

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 2, 1975

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 15 members of the 197 B. Brownie Pack. The Brownies are under the direction of Mrs. Atkinson. This group is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here this afternoon.
Presenting Petitions; the Honourable Member for Gimli.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. JOHN C. GOTTFRIED (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable Member for Wellington, I beg to present the Petition of Robert Malcolm Setters and Others, praying for the passage of an Act to incorporate the University of Manitoba Students' Union.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the Report, 1974, of the Worker's Compensation Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield) introduced Bill No. 20, an Act to amend the Heritage Manitoba Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill be withdrawn from the Order Paper. It will be reintroduced by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 21?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge) introduced Bill No. 23, an act to Incorporate the St. Andrews River Heights Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether any committee or task force will be established to oversee any pricing irregularities that may result from a changeover to the metric system.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): That, Mr. Speaker, is an interesting question based, I think, on matters that could lead to pricing irregularities in the business community, and certainly I would have to take it under advisement. I would not suspect the business community of pricing irregularities which were intended, which were deliberate, but certainly if that is a concern for the Leader of the Opposition I will take it under advisement and in due course, if it is deemed necessary, advise the House if such a task force might be necessary to be introduced.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether the Department of Consumer Affairs is monitoring the changeover to the metric system and the pricing that will be taking place.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce has primarily

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) taken the responsibility for piloting the changeover to the metric system within the Province of Manitoba. Monitoring is not now being undertaken in regard to this specific problem that the Leader of the Opposition mentions.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have another question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Does the government intend to establish a special task force to deal with inflationary problems in this province as suggested by the Labour Relations Council of the Winnipeg Builders Exchange?

MR. TURNBULL: . . . your question clearly, similar to the first question is a matter of policy, and I'll advise the House in due course if we in fact do that.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable Attorney-General. With respect to the incident at the University of Manitoba this morning where the police detained a number of people, could the Minister inform us if he's investigated this, and also could he inform us as to whether or not the Queen's Bench was violated by the police.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General. The second part of the question is legal, it's out of order. The first part . . .

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in respect to the first question relating to the incidents at the university, I was well north of here flying back from Churchill and only arrived back in Winnipeg a few moments ago. I did not land by the way in Wabowden either going or returning. So I have not received too much information in regard to the events at the university.

I am looking forward to receiving reports as to what took place at the university and if, on the basis of those reports, an investigation is warranted, then one will be requested. At the moment I can't speak beyond that because I'm unfamiliar with the particulars of the events at the university.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question related to the same subject to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that the people on strike at the university are in a bind because the government supplies the money to the university, is his department taking any special action with regard to bringing the two sides together with some help from the government to the university.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, that's sort of a triple-barrelled question. I want to say to my honourable friend that the Department of Labour is using their conciliation forces to try and resolve the dispute between the union concerned and the University of Manitoba.

The question of additional finances, of course, is a matter of policy to be decided by the government, and that will be done.

And if I may, Mr. Speaker, field the question that was directed to my honourable friend the Attorney-General in his absence, there were one or two incidents this morning of action where certain people attempted to cross the picket line and were obstructed by those that were picketing. We have a common law in the Province of Manitoba, and across Canada, to deal with such circumstances, and where necessary the common law will be invoked.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Minister of Health publicly announced that the government would support the nurses' demands to the rate of 38 percent increase, is not the Provincial Government going to act in a similar manner with respect to advising the Governors of the University of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I think that a correction should be made. I think that the Minister of Health suggests that the Manitoba Health Services Commission had informed the hospital that there would be only so much more money over and above the budget, and of course it was pointed out that this would be at about the offer that was on the table then which was about 35 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) of Education, Colleges and University Affairs. I would like to ask him whether his department is planning any steps to prevent further deterioration of the situation on the campus of the University of Manitoba, the situation resulting from the present strike.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I'm advised by the university that every effort is being made to continue with the operations of the university with the provision of its instructional services, and that is presently being continued and I'm not aware of deterioration at this point in time.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister contemplating any steps to encourage the administration of the university to meet with the strikes and their representatives in a meaningful way?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I refer to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member may recall the reply of the Honourable Minister of Labour that the services of a conciliation officer have been provided by this government to both parties, and that he is meeting with both in attempting to resolve whatever differences in their collective agreement negotiations may exist.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding those conditions, does the Minister plan any steps to prevent a recurrence of the kind of situation that developed today and that has explosive potential?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite certain what particular incident the honourable member is concerned about the recurrence of, but if he is concerned about the recurrence of anything that may eventually result in being interpreted as an infraction of the law, I can no more prevent the recurrence of an infraction of the law by anyone at the University of Manitoba than I can prevent the recurrence of infraction of the law by anyone resident in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, who I understand is in charge of the Olympic Lottery sales. I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the House what agencies have been established for the sale of Olympic Lottery tickets in the Greater Metropolitan Winnipeg area and in rural Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that as notice to provide the proper information.

While I'm on . . . in my seat, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could answer a question asked of me on March 31st by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Spivak. This was the question: I wonder if he can indicate what the policy of government is with respect to medical treatment not available in Manitoba but required by a resident of Manitoba, as to what cost and proportion of cost will be paid. I'm really referring to medical treatment which would not be available in Manitoba and would be available elsewhere, and it comes from the publication of a particular case of a young child with cancer who requires treatment outside of Manitoba. What I would want to find out from the Minister is the government's position with respect to the proportion of costs that would be absorbed by the Manitoba Health Services Commission for expenses related to treatment of something that's not available in Manitoba at the present time.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is: 1. For care and treatment that cannot adequately be provided in Manitoba, the Manitoba Health Services Commission pays the following:

(a) For hospitalization outside of Canada, the greater of either 75 percent of the actual hospital charges or a per diem rate based on rates charged in a Manitoba Hospital of equivalent size or facilities.

(b) For hospitalization incurred in other Canadian provinces the rate approved by the Hospital Insurance authority in the province where the hospitalization occurs.

(c) For medical services obtained anywhere outside of Manitoba, the same amount that would be paid to a Manitoba doctor for comparable procedures.

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)

There's a special provision under the Health Services Insurance Act which allows the Commission to pay a greater amount for insured benefits received out of the province for those who are in financial need.

However, the Commission does not have any authority to pay for transportation and hotel accommodation costs related to care received out of province because they are not insured benefits.

In addition, the Commission does not have power to reimburse individuals who act as escorts for patients receiving treatment out of the province.

The Commission generally pays the 75 percent of hospital charges for bills received from the U.S. because the U.S. hospitals do not have the same inclusive per diem rate structure as Manitoba hospitals, and this formula works to the advantage of Manitobans.

It should be noted that if transportation, hotel accommodation costs were to be covered such a benefit would be difficult to control and easy to abuse.

Now, the specific case of Master Geoffrey Pitura and the article of the Free Press of March 29th:

(a) The Commission has not received a hospital bill in this case to date. There is no documentation on file indicating that care and treatment of this case could not be provided in Manitoba. However, this normally is assessed when the hospital bill is received.

(b) Bills for anaesthesia and consultation have been received and these will be processed.

(c) The Free Press article says the Commission is refusing to pay the total cost of the child's artificial eye. This is incorrect. Mr. Pitura has received a cheque for this cost.

(d) The Free Press article refers to hassles over cost of physiotherapy. There is nothing on the MHSC file related to discussions about physiotherapy in this case.

(e) The Free Press article . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think Honourable Minister is now rebutting to an article and not answering the question. I do not believe that we should take up the time of the House for 40 minutes. --(Interjection)-- Very well. Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the answer given by the Minister of Health and Social Development. I would like to ask a question with respect to policy position expressed by the Minister. Will the government consider a change in the policy as it affects an infant who requires someone to be in attendance with the infant during any medical procedures that may be required outside of the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: This would be a major policy decision that would have to be taken up in Cabinet, and announced in due course.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, all again, that I'm asking the Minister is, will he consider that as a policy change to be discussed, the accompaniment of an infant who requires medical procedures outside of the province and in which case there are attendant expenses related to that?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think we would have to consider the implications. It would be very difficult, I would think, of covering something for people going outside the province, something that's not covered here in the province, so we certainly would have to look at the implications.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have some 44 people from the Stanley Agriculture Society of Winkler. These people are from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. On behalf of all the members I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS CONT'D

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the House what response, if any, he has found regarding the demand for Olympic Lottery tickets and the sale of Olympic Lottery tickets in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area and in rural Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health . . . Tourism and Recreation, sorry.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, being responsible for the recommendation in regard to distribution of lottery revenue, I can only indicate to the honourable member that I have received, by means of the Olympics, if that's the question, revenues based on past sales to the amount of approximately \$23,000. I have not received . . . yet, because the sale of the present issue of Olympic tickets has not brought in revenue.

MR. MCKENZIE: A supplementary question to the Honourable Minister. I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the House that he's satisfied that there's sufficient agencies established in rural Manitoba and the Greater Winnipeg area for the sale of these tickets.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is asking for an opinion. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can the Minister tell us whether his department is prepared to supply information and other forms of technical or financial assistance to individuals, groups, or municipalities, who wish to prepare a brief and appear at the public hearings of the International Joint Commission on the Garrison diversion question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware as to how the hearings are conducted. The people of this province and of the country will be represented by the Government of Canada.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's answer, can he tell us whether Section 23 under the Rules of Procedure of the Joint Commission, which invites participation of individuals and groups other than government to appear at these hearings, has that been abrogated in these cases, or has it been withdrawn, or is there some reason why it will not be operative under these hearings for the Garrison Diversion question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the section, and I indicated I'm not aware of the procedures, but I indicated that the people of this province will be represented by the Government of Canada. As far as the information is concerned, all the information that we have vis-a-vis the Garrison Diversion has been made public. The reports that we have prepared, the material that we have presented to the United States authorities, have all been made public. Anybody who wishes to avail themselves of it can do so. If they have means by which they can appear before the tribunal in accordance with the rules, they can do so. They don't have to ask me, nor will they ask me.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Minister's answer, can he undertake to determine from the International Joint Commission what are the exact requirements and opportunities for public representation at commission hearings; and would he also be prepared to provide and prepare some program of assistance for those municipalities or groups which would like to undertake representation at that time?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has just indicated that he knows how they are to appear, so he can undertake to inform those people. As far as I am concerned, the people of this province will be represented by their government, and that will be the representation that we will base our position on. Anybody else wishing to make independent representations can learn from my honourable friend what their rules are through which they can make those representations, and can go ahead and do so. They are free to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can indicate whether his department is monitoring price changes resulting from a changeover to the metric system.

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, a similar question I believe was asked the other day by the Honourable Member from Roblin, and I indicated at that time that it would be very difficult to measure the costs involved in this particular endeavour. Now, the honourable member shakes his head, so if he'd like to get up and clarify his question, I'd be glad to hear him.

MR. SPIVAK: My question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce is whether his department is monitoring price changes resulting from the changeover to the metric system?

MR. EVANS: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is again to the Minister of Education, Colleges and Universities, including the University of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister satisfy this House that the administration of the University of Manitoba is meeting in a meaningful way with representatives of the support staff?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I think if the honourable member would read the University of Manitoba Act, he would find that the University of Manitoba is governed by a Board of Governors to whom the administration is responsible, and is not responsible to me. I have not heard the honourable member at any time suggest such an amendment to the University of Manitoba Act to make the administration responsible to me.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister removing himself from responsibility for the University of Manitoba entirely?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Mines, and it relates to the answer that he gave to my colleague, the Member for Fort Rouge. Is the Minister discouraging or encouraging private individuals, or groups, or municipalities, to appear before the Joint Commission? Could he clarify that, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am neither encouraging them nor discouraging them. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I believe these people are free independent human beings who will do what they want to and not what I suggest that they do or what the Member for Fort Rouge suggests that they do. I have indicated that it will be my position that the people of this province as citizens of Canada will be represented by the Government of Canada before the International Joint Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education, Colleges and University Affairs. In view of the seriousness of the situation at the campus at the University of Manitoba, would the Minister take it upon himself to investigate the situation first-hand and report to the House as to his assessment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education. Order please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, the information that I have at the present time is that the two parties to the collective agreement negotiations are in dispute, and the dispute is in the process of being resolved with the assistance of this government, and that at the present time is the extent to which I intend to be involved in the matter.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise the House where he gets that information from?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, not from the honourable member within the boundaries of whose constituency the University is located, but from those whose responsibility it is to report to me.

MR. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister assure the House that those whose responsibility it is, to use his words, to report to him, have looked at the situation first-hand, have talked to both sides in the dispute first-hand.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of each and every member of the Civil Service and employee of this government to do his job, and that applies to those who report to me on whatever matters they must do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Attorney-General. I wonder if the Minister can report to the House if the government's giving any consideration to taking over the jurisdiction of the City of Winnipeg Jail, as recommended by the Winnipeg Police Commission and the Superintendent of Police.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that question probably would be better directed towards the Minister of Urban Affairs.

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I will direct it to whichever Minister is responsible, the Minister who is responsible for Corrections, unless there is no Minister responsible. But, Mr. Speaker, my question is, is the government giving any consideration to taking over the jurisdiction of the City of Winnipeg Jail as recommended by the Winnipeg Police Commission and the Superintendent of Police.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Speaker, this matter has not come to my attention in the form in which the question was put, and so I cannot give an answer at this time. If it's brought forward as something that should be seriously considered by the City, of course, we'll discuss it, but then eventually it's a matter of policy.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Is there any negotiations going on at the present time between the government and the City of Winnipeg?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, negotiations with the City have never stopped.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Government House Leader. I wonder if he could indicate when we might expect to have the Mines Bill, Royalty Tax Bill distributed, or whether we will be waiting until the budget comes in.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: No, it's not awaiting the budget. I believe it's in the printing process. I am not certain, but I would think that within the next ten days it will be here.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the First Minister, I address this question to the Minister of Tourism, who is responsible for the library system of the province. I believe he received a copy of a petition that has over 500 signatures from the Portage Library Board, and that my question is, is the government going to institute any of the recommendations, or all of them, of the Newsom Commission this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, to clarify the point made by the Honourable Member for Portage, libraries is a joint responsibility between the Minister of Education and myself; the Minister of Education being responsible for school libraries, and the public libraries falling under Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Some of the Newsom recommendations have been implemented already. Some have been in force for some time. Others have been accepted in principle by this government, but not necessarily the financial implications in the short run.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, to be more precise, could the Minister advise us if this year, is he doing to allocate more money towards upgrading the library services in rural Manitoba than last year?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is quite aware of the amount that I have within my estimates for library service. That amount can be exceeded, depending on the reaction of the municipalities pertaining to library service. There is this grant structure now contained within regulations that allows a cost sharing by either the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, and depending on the interest of the municipalities or LGD in question, the amount can be increased by Special Warrant if need be after the session.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland,

THAN a humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence between the Manitoba Government (including the Manitoba Mineral Resources Corporation) and the Canadian Government with respect to potential mineral deposits and particularly iron ore in the Gladstone, Neepawa and Arden area for the period 1965 to the present.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, Address for Papers - the Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that any is in existence but I will undertake to comply with the order on the following two stipulations: (1) on the usual stipulation that it will be consented to by the Government of Canada; and on the second stipulation that we will not be required to reveal any information that relates to exploration possibilities and ventures which may be required to be kept confidential because they are exploration possibilities. But otherwise there is no problem with complying with the Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, information I would be seeking would be any communication they have between the two governments to do with possibly DREE grants, to something along with line.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I'm perfectly agreeable, Mr. Speaker. The only stipulations that I make are the ones that I've referred to.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed) So ordered. The Honourable House Leader wish me to proceed.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, you may proceed with the Bills in the order in which they appear and that will be followed by the Motion for Supply.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Proposed Bill No. 3 by the Honourable the Attorney-General - the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. (Stands)

Bill No. 10 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

BILL NO. 11 - AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Well, Mr. Speaker, was this Bill No. 11 that we're dealing with, an Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act?

This Act has been perused by myself and my colleagues on this side, do agree with the contents of the amendments that have been made forthwith. But Mr. Speaker, we agree with the Minister when he says that we need greater flexibility in the operation of our grant program to the Agricultural Societies. He talks about making changes insofar as these grants are concerned only to Class A Fairs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we pose a question for the Minister, while we agree as far as Class A Fairs are concerned, we pose a question and ask him why he is limiting it to just Class "A" Fairs? I think we have Class "B" Fairs, and we have Class "C" Fairs in the province, but I believe in the minds of many of our rural people they are just about as equal importance, probably not completely, but do have a great importance to their respective communities.

I would like to know why the Minister chose just to choose "A" Class Fairs, which really are only Brandon and Winnipeg. You have your Class "B" Fairs such as Portage, Dauphin, Carman; you have Morris. I understand there's no consideration given to these areas whatsoever when the Minister talks about flexibility and improving the grant structure insofar as prize money is concerned. The principle, we agree on this side, but we wonder why he is limiting the amendment to this extent.

BILL 11

(MR. EINARSON cont'd)

Another area, Mr. Speaker, is that as far as the museum at Austin is concerned, we understand that the board, the present board have no objections to the increase in members that the Minister is providing. However there is further funds there that he's stated that he is granting to that museum, which we agree wholeheartedly. When he was making his promise, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering what was the reason for increasing the provincial appointments on that board, whether the way the board did consist previous to this, whether that wasn't sufficient. Possibly he has an answer for that reason for doing so.

Other than those things, Mr. Speaker, I think that the amendment, we agree on this side with the proviso, but we'd like an answer to some of these comments that I have made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, of course, am very pleased with the bill to the degree that I think that it will go a long way towards supporting the museum at Austin, in recognition that it is the official Agricultural Museum for the province of Manitoba.

I think the fact is now being recognized that the local incentive that has been put into the development of this particular museum is now being recognized by the province - it has been to a degree up to this point - that it now makes it official. I, of course, would like to know whether or not the three members mentioned in the bill are in addition to the existing three members; and whether or not the Minister is in any position to indicate how much further than the \$3,000 he plans to go. I don't expect that he will want to put himself firmly on the line along this line, but the one thing that I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, is, if the three members are going to be in addition to the present appointed three. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 14 - UNSATISFIED JUDGMENT FUND

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 14, the Proposed Motion of the Honourable, the Attorney-General; the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have no strong objections to seeing this Amendment to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund going on to Committee for further examination and further discussion, although there are one or two comments that we would like to make, and one is that there were statements made at the inception of Autopac that they indicated that there would be no more requirement for the fund, that it was a sort of a useless fund anyway, and the provisions of Autopac would be the end-all to problems such as the Unsatisfied Judgment was set up to solve, and with that they cease to collect any additional moneys for the fund, and naturally when that happens it doesn't take long to deplete the funds. It would seem that some of the cases that are being settled now require additional funds and the bill provides for payments from the Consolidated Fund to provide the necessary financing.

It would also seem that there possibly is a need for the fund to continue because even under the present scheme that we have there are many many drivers on the road that are not covered for many reasons, cancelled licences or breach of the premium payments, and things of that nature, that may require a payment to a motorist from the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, or a similar fund.

If the Minister is going to comment on it in closing debate I would like him to assure us that there is provision under our existing public insurance set up to provide for claims such as those that I have mentioned, an innocent party being hit by an uninsured motorist. If that is not the case I think that he should give more serious thought to the statement that he has made previously on what a ridiculous fund that it was, because it did serve a purpose, and I think if the funding had continued for a prescribed length of time that there would have been sufficient funds in there to settle the claims that have come before it.

But outside of those comments, Mr. Speaker, the Minister doesn't seem to be interested in the comments on passing Bill 14 to Committee, and if he has no more interest in seeing it passed than that, well we'll take it up in committee.

BILL 14

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: We're prepared to let the bill go to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

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

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE - UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA STRIKE

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to speak on a Matter of Grievance on this motion, and my grievance is really prompted by the performance that this House witnessed no more than half an hour ago by the Minister responsible for Colleges and Universities in what has to be one of the most insensitive, indifferent, and perhaps incompetent kind of performance that this House has seen by a Minister in a long time.

That we are facing, Mr. Speaker, a serious situation in the university. The events of this morning where this community had to witness the beginning of a brush between the police and picketers and students and faculty, begins to strike me, and is not something that can be dismissed lightly, or that can be passed off with the kind of adamant indifference that we saw the Minister of Colleges and Universities show. I think because it begins to symbolize and demonstrate that there are serious matters wrong at the university. There are serious problems there, problems caused in part by all those who are involved, students, faculty, administration, and by the government. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility under our system, as we are so often lectured to by his Ministers on that side, is a government has a right to lead, and when we ask for a right to lead, what do we see being expressed from the Minister who is supposed to have that responsibility, a simple and casting off of all obligations, almost a surprising abrogation of any responsibility, either try to con this House that it has no responsibility at all, eliminating the thing that there is on University Grants Commission and that they have the power of the purse, which is the most singular and most important power of all, seeming that somehow that that doesn't matter, that it is something like an organized transfer of funds, which we know very different, or he is simply being incompetent. It's either one of the two, we're either being conned, or he has no business occupying that chair.

That happens to be the fact of the matter. Because unless we are prepared to begin to introduce some measures to the ameliorate and respond to the development at the University of Manitoba we are in danger of handcuffing and emasculating and eviscerating one of the more important institutions in this community.

I think that the problem that we see here is that the strike that is now going on, for the kinds of demands being made by the AESES group are legitimate demands, and our group supports their demands. Because all they're simply saying is that they are trying to catch up to the same amount of salaries being paid to other public civil servants and provincial civil servants in this province. That's all. --(Interjection)-- They simply want to catch up. They simply want to get on a parity with people working for Manitoba Hydro, or the Manitoba Government, or other kinds of institutions, Public Works, or whatever. And all they're simply saying is, we're in a position now of bargaining on the other side." The university has been badgered to a large degree and maybe - and I won't begin to assess - I don't know who is responsible, Mr. Speaker, for the deficit that occurred last year, the \$4 million deficit.

The fact of the matter it is there, and it should not be hung like a millstone around the neck of the university because that millstone weighs not on the neck of the administration, it simply bears down upon the necks of the students and those who are involved in the university.

And unless there are some sort of intelligent response, some willingness to say --(Interjection)-- for goodness sake, let us take a look at the situation and let's realize that that 4 million deficit is a problem, and perhaps there has to be better administration and

GRIEVANCE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) management of maintenance and operations at the university. That is a clear legitimate concern. But to simply start sort of playing legerdemain and black magic with budgets so that when we talk about a 12 1/2 percent increase when it's really only six, and the university is handcuffed, before offering any kind of responsible or effective wage settlement to the striking workers, when we simply provide the seeds of discontent, which will not stop here, Mr. Speaker, because we're facing not simply this dispute with labour but there are five other unions which are going to begin bargaining within the next months or two. And all of a sudden we're sort of faced with the idea that we have a government which says, well, all of a sudden they set the budget, they establish the priorities, they're the ones where the governor of the Grants Commission walked into the Board of Governors at the University and says, "That's all and no more." And that's a provincial institution, Mr. Speaker, that's a provincial agency responsible to that Minister. He's the one that said, "That's the budget limit and no more". So all we're simply saying is from now on the university can - I suppose give the same answer that the Minister of Health gave to the hospitals - they can go out and sell pencils or raffle off, you know, sort of doughnuts, or hold a rummage sale, or whatever his kind of facetious response was a few weeks back. --(Interjection)--

Now, really what we're saying Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone in this group underestimates the difficulties in this present day of trying to deal with public service institutions. In part it's a problem of our own making; we are the ones that decided over a period of time to take over the funding of hospitals and universities, and so on. We've done that, okay. That is now a responsibility, therefore, of this Chamber and this Government. It is there. So all of a sudden to try and start playing games with the students and faculty, and with the life of that university, which is an important component of this community, simply I think is a dereliction, and then when we get the answers as we did this afternoon from this Minister, it's absolutely astounding. Actually there is no other words to comment upon the performance put on by that gentleman, Mr. Speaker, because it was nothing more than astounding that a man who has been charged with responsibility of nurturing and trying to develop the growth and evolution of a university to try and make it a stronger and better institution. In fact they're saying, frankly I don't give a damn. That's really what he was saying.

And yet the fact of the matter is, and I think it's clear, Mr. Speaker, that we can make a pretty good case, that there are all kinds of benefits that fall from the university into this community. Economic and social as well as the purely educational. That we can when we talk in this House, as we have talked from time to time about how do we solve problems of inflation. Well, one of the things that perhaps are not recognized by members of this House is that one of the major ways that you break through inflationary bottlenecks is through new innovations, new developments, new knowledge. That's how you begin to fight economic problems. At the same time we have members of faculties at the university saying that unless the problems are solved, that the senior university professors at the University of Manitoba will be leaving, the research work will come to an end, and we will simply watch the decline and erosion of this major institution, and along with it goes a lot of other things.

Along with it goes the opportunity that we thought we had won a few years back when we changed the universities from being small elitist organizations to making them open and accessible to everyone in the society. That was a major battle that was fought in this province. It was won, and we didn't think we'd have to go back and fight it again. But the battle is now being fought on different grounds. It's not being fought by saying, we're going to close the doors sort of by keeping people out through scholarships and fellowships, but we are going to close the doors through budgetary means. And that's exactly what's happening because once you allow the university to begin to erode and decline then it simply becomes an institution which is no more sort of than, I think the Minister of . . . to paraphrase the Member for Morris, a sausage factory, I think is what he called it, or was it Lakeside? And that's all we're going to be producing, and universities, Mr. Speaker, are far more than that.

And the tragedy is this. The tragedy really is this, that much of the work and life of the university depends upon to a degree the kind of atmosphere, the climate that stimulates the kind of thought and education, that should be part of it. But once you fill that climate with acrimony and dispute and niggling and haggling, so that the energy and concentration

GRIEVANCE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) of those in university becomes more concerned with what's happening in the picket line at University Crescent rather than what's happening in the classroom or in the research laboratory, then you are beginning to destroy that university. That is the real problem. That is something that has to be responded to. We must take responsibility for that and we can't avoid that responsibility. It is part and parcel of the Minister of Colleges and Universities job to see that that doesn't happen. He has been given the stewardship of that institution and he has said today that he abrogates that stewardship, that somehow it's not his problem. Somehow this is some kind of . . . all of a sudden he and the Minister of Labour are falling back now . . . now we're hearing the grand sort of theoretical notions of collective bargaining.

But there's a difference between a public servants institution in a collective bargaining process and one which is on the market, because someone in the private enterprise basis has to -- (Interjection)-- Oh no, I'm fully in favour of collective bargaining. But it also means that the two sides to a collective bargaining process must have some ability to bargain. But when you've handcuffed in this sense the administration and management and say you cannot go no further, that's it, then that's no longer bargaining. You've destroyed the bargaining process. I would suggest to that Minister and that Minister that they read their own Wood's report. Because they'll tell you exactly that. Instead of talking why don't you go and read your own Wood's report. You know, rather than sitting there with your finger in your ear, go and read the Wood's report and he'll tell you what exactly should be going on in a collective bargaining process.

It's too bad, Mr. Speaker, that this government spent so much money hiring so many consultants and then somehow forgot the ability to read those reports when they come out. I think it would be an awful lot better government if they put their money to work rather than their mouths, because that seems to be mostly what we get. And I think --(Interjection)-- Oh, here we go. Now, Mr. Speaker, the point is that we're talking about now, now comes out. Now we're saying, I'm up here pleading for my kids. Let me simply say, Mr. Speaker, that in my present position - and unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I receive no money at all from the provincial government by any way. My salary is paid through other funds in the Institute. Now that happens to be a fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, so let's clear this whole question of conflict of interest just so, the Member from St. Boniface, who seems to be obsessed all the time with conflict of interest for his own reasons, sort of . . . at least it's cleared up in this case.

The point that we're trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is not to worry about sort of the kinds of inadequacies of the Minister of Health and Social Development. We have many opportunities to bring those to light. What we're talking about at this point is the Minister of Colleges and Universities and the fact that this government seems to be walking away from a situation which is beginning to deteriorate, it will have an adverse effect upon the university itself and the students within it, that they are reaching a critical stage in the life of that university, at which point it either begins to decline or it can sort of right itself and find some new formula for its funding and for its labor relations. We have caused in this House through passages of acts in the past, which I think members on all sides of the House basically agreed with, but it means that when you give the right of collective bargaining to public service employees, that it carries with it many other responsibilities. And I ask you to look exactly what happens when they decide to use that right of collective bargaining to go on strike, which means therefore you have to look at how you finance these institutions, what you do with them and to be able to give the universities or the hospitals or other kinds of public institutions, the same kind of flexibility that an organization or business corporation in the private market would have. Because if they must deal with labor and they must sort of raise wage demands beyond the minimum wage, because that in fact happens to be one of the particular disgraces at the University of Manitoba, that members of that service employees' union are now working for no more than the provincial minimum wage, and all they're simply asking is to catch up.

Now when we have to face that situation, we have to look at how we're going to find a formula to fund these organizations more realistically so that they can bargain in good faith and provide some resolutions to their very difficult problems. And that is the matter of grievance, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to raise on behalf of this caucus at this time, because it is not a matter that can be tolerated to allow to continue to deteriorate, because the more it does,

GRIEVANCE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) the more problems we raise, the more problems we will face, at some point or other we will cross a threshold where we won't be able to do anymore than sort of partial rescue operations which will damage and severely hurt all those involved in the university.

My point in rising, Mr. Speaker, is simply to say, and ask this government to begin to look seriously at first backing up, sort of in part, the legitimate demands of that striking group simply to get parity with other workers in the province, and secondly to provide some serious thoughtful solution to the problems of the university in its funding and its ability to maintain the kind of service and educational quality of which I think all Manitobans have been proud.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, it was indeed absolutely astounding to hear the comments made by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. It's rather interesting but, you know, his concern about, to quote him, "a don't give a damn attitude" that he didn't seem to give a particular damn about a strike against a public agency, a school division within a constituency of one of the members of his group - not caucus, of his group, in the St. James School Division a few weeks ago, which is every bit as much a public corporation as the University of Manitoba is. And over there he was quite willing and ready to allow the collective bargaining process to continue to resolve the dispute between the employer, namely the school division, and the particular employee group which eventually was resolved. And in this instance, in dealing with the University of Manitoba, for some reason, some unexplainable reason, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member feels that I ought to assume the role of the Board of Governors. That I ought to step in and do the job that the Board of Governors is elected and appointed to do, the duties that are prescribed for it by legislative authority, by statute . . .

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Sit down while you're still ahead Ben.

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . and he wants me to assume that responsibility. He wants me to assume that responsibility, and as the honourable member speaking from his seat, for Birtle-Russell, says, "sit down while you're ahead". Yes, we have been ahead for a number of years - I'm not sure whether the honourable member is aware of this fact or not, and I feel reasonably confident that we'll remain ahead for a number of more years to come. --(Interjection) -- and perhaps even the constituency of Birtle Russell you know, this is perhaps . . . I should explain for the benefit of the honourable member that this is what responsible government is all about. That we have our function to perform. There are, within public agencies and corporate bodies, amongst which is a university, it has its role and responsibility, its Board of Governors with its duties, and it is not my desire to encroach upon the area of responsibility of its Board of Governors which has the management authority for the affairs of the university.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge suggests that we are walking away from our responsibility. I think if the honourable member would examine the estimates for the current year, he would find that whatever increases that there are allowed for the operation of various departments of government, for various agencies of government which government supports, that provision was made to take care of what we anticipate to be the normal inflationary increases. And the honourable member also well knows, or ought to know, that, as on previous occasions, there had been instances when . . . yes, and universities, and one other university did experience some financial difficulty a few years ago, and a way was found to assist it in resolving its financial problems.

He made reference to the meeting between the Chairman of the Universities Grants Commission and the Board of Governors and particularly some of the conditions proposed by the grants commission as if it were some form of a millstone. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that you would agree, and all honourable members would agree, that the conditions that were imposed upon the University of Manitoba were nothing more than calling upon it for responsible management and acceptance of the fact that if there's a deficit and it being a public agency and the university being responsible for the management of its own affairs, therefore some effort has to be exerted by both parts to find a way out of the financial problem. And it's as simple as all that.

GRIEVANCE

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd)

In closing, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge did make one point that did impress me and it's one I'd like to respond to. He spoke of finding a solution to the funding arrangements for the operations of our universities. Well I just wish to remind the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, that we had a task force on post-secondary education which brought in a report making certain recommendations with respect to the funding of post-secondary institutions. Those were some recommendations amongst others dealing with the manner of delivery of post-secondary education in general, but, nevertheless, dealing particularly with funding. And subsequently to that, there was a working group within government assigned the responsibility of reviewing the task force recommendations from a government point of view to determine those which we'll be prepared to implement in the manner and the extent to which we would be willing and able to implement them. And one of the matters that the working group is presently dealing with and negotiating with in discussion with the universities, with all three universities, is the matter of university budgeting, reporting to the grants commission, and to do so in a manner that would provide the grants commission and government with a more comprehensive and clear over-all view of the university operations, and the cost of university operations, to allow for even better budgeting than we've had in the past. And this is presently being worked on. And at the same time being mindful, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that universities are independent and autonomous bodies, that their Boards of Governors do have certain responsibilities, and it has not been suggested by anyone from the other side of the House, nor has it ever been suggested by this government that the powers or the duties, responsibilities of the Board of Governors or of anyone responsible for the administration of the university should in any way be eroded.

I'm sure that the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge would be the first one to oppose any encroachment by government upon the power and duties of a Board of Governors. But nevertheless, some suitable satisfactory working relationship between the two groups has to be worked out. And this is presently being done. And if, in the opinion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, this is an "I don't give a damn attitude", well that's his opinion to which he's entitled and I do not wish to take up the time of the House to attempt to correct within him. He's entitled to his own views. But I thought, Mr. Speaker, that I would take a couple of moments of the House's time to explain my position, that of my department and government vis-a-vis the universities and in particular, in this instance, vis-a-vis the University of Manitoba.

. continued next page

GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to use up my grievance opportunity on this same occasion because, and I extend credit to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge in this respect, the subject has been broached, the subject is of an emergency nature in my view and, therefore, I cannot allow the opportunity to speak in this emergency context on this subject, to go by.

I had intended, sir, perhaps to move for an emergency debate on the subject later in the week. I know that there will be an opportunity to discuss it in estimates in a few days, but the occasion for using my grievance on this particular subject is at hand now because of the mechanics of the House, and therefore I intend to take advantage of that opportunity now.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that what we are witnessing here, and I wish the Minister of Labour was in his seat because I would like to say this to his face, I think what we are witnessing here is an exercise in political cynicism of the highest order, you take your preference, the lowest order. What we have here, Mr. Speaker, what we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a situation involving some non-militant, non-aggressive workers, support workers at the University of Manitoba, who have little or no political clout, who have little or no political loyalty or allegiance to the New Democratic Government, and as a consequence the NDP is walking all over them. That's what's happening.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Mines and Resources, to his colleagues on the front bench, to his colleagues right through that side of the House, that if these were the steel workers who were out on strike, or if these were the mine, mill and smelter workers, or if these were the members of any unions with political clout and voting support for the NDP government, this government would not be washing its hands of the situation the way they're doing with these university support staff strikers.

There's no question, there is no question to any objective, impartial, honest observer, Mr. Speaker, that the situation here is one of political opportunity and cynicism being exploited by this government, because they have got as pawns in the game that they're playing in attempts to cut fragmentary corners of their budget - which is all shot to hell in other areas - in an attempt to play that political game, these people are pawns who are being exploited and who are being walked all over.

I acknowledge the undertaking of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge in having used up his grievance and having addressed himself to this situation today, because despite the non-chalance of members opposite, despite the complete disregard being exhibited by the Minister of Education, despite the petulance being displayed by the Minister of Labour, this, Mr. Speaker, is a very serious, very critical situation, and it goes right to the heart of this government's philosophy and their concept of higher education, and their attitude as to who should control the minds of people on campuses and off, and who should control the direction that education takes in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge made reference to the climate on the campus, and the climate is a very serious ingredient in any university or any academic atmosphere - and I'm not an academic, but I've spent enough time in academic circles to be aware of that truism. The climate on the University of Manitoba has always been a climate of excellence, or near excellence; the climate has been fostered and engendered by succeeding governments up until June 25, 1969, and has produced an institution of higher learning which was beginning to take its place, its noteworthy and notable place alongside those institutions on this continent who rank very prominently in the academic sphere. That is not a simple achievement in the academic world; it's not a simple business achievement; it's not a simple scholastic achievement; it's not a simple financial achievement; it comes about as a result of a spirit that is fostered between all elements, all ingredients of an institution of that kind, and it comes about as a result of an enlightened government which translates and transfers its enlightenment with respect to institutions of higher learning to the general public itself, to the taxpayer himself. And we had come some distance under succeeding administrations in this province, up until I say, Mr. Speaker, June 25, 1969, towards attainment of that kind of climate which was giving the University of Manitoba some degree of excellence.

So when the Member for Fort Rouge refers to the climate on the campus, he was referring to a very crucial ingredient and one that apparently members opposite have no regard for, no interest in, and in fact no awareness of. Destroy that climate, destroy that atmosphere, and

GRIEVANCE

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) you destroy the very heart and soul and spirit and direction of a university institution. And, sir, the things that are happening out there right now - and there were some unpleasant things that happened today - are combining, are combining to smash that climate, to undermine that atmosphere, and it'll be a long long time, sir, before that atmosphere of co-operation, that spirit of healthy competitiveness, that spirit of healthy co-operation, that spirit of satisfaction in excellence, will be restored or repaired, if indeed it can ever be restored or repaired.

Sir, there were some unpleasant things that happened today, and there have been some elements of blame distributed around different parts of the entity participating in activities this morning. Some people say that the police on duty were acting with more than necessary zeal; some people say that the picketeers on picket line duty were obstructing illegally the normal flow of commerce and traffic into the campus; some people say that the university students who were not members of the striking union, but were participating out of sympathy, failed to follow orders from the strike commanders who were working under the aegis of the union, and as a consequence created difficulties that should never have been there. Well, I can tell you, sir, that I was an eye witness to those activities on the picket line for some two to three hours this morning, and I wouldn't know where to begin to place the blame where those three elements were concerned, because I don't think the blame lies with any of those three elements. I think the police were doing a job that had to be done. I know the strikers were doing a job that for their families had to be done in order to protect their livelihoods, and I believe sincerely that the students who participated were doing what they thought was a very necessary job. And to look around to place the blame on any one of those three elements or ingredients is missing the target and missing the boat entirely, Mr. Speaker. The blame for that situation out there on the campus of the University of Manitoba lies squarely on and through the shoulders of the administration of the university and onto the shoulders and the buck-stops here of the Minister of Education and the First Minister of this province and their colleagues on the benches across, that is where the blame lies. And it's pure . . .

A MEMBER: Hogwash. Hogwash.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . nonsense to try to isolate difficult situations that perhaps arose this morning on the part of the police, the legitimate strikers and the student sympathizers, when you take into consideration the degree to which the frustration of the strikers, the degree to which the frustration of the members of that union has been allowed to build. And they are frustrated, Mr. Speaker, they're bitterly frustrated, because this government has refused to accept the responsibility for seeing to it that the administration deals meaningfully, discusses and talks meaningfully with the negotiators for that union in this labour dispute. And it's not good enough for the Minister of Education to walk away like Pilate and wash his hands of the affair and allow somebody to be crucified on a distant hill. It's not good enough to do that. This Minister, this Minister has got a responsibility through his oath of office. This Minister has got a responsibility through his oath of office to maintain a first-hand watch over the situation, and to discuss with both sides the grievances and the difficulties that are now disrupting the normal flow of events on the university campus, and to correct injustices and wrongs where he sees them to be occurring. And if he finds, if he finds that certain meetings are being called and held, and certain invitations are being extended, and those invitations are being flouted by one side or the other - and I suggest to you that many of them have been flouted by members of the administration - then it is his responsibility as the Minister of Education, Colleges and all the universities of this province, under his oath of office, to take it upon himself to go out there and talk to Dr. Sirluck - beginning with the president, yes, beginning with the president of that university - and to talk with other members of the administration and tell them, look, you are not dealing fairly with this negotiating team, because you are not listening to them, you are not talking to them, you are not examining or exploring the situation, you don't care what's happening. And I say that the president of the university in this instance is demonstrating rather clearly I think to a great many people, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps he doesn't care what's happening. And I say that the Minister of Education is demonstrating it more clearly, demonstrating more clearly that he doesn't care what's happening.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education shouldn't have to bear the full brunt for this kind of criticism. The Minister of Labour shares with him equally the responsibility for non-action, for non-handling, for cowardice in the face of crisis and emergency, and for political cynicism,

GRIEVANCE

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) to refer to my initial remarks in this statement, for political cynicism of the highest and/or the lowest order.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has said that he's being asked by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and others to step in and do the job that the Board of Governors is appointed or elected to do, and that he feels that that goes beyond the terms of reference of his job. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's absolute rubbish. That is simply unacceptable to any well-meaning person in the Province of Manitoba. The government funds this university, the government clamps down on the university budget, the government tells the university how much money it's got and how much it's not going to get. The government has indicated very clearly that it's going to start as soon as it can in doing a lot of the thinking for the university. The government has indicated very clearly, subtly but clearly, that it is going to start as soon as it can directing, overseeing, the kind of curriculum directions taken by this university, and then when it comes down to the crunch, when it comes down to the case of dealing fairly with support staff workers out there who are underpaid, then the government throws up its hands and says, "it's not my baby, I don't have anything to do with the university, it's up to the Board of Governors." Well I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Board of Governors would get a cynical laugh out of that attitude, out of that contention, by the Minister, except that it's so unreasonable and so unacceptable that it isn't laughable, it isn't ludicrous, it's tragic. But this is precisely what this Minister is saying, that, you know, when everything's going right, and when we get to call the shots, and when we get to control the education curricula, and when we get to control the extent of the budget, we're in charge here, we're in charge here. But you get into a bit of trouble, you get into a bit of difficulty with some of your staff, and then it's your baby, you're in charge, you handle it, we're walking away, we have no responsibility - that's what the Cowardly Lion, the Minister of Education, Colleges and Universities is saying in this House, and saying publicly, in recent days and weeks throughout this dispute, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are an enormous number of questions involved in this situation on campus apart purely from the one of the wages dispute. The wages dispute is critical because the administration of the university has broken faith with the members of the striking union on at least two occasions in the past. I suggest to you, sir, that that is a truth, there is no exaggeration in that statement, faith has been broken on at least two occasions in the past by the bargaining representatives for the administration of the university where this particular strike and union is concerned. They've been asked to take less than that to which they were entitled on at least two occasions, and perhaps more, in the past. Now they're being asked to settle for less again. To settle for less in a wage demand situation that is not by today's standards, not by today's standards in any way exorbitant or unreasonable, Mr. Speaker, and they have decided that they've been nice guys long enough, that they've been walked over and pushed around long enough. As the nurses did, as the nurses did, after they'd had advantage taken of them time and time and time again, because people think, well, nurses are conscientious, responsible, nice people, they'll never go out on strike. What happens under a government like this when you take that attitude? They thumb their nose at you and walk all over you, and they go out on strike. That's why the situation with the nurses reached the degree that it did, and that's why this situation at the University of Manitoba has reached the degree that it did; and that's why I say, and I say again, that you'd never see that happen with the steel workers or the mine, mill and smelter workers or the construction workers, 'cause they'd walk all over the government before they allowed it to happen. But the government knows they can get away with this when they're dealing with workers, with employees, with Manitobans of this type who are normally non-militant, non-aggressive, and who haven't, at least up to the present, demonstrated any consistency in NDP voting patterns, thank God.

Mr. Speaker, apart from the wage situation - which I believe is justified and is not unreasonable - but apart from that, there are a number of moral questions which are tearing at the very guts of that university now as a consequence of this situation. Picture the university student, Mr. Speaker, who is in sympathy with those striking support workers who are trying to get their wages up to a reasonable level, not even a competitive level with private business and industry, and in many cases with government, but just a reasonable level, that student is faced with the moral dilemma of whether he or she should write the exam for which he's been studying and preparing all year, and into which he or she has invested a great deal of time, effort and money; or whether he should side with the strikers with whose case he has

GRIEVANCE

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) considerable sympathy, because he can see at first hand the injustices being perpetrated. That's one of the moral questions tearing at the very fabric at the university now.

Another one involves research workers, who are supposed to be looking after animals, who are used for research out there, and who are not in a position to look after those animals any more, so the animals are either being destroyed without having the research experiments carried out on them that they were bought for in the first place; or the animals are neglected to the extent that they will not be valuable research subjects in the future, should the university get back on an even keel. That's another dilemma, the research worker feels that he is letting down those for whom he was doing his research work and yet at the same time he has a moral obligation, and in many cases a union obligation, to support the fight that's going on.

Consider the assistants in the clerical department, the secretaries and others who work for deans and other administrators, and have always got along extremely well with their employers, with their colleagues, with their fellow employees at the university. They have left the offices of the university, the running of the university in some disarray; that bothers their consciences. These aren't people without conscience. It bothers the deans that they no longer have someone to do the necessary work in their offices, and it bothers the secretaries and others out on strike that they're letting their employers down, and that creates a rift in personal feelings, it creates an interpersonal rift that will take a long long time to repair.

Consider the computer technicians who have obligations, not only to the university but to private business and industry - and I stand to be corrected - possibly even to the government to carry out programs, perform programs, fulfill duties and responsibilities in the area of computers, who have had to go out on strike because they are members of the union and they are fulfilling their fraternal duties as union members. They are letting people down, they are creating hard feelings, they are creating difficulties that are going to be hanging over the heads of everyone who continues in that position in the future.

This is the kind of climate that I am referring to, and I am sure it's at least part of the climate that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge was referring to; this is the fabric that is being torn at, this is the fabric that's being ripped apart out there on that campus now, Mr. Speaker, and it will be a long long time in repair, if indeed it can ever be repaired. And it's that very intangible that makes a university, makes an institution of higher learning good or inferior. It's that very intangible that creates the spirit that can make it good or make it not so good. And this is what's being sacrificed at the present time, over and above the livelihoods of the strikers, and I've already suggested that I'm not going into detail on that. I think their requests are justifiable. But these are the kinds of things that are being sacrificed, that are being ripped apart out there and the University of Manitoba may well never recover from this situation if it's allowed to go on much longer. It may well never recover, it will certainly be some substantial time in recovering even if the strike situation is resolved within the very next few days.

What we are asking, Mr. Speaker, is not that the Minister of Education and the Minister of Labour and the First Minister interfere in the collective bargaining process, nobody is asking that. What we are asking them to do is insure that there is a collective bargaining process. What we are saying is that at the moment there is no collective bargaining process. It's a farce. It's an exercise. It's window-dressing. There is no meaningful dialogue. I think that this government and the administration of the university has a vested interest in having that strike go on, so that many people will quit, so they won't have to be paid, so the university and the government can cut some corners in its budget. It's spending a billion dollars plus in its over-all program this year, but here and there they can find corners where crumbs can be swept up, corners can be cut, nickels and dimes can be saved. They can be saved at the expense of people who don't have the clout to fight back like the strikers and the university support services, and that's what's happening at the present time. This is precisely the nub of the cynicism of the whole situation. The strikers are being exploited so that the administration can try to meet the strict budgetary straitjacket, the ultimatum that's been handed down to them by this government. This government has told them to shape up or ship out. I'll say that again, Mr. Speaker. This government has told them financially budget-wise, ship up or shape out.

A MEMBER: Do you want to try again?

GRIEVANCE

MR. SHERMAN: Shape up or ship out, I said. And in order to comply, in order to shape up, in order to jump how high, the administration is not interested in settling this strike, and I don't think the government is interested in settling it either. And that's the tragedy and the cynicism of this situation, and 1100 support workers at the university are caught in the middle like mice caught in a trap, and they climate the atmosphere, the excellence of the university of Manitoba hangs in the balance and it's being destroyed because of this cynical political disregard, this non-handling, this non-action, this cowardice by this government, who will knuckle under to the steel-workers but will walk all over those who don't have that kind of political clout.

And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for this government to demonstrate some guts in dealing with that element of society who has a justifiable right to a fair wage claim but who doesn't necessarily conform to the voting patterns that these people like. And if these people want to cut corners and save on their budget, there are many areas that we continue to point out to them in the estimates generally in that billion dollar plus budget without imposing a ceiling, a straitjacket on the university and forcing the university to cut wherever it can just to meet that particular straitjacket. That's what's happening. The university has been told to do it. The university has said the way we can do it is to let these people strike. Several of them after awhile will quit. We'll never have to pay them again. The inequities in that whole process and whole procedure are enormous and staggering, Mr. Speaker, and really the root of this whole thing is the whole attitude, the philosophy of this government towards universities.

What is their concept of the University of Manitoba? We don't know where the money is being spent. We don't know how badly it's being administered. We don't know how badly it's being manhandled. If they'd show us and the University would be forced to show us line by line where every one of those dollars is allocated, I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that members on all sides of this House could find areas, could find areas very quickly in which savings could be affected and funds could be reallocated, rechannelled, redirected to take care of some of the problems plaguing the university. There wouldn't be this niggardly situation where slave labour wages, coolie wages are being paid to certain people and where others at high administrative levels are being paid 200 percent more than they're worth. There wouldn't be that kind of situation. But because there is no proper line by line scrutiny available to the public through its elected representatives in this Legislature of what the university administration does with its money, and how it spends it and how it misspends it, we get this kind of coverup where discovery is made of a certain situation that can be exploited to save some money on the spot. Doesn't matter who's caught in the trap, as long as I said, it isn't somebody with political clout. As long as you got people who don't have political clout, get them in the trap and squeeze 'em. That's what's happening.

The Minister of Labour who has missed this whole set of remarks, I hope will have the graciousness to sit down and read what I've said. I wish he'd been in here. I've said a couple of critical things --(Interjection)-- See, there's the typical attitude of this government. "I usually read your tripe." He doesn't come in here to listen to the Member for Fort Rouge and others and myself talk about a critical emergency situation involving one of our higher institutions. --(Interjection)-- He was here. The Member for Fort Rouge was here.--(Interjection)-- The Member for Fort Rouge was here and he was called out on the telephone, Mr. Speaker. I know the Minister of Labour has other duties. I wasn't criticizing him for not being in the House. I said I hope he'll have the graciousness to read what I said. It was his response to that, with the typical cynicism of that Minister and that government that then generated my other remarks. I say that that is typical of this government, that anything that comes from this side of the House is either not worth considering at all or it's tripe. That's because they have the divine right, the Day of Jubilee as the Minister of Mines and Resources discussed last night when we were bogged down in discussions of the Book of Leviticus.

The Day of Jubilee, Mr. Speaker, do you know when that was? As far as this administration is concerned it was June 25, 1969. That's right. That's right. --(Interjection)-- Next year, Jerusalem. Well Jerusalem came for them in 1969 and they're still enjoying it. They're still enjoying it. But I suggest to them that it's a very high-handed irresponsible moment of enjoyment when they take the opportunity to practise the double standard that they practise. This government, which was supposed to be the working man's government, supposed to be a

GRIEVANCE

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) government responsive to the problems of people who were underpaid, applies the double standard to save its own political necks; applies the standard of measurement as to whether an exploited section of the working force, as to whether an element of society who is not receiving its just benefits can pack the political clout and the political wallop to force decisions on them. And if it can't pack that political clout and political wallop, well then the double standard comes in and they walk away from it. It's no longer a social problem.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that virtually all the problems confronted by this government since they came to office have been measured in that context, in that frame. Not as social problems, as political problems. How do we stay elected? Well they did pretty well in 1973. Not as well as they expected, but there'll be another day of reckoning and possibly a Day of Jubilee in the future. And until this government demonstrates that it regards the just rights, claims and deserts of everybody in this province on an equal basis regardless of political affiliation or clout, they're not going to be around to enjoy that day when it comes. They're not going to be around to enjoy a further Day of Jubilee.

I think that what this Minister has demonstrated in the last few weeks, which has been the extent of this session so far, has been a total disregard for the problems that are facing him in the labour sphere as they relate to society as a whole. He has looked at every situation as it relates to the government and to the New Democratic Party. There's been a total disregard for the impact on society as a whole or for the fairness to society as a whole. And he's being joined at this time in this exercise where the University of Manitoba's strike is concerned by the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, who perhaps didn't come to that conclusion or that decision on his own. I rather suspect that he was directed to act the way he's acting, to put himself aloof and remain aloof from this difficulty, by his colleagues in the Cabinet who apparently are capable of responding with a sense of responsibility to departmental difficulties far more effectively and far more honestly than that Minister is. This Minister has not responded with any show, with any reflection of responsibility where this question is concerned.

It's time that this Minister of Education got out there and took a look at that situation. He doesn't demonstrate any sympathy for the situation. That is one thing, that's one thing. I can accept the fact that he's not sympathetic. The thing that bothers me and bothers everybody else there and bothers, I hope, a great many Manitobans, is that he doesn't even recognize the situation. He doesn't even recognize if there's a problem. He doesn't even recognize that there could be difficulties here that could injure the University of Manitoba. And that, sir, is the greatest political sin of all. That is ignorance plus cowardice and we've got that par excellence at the present time being demonstrated by the government in its stand on this question through that Minister. And his colleague the Minister of Labour certainly is culpable to the same degree. He has done nothing but berate us, heap vilification on any suggestion that's come from this side of the House and failed to meet his responsibilities in going out and looking at these situations and ensuring that fair collective bargaining is taking place.

Mr. Speaker, I think this government has to ask itself what does it think about the universities, what does it believe about universities, where does it stand on universities? I don't know where they're taking their philosophical direction from on that subject, but it seems to me, sir, that they've decided to close ranks against the excellence of higher education altogether. That they have decided that there are certain savings that can be effected in that area and that's where they're going to make those savings, regardless of the damage that it does to this province. And that is a basic root philosophical question that they're going to have to address themselves to. And that is a basic root philosophical course that's going to lead to disaster if they don't alter the manner in which they're operating, because there won't be that kind of university excellence on that campus, as I've suggested, in a very few years if this kind of attitude persists.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to that Minister of Education and that Minister of Labour and his colleagues, and the First Minister, to guarantee the people of Manitoba and the staff support workers, the faculty members and the students of the University of Manitoba, and the members of this House, that there is true, real, meaningful collective bargaining going on. We had the suspicion, you know, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think it's very far from the truth, we had the suspicion that this government didn't care about the Flyer Industry strike last winter. We didn't say much about it because there was a major . . .

GRIEVANCE

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, come on.

MR. SHERMAN: We said very little about that strike while it was going on, Mr. Speaker, and it's petty of that petulant Minister of Labour not to acknowledge that fact. We took a responsible line and said, "Let the Minister of Labour do what he can to effect a proper solution to the problem. Let's not worsen it by getting into it." But what happened, Mr. Speaker, what happened, Mr. Speaker, was that that course of action only encouraged the Minister of Labour and the government to let it ride, let it go, let it slide. They let it go on, they let it go on because it was, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to their advantage, politically and financially, to let it go on. And that was our suspicion throughout the Flyer Industry strike, and I don't mind putting that on the record for that Minister of Labour right now. But we did not say that during the course of the strike. We did not raise that issue. --(Interjection)-- We did not say that. The Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour as usual is fabricating and fictionalizing at the last moment of a debate from his seat. He hasn't heard anything that's gone beforehand. He's coming in here in his usual flamboyant red-faced fashion, elephantine fashion, stumbling into the debate, blurting out untruths and fictions, and I beseech him for one more minute to remain quiet.

We did not, Mr. Speaker, we did not raise that point during the course of the strike. But I'm raising it now because we've got an analogy on University Crescent today, where an administration and a government and a New Democratic Party, the champion of the worker, a champion of the common man has decided, "Let 'er go boys, 'cause we can make a saving, we can save a few bucks. A few people are going to quit their jobs, so just let 'er go." And the staff support workers out there are being squeezed in that political viser, that cynical political ringer. And I challenge this government to get up off their cynical seats in this House and do something about it to save and salvage what remains of a climate and an atmosphere out there on the University of Manitoba campus and to do right by people who have a legitimate wage demand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, in the gallery especially. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that the Member for Fort Garry has made more than one slip of the tongue during his speech.

The Member for Fort Garry has made an attack on the government and we know from the Member for Morris, and I don't criticize this, that the opposition's position is to oppose. And the government has taken a position vis-a-vis free collective bargaining and the Member for Fort Garry says, "I must oppose and what is the best line of opposition" and has proceeded to follow that line of opposition to a conclusion which we have heard expressed in the last 30 minutes.

Presuming, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister of Education had done other than what he did, he would have been congratulated by the Member for Fort Garry even though it's the duty of the opposition to oppose.

Now let us assume that we go back three weeks and follow what appeared to be the suggested form of action by the Member for Fort Garry. Let us assume that the Board of Governors of the university appointed in several ways, some by the alumni, some by the government, some by the university, some by the Senate, some by the Faculty Association, was carrying on collective bargaining with its employees. And let us say that the employees wanted one figure and the Board of Governors who are responsible for their salaries and other salaries within this administration and the salaries of the professors and all other salaries, looked at their budget and said "No, we don't want to pay this amount of wages. We have a right to suggest" . . . The Honourable Member for Fort Garry who wanted the Minister of Labour to listen I'm sure will be interested in hearing what his suggestion amounts to. That they said "No", that they don't feel that that is right, that they feel that there is inflation and they heard somebody say that the Member for Morris said that the government is one of the most serious causes of inflation, and that here is a place where they feel that the demands are too high, they may be right or wrong, but they are going to hold the line. And let us say that the representative from the employees came to see the Minister of Education and said, "We are bargaining with these terrible people; there's Peter Cain from Sherritt-Gordon Mines, Maurice Arpin," is he still on that board? He's not on that board. There are other people appointed by the Senate, other people, and these people really do not have an interest in the working man, they

GRIEVANCE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) do not have respect for our position, and they are demanding that we may be maintained at a certain increase which we say is slave labor. Slave labor rates. We want you as Minister of Education to go to the Board of Governors of the university, tell them that they should not be maintaining slave labor rates and that he should tell them that they are to increase their bargaining position, to pay more money, and that he will see to it that more money is passed on to the university grants commission. And let us say that at that point the Board of Governors says you are the Minister of Education, you are a persuasive man, you also are willing to pay more money, therefore we will do what you say. And, Mr. Speaker, they did that and the workers were rehired and they were given an increase and it was announced that the Board of Governors gave this increase. And then a member of the Board of Governors went to the Member for Fort Garry, and said, you know, we didn't want to give that increase, the Minister of Education came to us, told us that we are bargaining too strongly with these people, that he will give us money from the university grants commission if we gave an increase.

Members of this Assembly, the Member for Fort Garry would have you believe that at that point he would rise in his seat and say congratulations to the Minister of Education. "We salute you; you have proved yourself to be a wonderful person; you have proved yourself to really recognize the needs of the workers." Even though, Mr. Speaker, the duty of the Member for Fort Garry is to oppose, he would have you believe that he would come here to this House and that he would not say the following, Mr. Speaker. Because I know what the Member for Fort Garry would say; I know what the Member for Morris would say; I know what the Member for Birtle-Russell would say; they would say the following: They would say, here is a responsible citizens' board, independent board chosen by the senate, chosen by the government, composed of respected members of our communities, trying their best to manage a university, engaged in normal collective bargaining with their employees, desiring to hold the line, desiring to curb inflation, desiring to prevent the government from spending all kinds of money like it is going out of style. Wanting to put up a reasonable, normal collective bargaining economic dispute with its employees which results on the one hand of the employees not working and the university suffering the effects of not working, and a political intervention was made at the most irresponsible level by the Minister of Education. How many members in this House do not say that that would be the speech that would be made by the Member for Fort Garry, the Member for Birtle-Russell, the Member for Morris, and the members of the opposition?

MR. GRAHAM: Would the Honourable Member permit a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Would the Minister mind if I asked that I be disassociated from his remarks?

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not disassociate the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell from my remarks because I believe that that is what the Member for Birtle-Russell would say. I am not saying that he said it. I believe that that is in his mind. I believe it, Mr. Speaker, because when the longshoremen were on strike on the West Coast, the Member for Birtle-Russell did not say that the Minister of Industry and Commerce should go to the owners of the ships and say that they are irresponsible, that they are paying slave wages, and that they are preventing the grain from moving and that they should pay higher wages so that that grain would move. That's not what he said. He said that the labor unions have to be put back to work, that's what he said. Mr. Speaker, that is what he said.

And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Fort Garry has two speeches to make. He accuses us of duplicity. He has two speeches to make: the speech that he made today which is an opposition attack, and the speech that he would have made if the Minister of Education did what he says. And I say that the Minister of Education, as all other ministers, have to do what is right. But one of the ways, Mr. Speaker, which I will admit that you determine what is right, is that you test your position and you test what you will hear in answer to your position. And I'm sure that the Minister of Education did not do this clinically or systematically, but I'm sure that in the back of his mind, as in the back of anybody else's mind, that that process goes ahead, here's what happens if I do this, here's what happens if I do that. If I maintain a position of free collective bargaining by the Board of Governors of the

GRIEVANCE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) university with their union, I will hear what the Member for Fort Garry said today. If I do what he suggests I should do, I will hear the argument that I have paraphrased a few minutes ago.

And, Mr. Speaker, if we are to be under attack, which we are to be under attack no matter what we do, then in my view the Minister of Education has chosen by far the best argument to be attacked by. Because the argument presented by the Member for Fort Garry will not be sustained, Mr. Speaker, by any of the traditional people supporting the Conservative Party and will be recognized by trade unionists as being nothing but play acting. Mr. Speaker, I say that, you know, I was in the member's position when I was in opposition, I was the labor critic for the New Democratic Party. As labor critic for the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, I never ever said that a group of workers who were on strike, that their demands were justified, that they were entitled to what they were asking. I never said that once. I never ever said that a group of people on a picket line had the right to sustain their jobs by preventing access to the place where the people who did not wish to be on that picket line or who wished to enter that place, should go. I asked for one simple thing, and both of those positions have been taken by the Member for Fort Garry. He has now adjudicated that the workers' demands are justified. That the man on the picket line, and he didn't distinguish between the actions, had a right to be there and to do what he was doing to protect his job.

Now I stood on that side of the House and the former Attorney-General will recall, that whatever protestations I made vis-a-vis the Conservative government with regard to labor, that I asked for only one fundamental position, and that was freedom for the employees. Freedom to engage in collective bargaining, freedom to walk down the streets with a sign, freedom not to be ordered by a court to go back to work. Each of which demands was put formally in resolution form and I will show you, voted against by every member of the Conservative party. And that's all that was requested. Not an increase in wages, not the right to prevent people from walking into a plant, both of which appear to be pursued by the Member for Fort Garry, but merely the right of freedom which is requested and demanded by every other member in society. The right to walk down the streets with a sign, carrying true information, hoping to be persuasive, and the right to say that he will not work under order of a court.

The Attorney-General said what about violence on that picket line? I said if a trade unionist commits violence against another person in society, he has to be prosecuted. He said would you do that? I said yes, I will help you. If you want to prosecute a trade unionist for committing violence, I will support you. I will not condone that violence. Now, Mr. Speaker, those are the only two things that I asked for. The Member for Assiniboia will agree. I never ever said that a worker's demands were justified. I said he was justified in working to reach those demands. That he was justified in demanding the right of free collective bargaining to achieve those demands. He was justified in doing everything which free collective bargaining implies, which includes walking down the street seeking support for one's position, persuading other people not to take his position, but not in committing violence and not in preventing the freedom of others.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of asking for those demands, which I said that some day when people who are seeking to enact union laws which infringe on employers, that it's the Conservatives who will look to me for support. Because I say that the employer has a right and the employee has a right. But under the previous administration, and from what we see the Conservative members asking for in the House of Commons, they are not prepared to permit free collective bargaining. And when free collective bargaining is taking place, the Member for Fort Garry gets up and pretends that that is taking place because the Minister of Education is responsible to increase the salaries of those people. Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member does not know what free collective bargaining is. If he excludes the withdrawal of services and of strikes and the right of the employer to refuse to yield to the demand for wages and therefore to not employ, from the phrase "free collective bargaining," then with the greatest respect to the honourable member, with the greatest of charity to him, I must tell him that he doesn't know what the words mean. Because free collective bargaining implies the right of an employee not to work and the right of an employer not to hire. And until those two things take place in many cases, you never know what are justifiable demands. And for the member to pretend that we are involved in this because of some political non-affinity with the unions, Mr. Speaker, that is an incredible proposition.

GRIEVANCE

MR. PAULLEY: It's understandable coming from him.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member state his matter of privilege.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is I'm being misquoted. I'm not pretending that, I'm stating it as a fact.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Then the point of privilege that you are making is that I have not said it with sufficient clarity to justify your position. All right, Mr. Speaker, I will say it in over-clarity and then he will have another point of privilege. That he is falsely without any foundation, deliberately and irresponsibly accusing this government of fostering an industrial dispute because we are against the union involved in this dispute. Mr. Speaker, I have now said it with sufficient clarity so that the honourable member can understand it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the honourable member should know that we had a dispute in Sprague, the employees walked out a year ago, over a year ago. That was a trade union affiliated with the Canadian Labor Congress, which is normally a supporter of the New Democratic Party. That dispute, Mr. Speaker, has not been settled to this day. Why? Because we told those people, when you supported the New Democratic Party it was not to support your wage demands, but only your demands to have the right to engage in free collective bargaining.

We were told, Mr. Speaker, a year ago, by the union at The Pas, that they were protesting and were going to come out publicly against this government because we were not stopping The Pas Forest Complex from exercising some type of shut down of their workers, and that this was a government of the worker and that we were supposed to prevent the shut down and continue to pay them, even though there was nothing to do. And we told those workers that when you supported us it was not because we said we would support your wage demands, but because we said we would support free collective bargaining, which is rejected by our opposition and is still rejected by our opposition. They were a union affiliated with the Canadian Labor Congress and they were supposedly supporters of the New Democratic Party.

When the fish workers went on strike, it was retail-wholesale. Gordon Ritchie, a former client, a good friend, went on strike against the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board. A good supporting union, I believe, of the New Democratic Party. The Leader of the Opposition got involved in that strike. Said that we were supposed to settle it. We said to him and to those people that we will not support the position of trying to increase wages or reduce wages, that we support your rights to free collective bargaining and we will not upset that right. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have done that.

United Automobile Workers were negotiating with Saunders and they were having difficulties and they phoned our office, spoke to me personally, and I told them you had better negotiate with those people as if I was not here because we will not interfere with the free collective bargaining process. The people who will do that are the Tories. They will interfere with it in this case because they feel that it somehow affects their political position in the province of Manitoba and that's quite legitimate, although I think you're going to lose more than you get. Because when the Chamber of Commerce boys read what you have now said in your speech, I hope that they will pass resolutions condemning the Member for Fort Garry for suggesting the kind of position that he is taking, and that will hurt you a lot more than you will be helped by the so-called position that you think is going to get you some support in this Legislature as a result of that speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have two minutes before we change the time and then I'll finish.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member have leave?

MR. GREEN: I believe that I will have a few minutes time left. I am merely going to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the position of the Conservative Party has consistently been not to interfere with the Boards of Directors of Crown or other corporations who are trying to maintain a line in free collective bargaining. They go one step further than I would, and I'm not really able to speak for my entire party in this respect. They never said, tell the CNR to pay more money, tell the grain elevators to pay more money, tell the shipping companies to pay more money, tell anybody else to pay more money. They have never said that, that's a first today. We have a first, that they say, pay more money. They usually say the following: Don't

GRIEVANCE

(MR. GREEN cont'd) pay more money, which I say is legitimate. That half of the equation I can live with. But also send them back to work for the same money. That has been the traditional position of the Conservative Party in the House of Commons. And that has been the position, you know, the position that you took . . .

A MEMBER: So what.

MR. GREEN: Well, so what. Well, Mr. Speaker, all that I am suggesting --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Right, Mr. Speaker. All I'm suggesting is that ultimately, ultimately who judges an opposition attack has to judge it by its sincerity and its consistency. I say that when I sat in the opposition, I took no position inconsistent with what I am now taking. I said, I never asked for a wage demand nor did I ask for extraordinary rights for employees. I asked for equal rights for employees. I'm taking the same position today. That when the members of the Conservative Party as a group on labor questions - look at their convention, look at what they have said at their convention - have taken positions which they have taken, they have not been consistent with the position put by the Member for Fort Garry today. That doesn't matter, that doesn't matter, he could take a slightly different position on this question. All I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that, knowing that the duty of the Opposition is to oppose, the position that he is taking has to be counterbalanced with the position that he would have taken if another thing were done by the Minister of Education, and all I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that the Opposition attack that we have had to face today is marshmallow cream puffs compared to the Opposition attack that we would have had to face if the Minister of Education did what was suggested by the Member for Fort Garry that he should have done.

. . . . continued on next page

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - RESOLUTION NO. 1

MR. SPEAKER: Subject to Rule 19(2), we are now into Private Members' Hour, Resolution No. 1 by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, amended by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief on this resolution - or, I should say, on this amendment. Certainly I agree with the Member from Fort Garry's resolution on this subject, and I certainly agree very much with many of his comments that he made, in fact all of the comments that he made on the subject. And as the resolution says, the Federal Government has placed the Green Paper before the people of Canada regarding immigration.

The Minister of Labour, when he was speaking on this particular resolution, Mr. Speaker, he casually said, it's a Green Paper and it's there for discussion, and that was what would be done among the Ministers of Labour and the Ministers across Canada - Labour Ministers across Canada - they would discuss this resolution. But, Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot of experience in this country and in this province with White Papers and Green Papers, etc. Usually, when this government presents a White Paper, we don't have any doubt that that is going to be policy, because they very seldom discuss it when they say they're going to discuss it, and certainly the Federal Government has always seemed to be the same way when they present a White or Green or Blue or whatever colour paper you want for discussion. So, when the Whereas - the Whereas that is recommended to be taken out in the amendment - "WHEREAS the Federal Government's favoured position, as promoted in the Green Paper, appears to be one of rigid restriction in future years of immigration inflow into Canada," we have to say that that is basically the policy of the Federal Government, it is a restrictive Green Paper, and I'd be willing to bet my boots that they'll shove it down the people of Canada's throat, because the Prime Minister of Canada is an arrogant person who seems to like to do that, especially when it's Western Canada involved, and certainly the immigration policies in this Green Paper are harmful to Western Canada and it's time that he started to give us more consideration than he does the more populated areas down East. So the Whereas of this particular resolution that is recommended to be taken out, should stay in, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the second part of the amendment which says: "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the House consider the advisability of establishing a special committee with a view to receiving representation from the Manitoba Federation of Labour", I wouldn't for one minute believe or think that the Manitoba Federation of Labour will not have comments of their own on the Green Paper which they will send to the government. I wouldn't for one minute believe that the business community will not have something to say about the Green Paper. I believe the agricultural community, your farm organization and agricultural organizations will have something to do and make representation to the government on the Green Paper, and the general public, I'm sure, will have many opportunities to make presentation.

Mr. Speaker, if I thought the setting up of a committee would accomplish anything in this day and age, I might agree with the amendment, but quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, what happens with committees? It would probably take us a couple of months to get one formed, picking the people to be on it, and then you'd have your first meeting of the committee, at which time they would spend about an hour, a half an hour to an hour, deciding what their terms of reference would be and how it would work. And then somebody would say, "Well, when is the next meeting?" And everybody'd reach in their pockets for their notebook and say, "Well, I can't make it this day," and "I can't make it this day," so when they finally set on a day a month from now, what will happen then? They'll all gather together and spend another half an hour to an hour deciding what sub-committees they'll set up to report to the committee. You see? And so they've all gone away and done a real big job on wandering around setting up the committee, which really has accomplished nothing in this day and age. We have today more committees and sub-committees reporting to committees and nothing being done, than any time I've ever seen before in my life. So we'd be looking at a situation where we are setting up a committee that I'm sure will not even accomplish anything because what'll really happen at the third meeting when they disperse themselves, they'll say, "Well, we can't get together; we'll leave it at the call of the Chair." So, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, what are we asking in the "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED"? We're asking: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that ... the freest possible inflow of human skills into Manitoba, consistent with social and economic conditions - consistent with social and economic conditions - and that the position be urged

RESOLUTION 1

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . upon the Government of Canada with all possible determination. With all possible determination, Mr. Speaker, we are saying we want something consistent with the economic conditions of Manitoba.

Now, do we really need, do we really need to spend six months fooling around with committees to do that? Mr. Speaker, therefore the amendment of the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge is, you know, not that bad, except that it won't accomplish that much. It won't get anything done. It'll take six months for something to come back for this Legislature to do something; and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that we on this side, in fact I know the Official Opposition cannot support this amendment, because we want to see some action from the government regarding the Green Paper, and we want to see the action before the Green Paper is finally - and as I quite honestly believe - is pushed down the people of Canada's throat. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I follow the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek to deal with the subject of the Green Paper and the resolution, and to deal with the amendment of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, and to support the basic position that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has indicated.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, I approach this particular topic with a particular concern. I was the Minister of Industry and Commerce for the period of 1966 to 1969, and in charge of immigration insofar as the provincial responsibility during that period of time. I represented the Province of Manitoba on January 31, 1967, with a submission at that time on the White Paper on Immigration. The government of the day presented a White Paper. That White Paper was the subject of discussions throughout the country and submissions to a joint Senate and House of Commons committee, and ultimately the White Paper led into the legislation which we now have on the books and which we've been operating under for the past number of years.

The reasons for the White Paper were many, but I think it was obvious that there were changes that were requested and required with respect to the immigration laws at that time. I consider that the changes that were brought forward by the Federal Government at that time to be enlightened; I consider the changes to be very beneficial for Canada and to be an improvement over the immigration policies that existed before. The legislation, therefore, I consider to have been good in the year that followed the discussion on the White Paper. I may say that I think we were the only province to make a submission to the committee and to present our position, and many of the recommendations and in fact many of the procedures worked out between the Government of Manitoba and the Federal Government in terms of test immigration situations were responsible for the changes that ultimately came about in the legislation, which developed a point system, which simply gave the immigrant a requirement to reach a certain target of a number of points, and credit was given for his education, for his skill, for the region he would be coming to, for the particular job opportunity that would be available to him, and for other factors that would be important in his adjustment and settlement within the community itself. And I believe that the system itself has operated rather well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, prior to the White Paper, the immigration laws favoured, in the main, immigration to Eastern Canada rather than to the other regions of the country, and the White Paper provided the opportunity for the discussion of regional disparities and regional considerations, including the particular concerns of the Province of Quebec. The new legislation that was enacted after the White Paper, which is the present legislation that we're dealing with, provided greater flexibility to meet the needs of the particular regions and the provinces where there were in fact opportunities for jobs to be filled. As I've indicated, credit was given to those particular regions where an immigrant was intending to reside and to whether there was a particular job for him to be filled. And this led, Mr. Speaker, to the relationship between the Department of Manpower and Immigration, in which the liaison allows the opportunity for the immigrant to be channelled, if he so desires to come to Canada, with the educational requirements and the skill, to an area where there was either labour shortage or there was an industry target to be met in terms of some new development, and it gave the immigrant the opportunity of being able to adjust very quickly and to become part of the employment stream within the country.

The unrealistic position of the immigration law before the change, which basically stated

RESOLUTION 1

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . that you had to have a minimum education requirement, was changed as a result of the point system adopted in the new act which we now operate, which took into consideration skill, adaptability and aptitude. The one area in which there probably is further improvement needed, Mr. Speaker, and one area which has not yet been touched, and that is simply an adjustment of the point system, is really the problems of the frontier area, which is really the problems of the North, the ability of the immigrant to be given the opportunity to go to the North where developed opportunities are very difficult than the other parts of Canada, and which may very well require a different adjustment or a different status to be given to those who would be prepared to live and begin their life in the northern part of our country.

Mr. Speaker, the Green Paper is an important document and is a document which I suggest indicates very clearly a government policy. There is a suggestion that the Green Paper is really here for discussion purposes, and I think that there is a great deal of information that is important. And I want to read, if I may, some observations from the summary, which I think are significant because they indicate the fact that under the present existing immigration laws, the adjustments that had to take place have occurred in a very reasonable way. I'm now quoting from the Green Paper and from the report of the survey undertaken, which was Volume - well it's "Three Years in Canada" I believe would be the first volume, which, Mr. Speaker, would indicate, as a result of the survey, the percentages of - well, not only the question of percentage of involvement in employment in Canada, but which would deal to a certain extent with factors and indicators that would at least show the economic adjustment that was made as opposed to social adjustment, which is something that one has to measure in a very different way.

Quoting from Page 6, it says: "Within a week and a half of their arrival" - this is from the survey that was undertaken by the government - "50 percent of all immigrants who eventually entered the work labour force had already started working. For the other 50 percent, finding a job took quite a bit longer, with the result that the average time from arriving to starting to work for all immigrants was four weeks." I think that's pretty significant, Mr. Speaker. From Page 9: "The improvement in the incomes of the sample immigrants was quite dramatic up to the end of their second year, rising from an effective initial annual income of \$5,766 to a level of \$9,096. The increase to a level of \$10,040 in their third year was still strong enough to keep the immigrants ahead of inflation. The percentage of immigrants living below the poverty line decreased sharply from 22 percent during the first six months of their residence in Canada, to four percent during their third year. By the third year, unemployment had become increasingly important in explaining the income situation of those remaining below the poverty line."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what this indicates is that on the basis of the test sample undertaken by the Federal Government, within a three-year period there was a substantial adjustment by the immigrants, who were able to earn in average income, incomes that were higher than many in Canada, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, it indicated that in terms of the working immigrant, within three years only four percent were below the poverty line in Canada. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, all this indicates is the important fact that the immigrants who have come to this country since the introduction of the new Immigration Act, have in fact been able to adjust, even though economic conditions have not been the most stable, even though unemployment has in fact been high, and there is testimony in the Green Paper of the fact that their adjustment has been significant and that they have made a contribution to this country.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is the Green Paper goes further and it deals in many areas - and I suggest in areas which would give testimony to the statements made by the Honourable Member from Fort Garry, who, both in the framing of the resolution and in his presentation, indicated that the Federal Government in the Green Paper appears to be concerned about a rigid restriction in future years of immigration inflow in Canada - and I suggest that is the case, in the Green Paper that's been produced - and secondly, a bias towards the Province of Quebec with respect to trying to balance --(Interjection)-- No, not sheer bigotry at all. No, I suggest to the honourable member, I am going to deal with this, if I may, and I have some ability to be able to deal with this. --(Interjection)-- Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge says, "Here we go again,"

RESOLUTION 1

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

I'd like to quote, if I may from an article by Chris Young. Chris Young in the Ottawa Citizen was reprinted in the Brandon Sun on March 31st, in which he talks about White Man's Green Paper, and in which he quotes, and it states: "This is a mad policy as well as an immoral one. As I see it, the immigrant history over the last nine years is as follows: We decided to open our doors wider and eliminate all traces of colour barrier. It worked well. A lot of new people came, although not nearly so many as in 1913. The authors of the Green Paper have now looked at the situation and are astonished that the new immigrants haven't caused more trouble. Therefore, they suggest, we'd better get back to restrictive policy fast before the riots start."

Mr. Speaker, he goes on further to say: "It turns out that by selected use of facts and dexterous employment of double and triple negatives, a policy direction is strongly recommended. In fact," he says, "the Green Paper suggests to the government and to the public that it's time to close the door."

Now, Mr. Speaker. . .

A MEMBER: That's still Chris Young?

MR. SPIVAK: That's Chris Young I've quoted at this point. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Green Paper is a document which shows concern for the Province of Quebec, and I am not suggesting that that concern should not be expressed. But having said that, the policy implications are very severe for Manitoba and for Western Canada and the rest of the country, because, Mr. Speaker, if the policy implications were adopted, as proposed in the Green Paper, the implications are such that many of the people who came to this province and who came to Western Canada, and I daresay many of the ancestors of the people who sit within this Legislature, would not have been able to come; and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the problems of Quebec are something that we must recognize are important in our country, in the confederation in which we live, but there is protection for that province in a number of ways; through the British North America Act, through the legal competence of the National Assembly of Quebec, and through the Official Languages Bill, and that an immigration program has to be geared to meet the needs of all the regions of this country, and that any requirement which would attempt to try and balance French language in terms of immigrant, or any other language of immigrants coming in, would in fact be a restriction to a policy which has worked very well and which I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in giving credit to the government - and it is the Liberal Government who introduced these changes - was a very enlightened one, a policy which, Mr. Speaker, I suggest was an enlightened one.

Now, whatever one wants to say about what is happening in Quebec, one has to look at Bill 22 to recognize that they have the legal competence to do the things that they want to do within their own area - and no one is questioning that - within our constitutional framework. So the protection exists, but it would be wrong, Mr. Speaker, to find that a policy would be adopted that it concerned with the particular balance of power in the particular situation that exists between Quebec and the rest of the country. And I suggest to you that it is in this Green Paper, and I, you know, feel, Mr. Speaker - and there may be some who will object to it - that it has to be said and it has to be discussed; it's contained within the documents that have been forwarded. And, Mr. Speaker, this is not just something that has been said by one person or people on this side.

Now when the resolution was framed - and I realize I have only a few more moments to go - the Member for Fort Garry said: "Whereas the Federal Government's favoured position, as promoted in the Green Paper, appears to be one of rigid restriction in future years of immigration inflow into Canada" - and the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge wants that particular clause eliminated. Mr. Speaker, if that's accepted, then this Assembly is essentially saying that they reject that this is really part of the thrust of the Green Paper. And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is, for the reasons that I've indicated, and for some they may be valid reasons; I do not believe that they are valid reasons and I do not believe that that is in the interests of Western Canada.

The second part of the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge deals with the question of committee, and the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek has already dealt with that. I think we should have this debate and see whether there is a consensus that can be reached.

RESOLUTION 1

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I come to this conclusion: that I do not see the necessity of a fundamental change in our immigration law. I think that the present statute is working well. I think that the debate that is taking place is necessary, I think that there are adjustments that may have to be made on the point system. I think that at times, when there is economic stress and when unemployment is high, the point system can work very well, because it can be a consideration with respect to the ability of an immigrant to be able to find a job opportunity and therefore not be in a position to achieve what is necessary to be able to enter the country in terms of a number of points, and I think that adjustment can take place depending on the economic and social conditions that exist within the country at any given time. And those factors are monitored and will be monitored by a government. They're flexible and can be monitored by a government. I do not see the necessity of changing something which has been progressive, which has been an advancement, which if they had been followed in the years gone by would have allowed all our ancestors and those immigrants who settled this province and who were responsible for a great deal of the growth and the vitality that exists within this province and Western Canada, who still would have been qualified and able to come, in a policy situation which would have accepted the contribution that they could have made. And it would seem to me that that policy is one that we would want to identify with, and one that we would want to continue. And whether one wants to accept this or not, there is implicit in the Green Paper a policy position which would be restrictive, and I suggest that that is not in the interests of this region, not in the interests of the Province of Manitoba, and abhorrent to the very tradition that has been responsible for the development of a substantial part of this province and, as I suggested, for the vitality that exists within our own area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson,

MR. KEN DILLEN (Thompson): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been involved for some time in this question of immigration, and at times I am even at variance with our own Minister of Labour, but I guess that . . . Well, I don't suppose it'll be the last time we will disagree?

One thing that really bothers me about the question of a national debate on the question of immigration, is that I don't really believe that you will come to any consensus in the country, depending on where, what area of the country you happen to be in at the particular time that the debate is going on. If you were in a section of the country that was predominantly Chinese and you were attempting to get a consensus on their part as to the policies of the Federal Government at the present time, and if those same group of people were attempting to gain access into Canada for relatives and were unable to do so, they would describe the present policies, regardless of how liberal they happened to be, they would describe them as being extremely restrictive.

The same would apply if you were in an area - we'll use an area of Eastern Canada that has a tremendously high level of unemployment, and I think it's within the last couple of months there was a riot in one of the plants in Nova Scotia, where a group of guest immigrants were brought in to work in the Heavy Water Plant, and there was such friction between the people who were residents of the province and the guest immigrants that came in, that there was conflict between the two, and I think a fight broke out and eventually the people said that they weren't going to subject themselves to this kind of abuse in this free and wonderful place called Canada, and they decided to leave. So if you were to go to Nova Scotia in that sector and encourage a national debate on immigration policy, they would tell you that the policy is too liberal at this time. So, you know, how do you develop a consensus between a part of the country that has a high unemployment situation as opposed to a part of the country that has a relatively low unemployment situation?

And when we're talking about immigration, and the Leader of the Opposition - I agree partly with what he was saying about the point system - but what does the point system really do? If you are a doctor and you decided that you were going to go to a remote community, or a relatively remote community that didn't have any medical services at the present time, you had the qualifications to practice medicine in the Province of Manitoba, and you met all of the other requirements, you would have a massive number of points in your favour and you would be accepted into Canada to meet Canadian needs. But the person who has made the application and is accepted may have come from a country that has a doctor-patient or doctor-population ratio far in excess of the present doctor-patient ratio or citizen ratio that presently exists

RESOLUTION 1

(MR. DILLEN cont'd) . . . in the province or any part of Canada. So the effect of this point system is to cream the top off of the, we'll call them the Third World (?) countries, and they are listed: Portugal, India, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Phillipines, Greece, Italy and Haiti, which made up about 50 percent, or 46 percent to be exact, of the number of immigrants that were allowed into Canada in the last year. On the other hand, Britain and the United States amounted to 30 percent - 29, 7 percent.

So what really is developing as a result of the point system, is that if you are a doctor, an engineer, a dentist, an agriculturist, any professional person, your ability to be accepted into Canada is far greater than if you were an ordinary Joe, labour type, who is a - well, with a limited amount of skill. So the effect of this creaming process is to relegate the developing countries into a constant continuous state of dependency or in a continuously depressed state, because we are so selfish in our need to satisfy our own selfish needs for the services, the skills that another country can provide, that we attempt to cream the top of the best people that we can get from whatever country that will best suit our particular needs.

At the same time, while we are doing this, while we are taking the best of the crop from all the other parts of the country, we also reduce our necessity, or our determination to develop from within our own province, our own country, the skills that are necessary to meet our own needs. So what happens is that the . . . You know, if we could recruit and import 50 dentists tomorrow, there would be no tremendous effort on our part, on the part of this province or the part of Canada, to increase the number of enrollment or encourage enrollment or provide additional assistance for the training and the development of dentists in this province, and I think that that has the effect of working against us.

The other thing is that, you know, we still have to recognize the tremendous contribution that the immigrant has made to Canada, into its development, certainly in Western Canada provinces, but we seem to forget that there are people in this province who somehow are being denied this opportunity to develop. They're denied it as a result of their geographical location, they're denied it because of their lack of formal education or whatever. But, you know, if I were to visualize a relatively remote sector of the province, and if we applied the same principle that we apply to immigration policies to a remote community, which would mean that we would go to a remote community of five, six, seven, eight hundred people, and the first person that we would attempt to recruit because of a need that had to be filled in another sector of the province more important in terms of priority to that particular community, we would probably attempt to encourage the relocation of the Minister, the Priest, or the Reverend, because, you know, he really stands out as being a person with the prestige, recognition, the education, all of the attributes that we look for in an immigrant, to satisfy the needs of a part of the province that is more developed than the area that he's in.

Then we would look at the Bay manager, you know. He could fit in anywhere else in the type of training, in accounting and food service, his ability to meet the public and so on. He could fit in anywhere. And then we would probably look at those people who are permanently employed in the community, working for the Bay, working for the school, working for the Band office, working for the nursing station, and say, well, you know, they had the ability and they could satisfy the needs of a particular industry or sector of the province where the need is evident. But you know that the thrust in all provinces in determining a relocation process, or it's a variation of a form of immigration, that the thrust of the provinces in determining the relocation of individuals for improved conditions or the ability to develop skills to further up-grade themselves for educational purposes and what have you, is not with the higher echelon or the cream of the community, because I would not like anybody, and I don't think anybody in any province, any person who is responsible, would want to say that he would take Red Lake in Ontario or Kenora and go in one of the outlying communities and say we'll take only those people with the ability and the skills to satisfy the needs of a mining company, a lumber company, or paper company. And yet this is the type of process that we use, that the point system indicates, that we use in our present immigration policy.

I'm not sure whether it was Hoover or Roosevelt, one of the presidents of the United States, who said many years ago - I think it's recorded - he said, "Give me your sick and your weak and your disadvantaged," I'm paraphrasing but it was my understanding of what he was saying, that they didn't just want the cream of the developing countries, they wanted anybody. And I think an immigration policy has to reflect that type of a humanitarian approach

RESOLUTION 1

(MR. DILLEN cont'd) . . . to countries that have that type of a problem. Because if we just continue to take the best, or the cream, we are keeping that country in a depressed, continuous depressed situation, and continually under-developed.

I want to get back to . . . The other thing that the Green Paper on Immigration fails to recognize, and somehow they are not taking a position on it, is that in many countries of the world at the present time there are people who want to move. The Jewish population of Russia is an example, who want to go to Israel or to other parts of the world. And I think that the Federal Government in Canada, through their External Affairs Department, have got to take a position that where there is restricted movement by a country for external movement out of that country, has also got to be included in a Green Paper a policy on immigration. There are other countries included where, for one reason or another, the people are not allowed free movement and access out of the country.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. DILLEN: Thank you. The other thing that I wanted to go on to, sir, is our approach to a system that takes into account the social and economic conditions of the province. At the present time I would say that there are some areas of the province that have higher unemployment than others, and the emphasis at the present time - and I can cite a couple of cases, a couple of instances where I was involved personally in trying to ensure that employment opportunities went, first of all, to the residents of the area where the economic activity was taking place, that's written into a collective agreement, very difficult to have included. It required extensive negotiations, some giving, some taking. And the provisions of that - this is in the case of Hydro development in Northern Manitoba. There is a clause in the collective agreement that says the first opportunity for employment goes to northern residents. The second, opportunities for employment goes to Manitoba residents; the third, opportunity for employment goes to Canadian residents, and off-shore immigration will take place after that on the basis of guest immigration.

But, you know, if you are to take a person who had some limited skill, you know, there appears to be such a distortion of the policy between the various levels of Federal Government policy, where you have allowing guest immigration or permanent landed immigrant status, it generally is in places where no Canadian will work because there is a lack of housing, or inadequate housing, or insufficient housing, to house the number of workers required in a particular plant or mine or area. So on the one hand you have immigration, the allowance of immigration on one hand, and a restriction on the other hand for providing funds for the building of houses, particularly in one industry - resource towns. So this has the effect of causing a certain animosity between those people who are coming in and accepting jobs under conditions that normally a Canadian would not work under.

I just want to reflect for a moment on the resolution proposed by the Member for Fort Rouge, and I would just like to close my remarks by saying that, as stated in the resolution, "that this House consider the advisability of establishing a special committee with a view to receiving representation from the Manitoba Federation of Labour, the business community, agriculture, the general public, to establish a provincial immigration policy consistent with the above." Mr. Speaker, if I could just refer briefly to the Manitoba Federation of Labour, I am sure that they will be presenting a resolution to the Canadian Labour Congress convention, that they are an affiliate to that body, and they will be putting forward or supporting resolutions on the Green Paper on Immigration, which will be presented by the leaders of the Canadian Labour Congress directly to the Prime Minister and his cabinet.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to get into the debate. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable House Leader has a point of order?

MR. GREEN: Well no. If the honourable member would feel more comfortable in starting at the beginning of a day, it's up to him. I think that there would be a disposition to let it stand in his name, but I say that is optional to the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable? Call it 5:30. The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)