

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 27, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. ABE KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report same, and ask leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that report of Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to table the Return to An Order for Address No. 2, on the motion from the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . .

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE:** On Introduction of Bills, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of privilege to the House, I am advised by the Clerk that there is a printing error in the Orders of the Day in that Bill No. 16, which is standing in my name, has been omitted from the Order Paper and I accept that it is through inadvertence that it was missed from the Paper.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I thank the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre for bringing this to the attention of all members. There was indeed an error, for which we apologize. When we get to that Order, it will be called in the numerical rotation.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, a question to the House Leader. Can the House Leader explain the rationale, if there be any rationale, for the First Minister's statement at the Western Premiers' Conference to the effect that he calls upon his fellow Premiers to join with him in a reassessment, a reassessment of the crowrate for western Canada? Could the House Leader explain to this House the rationale for the call by the First Minister for such a reassessment?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris):** That's not a very difficult thing to explain in the light

of the question that my honourable friend has asked. What I would like to point out, Sir, is that what was reported — and I presume that he gets his information from the Winnipeg Tribune and what was reported in the Tribune is not necessarily in keeping with the facts. What the Premier has asked at the Premiers' Conference — and I will take the time to read the five points of the program that he put before the Western Premiers' Conference. They're relatively short.

The first one was whether a system of compensatory rates is required to assure a contemporary and efficient system for transporting grain and grain products and if so, what alternative method should be considered for such compensation?

Secondly, regardless of the system or level of compensation, should not the benefits to western Canadian producers of current statutory rates be retained in their entirety?

The third point is, if compensatory rates are paid, should not railways be held fully responsible for providing adequate service, obtaining their own capital and for providing necessary system in rolling stock improvements? fourth point was the alternative methods for coordinating the movement of grain from the Prairies to domestic and export markets including consideration of highway transport and road strengthening programs and the related effects of branch line abandonment. /ends I know that my honourable fri will quail at the though of strengthening roads in this province, but that's the way it is.

And the fifth is alternative strategies for the coordination and integration of federal, provincial and industry efforts to rationalize, strengthen and develop the processing of indigenous crops in the western region.

These were the proposals that were placed before the Premiers' Conference and in no way reading the communique, in no way can that be interpreted as suggesting that the crowrates be abandoned.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I believe after the House Leader has read from the communique that the Winnipeg Tribune correctly reflected the position of this government. So, again, I repeat my question. Why is the First Minister asking for reassessment of the crowrates out in B.C.?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Without again repeating the five points that I have just mentioned, Sir, at the conference that was held in Winnipeg here in January, the crowrates were one of the subjects that was discussed and one of the problems that was defined as leading to the difficulties in moving grain. And, unless they are discussed with the entire package of grain movement, then the whole consideration of the question of grain transportation is incomplete. And so, a consideration of that subject is necessary in order to completely find a solution to the problem of grain transportation and it was in that light that the proposal was made. I want to emphasize again that it was not in the context that my honourable friend attempts to portray here of attewriting to abandon the croates and leaving the farmers at the mercy of the railways. I think that the Premier made it very clear that the crowrates were either to remain as they are or if other forms of compensation are to be arrived at, then they would have to be in such a way as to not detract from the benefits that the farmers currently have under the present rates.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PWWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the House Leader would agree that in no way did I indicate that the government was urging the abandonment of the crowrates, but may we now draw from the answers from the House Leader, that he's just provided to the House, that the position of the government is in fact that the crowwsrate should be reviewed. Is that the position of the Manitoba Government?

**MR. JORGENSON:** If one is to consider the whole question of grain transportation in western Canada, then obviously the crowrates are part of that consideration, but that does not suggest, as my honourable friend is attempting to suggest, that the rate be abandoned.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the minister to whom the Manitoba Development Corporation reports? Can the minister tell us whether the Manitoba Development Corporation under instructions from the government is still attempting to find a private buyer for

Flyer Industries Limited which has earned profit in the last three years under the New Democratic Party administration and then under the Conservative administration and whose losses are about one-sixth of the amount that has been lost on Churchill Forest Industries complex in The Pas?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is the same as I've given two other times in the Legislature.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister and I am assuming that his answer is that they are still trying to privateer that Company, may I ask the minister, can he assure the people of the province of Manitoba that if that Company is turned over to private hands, then the \$16 million in investment, which the people of Manitoba made in the tough years, will be picked up by whatever rugged individualists my honourable friend wants to sell the Company to?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in replying to that question. Out of some \$13 million that we pumped into that particular Company, what we'll be able to get out of it from a good offer is something that we're trying to check into. We haven't received a proper offer at this time that we can look at or that we can consider and to what extent the \$16 million is recoverable, the member knows full well that you have to take into account the amount of stock, the value of the stock, you've got to take into account all these different things, but the member is aware that we've pumped some \$30 million into that Company, we're never going to get back what we put into it. What we get back will hopefully be the largest recovery possible to the taxpayers of Manitoba.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact when the Conservative government took over, the amount of losses, total losses which would be realized only if the Company went completely out of business was \$16 million, not more than that, but \$16 million. Is the Honourable Member telling us that under the Conservative administration, although the Company made a profit, that we have lost an additional \$14 million in two years?

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the member knows full well that there are some assets there such as buildings, such as inventory and that's what he's referring to in the \$14 million. He's talking about book assets right now. What those particular book assets are really worth is another question. You have Morden Fine Foods, we had a fairly large amount of money involved in there. What it was really worth was very precious little, and the problem with the members opposite is to realize these things should have been cleaned up and they didn't at that time have the guts to do it.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, not being given to the Progressive Conservative business sense, that buildings and equipment are worthless, is the minister now telling us that when a sale is made of this property to the rugged individualists, who will then be in the position of having the public investment of the people of Manitoba for nothing, is he telling us that he is going to give those assets away in the same way as he gave \$1 million worth of inventory away for Morden Fine Foods for zero dollars, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that the member opposite has is that he knew that when he took over that particular development corporation it was in a pretty bad state of affairs, and he knows that. What has happened here is that this government has cleaned up the mess, some of the companies that he himself knew were in a mess, like Morden Fine Foods. He knew it was in a mess, and all I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we are going to try and recover as much as we can for the taxpayer of Manitoba, and get them out of these money-losing ventures so that we can attend to other things that governments should be involved in.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister to whom the Manitoba Forestry Resources reports. I would like to ask the minister whether he is going to apply the philosophy of the minister to whom the Manitoba Development Corporation reports to Churchill Forest Industries, which has lost \$92 million of the people's money to date, six times that lost by Flyer Coach Industries?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister responsible for ManFor.



**HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West):** Well, Mr. Speaker, again the arithmetic that the Member for Inkster applies is not necessarily acceptable to this side, but I will not burden him with the evidence that has been compiled in recent months of the trend in that industry, and he is asking for a statement of what will happen under certain eventualities. We're suggesting that we're continuing to operate that industry and we are on an up-curve, and I'm sure he will be very favourably disposed to that situation. So, Mr. Speaker, when different circumstances are confronted, then we will make what decisions are necessary but in the meantime the operation continues.

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

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the Government House Leader, who is not in his chair but presumably he will be there in a moment.

Given the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the government has now opened the door to the removal of the crowrate, through the propositions of the First Minister in British Columbia yesterday, and I'm not sure if they're still discussing it today, has the government done any analysis on the actual costs to either the producers of grain, that may have to pay the differential, or to any public authority that would have to pick up the difference between the crowrate and the compensatory rates that may be Has the government done any studies to determine what the cost will be and who should pay it?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Without accepting in any way, shape or form the premise of my honourable friend, as my honourable friend knows, the question of the crowrate is not a new one on the prairies and I think that the difference between crowrates and what would be compensatory rates is well-known and has been well-documented and I'm sure that that information is available to my honourable friend.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to know whether this government has done any analysis to determine what their position is going to be as has done the Government of Saskatchewan in the last couple of years, Mr. Speaker. They have developed a model to determine what the impact would be if the crowrate was eliminated, and they are prepared to deal with that possibility even though they insist that the crowrate be maintained.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, it was in that light that the subject was introduced at the Premiers' Conference in the first place. It is a problem. My honourable friend knows it is a problem. My honourable friend also knows that successive, and this government is no different, governments of the Prairie Provinces have successfully, and have been determined, to maintain the crowrates, or a version thereof, to ensure that additional costs, regardless of what decision is taken, additional costs do not accrue to the producers.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN:** My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Has the Minister's department taken any initiative to publicize the April 1st rent decontrol deadlines in the rural areas affected, and if so, what measures has the department taken to date?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**MR. JORGENSON:** As my honourable friend knows when the program was announced it was stated that rent controls in rural areas would be removed on, I believe it was October the 1st, and at that time it was announced that tenants would have until April 1st to draw to the attention of the Rent Stabilization Board any problems that they may have with respect to rebates.

I might add that the termination date of April 1st in no way removes from the tenant the right to communicate with the Rentalsman's office or the Stabilization Board in the settling of disputes or in the settling of misunderstandings that might occur between landlords and tenants. Tenants are not losing any rights as a result of that termination date.

**MR. CORRIN:** In light of that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask whether the Minister is satisfied that sufficient information has been disseminated to make rural tenants aware of the legal significance of the deadline respecting the shift in onus and burden of proof from landlord to tenant.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I'm confident, Sir, that rural tenants are well enough apprised of the program that they know precisely what their rights are.

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

**MR. CORRIN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister whether he would consider extending the deadline of April 1st in order to afford yet uninformed rural residents, tenants, the opportunity to file their complaints on the same basis as tenants in the Cities of Winnipeg and Brandon.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I have not given that matter any consideration, but I can advise my honourable friend that if problems do arise as a result of the unlikely situation that he describes, we will certainly take them into consideration.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education concerning considerable dissatisfaction on the part of students, teachers and professors with educational funding. I would ask the Minister whether he would care to comment on the statement by the President of the Manitoba Teachers Society that it is dishonest to suggest that budget reduction does not mean a reduction in the quality of education.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, I certainly could comment on what the President of the Teachers Society has purported to have said in the paper. I'm not surprised that the president of that organization would feel that education requires more money. As a long-time member of that particular organization, I can remember that I myself often said the same thing and that the organization practically went on record every year as saying that not enough money had been directed towards education. I would be surprised to hear anything else from that particular organization because of their preoccupation with the education of the young people of the province. I would never expect them to be completely satisfied with the amount of funding that is allotted to that particular area.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would zero in on one point and ask the Minister whether he does not feel, as many people in society do, that there is a deterioration or a reduction in the quality of education due to the program of his government?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that the tone of his questions indicate probably an argumentative attitude. I would suggest his questions be more specific.

**MR. DOERN:** In a more pleasant and a cherry manner, Mr. Speaker, since I am one of those who feels that things could be better and I'm not as optimistic as the honourable member, would the Minister, who is an optimist at heart, not agree that there have been significant cuts that have resulted in fee increases, in the laying off of staff, and in the reduction of programs that have in effect led to a deterioration in the quality of education in this province? Smile, smile.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, in replying to my pessimistic friend on the other side of the House, I would definitely not agree. In fact, the report I am getting back is that the quality, if anything, is improving with the removal of some of the programs that he was instrumental, as a Cabinet Minister in the previous government, in placing before the educational system of this province.

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

**MR. DOERN:** I would then ask the Minister how he can subject the public school system to what I regard as crippling restraints and at the same time provide additional funding for private and parochial schools, some 200 or 300 percent higher than last year?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't accept the statement of "crippling cutbacks." If anything was ever an exaggerated statement, that certainly is. I have had reports from some school divisions that they will not even find it necessary to increase school taxes this year. I would hardly

call that a result of crippling cutbacks.

The second part of his so-called question, I would suggest I have answered some weeks ago in regard to the funding in that particular direction.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Yesterday the Minister read off a detailed list of lead in blood samples from one lead-using industry in the province. I would ask the Minister if today he can confirm that most recent test results for workers at Northwest Mining and Smelting in the City of Winnipeg show that 10 out of the 22 workers tested were in excess of 80 micrograms per 100 grams of whole blood, a level which has been proven to be extremely hazardous to human health.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** That is exactly correct, Mr. Speaker, and that is exactly one of the reasons why we implemented the program that we implemented. This situation has been going on for far too many years and now we are coming to grips with a problem as it is facing the workers in industries in Manitoba.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister also confirm that the results of the lead in blood tests for each individual done at that plant were given to the individual without an adequate explanation of what adverse health effects are commonly associated with these extremely high levels of lead in blood.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, under the new program, the first one of its kind in the province, all the particular people were retested and this was the first time this particular policy has ever been established. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, each one of the individuals were called in and the doctors themselves, when they gave them their medical, spelled out to them some of their problems and asked them how they felt. They had a thorough, complete medical and this is the first time in the history of the province, Mr. Speaker, that this has ever taken place.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister then to indicate if any of the workers at Northwest Mining and Smelting have been told that they can no longer work in those adverse and unhealthy lead conditions until their lead in blood levels are below .07, as per his program, if he can indicate the specific number of workers who have been told that they will be medically removed because of lead poisoning.

**MR. MacMASTER:** I would have to guess at it, Mr. Speaker, but I think I am reasonably close; it is six or seven of them who are off the job as of today, if not, then tomorrow morning. But I believe it took place this morning.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a question of the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. Would the Minister advise the House whether it is correct that the Manitoba Government authorized the Manitoba Telephone System to buy the hardware owned by Valley Cablevision, a company that serves Carman, Morden and Winkler?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Telephones.

**MR. McGILL:** Mr. Speaker, the member is referring to some negotiations that were going on for some months in the past between MTS and Valley Cablevision wherein the subject of the possible transfer of ownership was discussed. That matter is not one that the Government of Manitoba authorizes or does not authorize. It is a matter which the Manitoba Telephone System and the owners of Valley Cablevision were discussing. I understand and I am advised that while discussions were held, no agreement was reached.

**MR. EVANS:** Could the Honourable Minister advise the Legislature whether the government did approve, or if it wasn't involved in detail, did at least approve the policy thrust of the Manitoba



Telephone System to take over a private enterprise in this province?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, as I advised the member, the matter of the negotiations and the discussions between a prospective seller and a prospective buyer were brought to the attention of the Cabinet. These negotiations proceeded until, I am advised, they were terminated by the prospective seller.

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

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether he, as the Minister responsible, approves of this action by the Manitoba Telephone System, a publicly-owned enterprise, to move into what appeared to be a privately-owned venture? Does he, as Minister, approve of this attempt, a very active attempt involving discussions of down payments, etc.? Does he approve of this attempt by the Manitoba Telephone System to move into this particular private enterprise venture?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I would not object to any private sector ownership or private sector developer discussing with the common carrier any matters which he felt would be in his benefit if changes of ownership took place. But, Mr. Speaker, the member's question is somewhat hypothetical since no change of ownership did take place.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a fourth question.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister responsible for the Telephone System, which is, as he indicates, actively engaged in the province in supplying the communications highway for rural cablevisions, can he advise whether there is any progress in extending cablevision to the towns in southwestern Manitoba, such as Minnedosa, Russell, Souris, Virden, who are anxiously awaiting the extension of this service and who apparently are being held up by lack of action by the Manitoba Telephone System in assisting the construction of this communications highway.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the member's suggestion that this activity is being held up by lack of action of the common carrier. It was in response to a previous question, I believe from the same member, that I suggested that this matter was in the hands of the Association of Cable Operators in Manitoba who were meeting and who I think are still meeting in an effort to resolve a matter of rate equalization. When this matter has been resolved, I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that further decisions as to the extension of the inter-city broad band network could be considered by the common carrier.

**MR. EVANS:** Just a supplementary then, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Honourable Minister then advise the House whether, from his understanding of this particular question, whether he has any time frame in mind as to when there will be an extension of cablevision throughout at least some of the towns, into some of the towns in southwestern Manitoba. Will it happen in the year 1979, or will we not expect any action until 1980? Does he have any idea as to when this might take place?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, the member is now asking me to speculate on when there will a resolution of the problem which the ACOM Organization is now tussling with. I'm unable to speculate in that respect, Mr. Speaker, but I do understand that some progress is being made. We are rather hopeful.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Member for Brandon East asked about the Workmens Compensation Board Office that was at one time open and labelled as such in the City of Brandon. I have — and I don't know in times whether it was before the member asked the question or later, but I have received correspondence from the Brandon District Labour Council about the same particular situation. But, I want to answer him here before I answer the letter.

There was an Accident Prevention Officer with the Workmens Compensation Board placed in Brandon in approximately 1966 or '67. A few years later, there was an addition made to the office of a girl who acted as a secretary. In 1977-78, that particular gentleman was transferred to the Workplace Safety and Health Division and the girl, in fact, was transferred into Winnipeg. The

is now working with the Department of Labour and Manpower who are pooling all their works together in Brandon. I'm going to be advising the District Labour Council to arrange for a meeting with the Compensation Board and we'll see if there is need for a full time person to handle that type of particular work. They don't seem to feel there is at the moment, but evidence may dictate that there is. But, our Department of Labour in Brandon is quite willing at any time and there's some pretty adequate, knowledgeable people working in there who can assist the unions or individuals and, if that is not the case, they can phone long distance and it's collect, I understand and in addition to that, the Compensation Board does send officials to the City of Brandon periodically.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Meer for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** I would thank the Honourable Minister for that information, Mr. Speaker. I think it's welcome news that he is prepared to review it. I just wanted to get clear, did the Honourable Minister indicate that he was prepared to have his officials review this matter with officials of the Brandon Labour Council?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, our officials have reviewed it and they do not feel that there's the specific need for a person in Brandon. But, I'm suggesting in my letter to the District Labour Council that they arrange a meeting with the Compensation Board. Maybe they can lay some more facts on the table that we're not specifically aware of.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Could the Attorney-General advise us what steps he is taking to assess the apparent impingement upon our society by organized crime in the province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, my Deputy Minister and officials in my department meet on a regular basis with representatives of the RCMP and the City of Winnipeg Police Force to review this area throughout the year.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Attorney-General that he get a different script writer because I think that was the answer that was given by the former Attorney-General. But, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, there was —(Interjection)— That's a sition to be wished. But, Mr. Speaker, there was some indication in the past couple of years that Manitoba has become well up on the list of good places to launder money. I wonder if the Minister could take notice of the question of that particular aspect of organized crime and report to the House at some future date?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to take that question as notice. Perhaps we can discuss it in as much detail as possible during my Estimates. I can only hope that my script writer doesn't force me into the same position as the previous Attorney-General.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. PETER FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Acting First Minister or the House Leader, I wonder if we could get a tentative date when the Budget will be brought down?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister Responsible for Telephones.

**MR. McGILL:** Mr. Speaker, as soon as some firm information is available to the member, I'm sure that it will be communicated.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Education and ask him whether he concurs with the recommendation of the Manitoba Association of School Trustees that the province should provide direct funding of private and parochial schools and dispense with the



charade of handing it on to public school boards and then passing it on.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, the resolutions passed at the Trustees Convention will, I imagine in due time, reach my department and we will consider the resolutions at that time.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I assume the Minister has two alternatives. One is to accept that recommendation. The other would be — and I ask him whether he would also consider this — whether he would, if he does not accept that, consider giving the public school boards additional powers to set standards and/or conditions in relation to the eligibility for such grants.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member somehow has the unmitigated gall to sit there and infer that the legislation that we put through, this House passed last July, is some way not adequate. And, at the same time, he sat in a Cabinet with legislation that existed that was questionable and apparently said nothing, did nothing to change it. Now, when we have clarified that issue, he is critical of it, when half his own party supported that particular legislation. I find that rather strange, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I didn't see a smile on the Minister's face when he answered me. I want to ask him — and I didn't like his tone either, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister this question. Does he have the guts to accept the fact that his government is now providing direct aid to private and parochial schools? Will he dispense with the charade that this is still some form of shared services?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member seems to have some problem understanding what clarification means. We clarified the very legislation that he lived with for eight years as a Cabinet Minister, endured, did nothing about. We clarified it. He calls it a charade. I say it's clarification and we had enough guts to do that, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill. There's one minute left.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister indicate what stop work orders or work improvement orders have been issued at Northwest Mining and Smelting to ensure that workers taking the place of those 50 percent of the work place who have just recently been poisoned by lead contamination at that work site will not also be lead poisoned?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I can't agree with the portion of the statement or the question that workers are taking the place of those that have been taken off the job, but I would like to share with the Member for Churchill that our people were in there yesterday and they are in again today and orders are in fact and will in fact be issued. The extent to which they have to be issued, I would think he would appreciate, isn't known to me at this particular moment.

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

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, will you call Bills No. 6 and 21, and then 7, 9, 12 and 13.

### GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READING

#### BILL NO. 6 — CONDOMINIUM ACT AMENDMENT

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER, Attorney-General (Osborne)** presented Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Condominium Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, the most significant of the amendments to The Condominium Act makes clear provision for the establishment of condominium regimes where all or some of the units are defined by surface boundaries, like lots shown on a regular plan of subdivision.

It is set out that approval of this type of condominium will be required under the subdivision control provisions of The Planning Act and The City of Winnipeg Act.

In addition, there are appropriate complimentary amendments with respect to insurance, the impact of easements for shelter and the repair of service installations, repair after damage of buildings constructed on the units, and the division of the property between the unit owners in the event the property ceases to be governed by The Condominium Act.

Section 5(1.1) of the Act, which contains special requirements for tenants has been amended in two respects. Clause (b) is amended to make it clear that the right to be given an option to purchase a unit applies to all residential tenants whether or not they have written leases. There was some ambiguity in the past, Mr. Speaker, as to whether that option had to be given to a tenant who did not have a written lease.

Clause (d), which provides for a statement that the condominium corporation is the assignee of all leases was found to be impractical because it is the owner of each unit who is entitled to be the lessor of the unit. This clause is to be repealed.

There is a further amendment to clarify the requirements for consent to the filing of the declaration by persons having registered encumbrances against the land. There is doubt as to whether or not a caveator is a registered encumbrancer, although in most cases it is obvious that the consent of the caveator should be required. A good example is a purchaser under an agreement for sale who has filed a caveat. An amendment to Subsection 5(1)(f) will make the caveator's consent mandatory. A further subsection is added to give the court power to dispense with the consent of an encumbrancer or caveator where such consent is unreasonably withheld or the encumbrance or interest would not be adversely affected by the registration of the condominium declaration and plan.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL NO. 21 — THE REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT**

**MR. MERCIER** presented Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The Real Property Act (2), for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, some time during the week of February 11th of this year a Certificate of Title Register Book No. 1488, containing Certificate of Title No. 738413 to 738910 disappeared from the Land Titles Office. Following exhaustive but unsuccessful searches for the lost Title Register, the City of Winnipeg Police Department was contacted to investigate the apparent theft of the Title Register.

The particular Register Book was microfilmed in 1964. However, the Land Titles Office are presently researching all records of registration for the past 15 years to reconstruct the live Certificates of Title still in Register Book No. 1488. There are approximately 80 titles in the book that are current.

Bill No. 6 has been introduced for the purpose of giving legal effect to the substitute Certificates of Title for the missing certificates which are still current. The substitute Certificates of Title will have the same force and effect as the original Certificate of Title. Should the Land Titles Office err in the reconstruction of the Certificate of Title, for example overlook a caveat registered against the land in the substitute Certificate of Title, any person suffering loss as a result would be entitled to compensation from the assurance fund.

Mr. Speaker, there are now dealings with two parcels of land being held up pending enactment of these amendments to The Real Property Act, and I would ask, in view of the circumstances, perhaps the members opposite could give consideration to dealing with this matter as early as possible.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Attorney-General that when there is an urgent matter in the future it would be well to consult with us in advance so that we are ready as quickly as possible to accommodate to the government's need. Frankly, I think that on any reasonable request of that type he would get that kind of co-operation and the practice would be that he would give us the information, even as little as was contained in his original comments, so that we would be prepared to deal with it.

I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that there will not be an objection to it proceeding to Committee, although at Committee there ought to be, probably, a more extensive review.

But I was going to ask a question which appears to be answered by remarks made towards the end of the minister's comments, and that is the protection for anyone adversely affected by the possibility that the substitute Certificate of Title is not exactly the title that was lost, does not in full reflect that. Now, he has stated that there would be compensation through the assurance fund but I would be inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that there ought to be a very special mention in the bill or in the new Act, or the Act as Amended, that makes absolutely sure that there is that protection. I am not, myself, convinced that that is the case. I note that there is a provision that the Certificate of Title shall have the same force and effect as the original Certificate of Title and I would want an assurance by Legislative Counsel that there is full protection in the possibility.

Now, the other point — and again I was not prepared to deal with it yet but I am prepared to deal with it now, although I have just heard the reason for this — is that it is a very serious proposal that is being made, which goes to the very roots of the Torrens system, I suppose, that there is a Guarantee of Title that guarantees any defect that may precede the title itself.

Now, on that basis, I really wasn't sure that I approved of the principle of the bill, but since there is a specific instance and there is a clear-cut limitation to the scope of the bill, as intended by the Honourable Minister, I am wondering, and I will continue to wonder until we discuss this in Committee, whether it would not have been better caution to deal with the specific problem. If there are specific losses, then possibly we ought to deal with the specific problem of those losses and not have this general application, which might have ramifications that could be adverse. And I don't want to explore the extent to which the adverse ramifications might take place but certainly a Title is a document which has value and I'm just not sure that precautions might not be lessened in the future if there is the assurance that there's a method whereby the loss can be made up by the replacement provided in this bill.

So I do have doubts about it. I'd like the Honourable, the Minister to consider firstly whether it wouldn't be advisable to limit the bill to the specific need. Certain Titles were lost. The fact that they are being replaced should be advertised broadly because it could be that these Titles were used for security. They could have been hypothecated and therefore there could be a concern that people would have loaned money or advanced money or pledged something on the basis of these lost or stolen Titles, so there's that which I think should be a requirement either in the Act or by some form of regulation.

Secondly, I would think that a specific loss could be dealt with by replacing that loss and not by a general broad provision as is set out in the bill.

And thirdly, I would like to think that there is absolutely clear protection to anybody adversely affected by the fact that the Land Titles Office lost the Title and it is being replaced by a substitute. I don't quite conceive that there will be losses resultant therefrom but I think there should be no doubt whatsoever that it is there.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I once sued the Land Titles Office Registrar in an attempt to recover from the Assurance Fund and failed and my experience there was limited to the one case, so I haven't really studied the extent of the Assurance Fund, but I take the opportunity now to ask the Minister to clarify in due course the Assurance Fund which is dealt with in — I think it's Bill 16, and to know whether that is the only Assurance Fund or whether there's a broader Assurance Fund, because as I recall it in Bill 16 there's a limitation proposed of +50,000 for the Assurance Fund, and since he's referred to "an" Assurance Fund I'm under the impression that there must be another one and there must be a greater one and actually I think that the pledge of the Province of Manitoba should stand behind the Assurance Fund regardless of its extent, so I think that that too could be explored in Committee level.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, have no interest to withhold the bill further. I don't know if anybody else in the House is but I, for one, am prepared to accommodate the Minister because of what he feels is a matter of urgency.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate. The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, firstly, with respect to the comments of the Member for St. Johns, I didn't wish to make any improper reference to the concerns that he's expressed. This has only become an urgent matter in the last few days when some proposed transfers of land have been filed. It wasn't an urgent matter until somebody was going to deal with the Certificates of Title that are in the missing book, and I'm sure that the Member for St. Johns and the members opposite, as I do, wonder how someone left the Land Titles Office with one of those large books, if that is indeed what happened.

With respect to his concerns on the Assurance Fund, Mr. Speaker, as I recollect the Act there is a guarantee in the Act that if there's not sufficient moneys in the Assurance Fund that the Province of Manitoba is still responsible for any claims against that fund. I do agree with his concerns about ensuring that any losses that might occur as a result of substitute Certificates of Title being incorrect should be looked at carefully in Committee, and I'm sure all members of the Legislature would want to ensure themselves that someone would be able to be compensated for any loss that might occur.

With respect to his concern that he expressed whether or not this amendment should be confined to these particular Certificates of Title, I would say there is a fairly similar general provision in the Province of Alberta legislation and my only concern there would be that if, perchance, a book happened to go missing while the Legislature was not in Session, and hopefully that will never happen again, but if it should, then I'm sure members of the Legislature would not want to be called into a special Session of the Legislature, or whatever, to authorize the issue of substitute Certificates of Title. So, Mr. Speaker, that would be my concern there but I'm certainly prepared to discuss that with members of the Law Amendments Committee and members opposite after Second Reading, Mr. Speaker, and I thank members opposite for having dealt with this matter today and perhaps it can be dealt with fairly shortly at Law Amendments Committee.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I did wish to ask the Minister a question. Mr. Speaker, I want to know from the Minister whether the Titles that are being referred to are the Land Titles Office copies of the Title, and not the one that is released to the owner of the property, and if so, would they be clearly identifiable as such? In other words, would the Land Titles Office copy of the Title be in any way distinguishable from the Title that is released to an owner when he receives a Certificate of Title from the Land Titles Office, or is he aware, and if not, will he find out when we get to Committee?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, just to be absolutely sure, I'll take the question as notice and provide the Committee with the information in Law Amendments Committee.

**QUESTION put MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the adjourned debates on Second Reading: Bill No. 7, an Act to amend the Jury Act — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

#### **BILL NO. 9 — CROWN LANDS AND REAL PROPERTY ACTS AMENDMENT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 9, an Act to amend The Crown Lands Act and The Real Property Act — the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Mr. Speaker, having kept this for some time, and having been informed that there are just some technical changes in it, we are prepared to discuss those particular aspects in Committee.

**QUESTION put MOTION carried.**



**BILL NO. 12 — THE CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 12, an Act to amend The Corporations Act. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Thank you, Mr., Speaker. In this instance, it being of the same nature, we too will let this one go to the Committee.

**QUESTION put MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 13, an Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Could we have this matter stand, Mr. speaker? (Agreed)

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 16, an Act to amend the Real Property Act. The Honourable member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, it is our intention to proceed with the Interim Supply, as far as my honourable friends would be prepared to go. It would necessitate, of course, going into Supply and we will have to do that by leave. I would like to ask my honourable friends to give leave to be able to go into Supply, proceed with this bill and then later when we've gone as far as the bill will progress that we can go back into Supply again for the consideration of Estimates. If that arrangement is satisfactory to my honourable friends, I'd like to have an indication. (Agreed)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would outline the steps that he is going to take. You're going to go into a Committee of Supply for Interim Supply. Are you then going to introduce first and second reading of the bill?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Well, we'll progress as far as my honourable friends are prepared to allow us to progress.

**MR. GREEN:** But my real question is, I want to know the order of proceedings. The first thing you're doing is going into committee, then you'll be giving first reading to the bill? — (Interjection) — Second reading.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Committee of Ways and Means, and then first reading.

**MR. GREEN:** Okay.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** And then second reading.

**MR. GREEN:** Okay, go ahead.

**MR. SPEAKER:** We have now agreed to go into Committee of Supply.

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

**COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - INTERIM SUPPLY**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Don Orchard (Pembina):** Order please. The matter before the House is Interim Supply.

Resolved that a sum not exceeding +511,400,000, being 30 percent of the amount of the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1980, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1980. (Agreed)

Committee rise, call in the Speaker.

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

**IN SESSION**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, and I hope both the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker will remain in the House until we're completed this process.

**MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means with the Honourable Member for Radisson on the Chair.**

**COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats:** Interim Supply.

Resolved that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1980, the sum of +511,400,000, being 30 percent of the total amount to be voted for the departments as set forth in the Main Estimates, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1980, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. (Agreed)

Committee rise, call in the Speaker.

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

**IN SESSION**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**MR. JORGENSON** introduced Bill No. 26, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province, for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st day of March 1980.

**INTERIM SUPPLY — SECOND READING**

**BILL NO. 26 — THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1979**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON** presented Bill No. 26, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1980, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, this is certainly the opportunity for us to make a few comments about the direction in which this government is proceeding, the direction in which this government has travelled during the past 18 months.

We recall so well, Mr. Speaker, the repeated and repeated campaign slogans and rhetoric that were utilized by the First Minister and his colleagues across the way. We recall the campaign slogan that the Conservatives, once they were elected to office, would eliminate the fat but they would keep all the good New Democratic Party programs. We all recall that repeated commitment that was offered by the First Minister of this province, up and down, from east to west, to north to south, throughout the length and breadth of this province during the last election campaign.

We also recall other words that were uttered by the First Minister during that campaign, words to the effect, Mr. Speaker, that if Manitobans were given the opportunity to more freely choose how they would spend their own money, how much better off all Manitobans would be if big government was further removed from the pocketbooks of Manitobans in general.

This all sounded very rosy, Mr. Speaker, very very rosy, October, 1977. Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing now are the results of promises which have gone astray, promises, Mr. Speaker, which have been demonstrated to have been phony, phony in the furthest degree on the part of the First Minister and his colleagues across the way. Again and again we are seeing evidence which is accumulating, that Manitobans are finding that the social programs, the programs of benefit to the average Manitoban, have been injured and have been affected by the government across the way.

Mr. Speaker, even Conservatives on the Federal scene, with a federal election now called for May 22, are clearly nervous, jittery over what they recognize may very well be a reaction on the part of Manitobans, Manitobans who will say, we've had a little taste of Conservatives at the provincial level, but God help us of having a larger gulp of Tories at the federal level. That is what's happening, Mr. Speaker. We witness Federal Tories who I must assume have made their efforts to persuade their provincial colleagues to make certain amends, certain adjustments, now, Mr. Speaker, turning to New Democrats, asking for their assistance, asking that New Democrats become allies on their behalf attempting to modify some of the harshest and most heartless programs that have been undertaken by the government across the way.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer and I would like to read into the record, a letter from the Federal Member of Parliament, Mr. Jack Hare, to my colleague, our health critic, Larry Desjardins, the Member for St. Boniface. Let me read the letter dated March 8th, and I hope honourable gentlemen across the way will listen closely and intently to what their federal colleague has to say about what is happening in this province in health institutions. Let them listen. March 8. "Dear Larry:" Dear Larry, a very nice, friendly letter. "We have received several calls from St. Boniface constituents with regard to the service at the St. Boniface Hospital. Most of these people complained that with the cutbacks that have been made in the provincial system, that the cuts made in the hospitals have affected the lowest level of workers. This has meant that there are not enough orderlies on each ward and I understand, for instance, that there is only one orderly for 40 patients in the 5th Rehab Ward."

I would be interested in hearing later on from the Minister of Health and Social Development whether his federal colleague communicated that information to him and whether, because the Minister of Health and Social Development only the other day said, "I was totally unaware of what was happening at the St. Boniface Hospital until the memo came out from Dr. Adam." Obviously there isn't even a telephone call between the Minister of Health and Social Development and the Federal Member for Parliament, Mr. Jack Hare. Obviously not even a telephone call.

Then Mr. Hare continues: "I realize the need for restraint but I feel with hospital situation it should be done in such a manner that the health and care for the patients is not tampered with." We agree wholeheartedly. It carries on: "I would appreciate anything that you might be able to do, due to the fact that the St. Boniface Hospital is close to your centre of operations." Close to your centre of operations.

Then, Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting. There is a little bit of noise in the community and the Federal Member of Parliament comes in for obviously a little bit of criticism from some of his

colleagues. I have to assume that a wrist was slapped, a few toes were stepped upon, and the Federal Member sees fit to write a second time.

I would like to read into the record the second letter, Mr. Speaker. And this letter now starts off no longer Dear Larry, no longer Dear Larry. But commences Dear Mr. Desjardins. From informality to formality now, dated March 19th. Now, listen to this, Mr. Speaker. Please listen intently to this. "Last week I inadvertently wrote you a hypothetical letter on constraint in the St. Boniface Hospital." Mr. Speaker, maybe he'd been reading some of your rulings in this House. Pretty conscious of hypothetical rulings. "Last week I inadvertently wrote you a hypothetical letter." No longer on restraint, but on constraint in the St. Boniface Hospital. That letter was strictly hypothetical and was inadvertently sent out by error in the confusion of signing hundreds of letters prior to our federal election. I don't know to whom he had addressed hundreds of similar letters. I would hope that one of them had found its way to the offices of the provincial Minister of Health and Social Development, his colleague. Then it continues, "You will realize how badly I felt that through my error in signing the letter and the fact it actually had gone out to you, that it should not have happened." It should not have happened, he says. Then he continues on, "I trust it has not caused you any embarrassment." I trust it has not caused you any embarrassment.

**MR. SHERMAN:** It hasn't caused him any embarrassment.

**MR. PAWLEY:** "Yours truly." Yours, no longer Jack. No longer Jack, Mr. Speaker. It's now J. Hare.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I understand. I understand perfectly well, the frustration of the federal member of parliament for St. Boniface. The frustration and the annoyance of the federal member; the desire to the extent that he should communicate with the health critic of the opposition because obviously he's been unable to get anywhere with the existing minister of Health and Social Development for the Province of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not only do we have letters from Conservative federal members of Parliament as to what is happening to health care in the province, but we have letters — and I only wish the Member for Swan River was present, the Member for Swan River because I have another letter here. A letter which was forwarded to the Honourable L. R. Sherman, dated February 9th, 1979. Another letter. And it's from the home in Swan River, the residence for Mentally Retarded in Swan River, dealing with their 1979 approved budget.

It reads, "We have recently received information from agency relations that our approved budget for 1979 for the Lions Manor will be only 3 percent above our approved budget for 1978." The letter is an appeal to have this level of funding reviewed. "The following figures describe our situation in more detail." Then, they continue later in the letter, "At the same time as we are being requested to operate at less than last year's costs we are faced with the increases of 20 percent in the cost of hydro, 4 percent in the cost of fuel, 8 percent in property tax and a considerable rise in the cost of food and supplies. Our staff have not had a salary raise or increment for two years and under this approved budget, would not receive any increase for this year either. It is difficult to operate an effective service with the resulting poor staff morale." Continuing,

"Our building was constructed in 1965 and naturally a building of this age requires regular yearly repairs. Some of the bedrooms have not been painted since the building was built. I'm sure you will agree that it's important to maintain an acceptable standard of living condition for our residents. Consequently, it is difficult for us to understand why our residence for mentally retarded people is being penalized. . ." — That word is penalized, Mr. Speaker, penalized — ". . ." in such a way that the basic necessities of life cannot be maintained." Penalized in such a way that the basic necessities of life cannot be maintained. And the letter is . . . copy is sent to the member of the Legislature for Swan River, Gourlay, addressed to the Minister of Health and Social Development for the province.

So, Mr. Speaker, think back, think back to the echo of those words. We will get rid of that fat. We will get rid of that fat but we'll keep all of those good social programs intact. That's the echo that Manitobans still hear in their ears and they know, Mr. Speaker, now, the phoniness of that echo, the misleading nature of that echo.

Now, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we see that there is no restraint for many. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has indicated that there will be sharp decreases insofar as oil and mineral taxation in Manitoba. Last session we saw significant decreases in taxation for those on large incomes. We saw the removal of the succession duty tax insofar as those with large inheritances. No restraint there.

We witnessed, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the breweries have apparently only recently been approved an increase. No restraint there.

We see that the insurance industry is knocking on the door of this government. This government



may very well respond to the auto insurance industry. The auto insurance industry. No restraint there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the words that the First Minister uttered October 1977, recall, Manitobans will have greater freedom to choose as to how they will spend their money. Mr. Speaker, ask any municipal taxpayer whether they are benefiting from restraint when they go to pay their municipal tax bills at their local municipal office.

Ask the local school taxpayer whether he or she is benefiting from restraint in this province when they see the heights that are taking place so far insofar as their school bills. The Minister of Education earlier today said, well, I have a few instances. . . Note the word Mr. Speaker, a few instances. Few. I suppose he might have a couple of instances on his desk where there have been no increases in the school mill rate this year, a few instances. I would like the Minister of Education to tell me just how many school divisions he's heard of with sharp increases this year. Over the weekend I was out in the Ste. Rose-Kelwood area. Sharp increase in school costs there. The Manitoba Association of School Trustees. They let the First Minister know; they let the Minister know through their president about what they thought of a suggestion to them that they should tighten their belts. Tighten their belts the First Minister said. But more and more in the field of education are letting this government know and letting the First Minister know, and letting the Minister of Education know that it's gone beyond the point of tightening the belts of the little, local ratepayer. And what is happening now, Mr. Speaker, is that educational services are being hurt at the same time as there are being sharp increases in the mill rate at the local school level.

The Minister of Education took strong exception to the earlier comments by the Member for Elmwood, that the Member for Elmwood should have had the audacity, the audacity to raise this question in the House. He doesn't wish to discuss, he doesn't wish to discuss this issue with the school divisions in this province. He wants the First Minister to go and demand that every school division, every local authority in this province tighten their belts. And then acts perplexed; appears annoyed because my colleague, the Member for Elmwood asked him a question on this very point this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, ask the university student facing increases in their tuition fees whether they are benefiting from restraint. Ask the university students. I say to the Minister of Education, ask the students that are attending the Red River Community College facing increase in tuition fees of some 400 percent, 400 percent in a little over a year, whether they are singing and dancing in the streets as a result of the glorious restraint program, the glorious restraint program of the government across the way here. Yes, Mr. Speaker, even ask the residents of our care homes, those that are the most elderly, those that personal are weakest in our society, those that are suffering as a result of health ailment, whether they are dancing and singing because of the glorious restraint programs of our colleagues across the way. When' Mr. Speaker, we have and it can be demonstrated to the Minister of Health and Social Development for the first time, an increase in the per diem on personal care homes in this province that is at a rate which is higher than the rate of inflation and I can say to the Minister of Health and Social Development that in the all the years from 1973 right up to, in fact, 1978, the per diem rate increase was lower than the rate of inflation. This year, Mr. Speaker, is the first time that that rate increase has exceeded the rate of inflation upon our residents in our personal care homes, the first time.

Mr. Speaker, I asked this very question of the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development if he would relate back to Hansard weeks ago in this House, weeks ago. The Minister did not respond and has not responded since to the question that was posed to him. It doesn't require very much arithmetic, Mr. Speaker, not too much calculation, and the Minister would discover that that in fact is so. Mr. Speaker, there is greater and greater accumulation of evidence as who is to benefit as a result of the restraint programs of this government.

We raised earlier during the question period the question of the crow rates. Mr. Speaker, this is a government that is basically made up of many rural members from rural Manitoba; many members that represent areas which are involved in grain growing, grain farmers; members who I would have thought would have stood firmly and strongly together on the question of crow rates. Crow rates established back in 1890-some as a result of negotiations with our railways to ensure that railway rates are kept low in the interests of western agriculture.

The railway companies were given certain concessions, certain concessions by way of additional oil and mineral rights in return for low grain rates, the crow rate. What do we have, Mr. Speaker? We have an indication that there is no restraint in mind as far as this government would be concerned if they had their way for the railway companies.

Mr. Speaker, we have interestingly, and of course we've always known, Mr. Speaker, that of all the Conservative governments in Canada, of all the governments of a Conservative stripe in Canada, this is the most extreme. This is the most radical right by far, Mr. Speaker. By far, it leaves all the other Conservative governments way, way, way behind in the dust, way behind in the dust

as far as being a staunch, radical right wing government. I give them credit, they stand by their principles and their conviction. Why they make Peter Lougheed look a pinko and in fact, Mr. Speaker, we see out at the Western Premiers' Conference, in today's Tribune, and I did not hear anything from the House Leader to indicate that this report in the Winnipeg Tribune was inaccurate; in fact I believe in his answer to me that he confirmed pretty well, pretty well the accuracy of the report in today's Tribune about the position that was taken by ' his First Minister.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, and my honourable friend knows full well that I did not confirm what was contained in that Free Press report. What I was attempting to do was set the record straight by quoting from the . . .

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that Hansard will indicate clearly that the House Leader acknowledged that his government was interested in a review of the crow rate policy.

**A MEMBER:** We've got one from him . . .

**MR. PAWLEY:** Very, very clear. They're interested in review, so that we have a situation by which, and I'm pleased to say that Allan Blakeney indicated that the proposal by Manitoba disagrees with virtually every statement on the crow rates and grain transportation that Saskatchewan has ever issued. Their policy disagrees virtually upon every principle, every point that Saskatchewan has ever taken on crow rates. Saskatchewan's Premier Allan Blakeney indicated. Then the article proceeds, " Alberta Premier Peter Lougheed and B.C. Premier Bill Bennett echoed Mr. Blakeney's opposition to the proposed study of crow rates. We stand alone in Manitoba with our First Minister seeking a review of crow rates, and why, Mr. Speaker? The article proceeds on, "The First Minister indicated we want to see the producer protected, " — That sounds nice, we want to see the producer protected he says — "but at the same time, we have to acknowledge that until something happens to relieve the railways, wants to relieve the railways — "that they will not put money into upgrading the rails or buying more hopper cars." Yes, the First Minister and his Treasury Bench and his colleagues from rural areas in this province are more interested in relieving the railways, the CPR, than they are in relieving the plight of western farmers that are producing grain.

That's what's happening, Mr. Speaker. It's a little bit of a symptom, a little bit more of the symptom of their restraint programs. Why doesn't the First Minister say to the CPR, tighten your belts, tighten your belts. Why don't we hear that from the First Minister to the CPR? No, what we hear from the First Minister is, I want to relieve the plight of the CPR, I want to relieve the plight of the CPR. Does any member across the way deny, deny that their First Minister has indicated that their concern is to relieve the plight of the CPR as far as the crow rate policies are concerned? So we stand alone, we stand alone in Manitoba supporting the mighty CPR against Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. A proud record. Even Peter Lougheed had to race to disassociate himself from the position that was taken by Manitoba. And to think, Mr. Speaker, we adjourned the House last Friday so that colleagues across the way could have a real thorough, a real detailed discussion as to what the First Minister was going to present out in Prince George, British Columbia.

We all went home because we felt that honourable members across the way were putting together a very comprehensive, detailed submission that would benefit Manitobans. We were glad to cooperate with the House Leader to adjourn the House. Little did we realize, Mr. Speaker, that in adjourning the House, we were in fact, permitting members across the way to prepare a little sweetener for the CPR.

Mr. Speaker, that is why, and I believe it is in keeping that I believe that although Manitobans would like to cause a change in government federally for very good reasons, that Manitobans are pretty hesitant to jump out of the frying pan into the fire. After eighteen months of provincial Tories, they're just wondering, they're just wondering if they can take the chance with the federal Tories. That's why, Mr. Speaker, this election is going to be one of the most interesting elections because Manitobans are beginning to feel, and to realize in their hearts as never before, that there's something basically wrong with Conservative Party policies whether they be at the provincial level, whether they be at the federal level. So what do we have, Mr. Speaker? We have the First Minister this past Friday — and by the way, I thought that... I don't know when it was, I suppose it was taped the day before — the First Minister in an interview with one Peter Warren state that he supported getting rid of PetroCan. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought the First Minister had enough problems in Manitoba that he might not wish to become involved in the PetroCan issue. Mr. Speaker, it's not bad enough that the Minister for Physical Fitness responsible for the MDC wants to get rid of Morden

Fine Foods and Lord Selkirk and some other operations that were undertaken by the previous government, but the First Minister wants to get involved in getting rid of PetroCan, calling upon his colleagues at the senior level to bully themselves up, to march out into the field, and to get rid of that terrible PetroCan that is so foreign, foreign to the good thinking ideology.

Well, Mr. Speaker, again of course we witness a situation in the First Minister was interested in benefiting the CPR. I can only assume again no restraint for the multi-national oil companies that would benefit as a result of the elimination of PetroCan, no question, Mr. Speaker. The First Minister of this province is tying himself closely to the federal Tory policy and the federal Tory policy is to get rid of PetroCan. To get rid of the interests that the people have in their own oil company so they can develop their own energy resources, so they have an alternative to the multi-national corporations in Canada. No, the First Minister wants to crawl into bed with his friends in the multi-national oil industry, and to get rid of PetroCan.

Then Mr. Speaker, we have more and more instances, and I want to simply say that what we are facing again and again is a fact that there is certainly restraint for many, many Manitobans, the average Manitoban, the Manitoban of the lowest rank. Oh yes, there's restraint in the minimum wage, oh yes. They've got to tighten their belt. They've been told for how long to tighten their belt, since October 1977, they've been told 'tighten your belt' you people that are on minimum wage you've had it too good, you've had it too good, we call upon you to tighten your belt and the Minister of Labour still evades any answer from my colleague, the Member for Logan, the Member for Churchill, the Member for Kildonan and others. What are we going to do about minimum wage?

Has there been any restraint insofar as increased prices are concerned either in Manitoba or Canada during this period of time? We witness a 22 per cent increase in the Consumer Price Index since the minimum wage was last adjusted in this province. 22 per cent increase. We've slipped, Mr. Speaker, to the 4th lowest in Canada and I suppose the colleagues across the way are proud. They're boasting that they have moved down from the second highest in minimum wage to the fourth lowest, and they want to beat out, beat out New Brunswick or Newfoundland, one or the other, so I suspect, Mr. Speaker, if we do hold out for another six months or nine months, they will have succeeded in reaching their objective, their destination which is to be able to proclaim to all the people in Manitoba, we now have the lowest minimum wage in Canada. We told those guys on minimum wage to tighten their belt, we've now achieved our objective. And they'll smile across the way at this very credible achievement.

Mr. Speaker, we've seen a decrease in other services, whether it be in senior citizen housing for our senior citizens, whether it be in public housing for those that are of low income, for single parents with large families; we have seen, Mr. Speaker, the continued decay and deterioration insofar as the quality of life is concerned in Manitoba.

So Mr. Speaker, I want to serve notice today that the government across the way, the Treasury Benches and the opposition must recognize the fact that Manitobans are reaching a point where they've had enough. Enough of their phony policies and their policies that hurt the little people and not the large giants. And, Mr. Speaker, the day is fast approaching, fast approaching when Manitobans in general will say we've had enough, we've had enough.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health that Mr. Speaker we do now leave the Chair and the House . resolve itself into a committee to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty. I think, Mr. Speaker, in light of the hour that perhaps it may be advisable for only one committee to meet in this Chamber till 4.30.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for Health and Community Services and the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for Tourism and Cultural Affairs.

**SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** By previous agreement, we are on Resolution No. 65 on Page 50 in the Department of Health and Community Services, 4. Institutional Services, Item (e) Care and Treatment of Juvenile Offenders: (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, we really can't deal with this item until we understand what the Minister intends to do. There has been a change in the format and the functions and roles and everything else within this department, so that things which are somewhat separate in last year's Estimate have now been integrated with the rest of the department. And of course when we're talking about Salaries and Care and Treatment of Juvenile Offenders then I think it's incumbent at this time for the Minister to advise us on what his policies are going to entail in this upcoming year. I have a number of questions relative to this. I think it's incumbent upon him to outline his program under this item.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. The members will recall, however, when I made my opening statement on the 15th of the month on my Estimates, the Estimates of this department, that I addressed myself to Health, Community Services and Corrections. So it's certainly not my intention to exploit the time of the Committee or the House by repeating the statements I had made at the time or the introductory remarks I made, or the references I made to Corrections, generally, but I agree with my honourable friend, the Member for Winnipeg Centre, that there would be obvious questions that would flow from the revised delineation of the Corrections components in this year's Estimates, as against previous printed appearances. And in the time remaining, which is not very long, I will attempt to explain that situation. Private Members' Hour, of course, occurs five minutes from now, so we're not going to be able to cover much ground, but we would then, hopefully, be in a position to get into pretty careful examination of these appropriations, starting at 8 o'clock tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I might say to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre and his colleagues opposite that what they see before them in the Printed Estimates this year really is the printed reflection of the government's decision to disestablish the Ministry of Corrections and Rehabilitative Services and to absorb the Corrections functions and Corrections service in this province and through this government in the Department of Health and Community Services. The new alignment of the department calls for two basic components to the Department of Health and Community Services. One is a division entitled "Social Services and Community Health". I have to sometimes keep referring to that title because that was designed specifically, Mr. Chairman, to avoid confusion with the overall title of the department, Health and Community Services. That division, Social Services and Community Health, is really a component of the department and the department could be described as being divided into two basic components.

The other one is the Institutional Services component, and each of those components includes two or more divisions. One of them includes three divisions. The Institutional Services component includes two divisions. Those two divisions in Institutional Services are the divisions relevant to Mental Health Services and the operations relative to Corrections Services Corrections, Institutions, and Services; Adult, Juvenile and Probations.

We're dealing here at this point in the Estimates with what could be described as the Corrections Division of the Institutional Services component of the Department of Health and Community Services. At the head of the division is a Commissioner, Mr. Hans Schneider, and at the head of the component is one of the two Assistant Deputy Ministers and Senior Administrative Officers of the department, Dr. Roy Tavener, and the organizational chart includes the Deputy Minister of the department, Mr. Ron Johnstone, above those ranks, and then of course the Ministerial rank above that. So the line of reporting is from the Directors of Adult and Juvenile Corrections and Probation Services up through the Commissioner of Corrections, Mr. Schneider, up through the Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of that component of the department, Dr. Roy Tavener, and then through the Deputy Minister to the Minister.

The line-up in the Printed Estimates in front of you reflects that in that we deal specifically with the Care and Treatment of Juvenile Offenders as has been the case in Estimates in the past, the Care and Treatment of Adult Offenders and Probation and Parole Services individually, which is a matter in which they should be dealt, in our view. The administrative component is to be found in Item 65(a) in the Estimates, appropriation 65(a) Administration under Institutional Services, which is the component that includes the office of the Commissioner of Corrections and also resources for professional training of staff. In other words, that administrative unit is now part of a unit that obviously includes the office of the Assistant Deputy Minister. The office of the Commissioner of



Corrections is located there, in terms of presentation in the Estimates. In the past, you will recall, there was a specifically identified Ministry component where the Deputy Minister of Corrections and his staff was identified, and where they were provided for in the Estimates process.

So that when dealing with the Commissioner of Corrections and his office, we should be discussing that under 65(a); but when dealing with the specific delivery of programs in the juvenile and adult field, both in terms of the Care and Treatment of Offenders and in Probation and Parole Services, we relate to them in the items that are immediately before us now, starting with 65(e) Care and Treatment of Juvenile Offenders.

In this particular appropriation, we're looking at the juvenile institutions, Mr. Chairman, including Agassiz, Seven Oaks and the Manitoba Youth Centre, and we're looking at the administration through the Director of Juvenile Corrections, and we're looking at the administration of that particular individual function, including staff training. Those breakdowns are certainly available to the Committee. I will be pleased to provide them when we get on to the Salaries item, in more detail at 8 o'clock.

I trust that explains to honourable members opposite the break-out in this year's Estimates form.

**MR. CHAIAN:** The hour being 4:30 and in accordance with Rule 19(2), I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.

### **PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR**

#### **ADJOUED DEBATE ON SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILL**

#### **BILL NO. 19 — AN ACT RESPECTING THE GLENBORO HOSPITAL DISTRICT (NO. 16B) AND THE RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF SOUTH CYPRESS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** We're now under Private Members' Hour. The first item of business is Public Bills. Adjourned Debate on Second Reading of Bill (No. 19), moved by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Mr. Speaker, we have perused this bill. We find that the best place to deal with it is in Committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The next item of business is Resolutions. Before we proceed with the Resolutions, there was a Resolution put forward by the Honourable Member for Wellington, which I took under advisement and I would like to read the results of that deliberation.

On Monday, March 12th, the Honourable Member for Wellington introduced a resolution:

"WHEREAS the United Nations has proclaimed 1979 as The Year of the Child and we in Manitoba are dedicated to pursuing equality of opportunity for all our children; and

WHEREAS a substantial number of our children are parented by persons with limited life-skills and finances; and

WHEREAS many studies on child abuse cite poverty as the most serious threat to the well-being of families; and

WHEREAS children and families in certain regions of our Province are disadvantaged by reason of their domicile; and

WHEREAS those infants who suffer the effects of neglect and/or abuse in such circumstances are often undetected until they have suffered extreme physical, intellectual and emotional privation and abuse;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House do instruct the Government to formulate and implement a comprehensive program designed to assure that parents get necessary medical care, instruction respecting parenting skills, adequate nutrition and supervision, assistance and surveillance both before and after the birth of their children."

At that particular time and after some points of order were raised as to the propriety of the Resolution, I took the matter under advisement.

I have carefully perused Debates and Proceedings of March 12th, Pages 843, 844 and 845 and the advice offered by both the Government House Leader and the Opposition House Leader. I have

also read some 24 previous Speakers' rulings on the subject matter of anticipation as it relates to the Resolutions which have already been adopted and passed in the House.

In particular, I should like to draw the attention of the honourable members to a ruling by Mr. Speaker Hanuschak on August 19, 1969 (pages 22-23, Journals of Second Session of 1969) dealing with a motion by the then member for Ste. Rose, Mr. Molgat. The resolution requested the Government to consider the advisability of implementing the four main recommendations of the TED Report which called for the creation of a new Standing Committee on Economic Development, the appointment from the private sector of a high level Advisory Council on Economic Development, the establishment in Ottawa of an Office on Manitoba Economic Affairs and the development of an applied technical and research capability for industry in a new institute.

Before reading the resolution to the House, Mr. Speaker Hanuschak ruled as follows:

I have perused the contents of the resolution moved by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose dealing with the matter of the advisability of implementing the four main recommendations in the chapter entitled "Organization for Development" as contained in the Report of the Commission on Targets for Economic Development, and find that the resolution anticipates a matter already referred to in the Throne Speech on Page 3 which reads in part as follows:

'It is desirable to increase further our efforts to stimulate the economic development of our province and to reduce regional economic disparities. This task requires greater involvement of the Members of the Legislature in the appraisal of Manitoba's economic potential. It also requires more information and review of economic present.' development transactions past and

"In my opinion I must rule that the motion is out of order since it anticipates a matter already set for consideration in the Throne Speech. May I refer the Honourable Member to our Rule No. 30."

Under similar circumstances, on March 27, 1977, in dealing with a proposal by Mr. Patrick, the Member for Assiniboia, dealing with hours of work, Mr. Speaker Fox pointed out that the Throne Speech contained a statement which indicated the intention of the Government to introduce legislation dealing with the matter of hours of operation and overtime work. Mr. Fox ruled the proposal by Mr. Patrick to be out of order and cited Rule 31 of the Rules, Order and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly.

I should also like to quote from Beauchesne, 5th Edition, Page 35, Section 119 dealing with Speakers' rulings: "1. Speakers' Rulings, once given, belong to the House which, under Standing Order 12, must accept them without appeal or debate. They become precedents and form part of the rules of procedure. The Speaker is not vested with the power to alter them of his own accord. If they have been given under misrepresentation, the House itself, and not the Speaker, should take the initial steps to avoid the consequences or implications. Such actions would not be considered as an appeal against a decision of the Speaker.

"The Speaker's rulings, whether given in public or in private, constitute precedents by which subsequent Speakers, Members and officers are guided. Such precedents are collected and in course of time may be formulated as principles or rules of practice. It is largely by this method that the modern practice of the House of Commons has developed."

In considering this whole matter, I have taken into consideration the views expressed by both the Honourable Government Rouse Leader and the Leader of the Opposition, as well as the rulings of previous Speakers. In particular, I want to draw attention to the final comments of the House Leader of the Opposition in his final comments on March 12 in which he states:

"Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have not agreed that that amendment is necessary. I have offered a way out in which we can all agree. If my honourable friend will not give unanimous consent to the correction, we're going to ask you to rule this resolution as to whether it does in fact involve the expenditure of government funds in the way in which it is placed, and secondly, whether it anticipates government legislation. We will ask you to rule on both those points. I was hoping that members of the opposition would not make it necessary to rule on this point. It being necessary, we ask you to make a ruling on both points."

I should like to draw to the attention of both the House Leaders, Citation 424 of subsection 5 of Beauchesne's 5th Edition, and I quote:

"Any irregularity of any portion of a motion shall render the whole motion irregular."

I have carefully considered the motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington and I should like to quote from the Speech from the Throne on Page 7, in the middle of the page:

"The United Nations has declared 1979 as the International Year of the Child and in endorsing and recognizing its principles and objectives, my Government will be giving special consideration to the needs and welfare of children."

Bearing in mind the previous rulings of other Speakers dealing with the subject of anticipation and bearing in mind Citation number 119, I feel that I have no alternative but to rule the motion out of order.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I am respectfully appealing your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. Is it the pleasure of the House that the ruling of the Chair be upheld?

**MOTION presented and declared carried.**

**MR. CORRIN:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members. The question before the House is, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained.

**A STANDING VOTE** was taken, the results being as follows:

**YEAS:** *Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Domino, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Kovnats, MacMaster, McGill, Mercier, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Sherman, Wilson.*

**NAYS:** *Messrs. Bostrom, Boyce, Cherniack, Corrin, Cowan, Doern, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Malinowski, Miller, Pawley, Uruski, Uskiw, Walding.*

**MR. CLERK:** Yeas 24, Nays 17.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I declare the motion carried.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 1 — RIGHT TO WORK**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Resolution No. 1, proposed by the Honourable Member for Inkster, as amended by the Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Member for Pebbina has 10 minutes.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last week, when we were dealing with this resolution, amended by my colleague, the Member for Inkster spoke to the amendment with a certain amount of gusto and he pointed out that what we, the Conservative Party — or he imputed a motive to the Conservative Party in their amendment, in that what we were attempting to do, Mr. Speaker was, I believe, prolong and live by our standing commitment to the Conservative treasure of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I found that comment from the Member for Inkster to be not quite honest in dealing with the House. You see, the Member for Inkster, in his persistent drive of trying to persuade the House that unemployment is a Conservative treasure, is certainly not telling us everything that he knows, Mr. Speaker. That government, in which he was a very prominent member, Mr. Speaker, took eight years of governing in Manitoba to prove that they in fact believed in unemployment because in those eight years they had unemployment rates of not less than 4 percent in any particular year. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me as being quite interesting that during those eight years, the Manitoba economy underwent a period of growth which was unmatched in probably any other period of time in the history of Manitoba. Base metals were very strong so that mining in the northern communities was booming. Agriculture, through the very very good workings of the free market system, was booming. Grain prices took a substantial rise in 1973. Commodity exchange and all the things that our socialish friends so greatly fear, helped us along in the agricultural community by raising the prices of grains and various commodities, livestock. The manufacturing sector, due to a general buoyancy in the Canadian economy at that time was employing many many people.

Despite that, despite the boom years that the Manitoba economy enjoyed, through the — as I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, through no credit to the socialists but through the operations of the market system — through those boom years, unemployment was still at a fairly high rate in the Province of Manitoba. This, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the socialists were carrying out their philosophy that if you can't find a job for a person in the private enterprise, that you provide it through government, and they were hiring great numbers of people, their hiring in the government ranks, the Civil Service ranks, far exceeded the percentage of growth in the population of Manitoba, and despite that they still didn't solve the unemployment problem. Government hiring was at an all time high in not only the Civil Service. Hydro development in the north was taking ever increasing numbers

of people into the labour force. They had deliberately attempted many employment programs through Saunders and the like of other business enterprises that they took over, direct intervention into the marketplace, and what were the results, Mr. Speaker, of all those efforts, those eight years of efforts? Well, we had high unemployment rates then, high unemployment rates then, Mr. Speaker.

There was only one year that they managed to create a surplus in the Budget. That was 1973 where they absolutely fluked and completely misguessed the operations of the free market system and they collected considerable tax revenues from rural Manitoba because the commodity prices of grain and livestock rose dramatically that year, and at the same time that they were creating this employment heaven in Manitoba through government employment projects, increased Civil Service hiring, they ran the province into a deficit that we all know about and every Manitoban knows about, an increasing deficit year by year by year and all for what? To prove that they couldn't solve the unemployment problem. So that when the Member for Inkster tells us that unemployment is a Conservative treasure, that's what I mean, Mr. Speaker, when I say that he's less than honest in that presentation to the House because it obviously is a treasure that the Socialists very much appreciate and live by.

Now, we've got the Member for Logan dealing with the Resolution and interpreting anything that we say on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, as attempted union-busting, etc. etc., and he's particularly attributed that motive to me. Well, I think that once again the members opposite in the ND Party are out of touch with reality in the labour market. They are no more in tune with the union movement than they would like to think they are. They're going arm in arm down the streets with the different picket lines etc. etc., and whilst they're doing that and showing complete support and agreement with the union heads, the McDermotts, the Martins, and the Christophes. . . What's happening, Mr. Speaker? Well, the people in the Retail Clerks Union were going back to work in droves and opening a Safeway Store a week. That's what was happening whilst they were out marching in the streets and supporting union solidarity — completely out of touch with the rank and file, Mr. Speaker.

The same thing happened in the Construction shrike. We see them marching arm in arm down the streets with the heads of the unions. Meanwhile the non-union shops are taking more and more of the tenders in the Construction business in this city and they'll continue to do so, Mr. Speaker, because the non-union shops are able to bid more effectively and more competitively and lower the costs on many building projects in this province.

So what I maintain, Mr. Speaker, is what I said one evening during Estimates last year, that our Socialist friends opposite are out of touch with the rank and file of the union movement. The union movement, the rank and file of the union movement, want to work, Mr. Speaker. The vast majority of them don't want to go on a prolonged strike as advocated by many of the union bosses. They want to go back to work. They want to provide for their families. They want to earn a living. Our friends opposite don't really see that as a legitimate aspiration of anybody in the union movement and, Mr. Speaker, I suppose nothing could more adequately demonstrate that than about a week ago on the National News, after we'd seen — I believe it's McDermot and Broadbent — form their liaison for the election where the union workers are going to support the ND Party in the next Federal election. The report came out and strangely noted that at no time had the union movement voted more than 20 percent of its membership for the ND Party. And that, Mr. Speaker, adequately demonstrates how out of touch they are with the realities of the union movement.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read for the edification of members opposite an article which appeared — I got it in the mail the other day — it's a gentleman who obviously has a great deal of concern and insight for the Canadian economy, and this follows up very closely with some of the statements that the Member for Logan made about right to work, and this is a review from an American Weekly called "The Review of the News", and I quote, Mr. Speaker. "According to Labour Department statistics, the 20 right to work states gained 928,000 manufacturing jobs between 1966 and 1976. The states with forced unionism," something my ND friends greatly support, however, "lost 1,237,500 such jobs over the same period. In fact, one economic study reveals that the eight states with the best business climates have right to work laws while forced unionism was permitted in the bottom ten." Mr. Speaker, I think that adequately demonstrates why most of the workers in Canada are not adverse to right to work laws because they know that in right to work laws, business is able to provide them with the jobs they need.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member's time has expired.

**MR. GREEN:** I wonder if the honourable member would identify the people who published the particular pamphlet that he's referring to.



**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** It's a document called, "On target." It's from Flesherton, Ontario, and it is a summary of various articles that have appeared in various Journals throughout Canada and United States.

**MR. GREEN:** Being from Flesherton, Ontario, is it possible that it was published by a person by the name of Gostick?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a gentleman by the name of Ron Gostick has summarized the article. The article I quoted from was from the Review of the News, an American publication, not the words of Mr. Gostick, only as picked out of a news article that he read and summarized on.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member aware that Ron Gosstick is the most notorious

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Order please. Order please. The member's time has expired. If members give unanimous leave his time can be extended beyond the 20 minutes.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like the honourable member to table the piece of hate literature that he has just read into the record. Have the piece of literature tabled.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina. Are you now ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, it's a real anomaly to me that a simple Resolution — and the Member for Pembina was saying that we weren't providing jobs — and here we provide a Resolution which said that this government should provide jobs, should give people the right to work, and what happens to it? It's butchered. The Honourable Member for Roblin takes the Resolve part and cuts it down and takes out that which makes essence to the Resolution. Right to work is an euphemism, and even our own First Minister has said he doesn't like it, it's a misnomer, he would rather prefer to approach the situation in respect to the issues that he would like to see legislated, and probably they would enter the realm of The Employment Standards Act and a number of other areas.

But the anomaly that is created further is by the fact that the very people who debate this issue, their Caucus, their group in government, does nothing about employment. They chastise us. The Member for Pembina just a moment ago in his debate was saying that during our term we had unemployment, and of course when the Honourable Member for St. Matthews spoke, he cited Chapter and Verse of various kind of research he had done, that this isn't the kind of thing to look at, that you have to have statistics if you're going to work with anything in respect to employment. He was speaking at that time on the minimum wage. But I'm going to indicate to him and to the members of this Assembly that during the period of 1971 to 1977, our annually adjusted rate on the seasons was less than 5 percent, which the Honourable Member for Pembina did indicate, and of course the average number of people that were involved was 21,000. That was during the period of 1971-77.

Since the Conservatives have taken office now, these last 16 months, the average unemployment rate has been about 31,000. Ten thousand more people are walking the streets. Certainly the Labour Force has grown but not in proportion to the amount of unemployment, Mr. Speaker, and that has to be borne in mind.

Let me also indicate that even though we had 10,000 people less unemployed, we had a program during all those years of trying to create employment. We had a number of programs that we had instituted and that we carried through. Some of these programs were in the public sector; some were in the private sector. Nevertheless, let me indicate to you that our job creation program included PEP, which was Provincial Employment Program, which financed job creations by the local communities and in the local communities.

We had a Pensioner Home Repair Program, Mr. Speaker, where some 25,000 senior citizens received assistance in respect to repairs, and that meant that contractors, small and large, had an opportunity to bid and to create employment even though we had 10,000 people less on unemployment than the current Conservatives have.

We had special Municipal loan funds to create employment. We had special northern native employment programs. We had inner city employment programs. I haven't heard of one employment program yet that the Tories have done. Yes, they indicated that they were going to do something in respect to students through the private sector. I think that was just a give-away to the private sector because there was no guarantee that it would create employment for the rest of the community except, as I said, some give-aways to the private sector.

We had Public Works Acceleration which they decried at that time, but it was necessary in order to try to stimulate the economy. We had Northern Hydro Dam construction. We had 12,000 homes built by MHIC. So I'd like to know where the Tories are going to go with their particular programs that are going to create employment since they have that many unemployed.

Also, they indicate that they are such defenders of the people, but for over 18 months my colleagues and I have been exhorting them to do something about the people who are defenseless, who are not organized, who have no one to speak on their behalf except those who are elected public representatives.

What have they done about the Minimum Wage? They have stalled and stalled and stalled, and when you ask them what they're going to do, you don't get an answer. Oh yes, we get pious debate in here on the Minimum Wage Resolution my colleague introduced, and the only thing that we have been able to do, and that is when one of their members spoke without thinking, he put his foot in his mouth and said he was prepared to adopt 25 cents immediately. I made an amendment to that Resolution. But I'm certain, or almost certain, Mr. Speaker, that he'll be all alone. I doubt whether any of his colleagues will support him. I feel sorry for him because for a while he'll be ostracized. He'll be the black sheep of the Tory family over there.

The other thing that the Honourable Member for Pembina mentioned was the American experience. Well, unfortunately he only read an excerpt which, as my friend the Honourable Member for Inkster tried to point out, is disseminated by a person who is very, very well-known for his hate literature distribution. He's a racist. He picks on minorities. He also is against unions, and that is one of the reasons why he disseminates this kind of information.

Let us now get back to the Resolution in particular. Why did the Honourable Member for Roblin amend it as he did? Because he wanted to be able to vote with the Resolution and have his meaning of the right to work reinforced. He and his colleagues really do believe in right to work legislation which is going to try to create the climate which will be detrimental to trade unionism. You know, Mr. Speaker, the funny thing about trade unionism is that wherever it is, the wage level on an average, is much higher than in areas where you have very little organized labour. And the right to work states in the United States are very, very well known for having the lowest wage scales, average wage scales, compared to other areas. They also have a preponderance of strikes. Rather than decreasing in those areas where they have right to work laws, it increases them because workers get frustrated at having to live at a subsistence level, not having any real working rights in respect to their area of work and consequently they just rebel.

The moral issues in respect to right to work are that people should have free collective bargaining and it should be done in good faith. There are a number of people that have done research into this particular area and have come up with certain suggestions. And, they are not people that are socialists, they are not people that are trade unionists. Some of these people are people in the ministry, in the clergy. One of them, the most Rev. Andrew J. McDonald, Bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Little Rock, Arkansas, which is a right to work state, pointed out in a recent paper on right to work — and if the members will listen — he says the very title, right to work, is deceptive. Such laws do not provide jobs for workers nor fair wages. They merely prevent workers from building strong and stable unions. He goes on to say, "The right to work laws thereby hinder opportunities of encouraging the further development of constructive labour and management co-operation. Hence right to work law in effect means the weakening of workers' bargaining power and strike at the very structure of labour union democracy as strongly defended by the social encyclicals and effective labour management relations. On this score we judge the right to work law morally reprehensible at its very core."

Now, here's a person who really believes in Christianity and he practises it. He's not a unionist; he's not a management type; he's someone who's trying to guide us spiritually and I value that kind of consensus from a person of that stature.

I also have, Mr. Speaker, some indication of what goes on in Arkansas. In Arkansas with its sister states a scale of one to fifty is used with one being the best and fifty being the worst. This is just a short list and should by no means be considered as a complete list of indicators. But, Arkansas which has right to work laws, the average school years completed, it ranks 48th. Availability of higher learning institution, it ranks 44th. For pupil expenditure amounts spend by government on education on a per pupil basis, it ranks 41st. Here we are discussing a right to work state and almost all the indicators that should be of value to us, it ranks at the bottom.

Availability of doctors, number of doctors per capita, it ranks 48th. Average hourly wage, it ranks 49th. One from the bottom, per capita income, it ranks 48th. Now, do we want our province to go in that direction, Mr. Speaker? Because, this is what happens when you have right to work legislation of the kind that the Conservatives are interested in. My colleague, the Member for Inkster, wanted a right to work resolution which had meaning, which made sense, which said that we collectively want to do something to create a climate where there will be more employment, better employment, and more opportunity for those people who wish to work. But, no, we have to change the resolution and just use the euphemism, like motherhood, right to work with a totally different intent by that group of people over there on that side.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, before the clock runs out, I wish to make an amendment. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George that the resolution be further amended and the amendment reads:

"And be it further resolved that the right to work as enunciated herein is a meaningless phrase unless employment opportunities exist which ensure that those people in our society seeking employment have the opportunity of obtaining it." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I trust the House will give me time to consider the propriety of this resolution. I'll take it under advisement.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, before you take the resolution under advisement to consider it, I would think that somebody would have to object and then you would hear argument on both sides as to whether the resolution is acceptable, rather than a ruling coming without there being a question about it. The resolution, Mr. Speaker, is amended by providing a definition, and if there is some question about that and Your Honour is going to take it under advisement, I would at least hope that you would hear various members of the House before you made a ruling.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have heard the remarks of the Honourable Opposition House Leader. Has any other member any advice to offer me with respect to it?

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I do not have a copy of the amendment so I'm unable to determine whether or not, in my view, the amendment is in order.

**MR. ENNS:** I kind of think it is.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would urge that you not follow the practice of trying to rule on a question unless a member of the House has raised it. It has not been then raised by anybody. If it is raised various members of the House will argue it. I will have a position with regard to the resolution, perhaps somebody else will have. But in the meantime, the resolution is presented; it hasn't been objected to,

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Speaker is placed in the rather awkward position that, we have on occasion quite cursorily accepted an amendment to find out later on that perhaps we should have taken a further look at it in a little more depth. That's why I'm asking to have a few minutes to take a look at it . . . I have the opportunity to look at it and check it against Beauchesne to make sure of that.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point that I am making, that a ruling need not be looked for unless there is some objection to the resolution. If the Speaker proceeds in the way he is suggesting that he's going to proceed, he becomes the objector and then one is arguing against his objection. The fact is that the Speaker is only called upon to make a ruling when the House . . . Mr. Speaker, with great respect, it is a very dangerous thing for a speaker to become involved in dealing with matters which nobody in the House objects to.

The fact that an amendment has been made, all that you are doing now is going to ask people to seek to find objections to the amendment, and at that stage you are in the position of a judge, who has indicated that he wishes to rule against the amendment. No person in the House has raised objection to this amendment, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment be proceeded with, and that if you are going to take it under advisement, that at least you will let members of the House argue their positions before you make a ruling.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, having had an opportunity to look at the resolution, I have not had an opportunity to check with Beauchesne to determine the validity of the amendment, or its acceptability but I do recall and I'm not able to put my hands on the precise citation at the moment, I do recall that any amendment to an amendment has to relate to the amendment, and cannot in any way just negate the amendment that is now before the House. And for that reason, Sir, I would like to have some opportunity of examining the proposal that is now before us to determine whether or not it is in order, and I would suggest, Sir, that you take the amendment under advisement to determine its acceptability.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Opposition House Leader. On a point of order.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I have heard no objection to the resolution. The only objection or invitation that you have from the Government House Leader is to see whether the amendment negates the resolution. The amendment does not negate the resolution. It defines the resolution. The citation that my honourable friend is looking for is whether the House can pass an amendment which undoes a previous amendment which was passed in the House. The previous amendment that was passed in the House was that the words that would be taken out was that the House urge, yes, the previous amendment that passed took out the words, "that the government be urged to adopt programs in the public and private sectors to make sure that," that was passed and those words have been eliminated.

A new amendment cannot be introduced . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. —(Interjection)—

**MR. GREEN:** I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry, I thought that the previous Motion had already been passed. Fine.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I've taken the matter under advisement.

The hour being 5:30 I'm leaving the Chair and the House will return at 8:00 p.m. in Committee of Supply.