



Second Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVI No. 62A

2:30 p.m. Tuesday, June 13, 1978

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the galleries where we have 30 students of Grades 4 and 5 standing of the Poplar Field School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Ron Sumka and Mrs. Ann Chrudy. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George.

We have 20 students of Grade 8 to 9 standing from the Morweena Junior High under the direction of Mr. Shenk. This school is also located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George.

We have 20 students from the New Hope School of Grades 7 and 8 standing under the direction of Mr. Penner. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for inland.

We also have in my loge to the right the former Member for Rupertsland, Mr. Joe Jeannotte.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here today.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. LEN DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Thistle Curling Club Limited praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Thistle Curling Club Limited.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on June 13, 1978. Mr. Leonard A. Bateman, Chairman of the Board, presented to the Committee a report with respect to the activities of Manitoba Hydro to date.

Your Committee examined and passed the Annual Report of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board for the year ending March 31, 1977.

Your Committee received all information desired by any member from the officers of Manitoba Hydro and the staff with respect to matters pertaining to the Report and the program for hydro-electric development in the Province. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Radisson that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short statement on the May labour force statistics which were released this morning in Ottawa. The Statistics Canada figures show that for Manitoba, both the seasonally adjusted and unadjusted unemployment rates declined from the April figures. The seasonally adjusted rate was down 1/10th of a point from 6.8 to 6.7 while the unadjusted rate went down from 7.0 in April to 6.2 in May, a decline of 8/10ths of a point.

Both the seasonally adjusted and unadjusted rates continued to be the third lowest in Canada last month and both remained about 2.0 points below the national average.

The national unemployment rate at 8.6 on a seasonally adjusted basis remained the same as for April while the unadjusted rate declined from 9.3 to 8.4.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to report that Manitoba's decline in unemployment was accomplished in the face of a growing labour force. In May, our total labour force increased by 15,000 on an adjusted basis while the number employed increased by 17,000. On a seasonally adjusted basis, both the labour force and the number of employed rose by 3,000.

In actual figures, Manitoba's labour force in April stood at 464,000 of which 33,000 were unemployed. In May, the total labour force rose to 479,000 while the actual number of unemployed dropped to 30,000. On a year-over-year basis, the May 1977 total labour force was 460,000, some 19,000 fewer than last month. The number unemployed was 24,000, some 6,000 fewer than in May, 1978. It means that the actual number employed in May, 1977, was 436,000 compared to with 449,000 in May, 1978.

Mr. Speaker, while we are, of course, pleased to see an improvement in the statistics and to note that Manitoba continues to have the third lowest unemployment rate in the nation, there is no doubt that unemployment remains relatively high both in our province and in Canada as a whole. Some measures that we have taken have helped to alleviate the problem. For example, the private sector Youth Employment Program initiated, and as is well known to the House, has had an encouraging response. We have set aside an initial \$2 million in the hope of creating 2,000 jobs in the age group from 16 to 24 years. The funds committed to date are now in excess of \$2.7 million and the total employment under this program — as of today the figures are slightly in excess of 3,400.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, to respond very briefly to the statement on May 1978 labour force and unemployment statistics, I would say simply that it is encouraging in the one sense that there has been some, however minor, improvement in the absolute level of unemployment, but it should be noted that at the very present time a level of 30,000 in this province of one million people — 30,000 unemployed — does indicate for a month of the year in which employment opportunities should be burgeoning, that there is very much of a chronic problem here.

The reference to the \$2 million Youth Job Creation Program actually creating 3,400 jobs instead of the anticipated 2,000, would seem to indicate that the allocation of \$2 million will be insufficient, not by a few hundred thousand, but probably in the order of 50 percent; that is to say, that the amount that will be ultimately required in order to have an adequate job creation effort with respect to youth, will be in the order of \$4 million before the end of this summer season. And certainly, we on this side would not regard the \$2 million additional as being somehow unjustifiable or undesirable; it is very much needed, and any increment in amounts of money and jobs created for this particularly hard-hit of the unemployed group would be, we believe, in the overall public interest and would add to social stability. So with those comments, I conclude my statement by taking note that 30,000 unemployed in May of our year is scarcely a matter for any comfort whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think it would be appropriate to ask the First Minister if he would be able at this time to give us an indication of the response of the Province of Manitoba to the Prime Minister's constitutional change initiatives outlined the other day?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, in response to the Leader of the

it is not possible at this time to give to the House, or indeed to the people of Manitoba, a reasoned response to the propositions that have been laid before each of the governments and the people of Canada, which came to our hand only yesterday afternoon, late afternoon at that. I did have this morning a meeting with a representative sent by the Prime Minister in the person of the Honourable Otto Lang, Minister of Transport, and a senior representative of the Department of Justice who was with him, in which they spent roughly an hour-and-a-half explaining some of the provisions of the report itself and indicating as I think we all know now, that there will be legislation tabled in the House of Commons later on this month, which will go a long way toward fleshing out the generalized framework — and that is all that it is — that appears in the documents that were distributed to us yesterday.

And at this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask my honourable friend, parenthetically, if he can confirm my understanding that the Prime Minister's office did in fact deliver, to each member of the Chamber, a copy of the documentation — because otherwise we of course would make copies immediately available — but it was my understanding that copies were made available to all members of the House and it was not necessary to table them today.

So while we can make no final response to the federal document that was received yesterday, I think it is fair to say that there are a number of serious questions, of a substantive nature, that are raised with respect to the approach that is now being taken by the Federal Government; that we would wish to withhold any definitive comment until we see the bill that is tabled in the Federal House, later this month. In the meantime, there are certain obvious questions that are raised with respect to the Federal Government's initiatives, having regard to the definitions that they will apparently employ regarding the Executive Branch of Government in Canada; the question of the pre-condition that they are laying down that the so-called Charter of Rights must be accepted by the provinces; the perhaps unrealistic time frames that they are laying down with respect to those matters that are legally within their jurisdiction; and other matters of like nature — to say nothing of the Charter itself — and the whole implication of what an embedded and entrenched Charter would mean to the parliamentary system of Government in Canada.

All of these are, as my honourable friend will appreciate, open questions that will require much more consideration and more debate and we, along with him, look forward to the further elucidation and amplification of the generalized framework, which we received yesterday, which we were led to believe today by the Federal Minister, would be available as soon as the bill is tabled in the House of Commons.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and that is to ask the First Minister if it is correct that a Federal-Provincial meeting will likely be convened in September, to pursue the constitutional initiatives, if it is the intention of the Province of Manitoba to make known its position and attitude to these proposals before the September Federal-Provincial Conference?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend will appreciate having been involved in these discussions over a period of eight years, and I having been involved previously in these discussions — in a different role in the Sixties — that it's always dangerous to make a prediction on the date as to when you are going to make a pronouncement as to a final position.

What I will say to my honourable friend is this, that sequentially what is going to be happening is as follows:

The Premiers of Canada will be meeting, first of all, in Regina in August — August 9 to 12 I believe it is, approximately — and the constitutional review is an item on the agenda for the Premiers' meeting. So I expect that the plethora of documentation that we now have arising out of the western Premiers, out of the ten Premiers, arising from the Federal initiatives and the Ontario Paper and so on, there will be some winnowing of that material done at the Premiers' Conference in August.

Then it is my understanding that the Prime Minister is suggesting a meeting in September at which I would imagine again, it's only speculation, that there would be further winnowing of this large amount of documentation and during these two processes leading up, of course, to the third one, which we are led to expect to take place in November of 1978, another First Ministers' Conference. During the course of those two or three meetings, I'm sure that even to my honourable friend's satisfaction, there will be established positions on certain of the matters that are currently before us by the Government of Manitoba as these positions emerge after consultation with our sister provinces and the Government of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance, and that is to ask the Minister of Finance if he is in a position now to respond to my question of last week with respect to the possibility of being advised as to the specifics of the agenda of the Finance Ministers' Conference to be held here in Winnipeg next month?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I indicated last week that the representatives of the different provinces were meeting, in fact are meeting in Regina today and tomorrow for first go-around with regards to the preparation for the Finance Ministers' Conference. I'm not sure that there will be an official formal agenda issued. This will have to be decided, I think, primarily by the Minister of Finance in Ottawa as to what his desires are in that connection, but I would expect that by next week, Mr. Speaker, that we will know whether in fact the Federal Finance Minister intends to issue a form of formal agenda. I suspect it's more likely to be an outline, a very rough outline of an informal set of procedures that will be followed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the First Minister on the question of the constitution proposals. In view of their importance to both jurisdictions, can he indicate, I think I heard him say in his remarks that the Provincial Government intends to issue its own Proposal Paper which would contain the responses of the Province of Manitoba to the Federal initiatives and any other further components that they would like to introduce, issue that kind of proposal paper prior to the First Ministers' meeting so that there would be an opportunity in this province for a reaction or discussion about the position or stand taken by the province prior to his meeting with other First Ministers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps to repeat myself, I wouldn't want to mislead my honourable friend or give him a day certain or a time certain as to when the kind of documentation about which he speaks, which would reflect the attitudes of the Government of Manitoba would be available. I think that this is, as he is well aware, the kind of a process where there can be involved the searching out of opinions of the broadest constituency possible in the province. And I think it is, when we get down to the point of where we know what we are dealing with, because all we have at the present time were some generalized suggestions. When we are getting down, winnowing down these propositions to a point where they do seem to carry some consensus not only with the Government of Manitoba but with our sister provinces and the Federal Government, then I think there would be opportunity not only for a position paper to be presented, but also for the possibility of a committee of the Legislature to take the position paper, or the propositions, and to seek advice from the people of Manitoba by traveling about the province seeking their advice on constitutional matters.

I have always thought, when we got down to something that we were prepared to work with, that this would be the kind of approach that should be favoured by any government in Manitoba and I look forward, if we are successful in bringing down the propositions to something that is a workable document, that we might then consider in this House the advisability of striking a special committee and proceeding then to seek opinions in Manitoba and thereby to gain that kind of consensus that I think may well be possible, and certainly should be desirable with respect to anything as fundamental as the changing of the constitution of the country.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister partially answered my second question which, if he will recall, I had raised with him at the very beginning of the session, whether he intended to establish a committee of the Legislature to look into constitutional matters and at that time he indicated that he would consider such a move. I am pleased to learn that he is now more actively considering it than he appeared to at that time but I would be interested in knowing if he could be more precise about the timing of this process of consultation, if you like.

As I gather, he indicated there would be a meeting of the Premiers in August, followed by a First Ministers' meeting by September. By that, would he be prepared to initiate this process of consultation through a Legislative Committee prior to those fall meetings, so that the consensus could be reached by that time, after having seen the federal legislation? Would it be before those meetings or after those meetings that we would expect to undertake this procedure of receiving delegations and briefs from people in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: To repeat myself, I'm afraid I can't satisfy my honourable friend and give him a precise time. I think it will depend to a considerable extent upon progress — if that is the proper word — that is achieved at the series of meetings that we hold trying to winnow down this large amount of material — some of it conflicting, some of it a rehash and a regurgitation of conferences that took place within my memory and experience as long ago as 1959, 1962, 1963, Fulton Favreau, and all of those things that are now part of the history of Canada, the Victoria Conference more recently, and so on.

So I think that we're in a situation now where we have certain new — not new but certain other — initiatives placed before us in a slightly different way by the Federal Government. The other provinces, as well, are considering certain matters. That there has to be a discussion of them and then, when we get that distilled down to something that is more manageable than what we have at the present time, then — and I can't put a date on that — I think it would be certainly appropriate to have a committee of the House look at the harder nuts that we are trying to come out with after the process of consultation that takes place.

MR. AXWORTHY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, just by way of adding to the process. Would the First Minister consider, or take up with the House Leader, if there would be opportunity before this spring session has concluded, to find some time in the Order Paper for a debate at least on the general principles or objects of the federal proposals, so that at least the general appraisal of its outlines and the guidelines set forward could be debated in this House, and therefore set a framework within which maybe the more specific responses could be made, whether this could happen during an Estimates debate on the Executive Council or whatever it may be. But I would ask the First Minister if they might consider making place on the Order Paper for a debate of that kind so at least the process could start in this House before we get down to the decision on very hard specifics that he indicates.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, without trying to be facetious, I understand that in my absence that the elasticity of the rules of the House has been manifesting itself rather considerably and that there should be no lack of opportunity, either under the matters that my honourable friend has raised or under perhaps any other topic that they would wish to raise, for members of the House to debate the constitutional question. Executive Council would be perhaps as appropriate a place as any. There is certainly no limitation, however, on where it can be debated. Executive Council is mentioned as one place. I can think of others, but my honourable friend is equally adept at utilizing the very elastic rules of the House to raise the topic at his heart's content, almost whenever he wishes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education, relating to the report he gave to us yesterday regarding the BUNTEP and IMPACTE Programs at the University of Brandon.

In his investigation of the issues we raised in the Legislature last week, can he explain to us why it was necessary for the President of the University of Brandon to take over the administration of these programs when there was already a director in charge of the programs before he took it over?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, apparently that determination was made between the Director of Projects and the other officials that this was necessary to get these projects back in order.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister explain why, in view of the restraint program this government is presently undertaking, why there appears to be three people now who are, in one way or another, involved in directing this program whereas previously there was only the one.

In the information he gave us yesterday, for example, the former director's salary is apparently still paid out of this appropriation. The EA of the university president is being paid out of this fund, and also the president of the university has certain funds allocated to his personal office as a result of his administering the program.

Can the Minister explain why there are these three people now, where there was only the one director before administering the program?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is anything untoward about the president of a university, particularly a small university, taking an interest in programs that fall under his aegis at all. The Executive Assistant, as was mentioned yesterday, is spending some 80 percent of his time as Acting Director. I don't think that is out of line at all.

The previous director is acting as a professor in the projects and his salary is being paid as a professor within those projects.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, one final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister confirm that the former Director is actually receiving a salary much in excess of an ordinary professor and it is at the level that he was receiving when he was Director of the program, although he is no longer filling that function?

MR. COSENS: I would have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker, and check it out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. In light of the information that the Minister provided the House regarding the unacceptably high levels of unemployment in the Province of Manitoba, will the government now consider new initiatives to stimulate our stagnating economy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the announcement which I read indicated that the unemployment rates in Canada and Manitoba were still relatively high, but also contained in the statement was the indication that the direction is now on the right track and in fact, the unemployment rate is on the downward trend, even on the seasonally adjusted basis. Mr. Speaker, I would just say in finalization, if the results of undertakings by throwing money at a problem such as this are no greater than the results that were achieved last year by the millions of dollars that were thrown at the problem by the former government, that the course and track that we're on now is the proper one.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, following that logic, the Honourable Minister is throwing away money here on the Youth Program, using that logic.

Mr. Speaker, the Legislature passed a resolution unanimously that the government consider the feasibility of undertaking various initiatives to attack the problem of unemployment. In view of the fact that the rates of unemployment for the young people are probably more than twice the average shown for the total, in other words, around 12 to 14 percent, would the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the honourable member please address himself to the question?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm trying, but I'm being heckled in the usual unparliamentary manner by the Minister of Public Works. —(Interjection)— The same procedure is in the Committee of the Legislature.

My question, Mr. Speaker: will the Minister consider the resolution that was passed unanimously by this House to attack the problem of unemployment, particularly programs aimed at providing opportunities for young people, the unemployment rates of which are more than double that of the average?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the effectiveness of the private sector Youth Employment Program that was undertaken this year will probably in the long run, history will prove it's one of the most effective youth employment programs that has ever been undertaken by any government. Mr. Speaker, that in itself is enough initiative, the productivity of the program far exceeds anything that was undertaken last year by simply throwing millions of dollars at a program.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would say that this program pales into insignificance compared with what we did last year for the young people of Manitoba, and others. My question is, does the Honourable Minister have information on how many young people are leaving the Province of Manitoba at the present time?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the age group unemployment breakdown is high in the young group, and that is exactly why the Youth Employment Program was undertaken. As to the relative numbers

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

that are moving in and moving out of the province, Mr. Speaker, the exact figures on that are unavailable and would be unreliable if they were available. However, we do know, as a matter of fact, that Manitoba always has had and still has the problem of the emigration of young graduates and young people from our educational institutions outside of Manitoba in most categories; that is not going to be turned around in the very short term; in the longer term, perhaps.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: My question is to the Minister of Labour. Since we've had an Acting Director of the Women's Bureau for over six months now, can the Minister tell us if it's the intention to fill the position with a permanent Director?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, when we get to the Women's Bureau in my Estimates this afternoon, I'll answer him.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since the Minister of Labour was party to the closure motion brought in by the majority of the Conservatives yesterday, would she reconsider that answer in light of the fact that she's preventing me from asking questions on this matter in Estimates?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, if they'll change the subject they've been on for the past week and get to the Women's Bureau, I'll be able to answer it for them.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Labour. Since members of the Conservative Party have taken up at least one-third of the Estimates' time in the Department of Labour Estimates review, speaking on various issues, preventing me from asking questions on the Women's Bureau, will the Minister then reconsider her answers in light of the fact . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I would ask the Honourable Member for Transcona to retract that statement. He's casting derogatory remarks on the entire Chamber.

A MEMBER: What statement?

MR. SPEAKER: The statement that members are being prevented from asking questions. Would the Honourable Member for Transcona care to rephrase his question?

MR. PARASIUK: Point of order. If in fact we are given an ultimatum to finish the Department of Labour Estimates within two hours — I'm just a newcomer to this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, but I assume that that's prevention of my opportunity to ask questions — I've asked a question of the Minister of Labour; she has a perfect opportunity to answer the question now. I understand then that she is banking the question, as she's been doing in the Department of Labour Estimates, which is the major reason, Mr. Speaker, why the Estimates have taken so long.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Would the honourable member care to rephrase his question? The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the First Minister is haggling again. I will rephrase the question; I will direct it to the Minister of Health. Would he please have his department investigate the hospital that conducted the operation on the First Minister? It's obvious that they took out the bladder, but it's also obvious that they've left the gall in.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister of Labour confirm whether or not the statement in Frances Russell's column of February 10, 1978 indicating that her staff of inspectors in the Electrical Mechanical Branches is so understaffed that it is unable to test more than 25 percent of the amusement rides and 40 percent of the elevators in each year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the columnist got her facts from but they aren't correct.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, in view of the fact that the columnist indicates that she has received this information from her Deputy Minister, Jack King, would she discuss this with him in order to ascertain the accuracy of the statements made?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not responsible for anything that is printed in the newspaper, but those aren't correct figures.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. I wonder if she could give us a progress report on the negotiations in respect to the Civil Service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, they are still negotiating at the bargaining table and, as such, it is of a confidential nature and I cannot disclose it.

MR. FOX: I wonder if the Minister of Labour could give us an indication of when the Heavy Construction Wages Board recommendations will be presented to the House.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Honourable Minister confirm that the United Steelworkers of America and the Manitoba Federation of Labour have named Mr. Ken Valentine as their participant on the Mining Safety Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, they have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister now willing to table the terms of reference of that committee as she indicated she would be willing to do so earlier in the session?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I would table the terms of reference after we have a meeting with the . . . We've been waiting for Mr. Valentine's name to be brought forth; now we are prepared to have a meeting in my office and the terms of reference will be decided on at that time.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister then. I would ask her when she intends to have that meeting and could she indicate when it is expected that the committee will begin its investigation and report to her as to its complete findings.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, the names of the other two people in the committee of three have been available for the last three weeks. We have been waiting for the Federation of Labour to bring forth their nominee and they just gave it to us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, on June 8th last, the Member for St. Johns asked a question relating to documents received by MTS in connection with the Bell Canada-Saudi Arabia contract. The question was taken as notice on my behalf by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, on June 5th, I tabled for the Member for St. Johns and the House, copies of all information that MTS employees have received as well as the contracts which they would sign if they chose to participate in the Bell-Saudi Arabia contract. Any additional information would presumably be provided by Bell Canada to their employees. The information referred to by the Member for St. Johns appears to be in reference to import and customs regulations of Saudi-Arabia and should be readily available from a different source.

Mr. Speaker, there were further questions posed the following day by the Member for Inkster

and the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the Bell-Saudi Arabia contract. The Member for Inkster asked whether Bell Canada was involved in a boycott of Israel in dealing with Saudi Arabia and if I would be able to determine if there was a boycott involved in this contract. Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the contract which has been signed between Bell Canada and Saudi Arabia but certainly this contract is under scrutiny by the Federal Government for their determination as to whether or not this contravenes any statute regarding international contracts for matters of discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, the member also, in his questions, asked if I could assure the House that the Telephone System will not co-operate in any way to facilitate a company in Canada boycotting the State of Israel or in co-operating with a boycott against the State of Israel. Mr. Speaker, I can certainly assure the House that this government, either directly or through any of its agencies, would not condone knowingly a boycott against the State of Israel or of any other country in the world and that this would certainly be the position of the government and its agencies. The only departure from that statement would be, Mr. Speaker, if there was some federal sanction covering the activity of Canada and all its corporations in respect to international dealings with another jurisdiction.

I might also point out, Mr. Speaker, as well to the House that the Manitoba Telephone System has actively provided, in support of a Canadian corporation, important technical information on a contract with Israel on communications. So there has been no hesitation on the part of the Manitoba Telephone System to deal with other countries, providing it is not considered to be in any way facilitating, as the member describes it, a boycott.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition also had a question relating to this general subject, whether it was this government's policy to enter into a contract with a corporation or firm presently which itself had a contract with discriminatory clauses. Again, as I've stated in this connection, Mr. Speaker, neither this government nor the Manitoba Telephone System is directly involved with either Saudi Arabia or Bell Canada in this project. MTS is giving its employees the opportunity of participating in the project by allowing them to discuss the opportunity with Bell Canada and, if they wish, to sign contracts to participate in this project.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a preamble, I would remind the Honourable Minister that on June 5th, he stated, and I quote from Hansard, Page 3141: "I would foresee no difficulty in being able to obtain and table documents received from Bell Canada as a member of the Trans-Canada Telephone System group relating to the employment of people who may be interested in member companies of Trans-Canada Telephone System." Would the Honourable Minister be prepared to deny that included in the documents sent by Bell Canada was information indicating that applicants for visas would have to state their religion; and further, documents indicating that they would not be allowed to take certain articles of a religious and cultural nature into Saudi Arabia; and finally, that there would be difficulty for women to be engaged in Saudi Arabia? I'm suggesting to the Minister, with certainty, that these documents were forwarded by Bell Canada and that on June 5th he undertook to file these documents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member for St. Johns, I am advised that the documents tabled were in fact all the documents which were sent to MTS for dispersal amongst those employees who might be interested. Now the member is debating particular pieces of information within those documents tabled but I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that the documents which were tabled at his request were a full and complete documentation and that the kind of additional information to which the member referred may have been in relation to some visa or Customs and Immigration information which would then be received by an employee if he had undertaken a contract with Bell Canada but not in this documentation received by MTS.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether we cannot get a clarification from the Minister. He did not undertake to table only those documents which were sent for dispersal to employees, he undertook to table all documents received from Bell Canada in connection with Saudi Arabia; and the Minister would have to deny that those documents referred to, have been received by the Manitoba Telephone System, which I know he cannot do; or say, "I refuse to table all the documents received contrary to the undertaking I made."

Now the Minister should clarify whether he's trying to limit his undertaking. Also I would like the Minister to explain why he refuses to table those documents that we know exist and that we know were sent by Bell Canada to the Telephone System, just because it might be possible to write to Saudi Arabia and get the information? Why does he refuse to table documents which are available

— and he knows what they are . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for St. Johns, that when a Minister gives his answer it is common courtesy to accept that answer as being a very truthful answer. Now if the Minister has got information that is contrary to that, then I think he should produce it.

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't think you heard the nuance of what the Honourable Minister said. He said that he has tabled those documents which were sent for dispersal to the employees.

Now, at no time on June 5 did we discuss what was for dispersal; we discussed all documents received. And, Mr. Speaker, I speak with certainty to say that the documents received by the Telephone System include information that would indicate a denial of opportunity for certain employees to get to Saudi Arabia; and those are the documents I would like the Minister to table.

If he says they were not received, then you're quite correct, Mr. Speaker, but he didn't say they were not received. The fact is that they were received and I believe that he undertook to table them. And I'm saying, if he refuses to table them, in contradiction of his undertaking of June 5, would he explain why he refuses to table them?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Johns apparently feels that there is some document, or documents, that are not included in this tabling submission. I am advised by the Manitoba Telephone System that these documents are complete. I will again request that confirmation because the Member for St. Johns is so insistent that this is not complete. Certainly I would be very pleased to consider this matter and if there is indeed something missing, we will table it.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Question Period having expired, at this particular time I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have 20 students from the Cranberry-Portage Elementary School, Grade 5, under the direction of Mr. Friesen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, before calling the Orders of the Day, I would like to announce that on Thursday we will be considering the reports of the Manitoba Development Corporation and Economic Development through the Economic Development Committee.

It would be my intention some time next week to call the Municipal Affairs Committee — that will depend on circumstances — to consider Bill No. 18, if that's satisfactory with my honourable friends.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must confess that I had not intended to rise on a grievance this Session, for I was content up until yesterday evening to let the parliamentary system unfold as it should, to run its course, and I had great faith in that process, Mr. Speaker.

I must confess, Mr. Speaker, I still have great faith in that process, but after last evening I have lost some faith in the government. I question their faith in that process, because last evening the government finally unmasked themselves. If I can be somewhat crude, Mr. Speaker, the boil burst. It was a festering boil that they had been plagued with for some time — it is a festering boil on the backside of the the Tory Government filled with the puss of racism and hatred, Mr. Speaker.

From the beginning this government has assumed their role with arrogance, and fortified by their 49 percent minority, they have governed with intolerance; an intolerance coupled with their blind stupidity to their dogma; a dogma that at the best of times, Mr. Speaker, is short-sighted and onerous, and at the worst of times — and this is indeed the worst of times — it is nothing short of fascism.

That government's actions last evening betray their platitudes, betray their lip service to the democratic process. I do not believe that they believe in the democratic process, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that they believe in rational reasoning, and I find nothing to lead me to believe that they believe in the due process of this House. That government is a government that had the gall to fire three Deputy Ministers, to fire them before it was even legitimately the Government of the province in its intolerance — and several secretaries. Thank you. The Member for St. George reminds me, "and several secretaries;" they are just as important as those Deputy Ministers that were fired.

This government couldn't wait until the legitimate transfer of government, because it tasted power, Mr. Speaker, and like a beast in the jungle gone mad with the smell of blood, it lusted for more power. It turned its back on tradition, and we saw that in the first session. It turned its back on decency — the decency I'm talking about is a decency to treat the citizens of this province as citizens with full rights, and the members of this opposition as members of opposition with full rights. It turned its back on reason, and finally and most tragically, Mr. Speaker, it turned its back on the people of Manitoba.

That is a government that short-circuited the Autopac debate in committee. Like spoiled kids with some new toy on Christmas morning, they played with the committee; they played with the government of this province s like some spoiled kid who cannot contain themselves.

MR. JENKINS: Spoiled brats.

MR. COWAN: Spoiled brats, says the Member for Logan, and it has to be agreed.

And it is as if they believe that a 49 percent minority is what gods are made of, and as gods they can do no wrong. That is the government, Mr. Speaker, that has turned its back on the workers of Manitoba when it, last evening, forced closure on the Labour Estimates debate; and it did so because it is a government that cannot stand the spotlight of the Estimates. Because of the darkness of its own soul, Mr. Speaker, it is a black government, and although to my way of thinking they have forced closure without legitimate reason because I can see no justifiable or no legitimate reason for tyranny of that nature. They did make excuses and we should look at that excuse. What was that excuse? The Finance Minister sat in the committee last evening and gloatingly said it was because of the length of the Estimates, as if there was something wrong in continuing the Estimates, as if there was something wrong in seeking clarification on the Estimates, or as if there was something wrong with seeking discussion and discourse in a rational and reasonable manner.

To my way of thinking, Mr. Speaker, to my perception at the moment, it was that his government armed with that 49 percent mentality, is that that government believes themselves to be above all the rabble of the Estimates procedure. It has turned its back on a system that was developed and has been developed carefully and considerately to respond to the needs of this House.

They were needs that that government perceived when they were Opposition. They pushed for the changes in the Estimates procedure. They indeed perceived it as a necessary change as Opposition, and the New Democratic Government of the day acknowledged it. As the government of the day, they acknowledged that there was need for change and they made that change, but now suddenly when they are the government, when they are no longer the Opposition, when they are armed with that 49 percent mentality, suddenly now they are above it all. It is beneath them and their excuse, Mr. Speaker, is that the Estimates are taking too long.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have some shocking news for them. The Estimates are going to take a lot longer because when a government such as theirs manages to impose such hardship in such a short period of time as they have managed to do in their short reign, when a government such as theirs gives less than 3 percent to maintain the health and social needs of the people of this province and turns around and gives millions upon millions to Highways, and actually cuts the Department of Labour budget, actually cuts it from what it was last year — never mind taking into consideration those advances that are necessary to combat inflation — they have actually cut the money attributed to it. When a government such as theirs does those things and many more, which I will not take the time because I do not have the time that would be necessary in order to list them all, but when it does that, then they lie rise to a great number of questions and those questions are questions that need answers, Mr. Speaker. And as Opposition in this House, it is our duty to seek those answers and I might add that unlike the members opposite seemed disposed to do, we do not shirk our duty and just because it is a tedious process and at times it is a tedious process, I'm sure as tedious for us as members of the Opposition as it is for them as members of the

or because it is a time-consuming process, and it is a time-consuming process, we do not then decide on our own arbitrarily to short-circuit the parliamentary process and we do not do so, Mr. Speaker, because we believe very strongly in that process.

The fact is that Labour Estimates have been in Estimates for less than 20 hours, 16 hours to be exact if we are to believe the newspaper reports and I do, and I have been sitting through most of those 16 hours, Mr. Speaker, and granted it has proceeded with — to use a kind word — caution at times and to be perhaps a bit more specific it has proceeded haltingly at times, slowly at times. It has done that, but a quick perusal, Mr. Speaker, which I'm sure that you do, a quick perusal would substantiate the fact that if it were a toss-up between Opposition critics and a toss-up between government backbenchers taking up the time of that committee, then I would say it would be very close indeed and I do not begrudge them that opportunity. As a matter of fact, unlike the members opposite, unlike the government of the day, I would encourage them to take that opportunity because I want to hear from them, and I think in very many specific instances, I can learn from them as I think that they can learn from us in just as many specific instances.

So, if it is a toss-up between the Opposition members and the government backbench members doing the talking, we are sure that there is one thing that transpired and that is that the Minister, who is leaving the Chambers at this moment, I perceive did not do very much of the talking herself. I suggest that that is just as much a reason for the closure that this government has invoked, Mr. Speaker, as anything else that has transpired in the last few months. It is a bad reason, but I would suggest that it is just as much a reason and just as legitimate as any others we could come up with because closure didn't just happen last evening. The closure that took place last evening, the arbitrary and intolerant act of the government last evening, is a result of a long list of embarrassing errors by that government. They had to cover their tracks and they had to cover the tracks of the Minister.

Their first error was perhaps an error of the Premier himself in appointing a Minister that knows nothing about Labour and who has said that she knows nothing about Labour. I make no new revelations, that is her statement not mine.

Their second error in the Department of Labour specifically, Mr. Speaker, was the arrogant firing of competent staff and the staff was competent. The staff should not have been fired and that is what took up a great portion of the time in the Estimates debate, as it should be, as we should question all the actions of this government and as they should be willing to stand up to that questioning.

The third error is actually a series of errors and if they were not so tragic it might even be called a "comedy of errors," but they have continuously ignored the pleas of the workers of this province. They are currently ignoring the safety of all the citizens in Manitoba and that was another issue that took place at great length in the debates of the Labour Estimates, the safety of the people of this province in respect to anhydrous ammonia. It was a justifiable debate, Mr. Speaker, even if the answers weren't forthcoming, the fact that the questions should and will continue to be put is more than justifiable. And this government has been ignoring the plight of the minimum wage earners and their answer to that is, "Let them take welfare if they can't survive on the minimum wage, let them take welfare." Those are not my words, those are theirs.

And the last error, the fatal error, was that it might be acceptable if the Minister, that knew nothing about Labour, had at least wanted to learn something about Labour, and her fatal error was that she did not, that she did not care. For that was the case, the Minister knew nothing because she cared not to know anything. She was a know-nothing, a do-nothing and a care-nothing Minister of Labour, she was an affront to the workers of this province.

The Minister of Labour, it was not the Finance Minister, it was not the Government House Leader, it was the Minister of Labour herself that forced closure, because when they closed the Estimates of the Department of Labour, they closed on the Minister of the Department of Labour and that was necessary, they had to do it. As much as closure was a mistake — and it is a mistake I am confident that they will come to regret — as much as it was a mistake, it was fitting and it was to be expected because as she is a know-nothing, a do-nothing, and a care-nothing Minister of Labour, so is her government — a know-nothing, a do-nothing and a care-nothing government. A government that would rather hide than talk, a government that treats the business of this House with utter disdain at times, a government that would rather dictate than discuss — and that's what the Estimates debate is all about, it is discussion of the Estimates, a legitimate process of the House. A government that would force closure on the Opposition rather than force their own unwilling, or perhaps unable, Minister to answer to the Opposition, to answer to the people of Manitoba.

There were some big losers last evening, Mr. Speaker. We were one of them. As Opposition members we lost the opportunity to fulfill our responsibility to the people of Manitoba. That was taken from our grasp, not at any beckoning of our own, not at any insistence of our own, but at the hands of the government. For that reason, Manitobans in general, as a whole, were big losers last night, for they lost the opportunity for an in-depth look at how the government intends to treat

them as the workers of this province, whether they be organized or unorganized, as a productive force that produces and creates the wealth that keeps Manitoba what Manitoba is.

The government lost last night, Mr. Speaker. They lost the opportunity to show, to prove, for once and all in light of all their past mistakes — and there have been many — they lost the opportunity last night to show that they can truly govern with compassion, that they can truly govern with reason because it was an unreasonable act last night and it was hardly a compassionate act. They've lost the opportunity to show that they can truly govern with temperance because it was an intemperate as well as it was an intolerant act.

But the biggest loser of them all, Mr. Speaker, was the Minister of Labour who I note has re-entered the Chambers. Because she had to be embarrassed last night, Mr. Speaker, she had to be embarrassed by her colleagues and her government's lack of confidence in her, for as we were standing in this House last night voting on closure, we were also taking a vote of no confidence in her abilities. As shocking as that was to her, the fact that we would take a vote of confidence in her abilities, she must have been even more shocked when the Opposition showed more faith in her than did her own colleagues in government.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to listen to the Minister of Labour. I wanted to speak to the Minister of Labour. I wanted her to finish her Estimates. I encouraged her to finish her Estimates and we, as members of the Opposition, I believe, were more confident that she could do so than the members of the government were, her own colleagues. Her government last evening betrayed her. They voted no confidence on the Minister of Labour. They embarrassed her more last night, Mr. Speaker, than she could ever embarrass herself or we could ever embarrass her. They shut her up. And in their fear and in their haste, in their stupidity and their rush to close debate, they cast her aside and locked her out. They left the Minister of Labour out in the cold.

I have to take care not to be misunderstood at this juncture, Mr. Speaker. I do have sympathy for the Minister. I may even have faith in the Minister's abilities, but I believe that her colleague and her government played a dirty trick on her last evening and I think that she, along with all the other losers in this closure fiasco, had been done wrong by the Government of Manitoba.

And while I can feel all this towards the Minister because she is a human being and I hope because I am a human being, I don't want people to misinterpret my sincere sympathy. I still believe that she was a poor Minister of Labour. Not to say that she wouldn't have been a good Minister of another department, Mr. Speaker. For I believe that she is probably most capable if given the right chance or else she would not sit in this House with her colleagues that have betrayed her and with the Opposition that has shown such great faith in her.

But her government betrayed her even before last night, because they saw fit not to give her that chance to show her abilities, not to give her a department that was more suited to her background. Whatever the Minister may have been as Minister of Labour, she was ill-fitted, she was ill-suited and she was incapable, if not incompetent. I do not state that as a revelation; she knew it; her government knew it or they would not have forced closure or she would not have accepted closure because I hope they would have consulted her before locking her out in the cold.

And finally, the electorate knew it and they will know it come the next election. I sincerely hope that she gets a new department for a number of reasons. Firstly, and most pragmatically, is that it would get her out of the Department of Labour. Secondly, if that department is chosen properly, it would give her an opportunity to show her real talents, talents which I don't want her to let her colleagues believe do not exist. Thirdly, when she does, I, Mr. Speaker, for one, am certain that she will be a pride and she will be an inspiration to the women who need her, not only in this province but throughout this country. She will be a symbol of all women's value to the Legislative body. I say so, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that she does have the talent and she does have the expertise and she does have the willingness to serve as that model to the women of this province, instead of the dirty little joke that the Premier in his male chauvinism has tried to turn her into. And for whatever it is worth to her — I know at times she does not accept my opinion as being worth much — but for whatever it is worth to her, I wish her well. I wish her well because the government needs her, the province needs her, as well as the women need her.

But the real question that remains, Mr. Speaker, is not how good a Minister she was, the real question is how does this government feel towards Labour, how does this government feel towards the Department of Labour? I would suggest that their closure last evening, as much of an affront as it was to the Minister, also betrayed their true feelings of Labour. I would suggest that they think very little of Labour, Mr. Speaker. While we should be shocked and surprised at the closure, the closure motion itself and all that it implies, I don't think we should be surprised that they chose Labour as the first one to close, because I think they truly believe that Labour would just dry up and fly away. They have no use for Labour and they think very little of Labour, Mr. Speaker. There is a reason for that, it is understandable. They think very little of Labour because they think too much of their corporate friends.

It is true that one cannot serve two masters, and they choose to serve their high-place, powerful,

moneyed friends, then they must accept the responsibility that they choose to do so at the expense of the great majority of the working people of this province. As time passes, as time always does, Mr. Speaker, they will strip away their thin veneer of civilization as they did last evening. The truth of that statement will become more and more apparent and in a number of very short years they will lie stripped and naked before the electorate of this province once again. And while their actions last night have done them great harm, they have not even accomplished their stated goal, because they said "The Estimates are dragging on too long, Mr. Speaker, we have to short-circuit the process; we have to shorten the process." But I can assure them, regardless of who the Minister is and regardless of their feeble attempts, that the Labour Estimates will continue; they will continue day by day in the questioning period, Mr. Speaker; they will continue in a protracted and exaggerated debate whenever possible. They will somehow crop up in every department's Estimates, something pertaining to Labour, some unanswered question, and they will permeate this House with the foul odour that the closure left behind in its wake.

The government has not shortened the process; they have done, in fact, the opposite, Mr. Speaker; they have lengthened it — for just because they do not want to, or perhaps it is just because they cannot give the answers to the questions that we ask during the Estimates proceedings, that inability of theirs, Mr. Speaker, will not stop our questioning. It simply makes it more inefficient, and by that, they will lengthen the time that that questioning occupies the business of this House. They will make it last longer than it really should, just as the Minister made the Estimates, or what we managed to — plod through of the Estimates, last longer than they really should because of her refusal to answer questions.

So not only last night was her action arrogant and self-defeating, it was stupid and ignorant. I listened just last Thursday to the Government House Leader speak on the The Freedom of Information bill, and I'd like to read some of that into the record at this point, Mr. Speaker. He said, "If a government cannot provide open information, if they refuse to give the kind of information that the public seem to want, or if the opposition in this Chamber seem to want, there are ways of dealing with that kind of government. I said that when I was in opposition, and I'll say it again; the public will make the decision."

And indeed, the public will make the decision, and he will indeed say it again in opposition if he chooses to run. But he was speaking on why we don't need a Freedom of Information bill, and one of the reasons he gave — I would like to read into the record again — — and I'm paraphrasing him at this point — he said perhaps they need that Freedom of Information bill in Ottawa —(Interjection)— Okay, and why do they need it there? I'll quote him at this point. He said, "But one thing, there's one essential difference between the way we operate here and the way they operate in Ottawa" — and I understand that he has operated in both, so I will take him at his word — "They don't have unlimited," and those are his words, Mr. Speaker — ". . . unlimited opportunity to question the executive as we do here during the consideration of Estimates."

MR. COWAN: He went on to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Estimates are conducted — this is in Ottawa, I believe — in sequestered committee rooms and there is an almost incredible stricture placed upon members in the manner in which they are able to question not the government, not the Ministers — oh, no, they don't dare question the Ministers — but departmental officials. Well, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that incredible stricture is no less incredible than the closure that he forced upon the Labour Estimates last evening. And now we do not even have the recourse to ask questions in that form of department heads as they do in Ottawa. He has limited us even worse than Ottawa is limited in their Estimates.

So he goes on, he says, "So, they don't have an opportunity to get information." I would suggest we do not have an opportunity to get the information that we sought in the Labour Estimates because of his government, and I saw him stand and vote in favour of this government's closure. He talks about Estimates and he says that they are a pretty good opportunity for the people of this province to get the kind of information they want. Then last night, or this evening, or today, he is quoted in the paper as saying — he told reporters the NDP was trying to intimidate the government by repeating the same questions. There was no attempt at intimidation; there was attempt at eliciting information; there was an attempt at getting questions answered; there was an attempt at finding out the government's philosophy and the government's intentions as to the Department of Labour, but there was no attempt at intimidation. The only attempt at intimidation that took place in this House in regard to the Department of Labour's Estimates is the attempt, and successful attempt, of their government to intimidate their Minister into not answering those questions.

A MEMBER: They told her to bank them all.

MR. COWAN: He goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP's behaviour demonstrates, quote: "They have no control over themselves and, like all socialists, they require 'a body that tells everyone what to do.'" "Well, if there is any body in this government, in this House, that tells everybody what to do, it is the 49 percent minority on the opposite side. any more.

Mr. Speaker, we will ask the questions, as I said earlier. If we do not ask them in Labour debates, if they choose to proceed with the closure — and I would ask the House Leader to call a quick caucus in regard to that closure, so that, if for nothing else, they can revoke the closure and his word once again stands good, because when they betrayed the Minister of Labour, they betrayed the Government House Leader in the speech he made just a few short days before. But we will ask the questions, we will ask the questions. We will ask the government to explain the statements that they have made about legislating strikers back to work, because those are onerous statements and they demand clarification. We will ask the Minister to discuss the changes she has said her department is considering in regard to the Workplace Health and Safety Act. We want open discussion on that, Mr. Speaker, for if that Act is not working, then we want to be able, in our own way, to provide some information, to provide some expertise, in how to make that Act work. And if they choose not to accept it, that is their choice, but I think they should be at least willing to hear us out.

We will ask the government their intentions as to increasing, or — the Minister said it could happen — perhaps decreasing the minimum wage in the Province of Manitoba. And the Minister even said that it is conceivable, it is possible, that there could be no minimum wage at all; we will want to ask them about that again and again.

We will ask them what changes she said are being contemplated in a labour legislation act. I think we have a right to know; I think the people of this province have a right to know. We will ask them what their overall philosophy in regard to what the Department of Labour is going to play under their stewardship, no matter who the Minister may be. We will ask the Minister what she considers to be harassment by her department's inspectors; we will ask and ask and ask; the list of questions is long, and therefore, if we do not have an efficient way to ask the questions, the length of questioning, the time it takes, will also be long.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in the debate I referred to fascism, and I attributed that, to me, that most hateful characteristic, to the government. And I did so not unadvisedly, Mr. Speaker, nor did I do so without sincere conviction in the use of that word, in what I said, for by forcing closure on the Estimates last evening, and the manner in which they did it — the arrogant, arbitrary, intolerant manner in which they did it — they ripped a page right from Mein Kampf. For in that text, perhaps the most hateful fascist of all, Adolf Hitler, advised them, Hitler himself said: "The greatness of every mighty organization embodying an idea in this world lies in religious fanaticism and intolerance with which, fanatically convinced of its own right, it intolerably imposes its will against all others." And I would suggest that that is exactly what transpired in that committee room, No. 254, and exactly what transpired in this House last evening, because that government, fanatically convinced of its own right, intolerably imposed its will, its wishes, its whims against all others.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief.

If that is their choice, Mr. Speaker, if that is their path to the self-conceived greatness that that government has chosen, I must warn them, I must take the opportunity to once again try to warn them that it will not lead them to greatness, just as it did not lead other fascists to greatness, but that they will all find themselves at the end of that path, in defeat and in despair. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, it's a pity that my honourable friend was a victim of another fascist device, that is the 40-minute time limit on his speech, but he seemed to accept that one with some acquiescence.

Mr. Speaker, it's rather amusing to listen to one who has been in this House but such a short time to deliver of himself such a lecture on the rules of Parliament and what constitutes closure, and what is the responsibility of the government and the responsibility of the opposition. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, I should just go back a few years and remind my honourable friend — and for the benefit of all those who may not have been aware of the discussions that went on in this Chamber and in the Rules Committee with respect to the rules that were enforced when we came into office, or when the previous administration came into office perhaps my honourable friend would be interested in knowing that up to this point they have now consumed something like 238 to 240 hours in the Estimates, which is a record. The last —(Interjection)— Well, I'm not quarrelling with that, I'm not quarrelling with that. The last year that my honourable friends were

the government there was 238 hours that were consumed to complete the entire set of Estimates, which included Supplementary Estimates, Interim Supply and all those other things that go along with the Estimates. —(Interjection)— No. You had a responsible opposition, that's what you had. You had a responsible opposition, because we accepted the responsibilities of being opposition, even though my honourable friends opposite may not have accepted the responsibilities of being government.

Let me go back a few years, prior to the rule changes. When we inherited the opposition, there was a total of 80 hours that was designated for the consideration of Estimates; 80 hours. It was never possible to consider the entire set of Estimates; there were always seven or eight departments that were completely left out and not considered at all. —(Interjection)— About half. I did a calculation of the time that was consumed during those years, too. My honourable friends used that rule to good effect, and I'm not quarrelling with that, either. Things that go on in this Chamber that are perfectly natural and perfectly normal, I don't quarrel with them. My honourable friends always put the Ministers who could consume time, up first, so that they could take up the 80 hours, and the Ministers that they did not want to be subjected to questioning never had to be subjected to questioning because their Estimates were never considered. That was a situation that the Opposition House Leader and myself felt needed to be corrected, and we did negotiate in good faith to adopt a set of rules that would bring about an opportunity for an examination of the Estimates. There were two irreconcilable opposing objectives that had to be met. First, the right of the opposition to question and to examine, and the right of the government to govern.

Now, my honourable friend has spent a great deal of time talking about the right of the opposition to question but he has devoted no time whatsoever — they forget very quickly — to the right of the government to govern. He has not taken that into consideration, nor does it concern him and perhaps from his position it need not concern him at the moment.

But it was of concern to those members who were on the Rules Committee at the time and we began in 1974 to consider those rules and the rule changes to see if there was a possibility of reconciling these opposing objectives of opposition and government.

I can tell my honourable friend that in Ottawa, when I first went there in 1957, the opposition had that right — completely open examination. And the only thing that imposed strictures on the opposition in those days was the hot summer sun. But we always found that there were seven or eight departments of government that never got examined because they would devote their time to the first few set of Estimates that came up and waste — well I shouldn't say waste — and devote all the time to those Estimates and then forget about the others.

Then there was the opportunity for the opposition to stall the government program, to frustrate the government, and there was no countervailing measure that the government could use.

So in 1968 they decided they would bring about a change in the rules and then they went complete circle. They gave all the authority to the government and none to the opposition. There is no consideration of Estimates there at all, except as I described when I spoke on the Freedom of Information bill.

When we decided that we had to have some rule changes in this Chamber, we wanted to avoid both of those two extremes. We provided that there would be an unlimited examination of Estimates and, in return — we were in the opposition at the time — we gave up an unlimited question period which was in effect at that time. We imposed a limit of 40 minutes on the question period. We extended the hours of sitting from 10 to whenever the House decided it wanted to adjourn, which was an improvement, because if you got into a discussion that you wanted to conclude at that particular time, you had an opportunity to do that. And we removed the consideration of concurrence, which was a time-consuming and, in my opinion, a wasteful practice, and has now been reduced to the main supply motion. Members who feel that they have not had an opportunity to examine, or to question, or to speak as much as they would like, now have that final opportunity on the main supply motion.

Then we had a provision in the early stages that there would be an opportunity for the government, when they felt that debate was lagging or the opposition were stalling, that a rule would be placed thereon to enable the government to move a closure. We had that in effect for one year and I might tell my honourable friend again I think that what he should do, and perhaps a few other members over there should do it as well, is to start listening to their House Leader and they might learn a few things about rules and about parliament.

Following the 1975 trial period, it was the Member for Inkster who suggested that we place the present closure rule on the Statute Books or on our rules, and for a very good reason. He felt that the repeated invoking of the closure motion on every item would be time-consuming and unnecessary, and I agreed with him. And I still agree with him. And so a motion was placed that enabled anyone — that includes an opposition member — to invoke that closure rule and attach a time limit for the consideration of the remainder of the Estimates on that particular department, with the exception of the first item. —(Interjection)— Oh, my honourable friend said that's not the

issue. I don't know what the issue is.

Now, I don't know where my honourable friend was when the Member for Churchill was speaking. The issue was the imposition of closure. Just a few weeks ago there was a grievance motion as well because of the possibility of the imposition of closure. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, our rules provide but because there was a bit of a difference in the remarks that were made in the tenor of the remarks of the Member for Churchill as opposed to the Member for Logan, who did not rise on a point of order. But there is only provision to debate one subject during the course of a session, and we are pretty close to debating both of them. But I go on.

I was rather interested to hear the Member for Churchill complain about the fact that members on this side of the House were participating in the discussion on Labour Estimates. It wasn't very long ago when somebody else on that side of the House was complaining because the members on this side of the House were not participating in debate. Well, what do you want?T

I might tell my honourable friends that when we had the 80-hour time limit on Estimates, 75 — and I calculated it because I made a point of doing so — 75 to 80 percent of the time taken up in Estimates was taken up by the government. 75 to 80 percent of the time taken up on the Estimates was taken up by the government. — (Interjection)— Well, I wasn't here in those days; I am talking about the time that my honourable friends were on this side of the House. And I will repeat it: 75 to 80 percent of the time taken up in the Estimates was taken up by my honourable friends, because I counted the times. I marked them down during the course of the consideration of Estimates so I know whereof I speak. And my honourable friends can groan all they like but that was a case, and that did happen time after time. And there was a very good reason for it. They didn't want their weaker Ministers to be subjected to questioning so they stalled for them. And secondly, because it was obvious we were not going to be able to get through all the Estimates, we didn't make speeches on the Estimates. We made them on Second Reading of the bills; we made them on concurrence motions; we used the question periods; we did other things.

I am telling my honourable friend that 80 percent of the time taken up in Estimates was taken up by the government side. So if the rules are going to be bent, it works both ways. If my honourable friends are not anxious or desirous of adhering to the rules that we, ourselves, develop in this House, then there has got to be ways sought to ensure that again, and I repeat, the two objectives can be met. First, the right of the opposition to question and to examine and to criticize and, secondly, the right of the government to govern.

What has been obvious during the course of this session is that my honourable friends feel, still feel, at least some of them feel that they still have the right to govern, that they are the government and that they make the decisions — they don't. The decisions that are made have to be made by the people who have been given the responsibility to govern — not the opposition.

I don't want to take away from my friends the right to perform their role in a parliamentary democracy but I can tell them now, and I will tell them again, that if the occasion arises where it becomes necessary to invoke that same motion again, I will not hesitate to do it, because the right of the government to carry through its legislative program will not be frustrated and it is the reason why that rule was put in there. My honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, knew exactly what he was doing when he insisted on that rule being in the rule book. He must have known the kind of irresponsibility that my honourable friends opposite would show when they became the opposition, and wanted to ensure that there were measures in the rule books that would take care of that situation.

I have no quarrel with my honourable friends questioning or criticising but when it turns into nothing more — and we have seen that happen in the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development. On Friday we will have been on that set of Estimates for one solid month. We started on the 16th of May; Friday is the 16th of June. And I have no objection to questions being asked, but do they have to be asked by every single member opposite, and the answer provided every single time? That's what's happening, repetition, needless mindless repetition.

My honourable friend, the Minister of Health and Social Development, has done everything in his power, everything he possibly could, to provide answers to every single question that was asked, even if it was the fourth and the fifth time. In fact, I criticize him for providing answers *ad infinitum* to questions that have been asked over and over again.

I suggest to my honourable friends that there is a responsibility on both sides of this House to make rules work, rules that we develop ourselves. And I don't mind saying that in my opinion in this Chamber we have the best set of rules of any Chamber in Canada. But they can only work if members want to make them work. If there is an acceptance of not only the rights of members, but the responsibilities of members. And I'm looking forward to seeing my honourable friends accept that kind of responsibility.

We have gone now, as I said, almost 240 hours in the Estimates, which is more than we have ever done before. And there are still the Department of the Attorney-General, the Executive Council, Legislation, Finance, Northern Affairs, and Tourism to go through, plus the few other odds and

I don't think that my honourable friends have been denied an opportunity to examine and no one is going to deny them that opportunity. The government is going to insist that there be some point to the questioning, and that repetition is going to cease. If a question is posed once and an answer given, is there a need to put it on the record a dozen times? Is there a need to ask the same question and get the same answer a dozen times?

I have taken note of the implied threat of the Member for Churchill. I could tell my honourable friend that threats in this Chamber by him, or anybody else on that side, will be dealt with under the provisions of the rules. We have the rules which provide for an opportunity to take care of the suggestions that are being made by my friend from Churchill and I have no hesitation in invoking whatever measure is necessary to ensure that we will not be frustrated in our efforts to get our legislative program through. And I leave it up to my honourable friends. If they want to be here all summer, I have no objection to that. If they want to stay here until October, that's fine; we will stay here until October. They probably have nothing better to do. But in my opinion if they do that, they do it not because it's necessary, they do it because it is their desire to frustrate and to bog down the government's legislative program. And I'll tell by my honourable friend from Churchill that it will not happen, it will not happen as long as the Estimates are proceeding and the examination and the debates are proceeding without the kind of repetition that we've experienced on some occasions. There will be no measure taken or no steps taken to stop my honourable friends and I suppose it's a value judgment as to when one considers that that process has gone on long enough. I accept that responsibility as House Leader and I take the responsibility for it; if there's criticism, I take that too, but I expect that my honourable friends will assume a little bit of responsibility on their own shoulders, the responsibility of ensuring that they do their job in the way that is expected of them instead of the mindless manner in which they've been conducting the examination of the Estimates up to this point. I should not direct that to all of the departments because there can be no complaints about the manner in which some of those Estimates have been conducted, people have acted responsibly. But as long as they want to act like an undisciplined bunch of gangsters in opposition then they're going to have to be treated . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I just say to the honourable member that some of his language may be bordering on unparliamentary.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a pity you weren't listening to the Member for Churchill when he was speaking then. If there was a comment that was unparliamentary, it came from the other side of the House, an undisciplined bunch of gangsters is not in my opinion — and I will look in the rule book, but I bet you Mr. Speaker, I will not find that in the rule book as one of those comments that are prohibited. —(Interjection)— And I tell you if my honourable friend the Member for Inkster can find it, I will withdraw it.

The Member for Churchill made some pretty caustic comments about the Minister of Labour and it's very brave of him, very brave of him to make those comments but you know my honourable friend should have been here when we had a Minister of Labour on this side of the House from his party. Now that was a Minister of Labour. He should have seen some of the performances that went on there and some of the answers that we were getting to questions. It wasn't even possible to question him for reasons that I won't even tell in this Chamber, it wasn't possible to question. That's the kind of responsibility that we had when they were on this side of the House. —(Interjection)— No. The consideration of Estimates on the Department of Labour at the very most took thirteen and one half hours and if my honourable friend will believe it that was at a time when the Member for Fort Garry was doing the questioning. On another occasion three hours and on the occasion that it took three hours, it was the Minister of Labour did all the talking. —(Interjection)— So, if my honourable friend thinks that the situation is bad now, he should have been here a few years ago, he should have had a little bit of experience in this House before he gets up and makes a speech such as he did about parliamentary rights.

The Member for Churchill talks about serving two masters, now I wonder who his master is. There was a report in the paper just the other night, who his master was, Dennis McDermot is going to go all out, they were going to spend \$300,000 to win votes for the NDP and it's quite obvious that what my honourable friend was doing and has been doing is carrying out the instructions from Dennis McDermot and Nels Thibault. That's the kind of masters that they serve, that's the kind of master of my honourable friend. My friend the Member for Inkster has found something.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member accept as at least synonyms or equivalent, villians, ruffians, hooligans, all of which are listed and none of which are quite as bad as gangsters.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the Member for Inkster having found

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

that reasonable facsimile, I will withdraw the comment although I knew he would not find that particular exact reference in Hansard because I perused it. I think my honourable friends have used just about every other one that is contained in there directed on this side of the House.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's been an interesting experience. My honourable friend made some quotations from a speech that I made on the Freedom of Information Act. I don't take back anything that I said, but I presume from his remarks that he's one who is going to support The Freedom of Information legislation. It's going to be very interesting to see what happens on that side of the House because when my honourable friends were over here, to a man they voted against it and I know that there's going to be —(Interjection)— Oh, yes you did. And I know that there are going to members on that side of the House that have not changed their opinions from the time that they were over here and I advise my honourable friend that when the Member for Inkster gets up to speak, that he be in the House and listen to him because he might learn something. He might learn something from one of his own colleagues and one that I would advise my honourable friend to pay more attention to if he wants to learn something about parliament, if he wants to learn something about the Legislature. I wouldn't recommend that he takes that same kind of advice from anybody else on that side of the House because I haven't seen on that side of the House anyone who has the same sense of appreciation of what parliament is all about and what the rules are all about. The Member for St. Boniface uses the rules the way the Member for St. Boniface has always used the rules, for his own benefit.

In this Chamber there is a function to perform, it is the right and the duty of the members of this Chamber or the people of this province through their elected representatives to hold a rein or a check on government. It is our manner of doing so, other jurisdictions do it in a different way. The United States has a different way of achieving the same purpose. Essentially the function is to ensure that the dollars that are collected from the taxpayers are not wasted and that they are spent wisely and that they are accounted for and I have yet to hear anybody on that side of the House stand up and come to the defence of the taxpayer. There isn't a single member on that side of the House that has stood up and opened his mouth but at the expense of the taxpayer. Every single one of them have advocated increased spending all the way down the line on every single subject. Now, if that isn't an abdication of responsibility, I don't know what is and I can tell my honourable friends that because they forgot about the taxpayer, they are where they are today. Because they spent money like it was going out of style, because they refused to accept the fact that there is a limit to the amount of money that you can extract from the taxpayer and I know that the art of politics is to extract more money from the taxpayer without disturbing the voter.

My honourable friends disturbed the voter a little bit too much prior to the last election and if they want another example of what the trend is and what people are thinking, even though I think it was a fairly serious operation to perform, the voters of California gave further evidence of the fact that they've had enough from politicians who believe that they can buy their way into power and then continue to spend as if it was their money, as if it belonged to them and they could do with it as they pleased. And I'm glad that the taxpayers of this province have finally asserted themselves for the taxpayers of this province and the taxpayers of California and I predict that unless my honourable friends show a little bit more responsibility in the manner in which they want us to spend taxpayers money, not theirs, not ours, but the taxpayers then they're going to be staying on that side of the House for an awful long time. We have yet to hear one question from anybody on that side of the House as to how we could effect a saving of money, every single one of them has been urging us to spend more. Mr. Speaker, we've accepted the responsibility and we're going to continue to accept that responsibility notwithstanding the blandishments of my honourable friends opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I've had . . . —(Interjection)— I'm prepared to go on, I don't know whether we're going into Private Members' Hour or not. It's the members' prerogative whether they wish it or not.

I have had some twelve years experience in this House and this is the first time I am getting up to speak on a grievance. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before the member gets started on his grievance may I suggest that the time is 4:30 p.m., we're now in Private Members' Hour. —(Interjection)— When the subject next comes up the Member for Kildonan will have 39 ½ minutes.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

SECOND READINGS — PRIVATE BILLS

3665

**BILL NO. 17 — AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE
THE BRANDON GENEL HOSPITAL**

MR. EVANS presented Bill No. 17, An Act to Amend An Act to Incorporate the Brandon General Hospital, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The proposed bill tends to be, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in the category of a technical bill designed to improve administrative features of the Brandon Hospital operation. The proposed bill does not make any particular change in the structure or the composition of the Board of Directors. The composition of the Board of Directors is identical under the existing acts and under the proposed amendments. The Board would be made up of 15 persons elected from the members of the corporation, five of these would be elected each year and each for a three year term. In addition to the elected members there would be one member from the medical and dental staff of the hospital, the mayor and one other councillor from the City of Brandon and three further municipal representatives being one member of the council of each of the rural municipalities of Cornwallis, Elton and Whitehead as long as they continue to make grants required of them under the 1968 Act. Mr. Speaker, this makes a total Board of Directors of 21 persons. If any other municipalities made grants of an amount in excess of an amount fixed in the by-laws, a member of the Council of that municipality would be a member of the Corporation and eligible to be elected or appointed a director.

The effect of changes that would be made by the bill — if it was enacted — are primarily a matter of simplification of language and structure. Since the hospital was first incorporated in 1883, it has been amended by no less than 13 different Acts. It is almost impossible to trace one's way through these Acts, and therefore the purpose of the bill is primarily to bring the legislation up to date so that it can be understood in more simple language and structure.

The specific changes are as follows:

First, under the existing subsection 2(2), the signing officers are fixed by statute as the President and the Treasurer. Under the proposed new subsection 2(3), the board could prescribe the signing officers by by-law.

Secondly, the provisions relating to annual memberships are deleted. There is no reference in the new bill to annual memberships.

Thirdly, a life membership fee is to be fixed by by-law. Previously the fee was \$30.00. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the fee to become a member of the organization that supports the Brandon General Hospital, the Brandon General Hospital Society, or Association.

Fourthly, hospital employees are now eligible, as shown in Section 9(1) and (2) of the existing Act. Under the amendments, the hospital employees of the corporation would be ineligible to be elected as directors.

Fifthly, the timing for the annual meeting is now fixed by Statute as before May 1. This is changed to require the meeting to be held within 60 days of the Board receiving the audited financial statement proposed in Section 1. Other provisions relating to the annual meeting are also simplified.

Sixthly, old Section No. 13 required that the directors' annual report set out the Treasurer's report and a statement of the receipts and disbursements of the Corporation. Under the proposed Section 13, there is no reference to the Treasurer's report or to the receipts and disbursements. The language is made more modern.

Seventh, under the existing Section 14, subsection 6, additional municipalities must donate \$6,000 per year in order to be eligible to have a member of their Council as a member of the Corporation. This amount is now to be fixed by a by-law proposed. The proposed section is 3, subsection 6.

Eight, there is a new provision proposed in Section 3, subsection 7, for the temporary filling of vacancies on the Board of Directors, until the next annual meeting. :

Nine, the language relating to the auditor's report — which is old Section 15, subsection 2; and now a new Section 15, and to the report of the Corporation to the government, which is old Section 16 and also a new Section 16, this is simplified, Mr. Speaker.

And the tenth, and the last detailed point — the provision that the Act shall be deemed to be a public Act is now deleted.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said, this tends to be an administrative type of bill, which I am bringing in at the request of the City of Brandon, and those people who are associated with the Brandon

Hospital — the Corporation of the Brandon General Hospital.

I would take the opportunity to commend the people in the community — and not only the City of Brandon but in the area — for their efforts to support the hospital over many many years. I know they have given of their time — freely of their time — their energy, their ideas and their enthusiasm.

I would make only one comment, Mr. Speaker, and that is, that it would seem to me that it might be appropriate if there had been more opportunity for representation from the Government of Manitoba, perhaps, along the lines of the Health Sciences Centre legislation in the City of Winnipeg. I believe there is provision for some appointees from the government per se; and due to the fact that this is a large hospital as is the Health Sciences Centre — it's a general hospital — and also it would seem to me that there may be some room for suggestions for further representation from the municipalities that are affected. This is in addition to those who are appointed by the Brandon Hospital Corporation or the Society, as it exists, because as it exists, the board is made up primarily of members who are active in the Brandon Hospital Corporation or Society.

So I offer those as my own views on the matter, but as I said, I bring this in as a service to the city and to those who are involved in the Brandon General Hospital. I again take the opportunity to commend them for their efforts and for the progress that has been made in that very fine health institution over the years, which in no small measure is attributable to the efforts of these people. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Rock Lake the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 37 — AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE WAWANESA AND DISTRICT MEMORIAL HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake) presented Bill No. 37, An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate the Wawanesa and District Memorial Hospital Association, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 37 is a bill where the Wawanesa And District Memorial Hospital Association was incorporated in Chapter 100 of the Statutes of Manitoba, in 1948. No changes have been made since that time.

The Act is simply in the nature of house-cleaning. The amendments proposed to Section 2 merely withdraws the restriction on the annual value limit on the holding of real estate.

The Association was restricted to \$10,000 value of annual real estate. Normal corporations are allowed to hold property for their purposes up to whatever limits seem suitable to it. From 1948 to 1978 there has been considerable inflation, especially in property values and real estate, and the figure \$10,000, is completely unreasonable.

In Section 5, Mr. Speaker, the only change proposed is the reduction of quorum for directors' meetings. It reduced the quorum to five members of the board. There are also some minor changes to allow the Vice-President to act in the absence of the President and to have a director appointed by the Board of Directors, to act in the absence or inability of the Secretary or Treasurer.

The change to Section 7 simply makes every adult person residing within the Wawanesa Medical District, namely 12B, a member of the Corporation and eligible to be a director. Under the old 1948 Act a subscription fee was levied to families. This has not been the practice for several years and the change in this part of the Act is simply to bring the Act up to date with the actuality.

The bill has no contentious parts to it, Mr. Speaker. It is simply bringing up to date a corporation that has not been changed under the Act for 30 years. The bill will simply make the common practice with the Hospital Association legal.

With those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I recommend this bill to the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 5 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Emerson, Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I will be expressing my views. I don't believe there are any members in the Chamber who haven't made up their minds on this bill, so it's not my intention to try and talk the members out of voting the way that they're going to vote, but I am just going to tell you my views and hope that it might have some bearing on your final decision.

Yesterday, I had a very young lady come and visit me at the lunch hour. She had a personal problem which she felt I, as her Member of the Legislature, might be able to be of some assistance. She was 18 years of age. She will not be 19 until next February. She is being married in September.

After we had discussed her personal problem I thought I would ask one of my constituents what her views are on the raising of the drinking age. She was, in my opinion, a very mature young lady. She had graduated from Grade 12 in High School, and had taken one year of a business course, and as I mentioned she was being married in September. The one question she asked me — even though she was an almost complete non-drinker — was, "Mr. Kavnats, would I be allowed to have a drink at my own wedding?" Under the proposed law we would not be allowing her to drink at her own wedding.

I thought, it is a shame — freedom of choice — I thought of some of the other problems that would occur if we raised the drinking age to 19. You would be able to go up in an airplane, drink to your heart's content at 18, and as soon as you came down on the ground at 19, if the age was raised, you would have some problems.

I have one other story I would like to tell you. —(Interjection)— That's right, if you're high, you can drink, and if you drink you're high.

I spoke to the mother of a Grade 12 student graduating this year. The son is going to be the Valedictorian at the graduation exercises. The son had asked the mother, would he be able to drink at his own graduation? He would be 19. All he wanted to do was have the freedom to drink at his own graduation, at 18. He felt that he was mature enough to accept the responsibility of drinking at 18.

As I think might be obvious, I am speaking against this bill. My remarks will not be of a political nature. —(Interjection)— I think that when I was first elected I answered a few questions and maybe that's the reason I'm sitting over here. —(Interjection)— My remarks will be based on my own upbringing and an association with the many age groups it is my privilege to know.

When I was elected I tried to determine how and why I was elected. I'm not going to fight the election over again, but the remarks were most consistent, "Abe, we believe you to be fair and honest and of a high morality." Today, I believe in these qualities regardless of political affiliation. Let's be fair and honest in looking at this bill.

The measure of raising the drinking age to 19 will not correct the problem. There will be drinking in the high schools and the universities and the pubs and the homes and at parties. To correct the problem, there must be a stricter control on all under-age drinkers. Let's use some of the tax revenues, derived from the liquor sales, to educate and regulate the drinkers under the arbitrary age of 18.

The responsibility should be in our school system. Parents or guardians, liquor outlets and the under-aged people themselves, this problem would not exist to this degree had the previous government enforced the regulations and in fact discouraged, rather than encouraged drinkers under-age. How they encouraged them, they didn't control them by giving them identification cards.

Let's punish severely those people who encourage under-age drinking. Supplying them with liquor is a dastardly act and should be punished. Let's support the teachers in punishing those students who disrupt classes in school because of drinking. Let's educate the parents and make them aware of the problem. Let's help the authorities and outlets in identifying under-age drinkers. Personalized identification cards would be a step forward. —(Interjection)— The parents are responsible. Let's not single out the 18 year olds as the problem drinkers. There are some people at 50 years of age that are problem drinkers. Fifty happens to be my age but I'm not admitting to anything and I happen to know the Member for Seven Oak's age and I know it's just about 50 but I'm not going

to say. I sometimes wonder whether the arbitrary age for drinking should be 65 but you still qualify.

As previously mentioned by another member in this House, I also had my first taste of liquor or alcohol at the age of 8 days. I was told that it was to cut down on the pain. My next drink was at 17 while I was at university. — (Interjection)— Oh, it was just a little ceremonial wine which I grew to like. We are going to take away the rights of the students below 19 to make up their own minds. Let's consult the people who will have to live under the laws we pass and whose future is in our hands.

I took a survey of a high school and I think these results prove that we must not raise the drinking age. This survey was the Grade 9s, 10s, 11s and 12s at a particular high school in my area. I'm not going to read off the whole survey because some of it has to do with seat belt legislation because I feel that we, as representatives, should know what the people and the young people in our area who we are governing, we should know their feelings so that we can initiate laws that will look after them and what they want.

The first question was: The legal drinking age in Manitoba should be raised by the Manitoba government from 18 to 19, and you answer yes or no. Agree —69; disagree—279. It's quite obvious that the Grade 9 students are against raising the drinking age from 18 to 19. The Grade 10 students: agree—21; disagree—73. Grade 11 students: 15 agree the drinking age should be raised to 19; disagree—71. The Grade 12 students, the ones who really aren't affected because they now have the privilege of drinking; 14 agree; 51 disagree.

I thought the alternative would be to raise it from 18 to 20 — at least I considered it, Mr. Speaker — so we included that as one of the questions. The legal drinking age in Manitoba should be raised from 18 to 20. Agree—40; disagree—313. Raising it to 20 years of age is not the answer.

This kind of goes against what I made a remark about the parents should be responsible. One of the questions we asked: Parents should have the responsibility — oh, I'm sorry, it does back up my remarks. Parents should have the responsibility of making sure under-aged children do not have access to liquor: 245 agree that parents should have the responsibility; 102 disagree — 2 to 1.

I'm going to carry on with something else rather than just keep reading all these facts and figures but they all prove that the people that we are legislating for want the right to be able to take a drink at the age of 18 which is an arbitrary age, no other age is being considered.

But just before I pass, and I hope I'm not going to be ruled out of order, seat belts should be compulsory in Manitoba. 183 agree; 163 disagree. I think the Honourable Minister of Highways would be interested in figures that do show the people who are coming up and are coming of age, agree that seat belts should be compulsory.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I'm not voting against this bill to encourage drinking. I'm voting against this bill to encourage the authorities to develop a better alternative to correct the problems, particularly in the high schools. The answer might be to raise the drinking age but I'm not sure. Raising the drinking age from 18 to 19, one year, is insignificant and in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, will not correct the problem. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, the last time this subject was up for debate, I rose at the same time as my friend for Radisson and it puts me in somewhat of an awkward position in that he has stolen my speech. I don't know where I dropped it but, nevertheless, he has said by and large that which I had intended to say. So with the rules against repetition, I can't repeat the member's speech except to add to it that in my view, it is inconsistent law and I will say that if I thought that even in passing inconsistent law, it might solve the problem then I would be inclined to perhaps support the motion. But, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Radisson put it very well. In fact, he put it so succinctly that I think he put it better than I, the case to be made for not supporting this motion.

One of the reasons why I think we should take pause and consider this particular bill, relative to my suggestion that it is inconsistent, it will cause problems which will have to be resolved in a court of law. I don't know how you can make a person responsible with the age of majority being 18 and say that he is in one particular set of circumstances an adult and in another set of circumstances he is not. So, therefore, with that particular point in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act be not now read a second time but be read this date six months hence.

MOTION presented

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon East, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 6, The Freedom of Information Act. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Human Rights Act. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

PUBLIC BILLS — SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 33 — THE VENTURE INVESTMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION REGISTRATION ACT

MR. AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge) presented Bill No. 33, The Venture Investment and Research and Development Corporation Registration Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present to members this bill which, aside from having a long and awkward title, I think is designed to correct some of the particular economic problems presently facing the Province of Manitoba at the present moment. The problem that it is designed to correct is the substantial lack of investment in the research and development area in this province which leads to a lack of growth and development of technology based industries which provide jobs for people with higher developed skills coming out of our schools and universities. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there can be no refutation of that particular economic fact of life in the Province of Manitoba, that one of the most serious vacuums that exist in our economic planning and our economic promotion is any form of incentive to encourage private capital to move into the area of investment for industries and products based upon research or technological grounds.

We are entering an age, Mr. Speaker, when I think we are finally beginning to recognize that research and development is not some esoteric exercise conducted in the common rooms of the university for the joy or amusement of academics but it is in fact one of the most essential foundations for the development of a well running economy. The recognition of that particular fact has appeared only recently in the proposals put forward by other provincial governments, mainly those in the Province of Ontario and by the Federal Government in its recent announcement of a research and development strategy for Canada. In both those instances, Mr. Speaker, the Ministers introducing those, the Honourable Darcy McKeough in the Province of Ontario and the Honourable Judd Buchanan at the federal level, point to some important statistics which have appeared just recently through Statistics Canada and that is that Canadian manufacturing, Canadians generally, invest less in research and development than almost any industrialized country in the western world, that the percentage of GNP that goes into R and D efforts in Canada is .09 percent which, compared to the United States which is .15 percent, compared to countries like West Germany and Japan which is 2.5 percent, becomes one of the indicators, one of the mistakes if you like, that we have continually made in not promoting the use of research and development as a way of an economic stimulant. I point out that we are now paying a very heavy price for that lack of investment and that lack of development in the sense that many of the innovations and inventions that have been developed in this country must be developed and implemented and applied in other areas.

One of the things that surprise me, and I guess saddened me at the same time, is the fact that Canadians over the past 30 or 40 years, have produced some of the most significant inventions in the world but they have had to be developed in other countries. One could point to things like the drilling press, forms of xeroxing, innovations in the area of airplane technology, and yet our manufacturing areas, our government areas and our research areas may have developed the product but it has had to be applied and brought to fruition creating enormous amounts and jobs and

in other countries.

There is also another aspect to it which I think is equally serious and that is that we are not in the position where we can any longer offer the same kind of job opportunities for our highly skilled people coming out of our schools and universities. If there is any one area which is suffering is that we have spent a lot of money in the past 10 or 15 years investing in education and we now reach a stage where many of these people are coming into the work force and there's literally no work for them. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the problem is particularly acute in the Province of Manitoba. As we have all recognized, we do not sit on great pools of natural gas or oil. The standard assets of our economy, our agriculture and our mining have reached a certain plateau; they are not providing a great deal of further acceleration in economic growth. And the one asset that we have remaining which remains undeveloped and not fully utilized is the skills and brain-power of our own population. We have within the province three universities, the University of Manitoba in particular, which has a high research capacity, and yet we haven't made any effort to really develop the kind of economic assets that would grow out of those research centres. I attended, Mr. Speaker, a conference on Saturday morning sponsored by the medical faculty on medical research and they pointed out that the percentage of provincial investment that goes into medical research and development in this province represents something like 2 percent of total research dollars, that most of the money comes in externally. And yet what many of the people at that seminar pointed out is that medical research in its own right not only has a value in terms of better health but also has a value because it brings into the province highly-skilled people who create new products, new technologies and new inventions. And yet they said that curiously enough we seem to be working in opposition to that, in contradiction to that.

So it becomes very clear that the lack of economic stimulant and some of the problems that we are facing can be traced back to the lack of investment capital in high-technology areas. Now, Mr. Speaker, every province over the past decade or two experimented with forms of public investment in these areas. Our own Manitoba Development Corporation — and every province got into the business of trying to put large-scale loans and capital grants to assist the development of risk ventures in these areas. And I think it is fair to conclude by this time in our history that they all didn't work that well; that that particular experiment — and it wasn't necessarily a socialist experiment; it was as much tried in the Province of Ontario with Conservatives and the Province of Nova Scotia with Liberals, and the end experience was that it really didn't work all that well. But whatever the reasons were — I suppose it will take some economic historian to diagnose the reasons — it just didn't succeed in providing for a consistent and flourishing kind of economic base, and there was probably more grief encountered through those forms of public investment capital vehicles than any other one aspect of government. I suppose one reason why my seatmates on this side of the House are where they are now is because of the problems they ran into through the Manitoba Development Corporation and the particular ammunition it gave to then members of the opposition to exploit.

So the question is, what do we do? Do we do nothing? Well, that seems to be the case presently in the Province of Manitoba. Presently there is no program of incentive for venture capital or for research and development capital in the Province of Manitoba. We have stopped; we're winding down MDC, recognizing it to be a failure and not to be the proper vehicle. What have we put in its place? We have put nothing in its place; there is nothing in the Finance Minister's budget to do it, nothing that I've heard from the Minister of Industry and Commerce indicates that there is any incentive or any initiative being taken to provide for the flow of capital into these critical areas that we so desperately need. And the difficulty with that, Mr. Speaker, is that if we don't do anything, we will further increase our disadvantages compared to other provinces, and in particular, if we look at the Province of Ontario, it is providing specialized incentives through the vehicle of venture investment corporations to provide for risk capital to go into these very kinds of corporations.

So what we are beginning to face, and I should add as well that the Federal Government, in the latest budget, provided for a particular tax relief for the investments that go into venture investment capital as well. So, here we have a situation where one of our sister provinces is now providing a specialized corporate vehicle to provide special opportunities for risk venture capital and research and development capital that will provide a particular advantage for manufacturing or for entrepreneurs who want to get in that field, as compared to our situation where we are doing nothing, and that will only increase and abet the kind of disadvantages that we face. So if nothing else, for our own self-protection, Mr. Speaker, we must enact or initiate the kind of program that would encourage risk capital, venture capital into these areas.

That is the purpose of this bill. What it basically does, Mr. Speaker, is to set up a form of registration for two specialized kinds of investment vehicles; one would be a venture investment corporation, the other would be R and D corporations. Through these particular corporate vehicles, investment could be encouraged from the private sector based upon tax incentive. I can give by way of example that in the Province of Ontario under their Venture Investment Corporation Act,

the Government of Ontario now presently offers a 250 percent write-off on the initial investments that go into those VICs. They also then charge the 250 percent on the capital gains when it comes out, but they provide that specialized incentive within these areas. What the bill does is makes sure that there are very specific criteria of eligibility for what is a venture investment capital and what is a research and development capital. In other words, they are specialized corporate animals. They acquire certain advantages, certain privileges under the tax law because they are doing certain highly-specialized functions. If they do not meet the eligibility criteria set forward in the bill, then they don't receive the advantage, and that is the reason why you need a special registration to allow these corporations to become implemented. They can't become enforced under the normal Corporation Act because that is a general act applying to all bodies and classes and kinds of corporations.

Under this bill there would be a special class and kind of corporate vehicle which would provide for an investment flow from the private sector for high-risk ventures providing specialized tax relief, and the government can set whatever limits it wants to set, whatever it may be. Those tax advantages would then be applied to set up a pool of capital that would then be applied to various forms of small business venture capital. And I would hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that under the bill it is very clear that it can only be invested in the Province of Manitoba to create jobs and employment and business in the Province of Manitoba, situated in this province, and it is particularly applied under the eligibility criteria to small businesses so that it would encourage both the flow of capital into the area where it is most difficult. Large traditional lending houses are prepared often to provide high degrees of capitalization for large corporations; they are not prepared to provide anywhere near the same kind of access to funds for small business enterprises. This bill is aimed particularly at small business going into high-risk venture capital formation.

In addition, the bill also provides for the enactment of research and development corporations and again there is a series of criteria set out to exactly elaborate what kind of functions and tasks would be performed by an R and D corporation to allow it to become eligible for the tax advantages under a bill such as this. So basically this bill sets up the corporate vehicles under which those advantages can be applied. It would then be up to the government to decide if they want to apply any advantages at all; obviously, if they don't give it any advantages, no one will take up on it. If they do provide specialized advantages, then I would guarantee members opposite that they would be providing that kind of incentive that is necessary to move into these fields.

In debating or looking at the principles of the bill, Mr. Speaker, there is also one other principle that is important to measure and that is that there is under this bill a high degree of accountability in registration that would be formed, so that again, it would be a matter that those who would enact or implement a venture investment corporation or an R and D corporation would be required by this law to both register with the government and to have the Minister able to require frequent reports on the transactions that are taking place and to hold them accountable. It also gives the Minister the power if, when and how, to conclude that there are sufficient numbers of VICs or R and D corporations extant in the province and that they can hold a limit on the registrations for them. It is an instrument that must be done or must be implemented in co-operation with the public authorities to ensure that there is both sufficient advantage and also that those advantages would be limited.

So what I would say, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill, I think, should recommend itself to members of this House because it is a response to one of the most serious economic features or conditions faced in the province, and that is the difficulty of small business to get high-risk venture capital, the unwillingness of the private sector oftentimes to invest without tax advantages, and it does really in part — and I admit to it — is a departure in the general tax philosophy that has been followed by governments in the past, and that is, to use the tax incentive mode as a way of encouraging major investment patterns. There were really only two major precedents for it on the federal level; one is the tax shelter that was used to encourage private investment in the residential apartment field that has been in existence since 1972, I believe, and the recently enacted tax incentives for oil and gas areas.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has four minutes.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So that in those two departures, the Federal Government used the tax incentive vehicle as a way of drawing in private capital into two very strategic areas that they felt was necessary and where public capital couldn't complete the job; in one case, the area of residential housing, the other area, oil and gas development. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that a third area is absolutely essential and particularly essential in this province, and that is, particularly in the field of technological research and development and industries based upon those areas. So what we are simply saying is, these vehicles provide a means of encouraging, inciting, giving incentive to draw in private capital into the field of research and development for small business

enterprises in this province.

And I would say that if there is to be any salvation to the economic difficulties that the province faces, it is in the encouragement of exactly that kind of industry; that should be our asset. We don't have the oil and gas, we don't have the big major resources, but we do have a lot of skills, skills that we are now losing or are in danger of losing because there isn't the opportunity here. Under this kind of bill, under these corporate vehicles, we can begin to broaden and develop the range of opportunities for investment in these fields and therefore make full use and utilization of, I think, our major asset, which is the skills and brains of our own population, as well as to provide encouragement for an entrepreneurial class in this province to take advantage of our assets and to provide incentive for new businesses to flourish and that, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is the answer to some of our economic problems. I hope members in this House will take a look at the bill, support it on principle so that it can be then more thoroughly examined at committee stage.

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

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 49 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE ELECTORAL DIVISION ACT

MR. D. JAMES WALDING presented Bill No. 49, An Act to Amend The Electoral Division Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was going to get away lightly with that one.

Members who have looked at Bill 49 will find that it is very short, very simple and straightforward, Mr. Speaker. It deals with a matter of principle that has to do with equity of representation and one man, one vote; matters that are taken as given to anyone involved in the parliamentary system. The principle of the bill is so simple and straightforward, Mr. Speaker, that it ought to be adopted unanimously by the members of the House without any introduction or debate.

Let me just give a little bit of background to those members who might not be familiar with The Electoral Divisions Act and the Electoral Boundaries Commission that was set up to report to the House. The history goes back about 20 years, Mr. Speaker, when in 1957 a commission was set up to look into the matter of electoral boundaries. It was thought to be wise and equitable to change the principle of parliaments and legislatures setting the electoral boundaries and to pass the task over to an independent commission, in this case a three-man commission. They were required to report in 1968 and every tenth year thereafter, and that, incidentally, is the reason why it's being introduced this year, because this is the year when the Boundaries Commission will meet again to reconsider electoral boundaries in Manitoba, and if it's not dealt with this year it will be another 10 years before it becomes relevant again.

Subsequent to an amendment in 1968 to this same bill, the Boundaries Commission was required to take the latest population figures for Manitoba and to divide them by 57, and the resulting figure would then give a quota, or quotient as the bill said, which shall be the average figure for the population of any provincial constituency, which may be varied by an amount — and they set out certain conditions and provisions — by an amount up to 25 percent above the quotient or 25 percent below the quotient.

Bill 49 calls for that figure of 25 percent to be narrowed to the figure of 10 percent. What it is in essence is a move towards a greater equity of representation for the people of Manitoba in the election of their representatives.

Now, I mentioned previously the principle of one man, one vote, which is used something as a cliché and I believe is very widely and very generally accepted. But I wonder if members, when they use that expression, realize that the term "one man, one vote" really is meaningless unless one vote is equal to another vote.

I will give members opposite, including the Minister of Highways, an example, one from his side and one from my side that I am fairly familiar with, that I believe will point out to members opposite exactly what one man, one vote means and what one man, two votes effectively means; or one man, half a vote.

In 1969, when the constituencies in this province were last redrawn, the constituency of St. Vital and its neighbor to the south, the constituency of Riel, had almost exactly the same number of people residing within their border. It was 20,000 in round figures. Now there has been very little development in the constituency of St. Vital in the intervening ten years but there has been a lot of building and a lot of people have moved into the constituency of Riel in the last ten years.

So again in round figures, Mr. Speaker, there are still 20,000 people residing in the constituency of St. Vital, but in its neighboring constituency to the south, represented by the Minister of Finance, there are now approximately 40,000 people. —(Interjection)— Well, my colleague from the front row is heckling me — is making the point for me, Mr. Speaker, that because there are twice as many people in the constituency of Riel as there are in St. Vital, it means that the political rights and the representation of the people in that constituency are only half of what they are in St. Vital. It means that the votes of my constituents in St. Vital are worth exactly double what they are in the neighboring constituency of Riel.

But what is the effect when we come here? Do we give the Member for Riel twice as much speaking time? Do we pay him twice as much or, on the other hand, do you penalize the Member for St. Vital and pay him only half as much because he represents only half as many people? There is also the factor that the Member for Riel, representing twice as many people, probably deals with twice as many complaints and questions from his constituents as I get from mine.

So the inequity in those two particular instances is obvious to all members, Mr. Speaker. A similar comparison could be made between any other two constituencies in this province and the ratio might be anywhere from one to one, to two to one, three to one, even more than that. I have not looked through all of the latest figures available but I would suspect that in some of our suburban areas with the rate of growth that we have experienced over the last ten years, the ratio might now well be more than three to one. It will be a task of the Electoral Division's Boundaries Commission this year to re-examine those changes in population and to bring back to this House recommendations for new boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, in the research I have done on this matter — it has been discussed by a number of legislatures and a number of parliaments in this country in various other countries, and whenever the debate is enjoined, having to do with equity of representation and the principle of one man, one vote, the debate becomes rapidly obscured because people bring in another consideration, which is quite separate and distinct from what we are speaking of in this case. And in an attempt to prevent that issue from becoming confused, let me point out the essential difference. What we are dealing with in this bill and the Electoral Divisions Act is essentially the representation of the people. It's a matter of the political rights of the people of Manitoba; it's their right to have one vote in their particular area equal to one vote in another particular area.

The other matter that is brought in to confuse the issue, Mr. Speaker, is the matter of the convenience of an elected representative. Now, I recognize very freely that there are differences in representation in different parts of the province. It is frequently pointed out that distances are further in the country, that communities are further apart in the north, and it may take ten times the time and the distance to travel about a constituency in the north than it does in the south.

However, Mr. Speaker, these are two distinct and separate things altogether. If the government wishes to bring in amendments to the Legislative Assembly Act, which has to do with the rights, the expense allowances, etc., of members, I will look at that with considerable sympathy if it can be shown that members in rural areas or members in the northern areas need additional facilities in order to allow them to carry out their jobs in that particular area.

When it comes to candidates running in an election, I recognize that is probably more difficult in the rural areas than it is in the city, and that it is probably more difficult in the north than it is in the rural areas. And again, if the government wishes to bring in amendments under the Elections Act to make that more equitable as between the different regions of our province, I will be sympathetic to those moves and I would probably support them. But the two matters are quite separate and distinct and I would urge members opposite not to get them confused when we are talking about a very definite principle involved in the representation of the people.

I have a good deal of other facts that I wanted to bring into this, Mr. Speaker, but I will just end in order to finish in one "go" by mentioning two matters to members opposite.

First of all, it would be possible under the Act as it stands now for the Electoral Divisions Boundaries Commission to bring in recommendations for constituencies within the 10 percent variance. They have that ability to do so right now. Members might be interested to know that the last time that the boundaries were redrawn that the Commission was able to get 26 of its constituencies within that plus or minus 10 percent; the rest were beyond that.

They might also be interested to know that in the Commonwealth of Australia, it has a similar provision for redrawing its boundaries. There its tolerance range is 20 percent, up and down. The last time that it was redrawn, following the census of 1955, the Australian Boundaries Commission

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

was able to get 114 out of 122 of its boundaries to within a 10 percent tolerance rate and only eight of them were between the 10 and 20 percent range.

I would remind members of one other point involved here, and that is that the Boundaries Commission, when it has completed its report, submits it to the Lieutenant-Governor, who then transmits it to the House, and it is — the Legislature itself — controlled by the government and its majority. That is, in the last analysis, responsible for drawing and approving and passing those boundaries. So what we are speaking of here is only a matter of recommendation to the Legislature, but I would suggest to members that the decision that is made by this House, in the form of a recommendation to that Boundaries Commission, will weigh very heavily upon its deliberations, and the instructions that we give to the Boundaries Commission I believe will be reflected in its deliberations and its recommendations. I recommend the bill to the House.

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

MR. DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Emerson, that debate on this matter be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8 o'clock.