe Mr. Justice Tritschler is thinking in retrospect;

Thursday, 27 March 1980

maybe that's what he hoped we would do so that we would have been defeated in 1973. And as it was, Mr. Chairman, over those years between 1969 and 1979, in spite of criticism of the most contradictory kind - proceed with the Churchill, don't proceed with the Churchill, proceed with Lake Winnipeg, don't proceed with Lake Winnipeg - we put in place all of the facilities which have enabled a five-year freeze of hydro-electric rates and which have enabled the kind of announcement that was made by the First Minister today, because without those facilities that announcement could not have been made.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is a very interesting thing who the First Minister seeks to hope to make credible. What you do, Mr. Chairman, you are answerable for; you've got to go back to your constituents. What I do I have to go answer to the public for. What the members of the government do, they have to answer to the public for. What a judge does, Mr. Chairman, can be reversed on appeal. What the Appeal Court does, can be reversed in the Supreme Court of Canada. But nobody holds George Tritschler responsible except, Mr. Chairman, the people of the province of Manitoba. And his report is so incredible that within weeks of its being issued the people overwhelmingly voted for the party that the First Minister says wasted \$500 million to \$700 million.

Mr. Chairman, I have an interesting personal observation. I walk down the streets of Winnipeg; I walk into Hudson's Bay; I walk into Eatons; I go into restaurants and generally - and this is good for a politician - I am recognized and people are generally friendly. Not one citizen in the province of Manitoba has come up to me and said, "You cost me \$500 million to \$700 million", because nobody, nobody believes what the First Minister is saying. Nobody.

Well, I am telling you, Mr. Chairman, that if there was a condemnation that this government cost the people \$500 million to \$700 million and the people believed it, they would not have voted for them in the federal election. And, Mr. Chairman, they would be telling it to me to my face. But nobody has made that remark. And the people of the province of Manitoba have filled that vacuum of responsibility which doesn't exist for Mr. Justice Tritschler, which exists for the Member for Lakeside, which exists for the Member for Souris-Killarney, which exists for myself, which exists for most judges who can be reversed on appeal, but doesn't exist for this man who said, "I will serve without pay as a one-man Commission to examine the criticism or to employ the terms of reference".

And, Mr. Chairman, it's very interesting because I'm not going to deal with the Tritschler Report today. I've given notice there will be a Notice of Appeal filed. Mind you, it's a Notice of Appeal after the effect because I am sure that the appeal has already been registered. But there will be a Notice of Appeal filed before this Legislature indicating the errors, the omissions, the inconsistencies, the outrageous statements and methods of judicial reasoning that have led to this document; this document, Mr. Chairman, which doesn't limit itself to Hydro development; which the man is so insistent on getting into the political involvement that even after he has finished his enquiry and some official of Manitoba Hydro issues a statement - some official last year issued a statement saying: "Look, we've been doing the right thing all along". A separate chapter, Mr. Chairman, is devoted to Mr. Justice Tritschler. Well, is it a whole chapter? I'm not sure it's a whole chapter, well, it probably is. What is it? Hydro's Public Relations. I'm not sure that that is the chapter, Mr. Chairman, but I've read it and there is a separate allowance made of criticizing this Hydro official who had the nerve to say that we've been right all along and we've been doing the right thing. That is also included in George Tritschler's terms of reference.

So I say to you I'm not going to deal with the matter today. I am only going to deal, Mr. Chairman, with certain succinct facts because the First Minister has chosen to say that Mr. Justice Tritschler has found \$500 million to \$700 million. He has not found 500 to 700 cents. He says he can't quantify it, Mr. Chairman. He says he can't quantify it. He doesn't say, "Jenpeg is a waste of \$180 million". He can't say it. What he says is that Jenpeg need not have been built, even though the first recommendation says it should have been built. He says it need not but he doesn't say what is it worth to the people of Manitoba today? He can't answer. That's a dangerous question to answer because then he'd have to find out. And what happens is that Jenpeg produces \$20 million of electricity a year which is sold and amortized on the basis of its investment. It is there; it is earning its way and it's available to do the kind of things that are necessary for the First Minister to make his announcement today.

Thursday, 27 March 1980

But anybody who says an asset producing \$20 million a year is worth nothing is an idiot, is a financial idiot.

Mr. Chairman, they have an asset; and I ask the Minister of Finance, would you say that CFI is worth nothing? Well, he should know, he would never value it at nothing. It's a good project. It's producing. It loses \$10 million a day but he doesn't value it at nothing. He's probably valuing it at something like \$150 million even though it loses \$10 million a year. Did I say a day? A year. --(Interjection)-- Well, I changed that. I make it a year. It loses \$10 million a year even on the basis of its existing financial statement which shows no losses but which relieves it of interest of more than \$10 million a year.

But we have financial wizards on the other side. You know, I went to a group of financial analysts and I said to them, "If you had an asset which was producing \$20 million a year, could you value it at zero? And they said, "No, who does that?" And I said, "Progressive Conservatives, that's their arithmetic". Because Tritschler didn't say that. Tritschler never added up those figures. What happened was, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister of Finance got the report he was looking for that statement because the Conservatives for five years have run around this province saying that the New Democrats have cost you - they started at \$200 million, then \$300 million, then \$400 million, then \$600 million - and they gave the reason. Mr. Chairman, they gave the reason; because you built Lake Winnipeg before you built Churchill. If you would have built Churchill first you would have saved \$600 million.

When the Minister of Finance got the report it was a disaster. A disaster. Tritschler hasn't been able to say that one cent was lost by building Lake Winnipeg before Churchill. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, Mr. Justice Tritschler has not been able to find one cent in losses by building Lake Winnipeg before Churchill. As a matter of fact he says it cannot be quantified and that the Task Force Report confirms what Bateman had been saying all along, that there was only a marginal difference between going one way or the other way.

When Mr. Craik got this - excuse me, the Minister of Finance - he was thunder-struck. The reporters are going to get this document, they're not going to find any \$600 million. So the Minister did a very peculiar thing. He ran through the report; he went through the facilities that Mr. Justice Tritschler said maybe were not necessary when they were built; he added them up and he says it comes to \$800 million; but he placed no value on the facilities.

Mr. Chairman, this is Progressive Conservative arithmetic. These are the people who are handling the affairs of the people of Manitoba. How long can we let this last? How long can the people of Manitoba trust their affairs to people who calculate in that way?

Mr. Chairman, I indicated I am not going to do it all today. I mean, I have been very anxious to get into it but I'm not going to do it today, I'm going to confine myself to certain basic propositions and I'm glad the First Minister is here. Because the First Minister talks about reading and I'm going to deal with the reading, Mr. Chairman. He has shown himself to be a graduate. He says that the Tritschler Report confirms Campbell; it doesn't. Campbell said you should build CRD; the Tritschler Report says no. He says the Tritschler Report confirms Kristjanson, Kristjanson said you should build CRD; the Tritschler Report says no. He says that it cost \$600 million; the Tritschler Report doesn't say that.

Mr. Chairman, I have read the entire report. I read it for my learned friend. I cannot make him understand it. Mr. Justice Tritschler says that when we took over the government we should have gone ahead with neither program. We should have built a thermal plant and studied it. The honourable member says no, that's not what it says.

Mr. Chairman, my honourable friends not only have a problem with arithmetic, they have a problem with English. They cannot understand the English language. I read it to the House earlier and I'm going to take a few minutes now again to find the page because my honourable friend has to hear it read again. --(Interjection)-- I'm interested to hear the honourable member protesting that Mr. Justice Tritschler never said that because that would obviously be horrendous, wouldn't it? I mean, if Tritschler said that it would be a terrible mistake on his part, would it not? I ask the Member for Lakeside, who says that Mr. Justice Tritschler never said that. What he is saying is that Mr. Justice Tritschler never said that because that would be totally wrong, wouldn't it? --(Interjection)--

Thursday, 27 March 1980

Mr. Chairman, I have lost the page. I had it here.

MR. ENNS: Great gobs of money were shot down the drain by you idiots, and that happens to be the truth.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I've found the page. The honourable member says that Mr. Justice Tritschler did not say that we should have proceeded neither with the Churchill River Diversion nor the Lake Winnipeg Regulation; we should have built a thermal plant and done studies.

The honourable member says that Mr. Justice Tritschler didn't say that and he also says that that would have been a terrible thing. Mr. Chairman, that's what he said. He knows I have found the page and he is a little concerned now. I am going to read what Mr. Justice Tritschler said:

"Hydro was not ready in 1970 to commit either Lake Winnipeg Regulation or CRD. It should have bought time to complete proper studies by purchase agreements. We should have bought power with adjacent utilities or by the building of a thermal plant. It rushed into both projects, with disastrous results".

Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Justice Tritschler says that in 1970 we shouldn't have built CRD. Kristjanson said we should have; Campbell says we should have, and we don't know what these studies of Mr. Justice Tritschler's would have found out.

If you are engaging in studies in 1970, I presume that it is to find out. So that he never said that we should ever go ahead with these programs. That is the basis of the Tritschler Report and that, Mr. Chairman, would have been a disaster. And if we would have done that the Member for Lakeside would have been on this side of the House yelling, "Studies, we've got the CRD, we've studied it for years, why are you not proceeding with it?" But we would have said, "We are engaging in studies because we hope a Judge nine years from now will say that we were right in studying". That's what he says, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lyon says that Campbell is confirmed by Tritschler; that's false. Mr. Lyon says that Kristjanson is confirmed by Tritschler; that is false. Mr. Lyon says that the Tritschler found losses \$500 to \$700 million; that is false, all of those figures. --(Interjection)-- Oh, Mr. Chairman, now he says that Tritschler doesn't say it. That's true.

MR. ENNS: We never said that.

MR. GREEN: He has finally read the Tritschler Report.

MR. ENNS: We never said that Tritschler said that.

MR. GREEN: Now, Mr. Chairman, get that, get that, get the Member for Lakeside's remarks. He says that the Conservatives have never said that the Tritschler Report confirms losses of \$500 to \$700 million.

MR. ENNS: No, that's not right. No, no, no. That's a good courtroom lawyer for you . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing; Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the Tritschler Report unless - and I've given you . . .

MR. ENNS: You get paid \$75 an hour across the street for doing that, but not here.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I have given you how they can get there. I have given you how they can get there. I've added the figures for you. --(Interjection)-- If you take a \$180 million asset which is producing \$20 million a year and say that it is worth nothing, which is apparently the way Progressive Conservatives calculate, then you can get to \$8 million.

But Mr. Justice Tritschler wouldn't do that. No economist would do that. No accountant would do that. Nobody in fact who had any knowledge of elementary mathematics or economics, would do that. The only one who would do that is a Progressive Conservative, he's the only one who would do that.

Thursday, 27 March 1980

So, Mr. Chairman, I told you I'm not going to deal with it all today. I am going to file the Notice of Appeal showing all of the errors that have been made but I can say this, that although I cannot say that the Minister doesn't know how to read, what I know is that Mr. Craik, when he got this report, had to make an invention and he made his invention and we are now engaged in the Craik school of falsification of which student No. 1 is the First Minister. Student No. 1 is the First Minister, Mr. Chairman.

And when the First Minister said that this was so, when he adopted Mr. Craik's remarks, he said it was a Conservative estimate, Mr. Chairman. He should have said that it was a Progressive-Conservative estimate because that's the kind of estimate it is.

Mr. Chairman, I have not only read the report in its entirety, every word, but I have received sound professional engineering advice that the following conclusions, that these are the conclusions that are documented in the report:

No. 1. The sequence of Lake Winnipeg Regulation, Churchill River Diversion adopted by Manitoba Hydro, was based on and supported by the conclusions of the Task Force Report which indicated, Mr. Chairman --(Interjection)-- This is the Tritschler Report. This is in the Tritschler Report. In the report, Mr. Chairman, which indicated that there was no substantial economic difference as between either sequence. That's what the Task Force Report said. It said that the differences were marginal. There may have been a short-term advantage. --(Interjection)-- That's what the first version said.

MR. LYON: That's after you've tinkered with them.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, that's what the first version said . . .

MR. LYON: You misread the report. You misled the House.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Justice Tritschler said there was no substantial difference between the first version or the second version and those are practically his words. He said there was no substantial difference. Mr. Chairman, that's No. 1.

Not only does Mr. Justice Tritschler --(Interjection)-- The Commission heard no evidence - just a minute - it heard no evidence and made no findings, that having proceeded with this sequence there was a waste to the taxpayers of \$600 million, let alone 600 million cents.

Mr. Justice Tritschler makes no quantitative finding as between going in one direction or going in the other direction, and says he can't - says he can't, Mr. Chairman. --(Interjection)-- Sure, go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, would my honourable friend care to refresh his memory and tell me if these statements by Mr. Justice Tritschler are true? On Page 465: "The final cost of the combined Lake Winnipeg Regulation-Jenpeg is some \$315 million. The cost allocated to control work is \$125 million, as compared to the \$50 million projected at the time of the LWR project".

And on Page 21: "Had a proper project evaluation been carried out, it would have demonstrated that Jenpeg was not viable for power. Obstinate refusal to heed warnings has resulted in substantial and unnecessary costs being borne by the Manitoba consumers".

Will my honourable friend confirm that that's in the report?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think that there are lots of irrational statements in the Tritschler Report. Mr. Chairman, but not one of the statements that he had read makes a finding. He says that an estimate of \$50 million was increased to \$125 million. He doesn't say there's been a loss of \$75 million. He doesn't say the project isn't worth \$125 million. He doesn't say that that has been a waste of \$125 million. I'll show you the same George Tritschler, about what he said when he was defending the Grand Rapids project, who said that these

Thursday, 27 March 1980

kinds of installations are normal, the same George Tritschler, Mr. Chairman, the same George Tritschler. In the percentage they are comparable.

But anyway, my friend read out statements. Did any of those statements say that there has been a loss of \$600 million by proceeding in a different sequence? They need not have been built. Does any of those statements make a finding as to what they are worth today to the Province of Manitoba?

MR. LYON: Why build something you don't need? It's like the government garage.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, that may be true; that may be true. But my honourable friend goes from there to a very interesting conclusion. I don't need another house, and I build one, and somebody says, "You fool, why did you build it?" And it cost me \$20,000 to build, but is worth \$30,000.00. By my friend's reasoning, the house is worth zero; by my reasoning it's worth \$30,000 even though I didn't need it.

Now I am not saying that we didn't need it, but Mr. Justice Tritschler makes no finding as to what those facilities are worth to the Manitoba Hydro system and he does not say that we are \$600 million worse off for having built them, and that's what the . . . oh, take it easy. When I hear the kind of junk that's posed at me from the other side of the House it's hard to take it easy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I am going to make these statements again and I am going to run them through without a question just so that they will sink in.

1. The sequence of Lake Winnipeg Regulation, Churchill River Diversion adopted by Manitoba Hydro was based on and supported by the conclusions of the Task Force Report which indicated that there was no substantial economic difference as between either sequence. All of these things are findings of the Tritschler Report or conclusions which are based on what Mr. Justice Tritschler wrote.

2. The Commission heard no evidence and made no findings that, having proceeded with this sequence, there was a waste to the taxpayers of \$600 million, let alone 600 million cents. They don't find any waste.

3. There is no evidence, and this is the important thing, there is no evidence or findings that any alternative program or scheme of development would have resulted in greater economy than that which was achieved.

Mr. Justice Tritschler makes no attempt to say, if they had left this out they would be further ahead or that they would have saved money or that they would have a more valuable system. The only alternative suggestion that's made by Tritschler is that in 1970 when we came to power, and you remember the pressure that was on us to get Hydro Development, we should have built a thermal plant or bought power from Ontario and Saskatchewan, and studied. Mr. Chairman, if we did that, we should have been defeated; and the reason that we didn't do that, the reason that we took the bull by the horns. . . Mr. Chairman, I've stopped for a diversion, one of the most interesting statements I heard on television was made by Dave Courchene, who said very seriously, "Now is the time to take the bull by the tail and look it straight in the eye". We took the bull by the horns and we went ahead with these projects, Mr. Chairman. And if the First Minister, who is here, and I am anxious to discuss this with him, I tell him that I'm not finished, that I am preparing a Notice of Appeal that will be much more detailed than what I'm dealing with at present. I just want to get over the three subjects which I know, Mr. Chairman, are not in the report.

Now the First Minister, who thinks that he is good at reading, I repeat, he gets zero for comprehension. He proceeds on the assumption that a completed project built before its time has no value. Isn't that what he's saying? That if you do something in advance of its time it's worth nothing. Isn't that stupid, Mr. Chairman? That if you built the hydro plant, and you found that you could have built it two years later, it seems to me that even if that was your conclusion it doesn't become worth nothing. You carry your interest charges for two years; that's what you do, to hundreds of millions. Mr. Chairman, you'd better calculate that. Now if Jenpeg was built two years too early. . .

Thursday, 27 March 1980

MR. LYON: Jenpeg should never have been built.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, you know, the Minister says that Jenpeg should never have been built. Even Mr. Justice Trites says that the first recommendation upon which Jenpeg was based was right, that at the time that they received the first recommendation to go ahead with Jenpeg it made sense and they should have gone ahead with it. That some years later, some time. . .--(Interjection)--- it's not in there?

MR. LYON: I said, you'd better find the quote.

MR. GREEN: I will sure find it for you. That some time later there was a re-evaluation and before they started they could have stopped. That's what Mr. Justice Trites said. My learned friend says he didn't find that; maybe he didn't read the report, Mr. Chairman. That's what he said. That the first recommendation, and we'll test each others memory on this, that the first recommendation was it made sense when they brought it in, but that some years later there was some changes and they shouldn't have proceeded with it, which I happen to disagree with Mr. Justice Trites. And I had the responsibility to go to the citizens. . .he is very fortunate, you know, he doesn't have to answer to anybody, not to anybody, therefore he can make any irresponsible statement he wants. ~~That's right~~, Mr. Chairman. I say that this book contains irresponsible state-

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable member's time is up.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I do not back off one step from that. I don't care if he's a judge, I don't care if he's God, he has made irresponsible statements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I start with those well-worn words that I had not intended to participate in this debate. But hearing some of the comments and unfortunately, the last comment by my honourable friend from Inkster, and I do wish that he would reconsider what he has just said.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to reconsider. I want to reconsider for my honourable friend. I want to go back to what Mr. Seigny. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend has had his chance, maybe he'll let me have mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: I think my honourable friend will, Mr. Chairman, after the heat of the moment has passed his fevered brow, wish to reflect and cogitate upon some of the implications of his last remarks, because he, by implication, and I give him every benefit of the doubt, because he is an honourable man. I'm speaking of the Member for Inkster. I say that I do not think that he would wish, even by implication, to question in any way the integrity of the former Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Chairman, I merely ask my honourable friend to reflect upon that proposition and perhaps when the passion of the moment has passed he may agree that my friendly suggestion to him would be worth following.

Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend has made a number of deviations from the report of the Trites Commission this afternoon in an attempt, in an attempt that I find is intellectually unsupportable from a mind as good as the Honourable Member for Inkster, to say in effect that up is down, that black is white, that round is square, and really, he is saying he should almost qualify for being a member of the "flat earth society." How anyone can read the Commission of Inquiry

into Manitoba Hydro, which my honourable friend has in front of him and come up with some of the statements that he has made, and even more particularly, his former leader, the Leader of the Opposition, makes from time to time, and I've even heard the Member for St. Vital on television on one occasion trying to make cement out of straw, and doing a valiant job but failing abysmally, trying to worm their way out of the clear precise findings that were made by the Commission of Inquiry with respect to the fundamental mismanagement of the Hydro Electric Utility when my honourable friends had responsibility for government in this province.

The report, I know, bothers my honourable friends but their comments about it will not in any way diffuse, or in any way color the truth that is contained in that report. Because it was the truth, Mr. Chairman, that was self-evident, I would think, to many many people, certainly many members of the Hydro staff were aware of this, throughout the peace. But my honourable friends persisted in proceeding ahead on matters that, as it turns out unfortunately for even generations yet unborn, were beyond their ken, and proceeded on a course, and the word that I have used on many occasions, was disastrous. I believe that word is used in the Commission Report as well, a disastrous course of development.

Now what did Mr. Justice Tritschler say on the development sequences - and that's what we're talking about. He said, on page 23, "The development sequence adopted for the utilization of the Nelson-Churchill River Systems, did not promote economy and efficiency", and these are excerpts, Mr. Chairman, "Lake Winnipeg Regulation should not have been committed. Jenpeg power commitment should have been cancelled. Long Spruce was committed too early without any economic justification. The Churchill River Diversion was re-committed in 1972 without adequate appreciation of engineering and mitigation problems. Burntwood River plants perceived to be an economic alternative, remain unavailable as they have not been adequately studied. Limestone was committed in 1975 in the absence of other alternatives and construction was commenced without adequate analysis of the economics of postponement".

Now, Mr. Chairman, those are a collection of statements made as findings by the Commission with respect to hydro. Now, my honourable friend wants to argue about what it cost. Now, Mr. Chairman, when you say that Lake Winnipeg Regulation should not have been committed, you mean that means it shouldn't have been done at that time and the report goes on to say, "if ever, if ever, if ever", Mr. Chairman.

MR. GREEN: I want to ask the Honourable Minister a question. He certainly asked me a question.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend is free to ask me any questions when I finish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: The Commission. . . on the development sequence, because there was some objection taken by my honourable friends in the course of Question Period when I mentioned the fact that the Public Utilities Committee of this House had been misled. On page 20, what does the Commission say? The Commission is critical of those who publicly misrepresented the validity of the sequence chosen, that is, Lake Winnipeg Regulation before Churchill River Diversion, or remained silent when circumstances warranted correction of misstatements. --(Interjection)-- And all the Member for Inkster can say is that the Commission was wrong when they made that finding a fact.

MR. GREEN: That's right, that's right. What is it based on?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, on page 19, on the Regulation of Lake Winnipeg, what did the Commission say? "The construction of Lake Winnipeg Regulation prior to the Churchill River Diversion did not promote efficiency in the supply of power. Economic strategy should have dictated the development of the Churchill River Diversion in advance of Lake Winnipeg Regulation." My honourable friend can twist and turn and wiggle all he wishes. That is the fact. That is the finding, and that is the fact.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if you build something that you don't need and you have to pay carrying charges on it, my honourable friend has been in business long enough to know, that if you put \$315 million - and I correct the figure, I think I used the figure \$330 million before - but if you put \$315 million in place for Lake Winnipeg Regulation and for a power plant that you don't need, then, Mr. Chairman, you are paying carrying charges in the scores of millions of dollars, to say nothing, Mr. Chairman, of the fact that the particular projects in question might never have needed to be built, and if at all, way down in the 1990s. And that's in the report and I'll come to that, just to refresh my honourable friend's memory.

On page 20, "The timing of Lake Winnipeg Regulation and associated power development at Jenpeg was not an optimal choice. Had the Churchill River Diversion preceded Lake Winnipeg Regulation, the need for subsequent development of Lake Winnipeg Regulation was not a certainty. Hydro's commitment of it was inexcusable." Those were the words of the Commission, Mr. Chairman. No need to speculate about it. That's it. Hydro's commitment of it was inexcusable. --(Interjection)--

On page 454 of the report, Mr. Chairman, "Cass-Beggs and Bateman stated to the public that the board decisions to proceed with Lake Winnipeg Regulation ahead of the Churchill Diversion were based on the final report of the task force. Their statements were false". --(Interjection)-- Oh, well, you see now, Mr. Chairman, we're going to have a commission report written by the Member for Inkster because he doesn't like the one that came in from a neutral source; he's going to write one himself.

So I say to my honourable friend that kind of an argument from him really does a lot of harm to his intellectual reputation. Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has got to say more in this House, his former leader and colleagues have got to say more in this House than it isn't right. They've got to prove it isn't right.

On Page 18, "Cass-Beggs gave figures to the Standing Committee which were false and Mr. Bateman, who knew better, remained silent. Other staff members must be faulted for failure to correct statements known by them to be erroneous." What does my honourable friend say about that? Was the Commission wrong there, too?

Mr. Chairman, on Page 17, "Costs of Lake Winnipeg Regulation were consistently under-estimated by Hydro with the carelessness ranging from from reckless to irresponsible." And that's part of the record of Manitoba under the guidance of the New Democrats, who claim to be managers of public affairs. --(Interjection)-- The Member for Inkster says that the Commission made an irresponsible statement, yes. Well, Mr. Chairman, there is an ultimate court of appeal that my honourable friend is well aware of and that's the public opinion. I'm quite satisfied with the brand that has been quite profitably imprinted on my honourable friends for a kind of callous mismanagement and maladministration by this report is something that they and their party are going to carry for many many decades in this province, and they deserve to because of what they cost this province.

Mr. Chairman, on Page 465, "The final costs for the combined Lake Winnipeg Regulation-Jenpeg project is some \$315 million. The cost allocated to control work is \$125 million, as compared to the \$50 million projected at the time of the Lake Winnipeg Regulation project."

MR. GREEN: What's it worth?

MR. LYON: Well, if my honourable friend at some stage in the course of this Sessions wants to stand up and give us a dissertation on the worth of Lake Winnipeg Regulation, I'd love to be here to hear it because, Mr. Chairman, no such justification exists, not on this world anyway. It may in my honourable friend's private little world but it doesn't in the real world that we're talking about.

Mr. Chairman, on Page 21, what did the Commission say, "Had a proper project evaluation been carried out it would have demonstrated that Jenpeg was not viable for power. Obstinate refusal to heed warnings has resulted in substantial and unnecessary costs being borne by Manitoba consumers." My honourable friends say that finding was wrong, too?

Oh, yes, on Page 465, Mr. Chairman, "The decision to proceed with the Jenpeg Generating Station was a serious and costly error. Obtuseness of the approach followed by Hydro meeting to its committal to the Russian tender compounded the original decision error."

Mr. Chairman, the Hydro Task Force my honourable friend tries to make out in some kind of verbal witchery that he's carrying on, that the Hydro Task Force was a justification for anything. On Page 17, what did the Commission say? "The sequence and program recommended by Cass-Beggs and adopted was at variance with the news of the task force and Hydro's executive."

Mr. Chairman, read Page 104, "The conclusions do not thoroughly reflect the engineering and economic judgment of the task force that Lake Winnipeg Regulation should not be installed in advance of CRD."

Mr. Chairman, carrying on, on Page 17, and I ask my honourable friends to pay particular attention to this, "After July 30, 1970, the public was subjected to a continuing course of misinformation and deception." Was that what my honourable friend . . . --(Interjection)-- Sometime in this session I would love to hear my honourable friends respond to that indictment, and find it.

At Page 453, Mr. Chairman, "The chairman orchestrated the work of the task force to validate his earlier conclusions. This does not absolve the task force members of responsibility for their work and report. They should have, but did not adhere to their terms of reference", Mr. Chairman under the guidance of my honourable friends opposite, a pattern of deception and withholding of facts from the public of Manitoba that was found as a fact by the Commission of Inquiry by my honourable friends opposite and principally by their appointee, their first appointee as the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, Mr. Cass-Beggs. The Member for Elmwood says "a good man", let him read the report and see what kind of a good man he thinks he is, after he's finished the report. --(Interjection)-- And somebody on the other side has the gall to say, "And who was Tritschler?" Well, Mr. Chairman, we all know who Cass-Beggs is and we all know what he, aided and abetted by the former Premier of this province and my honourable friends opposite, cost the public of Manitoba, a political appointment that they made, a political appointment that they made in this province after he had been fired in the Province of Saskatchewan. We all know about Mr. Cass-Beggs.

Mr. Chairman, on Page 118, because my honourable friend from Inkster was talking about Mr. Campbell, "Mr. Douglas Campbell questioned the decision in a letter to the board"; we're talking about the task force study and let me interrupt, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Douglas Campbell is a man who was a distinguished Premier of this province and a friend, I think, to all of us in this House. He was approached, as we all know, by the former Premier, Mr. Schreyer, to sit on the Hydro Board. He was asked by the former Premier to sit on the Hydro Board. On Page 18, what is said there? "Mr. Douglas Campbell questioned the decision in a letter to the board on April 12, 1971. He claimed that Task Force Report was not a sound, technical or practical appraisal. Mr. Batemen chose to interpret this statement as expressing doubt about the integrity of the task force and converted a question regarding the technical soundness of the task force into a question about the professional integrity of the members."

Mr. Chairman, and later on I'll come to the point where Mr. Campbell then went personally to the former Premier of this province and literally pleaded with him to stop the disastrous course of action upon which that NDP government was embarked with the most important utility that we have responsibility for in this House. So, let my honourable friends say that those findings are not true. Let them prove that they're not true.

Mr. Chairman, on Page 112, in dealing the actions of Hydro staff, Cass-Beggs mislead the board by not informing it of the real opinion of the task force members, which was known to him. "Senior members of Hydro, who were present at the board meetings of July 22 and 30, 1970, should have been insured that the board, and hence the government, were properly informed." Where is that willowy voice across the way that wants to talk about Mr. Cass-Beggs now? And there's lots more here and you're going to hear it.

Mr. Chairman, on Page 119, a statement from the Council of Profession Engineers was issued. Quoting from that statement, "There is no intention of getting involved in the political considerations of this or any other matter unless evidence that engineering information is being misrepresented to justify a political decision. None of the members of the task force was placed in a position that compromised his profession responsibility," and the Commission then goes on to say, "The association could not have been privy to the circumstances under which the task force prepared its report, as brought out in evidence."

Thursday, 27 March 1980

Mr. Chairman, these are just a few selective quotes that I'm giving to indicate to my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, that squirm and twist and words as he will or may, he can't evade the findings that were made with respect to this continued course of deception that was practised by that Chairman of Manitoba Hydro and carried out right into the Public Utilities Committee of this very Legislature, chaired by member of the Legislature who was also a board member of Hydro. How judicial; how judicial, Mr. Chairman.

Well, Mr. Chairman, on Page 410 of the report, and I'm just giving my honourable friends the briefest quotes I can, "Hydro has often failed to provide timely and accurate information. It is concluded that inaccurate information provided through the early 1970s had much to do with the delays in completing the Churchill River Diversion. Recent information releases," this is coming up to recent times, Mr. Chairman, "of Hydro have continued to be self-serving and do not correctly reflect known facts. The Director of Public Affairs made a public pronouncement stating: This 1979 surplus shows critics that the course of action we followed was the right one. We have gone through a lot of public abuse and now our building is paying off."

Mr. Chairman, is not the line we're hearing from our honourable friends opposite that is being parroted or was being parroted by the Director of Information at Manitoba Hydro? And what did the Commission say about that? "Senior management," said the Commission, "is well aware that these public pronouncements were inaccurate. The 1979 surplus does not prove that the course followed by Hydro was correct. The rates charged to Hydro's customers are based on a cost of the service which has been inflated by the necessity to recover the cost of facilities that were imprudently incurred and which were not required." That's the finding of the Commission.

And the Commission continues, Mr. Chairman, "The customer would not realize that the amount he was being charged was larger than it would have been but for some managerial blunders during the preceding years, nor was he told of all the reasons why Hydro's 1978-79 performance was better than was stated in the release."

Mr. Chairman, again, on Page 410, "The reader was intended to understand that generating capacity of Jenpeg and Long Spruce were good news, shielded from the fact that evidence showed that Jenpeg generation was committed unnecessarily, was a financial disaster, and the power produced the most expensive in Hydro's history, and Long Spruce was constructed in advance of Manitoba's need, while providing significant revenues, is not profitable." Is my honourable friend or any of his colleagues going to stand in their place and say, "That's just not true"?

MR. GREEN: That's not true.

MR. LYON: The Member for Inkster obliges me, he says after a two and-a-half year study with a close review of all of the evidence - I believe that my honourable friend gave evidence - that finding is not true.

MR. GREEN: That is not a correct finding.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend's got the rest of the session and, indeed, Mr. Chairman, the rest of his life to try to prove that it's not true.

MR. GREEN: I will; it won't take me that long.

MR. LYON: Yes, yes, well, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GREEN: It won't take 10 minutes.

MR. LYON: "A review of Hydro's public relations points to the conclusion that its Department of Public Relations should change its objectives to provide the public with factual information and not indulge in a self-serving public relations program."

Mr. Chairman, does my honourable friend want to hear some more about the findings of the Commission that he --(Interjection)-- oh, no, it doesn't matter. My honourable friend - it's funny, he didn't bother quoting any of these though, did he?

MR. GREEN: No.

MR. LYON: No, he didn't quote any of these findings of the Commission when he was trying to squirm, twist, and get himself, and his colleagues and his former leader off the hook on which they are impaled for all time. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't take any particular joy in them, because as my honourable friend knows, I was one of those who, as a private citizen, went before the Lake Winnipeg Regulation Board and, in effect, pleaded with my honourable friends to stop the course that they were on at that time because it was going to cost the ratepayers of Manitoba a large amount of money.

I think the figure I used back 1971 or '72, when I made one submission to that board was, if my memory serves me, Mr. Chairman, \$50 million. I pleaded then with the government of the former Premier of this province to stop the course of action that they were engaged upon, because it was patently obvious to anyone who knew anything about Hydro, that they were on a disastrous course. Mr. Chairman, the Commission has now found that is the case. There were many many people throughout the length and breadth of Manitoba who knew it but because, as the Commission found, that the obtuseness of my honourable friends and some people of Manitoba Hydro, the people of Manitoba were subjected to these tremendous costs and their rates were escalating. Let my honourable friend get on to this topic some time in this session, or in the rest of his lifetime, and tell the people of Manitoba why it was necessary on a compound basis for them and their instrument, Manitoba Hydro, to raise Hydro rates 150 percent over a three-to-four-year period. Maybe my honourable friends would like to answer that question, and then in the course of answering it, Mr. Chairman, they can begin to tell us about why you have to pay carrying charges on capital installations that need not have been committed or put into place, and that was what causes hydro rates to rise. Because when you're paying carrying charges on things that you don't need to build, it costs the public money. It's a very simple proposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, well, my honourable friend has the rest of the session to try to explain some of these very common-sense findings that were made by the Commission.

Mr. Chairman, on Page 18: "Repeated attempts to expose the facts by opponents of the sequence and program were blocked by the government majority on the Standing Committee on Public Utilities, which deemed it fitting that a government member, also a member of the Hydro board, should preside as Chairman during examination of Hydro's affairs."

That's a finding of the Commission, Mr. Chairman. My honourable friend, I suppose, says that's not true either. --(Interjection)-- I see. My honourable friend says that it wasn't the member of the Hydro Board and the Socialist Government who was the Chairman, I said who blocked the attempts? Because I was there on a few occasions as a private citizen and saw the blocking take place, Mr. Chairman. That's a finding of fact which my honourable friend can wiggle all he wishes about. It happened. It's true and was found in the Commission report. I'd love to hear his comment about how the government majority of which he was a member at that time, blocked - blocked - in this committee of the Legislature, the attempt by opponents of this sequential development scheme to get their case before the committee. I'd love to hear my honourable friend prove that that isn't true. --(Interjection)--

And on Page 234, Mr. Chairman: "The repeated ignoring of these warnings was unfortunate and demonstrates an unwillingness to review hydro critically."

Another example was the establishment of the special Advisory Committee to Cabinet. "Solidarity of approach between government and Hydro was the posture adopted throughout, and government was unwilling to admit the possibility of error. It shut its eyes and failed to respond to the many concerns being expressed about Hydro. This solidarity of approach and lack of critical appraisal of Hydro by government is all the more astonishing in light of the fact that Mr. Schreyer testified that from time to time he had reservations and concerns about Hydro."

And the Leader of the Opposition gets up today and asks that peons of praise should be offered to the leadership in that period, covered by the Commission's report in that statement, and many others that appear - not very likely, Mr. Chairman. Not very likely.

On Hydro rate increases on Page 19: "How much such deviation have cost the consumer cannot be precisely quantified." That's true. "It is obvious to the Commission that the adverse impact on rates has been significant."

Page 23: "The Commission finds that Hydro's actions have resulted in significant and unnecessary increases in rates. It is certain that a very large sum is involved, one which must be borne by Manitoba consumers." Does my honourable friend say that that is a mistaken finding as well? And he's got today and the rest of the session to prove that that finding is wrong, Mr. Chairman.

And on Page 346: "There is no evidence that the government or Hydro paid any serious attention to the warning of significant weaknesses in Hydro's financial position or the implication that the increasing demands for capital to support its projected expansion program could jeopardize the province's capacity to support its other programs."

On the export of power, Page 14 the Commission found: "Failure to recognize the importance of export marketing has been a major deficiency in Hydro's planning process." And the Leader of the Opposition stands up today and battles words about wanting to take credit for the Western Grid. Some credit, Mr. Chairman, some credit that government could take for anything except the maladministration of Hydro for eight years.

Well, Mr. Chairman, with only a minute left, that I've only begun to make my point. And if my honourable friends wish to continue the debate on Hydro, I can assure them that I will be happy to join them at any time, because they cannot, notwithstanding, Mr. Chairman, they cannot in any way, shape or form try to distort the words of the Commission report. They are certainly free to try to disprove them and I invite my honourable friends to attempt to do that. But to say merely it isn't true is not good enough. It won't wash here in the Legislature. It won't wash with the people of Manitoba. My honourable friends, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friends killed their own albatross; it'll now hang around their necks for the rest of their lives.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: . . . might as well let me say that I intend to prove everything that I say out of the mouth of Mr. Justice Trites, using no other evidence, Mr. Chairman. With respect to the fact that my learned friend will continue to read what I have termed, advisedly, irresponsible statements, I repeat that, Mr. Chairman.

My honourable friend says I've challenged the integrity. I don't challenge my friend's integrity. He believes everything he says. Mr. Justice Trites believes everything he says, but they are irresponsible statements. I am not sinking to the depths of Conservatives, Mr. Chairman. And by the way I happened to agree with those Conservatives at the time.

Mr. Pearson set up a commission to examine Mr. Deifenbaker. It was the most vindictive, political act ever committed in the history of Canada. Mr. Deifenbaker had some choice words to say about a Supreme Court Justice, a sitting Justice, Mr. Justice Spence. He was sitting on the Supreme Court of Canada and Mr. Deifenbaker said, and I'm paraphrasing: "A drum-head commission set up in political vindictiveness and designed to bring about a desired result." That's what the Conservatives said about a commission.

Mr. Sévigny was much more eloquent. He said, when they first came to him, "Horse manure," and he didn't say "manure", Mr. Chairman. --(Interjection)-- I am telling you what Sévigny said. Mr. Chairman, I have given my remark about the commission. I said that there are irresponsible statements in this report; that they are responsible to nobody; that there is no appeal; that he does not have to face the electorate; that he doesn't have to face anybody; that he is not appealable, and has proceeded accordingly.

As a matter of fact, a judge proceeding in court is subject to appeal. And we say, oh, yes, I've told the members of the House that I will file my appeal, Mr.

Thursday, 27 March 1980

Chairman. I certainly will. My honourable friend should know what is irresponsible.

About a week ago the Member for Morris got up and said, 3,500 have left, and I don't disagree with the Member for Morris. At the time he knew that there was another estimate. At the time he knew that there was another estimate, but he said, "I'm not going to bring another estimate in because it, too, may be wrong". I sympathize with the honourable member. I sympathize with him. He had 35; it came in wrong. He knew about another one, and he said, "I'm not going to say anything, that one might come in wrong."

For doing that, and even on no evidence whatsoever, because Mr. Justice Tritschler doesn't find, he doesn't find that Cass-Beggs knew - or not on any evidence - he said, "I believe that when Cass Beggs gave the figure \$50 million, he knew there was another one. Bateman said he knew that Cass-Beggs was giving a wrong figure, but he didn't want to change him. But all that we are talking about is an estimate. If it's good enough --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, if it's good enough . . .

MR. LYON: For how many months did they . . . to the House.

MR. GREEN: They came in and then they gave us the next estimate at the next report. Mr. Chairman, if it's good enough for the Member for Morris to say that, "I had an estimate of \$35,000. I got a new one but I wasn't going to give that one, because I would be found wrong again." And he doesn't get fired, and no irresponsible statements are made about him misleading the House. And I don't say it, because he didn't mislead the House. Why do they say that when Cass-Beggs does that? He had an estimate of \$50 million. . .

A MEMBER: That's different.

MR. GREEN: Well, of course. Mr. Chairman, of course. Do you know what the First Minister said just now. He said, "I didn't say that, the Commission said it." Because it's an irresponsible statement; he wouldn't make it. He says that the Commission made it. He said that the Commission made it.

MR. LYON: Yes, that's right.

MR. GREEN: Now I'm going to read you, Mr. Chairman, my finding. Mr. Chairman, I am going to read you the findings. What was told to the House on numerous occasions, is that Cass-Beggs came and told us that there was a marginal difference between going Lake Winnipeg first, or Churchill River first, and that given the fact that it was within mathematical error, and scientific error, we could choose one or the other, and choosing Lake Winnipeg gave us more time to study Churchill River, which Tritschler says we should do, by the way, which Tritschler says we should do.

Now, that's what we were told. That's what was said at all times. Here are the Task Force report findings. They say exactly that, and I'm reading from the Tritschler Report, and these are the Task Force Report findings. The comparison of the short-term economics.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30. I am interrupting the proceeding for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 o'clock tonight.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: We're now on Private Members' Hour. The first item of business on Thursdays in Private Members' Hour is Public Bills. We have a Public Bill today, Bill No. 25, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for River Heights.

SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 25 - AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE SINKING FUND TRUSTEES

Thursday, 27 March 1980

MR. GARY FILMON (River Heights) presented Bill No. 25, An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of the Winnipeg School Division No. 1, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the explanation of the amendment is one that has been done in the past. It's a change in the amount of money that's allowable to be paid to Trustees who are not members of the profession, not staff members of the Winnipeg School Board.

Consequently they are paid a fee of \$100 per meeting attended, for attending meetings of the Trustees of the Sinking Fund and up to a maximum of \$1,200 is what appears in the present legislation. That limit is to be increased to \$1,800.00. This is in keeping with the progress of time. The limit has been changed in the past. A number of years ago it was increased to the \$1,200. Now it's being subsequently increased to the \$1,800 so that these people can be adequately paid in accordance with normal remuneration of the times.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The second item of business is Private Bills. We have a Private Bill.

The Honourable Member for Crescentwood. (Stand)
May we then proceed to Proposed Resolutions.

RESOLUTION NO. 9 - APPOINTMENT OF CLERK'S ASS'T/CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 9, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet. He has twenty minutes.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before us of course deals with the question of the way in which a very important servant of this Assembly was selected by the Premier of this province, and indeed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. And the resolved part of this Resolution suggests that this House deplore the partisan appointment of a Clerk Assistant and Chief Electoral Officer, and make such recommendations as it deems advisable, to the President of the Executive Council and the Board of Internal Economy Commissioners and this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, it's not often in the course of the history of this Assembly, and I'm sure perhaps it has never occurred before - and I happened to research that - but I would hazard a guess that this kind of Resolution would not normally arise or on the Order Paper, excepting that we find, Mr. Speaker, there has indeed been quite a change of style on the part of government in recent years, and in particular since this government has taken control of the affairs of the province, Mr. Speaker.

It seems that the need to appear to be non-partisan in the appointment of a position that is indeed a position that would service all of the people of Manitoba and all of the political parties in Manitoba, it seems to me that the appointment of that person, or the fact that it should be a non-partisan appointment, has gone by the wayside. And I say that, Mr. Speaker, because it has been made abundantly clear on a number of occasions that that particular individual who has been appointed, has had a fair degree of political involvement, is known for his political beliefs, and therefore it creates a problem to himself, Mr. Speaker, in accepting such an appointment, and it creates a problem to members

of the Assembly who may question the wisdom of that appointment. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that that has nothing to do with whether or not he is able, has the capacity to carry out his responsibilities. It has to do with whether or not it is perceived by all members of the House that we have an appointed person that is in the service of this Assembly that will use that appointment in an unbiased and non-partisan way.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it makes it somewhat difficult for members here to accept that appointment as it was made, because we recognize that in our rules, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the assistant to the Clerk of the House, the rules indicate that the assistant is an officer of the Assembly. That's under Section 92 of our rules. On Section 103, Mr. Speaker, we find that vacancies are to be filled, and I will quote: "The filling of any vacancy in the service of the Assembly shall be made by the Board of Internal Economy Commissioners, on the representation of the Speaker, after enquiry touching the necessity for the continuance of the office." And that, Mr. Speaker, is an important point in trying to deal with the question of appointments to what should be a non-partisan position.

We find, Mr. Speaker, that under Section 5, it's indicated that the Board of Internal Economy controls the officers and employees of the Legislative Assembly. And so we find that we have some difficulty in accepting the appointment that has been made in the person that is now responsible in that area.

Section 4(1) of The Elections Act, Mr. Speaker, indeed suggests that it is a Lieutenant Governor-in-Council appointment, and no one is arguing against that, Mr. Speaker. But let's examine, Mr. Speaker, what the responsibilities are of the Chief Electoral Officer. This is a person who has a dual responsibility. We must appreciate the fact that the Chief Electoral Officer has to supervise - or his duties are, one of his duties are - is supervision of the election process. That obviously is a very sensitive position, and one would have thought that the government of the day, whoever it was, from time to time, when this question arises, would want to make certain that the appointment would have all the appearances of non-partisanship.

The more important aspect, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the fact that this appointment is also an appointment to the Electoral Divisions Boundaries Commission. And we have just completed a new one. . . yes, we have just completed studies and recommendations that were accepted by this Assembly as to the new constituency boundaries that would become effective in the next election. And, Mr. Speaker, we recognized, and I have had now a number of opportunities in that connection, in both experiences of mine, I find that there have been vast changes with respect to boundaries in my own particular area which one may not appreciate, Mr. Speaker. In the first instance, my whole constituency was wiped out. In this particular example, we have a very awkward boundary situation, and I think even the Commission agreed that it's awkward.

But, Mr. Speaker, we decided not to challenge any of those recommendations on the assumption that the commissioners did their best, that that was their . . . they were convinced of that position that the boundaries that if they were recommending to this Assembly were the best that they could come up with under the circumstances, and no one really is questioning that, Mr. Speaker.

But we now have a situation where we recognize that the First Minister of this province, and he has made mention of it on one or two occasions, is not happy with that boundaries commission. I recall some comment made - and I don't know if it's on the record or off the record - but on the part of the First Minister, where he wasn't certain that the make-up of that commission was such that they could do a reasonable job in redrawing the electoral boundaries in this province. And he wasn't referring to the individuals. He was referring to the positions; the Chief Justice of Manitoba, the president of the university, and the Chief Electoral Officer of the province. The Premier at least knew whether or not they had the capacity to fully understand and appreciate the circumstances and considerations that must go into the drawing of new boundaries.

And so we now find ourselves in the position, Mr. Speaker where we have the First Minister having already altered the make-up of that commission, not by the positions that are represented on the Commission, but by introducing a partisan element into the Commission through the person that was appointed. So we from this side can easily argue, Mr. Speaker - rightly or wrongly, and I suppose no one will ever really know - that the First Minister has now one Conservative confirmed

on the so-called independent Electoral Boundaries Commission. That argument can now be made because of this appointment. And I was disappointed when I realized, Mr. Speaker, that that is now the situation, because it is one of those things that will carry on forever and a day until there is a replacement. I don't know how that argument will ever be resolved, Mr. Speaker, to the satisfaction of 57 members in this Assembly.

Now, I don't know what the position of the First Minister is, whether he truly wanted a partisan position within the Boundaries Commission, or whether he truly feels that this individual can separate his party loyalty from his responsibilities on the Commission. I really don't know what motivates the First Minister. I know that it doesn't look good, Mr. Speaker. And I know that it will be questioned as long as that person is there. And perhaps unfairly questioned, perhaps unfair to the person who has that position.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you want to question it and it's open to question, then could you imagine the scenarios that can be developed with respect to the next electoral boundary division changes that take place several years down the road. And I remind members of what happened in Saskatchewan when Ross Thatcher was Premier, when he decided that he was really going to do a job on the constituency boundaries in order to maintain and sustain his political party in power - the gerrymander approach that he used in Saskatchewan at that time. As I recall it, Mr. Speaker, at that particular time there were some 20 ridings, 20 constituencies, that were obviously gerrymandered, that is, in the opinion of the media and the opinion of the opposition, in the opinion of any one that took a look at what was happening to the boundary changes in that province at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I simply point it out because in the subsequent election campaign, Premier Thatcher lost 18 of those 20 ridings that were gerrymandered. And so, while it may be of some comfort to members opposite, if this is their thinking behind this appointment, that they have now some one in the Commission that will argue their position with respect to the drawing of new boundaries the next time that this has to be done, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure, I'm not just sure that it will not come back to haunt them, because we have a good example to the west of us in the province of Saskatchewan where it did not work, where the people knew what they were doing, and where the people reacted to that kind of a maneuver in the most positive manner by defeating the government in the first election after those boundaries were drawn.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it's wrong, I think it's irresponsible, and if it is the belief on the other side that they want to have a partisan position here, then, Mr. Speaker, I think it's incumbent on them to delete or amend The Elections Act, especially section 4(5), Mr. Speaker, and I want to quote to you section 4(5). It says, "Removal of Chief Electoral Officer. The Chief Electoral Officer is removable by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council only by Order-in-Council made on an address of the Assembly carried by a vote by two-thirds of the members voting thereon." So, Mr. Speaker, if the Conservative Party wants this to be a partisan position, I suggest that they should bring in an amendment and delete this section so that it is indeed the government by Order-in-Council can choose the person that they want to serve as Chief Electoral Officer. And we will accept it as such. I wouldn't accept it as being a moral way of approaching it, but we will accept the reality of it. And when governments change, that position would have to change with the government, Mr. Speaker. It's very simple.

Mr. Speaker, I think they want the best of both worlds. They want the appearance of neutrality, yet they want to inject partisanship into that position, and so now we have an impossible situation where the Chief Electoral Officer will likely not be completely trusted by all members of the Assembly at any given time. And I'm not referring to the members that are in this Assembly now, Mr. Speaker, it could be members that are present here, it could be new members subsequently elected. But when you have that kind of a partisan approach to an appointment of a Chief Electoral Officer, it's inevitable, Mr. Speaker, that there will be questions raised, eyebrows raised, as to the propriety of that kind of an appointment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just the other day we had an announcement on the part of the Assistant Clerk, who decided that he was going to enter the political arena. And, Mr. Speaker, he alluded to the fact that this government was bent - in his press release - he alluded to the fact that this government was bent on the idea of

Thursday, 27 March 1980

politicizing the key people in the Public Service, and that he was objecting to it and this is one of the reasons that he has decided to become politically involved himself. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how much pressures were brought to bear on that particular person. I do know that in the course of . . . in the number of years that I have known the individual, that I could not extract from him a partisan point of view in all of the years that we were in government, and the years that we were in the opposition, during the time that he served this Assembly. I at no time was ever in a position to be able to find out his philosophy, his political party, I could not extract from him a political point of view. I believe that he maintained a very very neutral image as a servant of this Assembly. And I find it tragic that he feels so strong about this point, that he feels so certain that this government is indeed politicizing the key positions that should not be politicized, that he undertook to resign his position and is now seeking public office. Now I want to wish him well, of course, Mr. Speaker, for obvious reasons, but that is not the point I am trying to make.

The point I am trying to make is, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite should search a little deeper and determine in their own minds, whether or not this was a practical, logical method and appointment that should have been made. And if they feel that there is some doubt and reason to doubt, then I believe that this Resolution points the direction and a way for them to resolve the problem. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, on the general matter that has been raised by several speakers in discussing this Resolution, I have to really make a very serious effort to restrain myself when the general talk of politicizing the Civil Service is referred to and is subscribed to us as being, in some way, initiators of that trend, which I refute is there necessarily. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, those of us that were in the Chamber when that government passed legislation - passed legislation, Sir - to politicize the Civil Service, and we, at that time, in opposition, we expressed our concern about it - we expressed our concern about it. So, I'm somewhat amused that members opposite would even raise that particular matter in dealing with this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I really suggest that the Resolution was a Resolution that need not have appeared on the Order Paper. I really believe it's a Resolution where we're talking about something that is only being thought about and perceived in the honourable members' minds. Surely, Mr. Speaker, what we're talking about here is his performance at his job, and so this whole discussion is premature, if you like. If the wildest dreams come true of honourable members opposite, then perhaps a Resolution like this would be quite in order, two years hence, three years hence, or whenever - if the present Electoral Officer in any way demonstrates, in any way abuses the privileges of his office, or in any way demonstrably brings bias, political bias, to his work. So, let's put it in its proper context, Mr. Speaker. We're not . . . really, this is a debate that - I don't believe it will ever happen, Sir. I don't know the man, but I believe that he has the kind of integrity that will bring to bear the kind of work performance that the particular position calls for.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet says that we have introduced into this triumvirate of people that, under our system, every 10 years redistribute the ridings, that we have introduced now an element of politics into it. Well, Sir, does the honourable member really mean to say that before the University of Manitoba can hire a president, that we have to check to make sure that he's not a Conservative, or a Liberal, or a New Democrat. I don't think anybody checked President Campbell's political affiliations. I don't know what they are, but I suspect that he has some; I expect he has the biases of something like that. I suspect, Sir, that the Chief Justice, certainly at some point in time, probably had a fairly active interest in politics. It's been said in the course of this debate that judges very often get their appointments by having had some involvement with a political party at some particular time. --(Interjection)-- But is the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet saying that any future chief justice that might, at one point in time, have worked for a political party cannot serve on this committee?

So, Mr. Speaker, the test surely is . . . and, Mr. Speaker, we have been well served, particularly by one of the most important functions, if you remember I alluded to, that is the every 10-year redrawing of constituency boundaries. Sir, I doubt very much - he made the references to other jurisdictions - but I think one of the things that we can all be collectively proud of in this province, brought in by a Liberal administration under D.L. Campbell, sustained by a decade of a Tory administration under Duff Roblin and Walter Weir, and sustained for eight years under a New Democratic Party administration, a system of fairness, even though some of us individual members may have some thoughts about it when the crunch seems to come to the centre of the province. I think they start off in the far outer reaches of the province where the squares are easy to draw, but then they all get muddled up when it gets around the bottom end of Lake Winnipeg and we start swinging around there. But, Sir, we accept that in good faith, and we, by and large, have not - and for a good reason - challenged the integrity or the intent of those people charged with this responsibility.

So, Mr. Speaker, I really believe that the debate that we're having here is premature, to be charitable, that we should vote this Resolution out of the Chamber and get on with more important matters of the Chamber, and allow the incumbent to demonstrate his capabilities in filling out that job. Mr. Speaker, let me speak a little bit. I can recall the services of Mr. Anstett well; he was a pleasant person in carrying out the duties of that job. I must tell you, rightly or wrongly, that I never was under any misconception as to where his politics lay. He never confessed any particular political preference to me, but there was no confusion in my mind, as there were in the minds of a number of other members that worked with for him for eight years, or the better part of eight years, as to where his politics lay. But we don't, and do not suggest, and nobody on this side suggested, charged that he brought political bias to his work. I don't think that statement has been made by members on this side of the House, or will be made. Mr. Speaker, I say this, not in any sense of unfairness to Mr. Anstett, but when he states that one of his reasons for resigning last year was that he felt the government had a - and I'm trying to quote him, "Lack of confidence in his work."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it can be stated that there was, perhaps, a desire on this government to have a person occupy that position with a legal background. We've had, particularly in the last number of elections, more and more electoral matters referred to the courts, the business of elections that been close and tight, where contraventions have taken place, where recounts have had to have been adjudicated, where decisions had to be made, where the whole election machinery has become more complex. There was, I think, an understandable desire on the part of this government to have a person in that position with some legal background. And, Mr. Speaker, perhaps, that was known - I think we didn't hide that intention. Mr. Speaker, I can understand Mr. Anstett for feeling that, not having that particular training, and perhaps not seeing that he was going to be promoted into that position as Electoral Officer, that he felt, for his reasons, that his career had reached a level of classification, if you like, that he was not prepared to be satisfied with it.

Well, that's fine, that's fair game on his part, too. But, Sir, with the suggestion that he conveniently now finds to make, when casting about for, I think, an overt expression of his political affiliation, and seizing, as a good up and coming politician should always do, the opportune moment to seek some favourable publicity, support that cause. He chooses to enter into the issue in such a totally misleading way that the president of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association finds it necessary to issue a statement refuting, in essence, what Mr. Anstett charges.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I jeopardized the position of the president of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association by quoting him, because I will now hear the charge that he has to be one of our boys. I doubt very much whether you can attribute that to the president of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association. I think he is doing his job, as all people elected to that position, have to do their job, whether it was the previous president, Mr. Jackson - who, I think, was a pretty identifiable Liberal, if I recall, but who did his job in representing the group of employees, in this case the Manitoba Employees'

Thursday, 27 March 1980

Association, and did his utmost and his best to represent them, no matter which government was in power.

Mr. Speaker, I really think that the Resolution is best dealt with if we expeditiously deal with it and vote it out of this House. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Dealing firstly with some of the comments of the previous speaker, he informed us that the previous government had passed legislation politicizing the Civil Service. I wasn't in the House at the time, but as I recall, as a member of the public at that time, there was some legislation passed allowing individuals in the Civil Service to become involved in political matters, allowing people who are civil servants, allowing our employees, the freedom of choice. The previous speaker referred to the matter of wait and see, let's see how this individual who has been appointed in this manner turns out. We're not criticizing the individual who has been appointed. We are criticizing the method of appointment, and we are suggesting that justice must not only be done, it must be seen to be done. We are saying, in this particular case, that the manner of appointment is one which is not one consistent with previous appointments. It has been done in a partisan manner; it has been in a manner which excludes the opposition from any input; it has been in a manner which excludes, possibly, very many other individuals who might be interested in applying for that particular job, from ever having the opportunity to apply because it was not bulletined. And, therefore, I think it was not done improperly and, therefore, I support the motion of my leader.

The previous speaker stated that this particular position requires the services of a lawyer. Now, as a lawyer, I can sympathize with that in these uncertain, economic times. In this particular province there are many lawyers who can use extra or other employment. The Tories have driven them to that, yes. Yes, the Member for Pembina is laughing. I was at a lawyer's office in Winnipeg the other day. It looked like the remains of World War II, practically. There was half the staff missing because they'd been laid off because they don't have enough work. I suggested to him that he get into bankruptcy work, because that is the area that appears to be increasing in this province.

Now, governments are traditionally entitled to employ, without consulting anyone else, certain individuals, such as executive assistants, such as Deputy Ministers. Many people can be appointed by the government in the way it sees fit. I suggest that the Chairman of the Electoral Boundaries Commission is not one of the individuals that you can choose in that fashion. That is an appointment which is certainly distinguishable from the appointment of a judge, for instance. The appointment of a judge has been referred to here. We appoint judges, and certainly no one would say that past political involvement isn't one of the factors in appointing judges. But judges. . .--(Interjection)-- yes, first of all, of course, it's a life-long permanent appointment. Secondly, it is an appointment to deal in general with matters which are not political in nature. It is a matter of appointing a judge to a criminal court, to a family court, to any court which is dealing basically with civil or criminal matters, not political matters. This particular appointment, I believe, that was done by a judge who was already retired, as an extra for the Tories, but judges are appointed, again, to work with criminal and civil matters and peripherally, they may well be involved on occasion with political matters, but that is not why they are chosen.

In this particular case, the only reason you choose a chairman of an electoral boundaries commission, the only reason you choose a chairman of an electoral boundaries commission, is to deal with matters political, to deal with matters which involve the method by which people are elected to this House, to determine what particular geographical area will be represented by the 57 people who will be elected to this House. And any member of this House knows full well, that by changing the map of the City of Winnipeg by several streets back and forth, some individual could in fact change several three or four seats from PC to NDP, or from NDP to PC. That can be done. And again. . .--(Interjection)-- no, I don't believe that any amount of change in the electoral boundaries will save one single Liberal seat for the next election. I don't think it can be done. No, I'm really sorry, but I can't see a Liberal in the next House, not even with a gerrymander.

And I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that the particular person who has been employed in this position will, in fact, when he sits on that Commission, do anything improper. But again, justice must be done, must be seen to be done; it must be seen to be done. And there will be people who will be concerned when that map is drawn up, and I suggest that the next time the map is drawn up, if the chairperson of that committee is a person who has been appointed by the government alone, with no consultation with the opposition, be it the current appointee or the one whom we will bring in after we form the government, if we would do it in the manner in which you have done it, in the manner in which this government has done it, then I would suggest that the opposition will not have faith, that the boundaries provided by that chairman are the boundaries which would have been provided had there been a non-partisan appointee.

One of the members in the background there is talking about presidents of universities again. Presidents of universities are chosen on the basis of what they will do at the university. This has to be one of the most peripheral rationales for appointing a president of a university. He's got 119 things to do, and this may be one-half of the 119. When he's doing it, that's all he has to do, but it's a very peripheral area of concern in appointing a university president. Not only that, not only that. I suggest to you that in practice, what happens, is that the individual we have appointed here, when he calls the Chief Justice and when he calls the president of the university to sit down and have a meeting, he is the person, or she is the person who will come to that meeting with the map, with the population figures, with all of the demographic figures for the province, and probably, probably, with some suggestions that he or she will have worked out with staff before they get there. And I would suggest that those other two individuals are there more to make sure that everything has gone right, to put their stamp of approval on the work of a civil servant, than for any other purpose. And I am sure they don't spend a great deal of time or effort worrying about this.

And therefore, this position, if my theory on that is correct, this position takes on greater importance. This is the one individual, the very one and only individual, who actually will be making the decision as to how our boundaries will look ten years from now. I simply, as a member of this Legislature, do not wish to see my particular electoral area divided up by an individual who was not appointed by this entire House; not for a minute. I believe that the method of appointing people to this position has traditionally been non-partisan and I believe that it should continue to be so in the future. I think this motion is important, I think it should be passed, in all haste. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on this question before the question is put, so that there is no misunderstanding on my particular position on it. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against the resolution. I have heard nothing, Mr. Speaker, but suggestions that justice is not seen to be done, because a person who is appointed to fulfill a function in the Legislature once carried a party card or even, Mr. Speaker, if I was advised that he was very active in politics. --(Interjection)-- Well, I don't care if he carried three party cards, and I don't care if he has been active in politics. I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the character and the integrity of the person and the job that he does. And I have heard nothing to suggest to me that this person should not have been appointed. The only thing that I've heard is that he'd been in politics. And if I've disqualified people on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I have a problem. I have a problem as a government; I have a problem as a human being.

If this person does a bad job on the basis that he is going to help those who put him into power, I believe that the opposition will get the benefit of it. My friend, the former Minister of Agriculture, said that Thatcher gerrymandered outrageously. He also lost the election. Because, Mr. Speaker, we can not underestimate, we can not underestimate the intelligent of the electorate, and if the government by this particular appointment is trying to secure themselves in office - and that's what they need, to secure themselves in office - then I don't believe that the public will keep them in office. I don't believe they'll keep them in office anyway, but if they hope to secure office by having a person on top

Thursday, 27 March 1980

of the election machinery, who is somehow going to make it easier for them, then I say they are going to lose votes.

And I, by the way, do not say that that is what the government is doing. I mean, I really see nothing about this appointment, Mr. Speaker. And I have to say that if we're talking about a dissensitive position of elections, I don't think that there could be a more sensitive person involved in elections than the Deputy Returning Officer. The Deputy Returning Officer is there. He's going to appoint the renumerator, he's going to get the things in when the vote comes in, and the Deputy Returning Officers are appointed by the party in power and indeed, Mr. Speaker, I believe that most of them are appointed from friends of the party in power. I will disclose that my Deputy Returning Officer was a member of the Executive of the Inkster Constituency New Democratic Party. And, Mr. Speaker, if the election was tied, I hope, you can never be sure. . . I know that Jim Naleway waited for about three days before voting for Murdoch McKay, and I can tell you that I was becoming very excited about what was going on. But the election was tied on election night. Jim Naleway was the president of Wolseley, and it took about three days for him to decide that Murdoch McKay was a better candidate than Izzy Asper. It wouldn't take me that long.

But, Mr. Speaker, it then went to a judge, and His Honour Irving Keith thought that Izzy Asper was a better candidate than Murdoch McKay. No, I shouldn't say that. He counted the votes differently. And then the Court of Appeal counted them still differently. --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm not going to. . . you know, I'm already talking about one judge; I'm not going to another judge.

Mr. Speaker, we are able, in the profession, to say things that a normal person would say about somebody else not being accurate and using language. . . . in the legal profession, we say, "the learned judge erred in not having found another way than what he did find". Somebody else would use earthier language, but we are able to do it in that respect, and sometimes we win and sometimes we lose. But let's get back to this appointment.

I am not going to support this resolution. And I will, if I am ever of the impression that the person who is appointed in such a position is behaving in such a way as not to merit the position, I will deal with it, but I won't decide in advance because a person worked for the Attorney-General, that he is not fit to hold the position. I see other problems with him. I mean, he has bad judgement about who he should support, but I don't say that he can't hold this position, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I also want to rise to put my position on the record with respect to this issue. I know the person in question; I have known him for some time. We both went to university together. I certainly have respect for the individual as an individual. I, however, will support this motion, not because he had been involved with the Conservative Party, but because the resolution says that the government erred, the learned government erred in the way in which it proceeded to appoint the assistant clerk to the Legislature. And if you look very closely at the legislation, I think it erred grievously in that particular aspect of the appointment. One might argue that the government could have consulted with the opposition in appointing the Chief Electoral Officer, because I think that that appointment should be seen to be, in a sense, accepted, by all groups. I don't know if you can make completely non-partisan appointments, but you can make appointments that are accepted by the partisan factions within the Legislature as being one that is a workable one. And that effort was not made by this government. They didn't make that attempt and I think that was wrong. Now that's with respect to the appointment of the Chief Electoral Officer.

And I think we understand, we've heard reasons why the partisan factions within the Legislature, and within Manitoba, should have confidence in the Chief Electoral Officer. The Chief Electoral Officer does play a very important role every ten years in the setting of boundaries in the Boundaries Commission. The Chief Electoral Officer, I think, probably plays a very significant role; and that the two other appointees to that Electoral Boundaries Commission, in a sense, probably don't spend as much time in the whole process as does the Chief Electoral Officer. And the various communities and segments of communities that are affected

by changes that do take place to their communities, when electoral boundaries are shifted - and my community was one that had electoral boundaries shifted within it - want to feel that is being done in as objective a manner as possible, and I think they believe that was done in the last case.

I commend the Boundaries Commission for being objective, for being patient, for listening to all the presentations made to it. I think that it did a good job in very difficult circumstances. And as a result - although my constituency was split, and it's an old community, the old community of Transcona - split for the first time or for a long time, via boundary, and people were upset with that, I could go to them and explain that this is being done, not for any partisan game, because I had complete confidence in the objectivity of the Commission, and I could argue to them that the Commission was non-partisan, objective, and all told I think that they accept that and they believe it.

I think that holds true for other communities that may, in fact, have been concerned by changes that took place in electoral boundaries, which took place now and will take place 10 years from now, or eight years from now. And that is a very very difficult job and I think that one can always second-guess the motives of any group redesigning boundaries, and I think that this Commission has done a good job, and I hope that the future one will be able to do it.

I am a bit worried that maybe people will not have complete confidence in the objectivity of the Boundaries Commission because of the manner in which the appointment was made, and that will create problems. The government could have avoided all of those problems very easily, and it chose not to. And I think in that respect, I don't know if it's because it was partisan or whether it was incompetent, but it certainly wasn't farsighted with respect to that appointment - that's the appointment of the Chief Electoral Officer.

Now, when we come to the appointment of the Assistant Clerk - because the Chief Electoral Officer is also the Assistant Clerk - then I think we have a very severe problem. That is a position that should be filled through the Civil Service Commission. The other one isn't necessarily filled by the Civil Service Commission bulletining procedure, but the Assistant Clerk position should be. It's not called for in the legislation as being an Order-in-Council appointment. It is one that should be done through the Civil Service Commission. The last holder of the position of Assistant Clerk to the Legislature was indeed bulletined. It was a result of a Civil Service competition. I believe that on the board, in fact I know that the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly was on the panel that did the interviewing, and that appointment was made in the most objective way possible.

There was, I believe, consultation prior to the appointment, with the opposition; that wasn't done in this particular case. --(Interjection)-- Well, the Member for Lakeside says it wasn't done then. I wasn't here at that time. My understanding is that there was consultation at that time, and I'll have to check further on that, but my understanding is that there was some consultation with respect to that appointment. But that didn't take place this time.

You see, the Assistant Clerk is someone that I have to deal with every day. And I deal with the Assistant Clerk in a somewhat different manner. I want to know that that person fills - or meets - the criteria of the position; and when the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Public Works, says that we needed a lawyer in that position, or we needed legal expertise, I want to assure him that I've never really required legal expertise from people who are Clerks or Assistant Clerks.

I felt that where I received the legal expertise was from Rae Tallin, the Legal Counsel to the Legislature, who has, I think, again - as an officer of the Legislature - served us all admirably well. I think he provides excellent counsel to the government in the drafting of legislation, he provides excellent counsel to individual members of the Legislature when they want to draft private members' bills - some of those private members' bills may indeed embarrass the government. In fact, that's often what an opposition member wants to do with a private member's bill. He wants to focus attention on a particular issue, using the private member's bill, using the device of the private member's bill, and in that respect you want to get objective advice. You want to do it . . . you want to proceed strategically. You don't want the government to know that you are working on that particular piece of legislation. You don't want the government, in the Throne

Thursday, 27 March 1980

Speech say, to preempt you from introducing that bill by mentioning that particular issue in the Throne Speech - and that's a device of the government - for preempting certain strategic actions by members of the opposition. In that respect, I must say that the Legal Counsel to the Legislature has been an excellent servant of the Legislature.

And in the past, to date, the Clerk of the Legislature and the Assistant Clerk of the Legislature, have also provided advice in that manner to me, as a member of the Legislature, for a fairly short time. When we come into the Legislature as new members, we have to relate to the Clerk and to the Assistant Clerk for a great deal of advice, and we can do so - and we have been able to do so - knowing that our discussions are completely between the officials of the Legislature and ourselves. That's improved our effectiveness as legislators. I think it's improved my ability to understand what's going on in the Legislature. It's improved my understanding of the rules. It's enabled me to look at different devices, to bring across to the public, or bring across to the Legislature, a particular point.

I can recall certain instances where advice from the Clerk or the Assistant Clerk enabled me to bring in amendments when I thought I might not be able to bring in amendments and I went to the Clerk, I went to the Assistant Clerk, and said, this is what I want to do - is it possible for me, under the Rules of the Legislature, to do this, rather than doing something which is not legal or provided for under the rules, bringing it up in the Legislature, running into a great problem, having the Speaker rule against me. We can preclude that by going to the Clerk and getting excellent advice, and that's one of the major functions of the Clerk to opposition members. And, as I said, I felt fully confident in the objectivity of the past officials of the Legislature, the present Clerk.

I feel sorry that, for some reason, the previous government did not show, or did not have confidence in the Assistant Clerk, that is the previous Assistant Clerk. I feel that person did an excellent job. --(Interjection)-- Sorry, that this government has it. And I can't understand why they've done that. Why they wouldn't have confidence in that person. In fact, it does reinforce the feeling that I think exists amongst many civil servants, that indeed, if you are neutral, then somehow you are against the government. --(Interjection)-- It's not the press release in that instance. There are many civil servants who have been fired by this government who feel that way, who were indeed objective civil servants. And the danger with that particular approach --(Interjection)-- The danger of that particular approach, frankly, is that it is a totalitarian approach. And the definition of totalitarianism is that you extend politics into every facet of life, so that when a chartered accountant is fired by this government, and then word is spread through the chartered accountancy community that that person is a New Democrat, and therefore that person shouldn't be appointed to particular positions, or shouldn't be given jobs, then that I think is totalitarian. --(Interjection)-- That is totalitarian. And when this government tries to deny that that in fact is taking place, they're wrong.

This is the government that likes to talk about totalitarianism. This is the government that likes to talk about freedom, and this is the government that is practising it to a degree. To me it's very wrong when word goes out, when whisper campaigns are started, that this person --(Interjection)-- We never started any rumours like that. The first time I heard something like that - and it wasn't a rumour - I can recall the present Minister responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation saying - and I think this is completely true - that if he had an opportunity to, he would sell public housing, and that's on the record. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. Order please. The hour being 5:30 . . . The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. (Friday)