



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

28 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXVII No. 45A

2:30 P.M. Monday, April 23, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, April 23, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

MR. CLERK: It is my duty to inform the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker because of illness. I would ask the Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member for Radisson, to take the Chair, pursuant to the Statutes.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my right, where Mr. Richard J. Backes, Democratic Floor Leader of the North Dakota House of Representatives, and Mrs. Backes are present. On behalf of all members of the Legislature, I welcome you here today.

I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 21 students of the Joseph Wolinsky Exchange Program School. These students are under the direction of Ms. Saren Prodovsky. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster. In addition, I would like to direct the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 18 students from the Nelson McIntyre Collegiate, Grade 11, under the direction of Mr. Koth. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital, and on behalf of the honourable members, I welcome you here today.

Orders of the Day . . . Presenting Petitions . . .

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. CLERK: Petition of United Health Services Corporation praying for the passing of an Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate the United Health Services Corporation.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Environment.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement concerning the flood conditions in Manitoba. The water levels along the Red River between Emerson and the Red River Floodway Inlet structure have risen substantially during the last 24 hours. Stages have increased by 0.4 feet at St. Jean, 1.05 feet at Morris, 1.3 feet at St. Adolphe and Ste. Agathe, and 1.45 feet at Emerson.

Openings in the permanent ring dikes at Emerson, Dominion City, Letellier, St. Jean, Morris, Rosenort and St. Adolphe are being closed at the present time. The forecasts for the Red River issued on April 21st are still valid. The Red River is expected to crest at Emerson on April 29th at an elevation between 788 and 790, with the peak stage expected above the floodway inlet structure on May 2nd of between 763 and 765.

The Boyne River crested at Carman late yesterday with levels slightly above those which occurred in 1974. The river is expected to remain near 1974 levels for the next day or two. The Morris River is near peak at Morris. The La Salle River will peak within the next two or three days at stages comparable to those of 1974. Weather conditions during the next week will be highly significant. Current forecasts indicate a high probability of significant precipitation over the Red River basin during this period.

Conditions along the main stem of the Pembina River have remained relatively stable during the last 24 hours with only minor changes in water levels being reported. It is expected that the Pembina River will crest at Windygates late this week at levels similar to those which were experienced in 1976. Water levels on tributaries to the Pembina River are declining at the present

time. Overflows from the Pembina River near Gretna are declining.

Water levels along the Assiniboine River upstream of St. Lazare have declined since April 22nd. Below St. Lazare water levels have generally increased. The Assiniboine River has risen by 1.35 feet at Miniota, by about one foot at Virden, and by two feet at Brandon. Stages below Portage la Prairie have generally declined as the early peak caused by local runoff passed through this area. Approximately 3200 cubic feet per second is being diverted to Lake Manitoba by way of the Portage diversion at the present time. All inflow into the Shell Mouth Reservoir continues to be stored.

On the Souris River water levels at Melita have risen about one foot during the past 24 hours, whereas at Hartney and Souris levels have dropped due to ice moving out. The water levels at Wawanesa rose over seven feet yesterday due to an ice jam. Levels have now receded somewhat. Tributaries of the Souris River are now starting to rise fairly rapidly and water levels on the Souris River are expected to increase by about one foot per day for the next few days. The Souris River is expected to crest near the end of April at levels approximately four to five feet higher than those occurring at present. Water levels are expected to remain high throughout May due to sustained levels of above normal flow from the upper watershed.

In the Dauphin area, the Turtle River at Ste. Rose is now near peak at a stage somewhat below that which occurred in 1974. The Vermilion River at Dauphin rose about one foot in the last 24 hours. As the melt rate has been favourable, it is now unlikely that flooding in the Town of Dauphin will occur.

On the Whitemud River, water levels have risen rapidly during the past 24 hours. Peaks are expected this week at levels somewhat higher than those which occurred in 1974 but slightly below those which occurred in 1970. In the Interlake area ice jams on the Icelandic River which caused flooding in Arborg yesterday and in Riverton overnight, have moved out and water levels have declined somewhat, however water levels are expected to rise again at these locations as discharges in the river increase to forecast levels but previous peak stages will not be exceeded. The Fisher River is continuing to overflow its banks through the Peguis Indian Reserve as the crest approaches. Water levels increased by about ½ foot in the last 24 hours. Peaks are expected in the next two days at levels approximately one foot higher than present. Mr. Speaker, the Minister in charge of The Emergency Measures Organization will be making a statement with respect to actions that have been taken concerning control of the flood situation. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to provide an update to the members in general terms of the flood situation in the province. You are aware by now that a special meeting of Cabinet on Saturday morning considered the latest threat to the Red River Valley created by some extensive rains on Thursday night in the United States' section of the valley. Cabinet was told that flood levels could reach those of 1950 without any further significant rain falls. Because of this threat Flood Operation No. 1 was signed on Saturday by the Premier and I wish to table that Flood Order Operation No. 1 with the House members information and have it distributed.

With the signing of this Flood Order the Emergency Operations Plan was put into motion. This Order places Emergency Measures Organization on a 24 hour operating basis to help co-ordinate the work of municipalities who are the first line of defense and to give them the solid administrative backup. Ring dikes around the towns and villages in the Red River Valley were ordered closed and the flood co-ordinating committee of Cabinet which has been operating on an ad hoc basis over the past several weeks has its actions formalized under the Flood Operations Order. This Cabinet committee headed by myself includes the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and Environment, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Urban Affairs, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, and the Honourable Minister of Finance.

Cabinet also asked representatives from the affected municipalities of the Red River Valley to attend a special meeting Sunday morning. This was chaired by the Honourable, The First Minister, and included Cabinet Ministers as well as senior representatives from EMO and the Water Resources Division.

When we speak of flood levels reaching those of 1950 most members here realize that conditions are different in that the Red River FLOODWAY HAS BEEN IN PLACE FOR A DOZEN YEARS, AS WELL AS INTERNAL DIKING SYSTEMS AND PUMPING STATIONS. Ring dikes have been constructed to give protection to the towns and villages in the valley above the 1950 levels. These were built from the years 1967 on. As well a number of farm homesteads in the valley where residents so wished were protected by individual dikes or by raising the farm homes on pads above the 1950 flood levels. Nevertheless, some serious problems can be anticipated.

The First Minister pointed out on Saturday that ring dikes themselves constitute a potential hazard

where people are encircled by high waters pressing against a diking system. Furthermore problems of isolation of both villages and farmsteads and the problems of the protection or removal of grain, livestock and feed supplies from flood threatened areas remains a concern. What should be stressed as The First Minister did on Saturday is that there is a chance that settlements in the Red River Valley south of Winnipeg may have to be evacuated if conditions worsen, and he indicated that even a quarter to a half inch of rainfall could be enough to set this evacuation into motion.

I would like to quote the First Minister in this regard when he said, "I do not intend to raise any undue concerns or alarm but it is the first charge of government to protect the lives, the health and wellbeing of our citizens and they must look upon evacuation as a possibility."

There has been a considerable amount of action and instead of dwelling at further length I will give you some of the highlights of the action that has taken place.

Some 500 people from the Peguis Reserve have been evacuated to Gimli. This is our largest evacuation to date. In addition to that, some hospitals and personal care homes in the areas, such as Carman and Arborg, have been evacuated, as well.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture toured the Red River Valley Sunday by air and has asked the C.N. and the C.P. to move in rolling stock where possible, to rescue grain, which they indicated they would do. He also telexed the federal Minister of Transportation asking urgent steps to be taken, as well, by the Canadian Wheat Board. This is in addition to the normal precautionary spotting of cars in potential flooded areas.

NO. 3, Manitoba had a million sandbags in stock and have arrangements for local suppliers to produce some additional 80,000 on a daily basis. A further half million have been ordered from the United States, of which some 100,000 were flown in early this morning for dispatch to Rosenort and other areas.

The swollen waterways and flooded lands have made some 100 provincial roads impassible, and have washed out about a half a dozen bridges, which is impeding movement. Similarly, the closing of ring dykes and limited traffic on routes into the valley communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am also tabling with the House uighlights of some of the difficulties that the highway system is encountering at this time.

No. 75 highways, our major link to the south, still has one lane open and vehicles are moving over the closed ring dykes on ramps.

The Red-Assiniboine Rivers are slowly rising but have not yet caused any direct problems. Problems have occurred in a number of places, the three most serious being:

(a) The Boyne River where the crest began to recede early this morning at Carman and is reducing the threat to that town, but very serious flooding has occurred at Carman. Downstream on the Boyne my highways' engineers have had to breach a provincial road at Brunkild to help relieve pressure on the village at that point. A tressled railway bridge was destroyed and, further downstream, Rosenort is currently battling high Boyne waters.

(b) In the Gretna region the Pembina overflowed its banks, but overnight water has begun to recede.

(c) High levels were experienced on the Icelandic River at Arborg and more particularly at Riverton. All schools are closed at this time at Riverton, but the dyking systems are holding and the river appears to have crested.

Some more rainfall is expected in the area, unfortunately, including the U.S. portion of the Red River Basin, and this has caused considerable concern.

Mr. Speaker, it was my hope that the First Minister and I would be visiting some of the oommunities affected. However, both helicopters available to us are in direct use at this moment, in the blasting of ice jams and in the provision of emergency telephone communication to some of the isolated communities, and we have had to postpone that view that we had hoped to take this afternoon. We will probably schedule it some time tomorrow.

It would also be my intention to invite the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and/or some additional representatives of his Party to join us on these overviews in the succeeding days, for him to be able to avail himself of the very serious situation and condition that we face, particularly in the Red River Valley.

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

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the members for their statements, both the Minister responsible for Natural Resources and also the Minister reponsible for EMO. We do not, I would like to point out to the Minister responsible for EMO, have a copy of his statement, and I rest assured that it will be forthcoming.

Secondly, we have found that the information is certainly very pertinent at this point, and in commenting I would like to pay tribute to local government. I believe that during a period such

as this, a time of emergency, that if there is any doubt in the minds of any Manitobans as to the effectiveness and usefulness and the ability of local government to respond to a need, certainly that doubt must be removed as a result of the initiative and effort and involvement of local government within the past few days.

Thirdly, I think at this point as well, we should emphasize the fact that volunteer effort within the various municipalities that have been affected is already demonstrating itself in an outstanding way and it seems, again, that during a period of crisis such as this, the finest in the individual always comes to the fore when confronted with an emergency such as a flooding situation.

So I believe that one can speak on behalf of all members in this Legislature as to the appreciation that we have for the response of the volunteer effort that we have seen in the past few days.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not commend the First Minister and the Ministers responsible for EMO and for Water Resources on the time which they have already contributed towards co-ordinating the flood fighting, the efforts which obviously they participated in over the week-end and thus I would like to commend the government on their initiative during the weekend in this respect. Needless to say, we will all be watching with concern the events of the next few days and I suppose only providence can determine whether or not we will in fact have a repeat of the 1950 situation such as the Minister responsible for EMO has indicated.

Thanking the members again, we will look forward to the developments in the next few days.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to make a brief statement relative to a capital project in the Health field. I have copies of the statement.

Members will recall that during the Debate on the Speech from the Throne in February, while outlining the government's 1979-80 capital construction program under the Manitoba Health Services Commission, I announced some one dozen capital projects in the hospital and personal care home field and advised the House that I hoped to announce a decision as early as possible on a proposed personal care home for Flin Flon.

I am pleased to be able to advise the House today that the government is proceeding with the Flin Flon project. It will be a 30-bed personal care home attached to the Flin Flon General Hospital. Approval marks a major increase in the number of personal care beds approved for construction in 1979 to 152 from 122. Earlier other personal care home construction projects were approved for Baldur, the western Interlake, Pilot Mount, St. Claude and Wawanesa, all in rural Manitoba. Approval of this home will mean the addition of a personal care home designed to meet the special needs of northern Manitobans. The building of the new personal care home in Flin Flon will be accompanied by a 25-bed reduction at the acute care hospital. The personal care home will complement the 30-bed Northern Lights Manor Hostel. Tenders are expected to be called within a few days and construction is expected to be completed in 12 to 14 months.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for this long overdue statement. My colleague, the Member for Flin Flon, is not well today, and I am sure he would respond if he was here —(Interjection)— and perhaps more biting than I would because he has been asking about this for a number of weeks now. This of course is a project that has been on the books for some time, and it's the thaw which we are experiencing in another sense, and is resulting in floods. In this case there is a thaw, but I would say hardly a flood. It's one project that has been announced, and as I say, it's a long overdue one. It does continue a concept that we developed, which is the phasing out of some acute care beds and replacing them with personal care home beds. It makes sense, it's a natural way for the health services to develop.

I know the people of Flin Flon have been anxiously waiting for this. It's regrettable that it's taken this many months to announce, but I hope that now that it has been done —(Interjection)—

MR. CHERNIACK: You're lucky to get it.

MR. MILLER: We're lucky to get it — well the First Minister says that we are lucky to get it, and I believe the First Minister, because if it's not in Conservative true blue country then anybody is lucky to get anything. And the First Minister is, I think, honest in saying so. —(Interjection)— I believe him, I believe he means exactly what he says. If you're not true blue Tory, then forget it. —(Interjection)— Well, that's what I interpret, the way he said it, and of course if he had said nothing

then I wouldn't have anything to interpret. But he persists on talking from his seat so that's his privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I want to welcome this announcement, which is long overdue. I know the people in Flin Flon will recognize it for what it is, a welcome addition to the health services, albeit a very tardy one and long overdue.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne) introduced Bill No. 39, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1979. (Recommended by Lieutenant Governor).

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Finance. Does the Minister of Finance have an announcement today insofar as the date for the presentation to the House of the 1979 Budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I hope to be able to answer the question from the Leader of the Opposition by the end of this week.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the minister be able to assure us now, today, prior to the end of the week that in fact when that announcement is made, that the Budget will be introduced prior to May 22nd?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I was rather hoping that the House might even be prorogued by that date.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want to address several questions to the Honourable Minister of Health who has been notified; at least, I notified his office that I would be asking questions about the subject of the Summer Day Care and Recreation Program for Multiple Handicapped Teenagers conducted at the North Branch of the Winnipeg YMCA.

The minister, having written a letter to the YMCA on April 3rd and having informed the YMCA that he will look after the transportation grant, but has not indicated yet his intentions regarding the staff help that they need and which they previously obtained through the STEP Program. Could he now indicate what are the factors that will be used to determine whether or not there will be funding available for staff in connection with this program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for St. Johns for giving me notice of this subject. At this juncture, I can only say to him that the possibility of hiring counsellors, hiring staff to handle this program during the summer rests with the initiatives of persuasion that can be undertaken from my department and the initiatives of action that may or may not be possible under the aegis of my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Labour and Manpower who is responsible for the STEP Program. I do not know whether there are sufficient resources available in STEP to fund counsellors for this program this summer, but my department is in consultation with my colleague's department on that point.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable minister for that response. In his letter, he stated that his department would assist as much as possible in helping the obtaining of student counsellors and he did state that he is in touch with the Minister of Labour's Department. The Minister of Labour may wish, Mr. Speaker, to comment on this program, and I think the minister

just came in and didn't hear the matter. So if I may, Mr. Speaker, I will repeat the reference to a Summer Day Care and Recreation Program for Multiple Handicapped Teenagers being conducted at the North End YMCA which has relied in the past and must rely this year for assistance for staff under the STEP Program, which I gather from the Minister of Health is now the responsibility of the Minister of Labour. I did not know that so I could not warn in advance that I would be asking questions and if the Minister of Labour can make a contribution, I would appreciate hearing from him in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'll take it as notice, get the answer and specifics and get back to the Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable minister. That would be helpful. May I then again address myself to the Minister of Health who, in his letter of April 3rd, mentioned the high cost per client of the program but recognized that it was a useful program, but then he stated it would be helpful if the Director of the YMCA would address the concerns as to the effectiveness of the program.

Would the minister be prepared to indicate the factors, or let's say, the terms of reference that would be used for the evaluation in an attempt to relate cost to the delivery of the program and the benefit to the individuals, to the handicapped who will be part of the program?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it comes down to a question of meeting the needs, the perceived and recognized priority needs of multiply-handicapped teenagers and as far as the professional criteria and scientific criteria are a concern, I'd leave that judgment in essence to the Director of Programs for the Retarded for the province and officials of my department of that calibre.

I would point out to the Honourable Member for St. Johns that in my response to the Executive Director, Mr. Thomas, I suggested that it would be helpful if we had some assessment and some examination from him so that we could be looking to the future, determining what course of action we would take in the future, not just in 1979 but beyond.

The Transportation Grant that we are making this year is, in fact, larger than the transportation grants previously provided and the number of clients, the number of multiply-handicapped children being served has increased substantially to the point where it now includes many who are not in Montcalm School, and I think as the honourable member knows, the program started out being related directly to Montcalm School.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, . . .

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if I might just continue on this. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation is having a problem, I don't know if he needs help or whether I should . . . possibly, I'll ignore him. It would be the best help he could have.

Mr. Speaker, addressing again the Minister of Health, the transportation contribution by the government may be increased, but I'm wondering how the minister could expect the YMCA to deliver this program, or any part of it, without the needed staff for which he has not yet got an answer. I understand the Minister of Labour has yet to deal with it, but could the Minister of Health not indicate that there's no program possible unless there is staff which is estimated in the Budget to be in excess of \$20,000.00. Could the minister respond to that feature of it?

MR. SHERMAN: I think the Honourable Member for St. Johns poses a very valid question, Mr. Speaker. All I can do is reiterate that we are looking into it and my office is in contact with the office of the Honourable Minister of Labour and Manpower and I will be in touch directly with the minister, my colleague, myself.

I think, though, that it should be recognized that this program grew out of a desire to meet the needs of multiply-handicapped children through the school year and through the school day. And it reached a point where it was meeting, or certainly attempting to meet those needs for 10 months of the year. Then the summer camp program became an extension to that. In those instances, one always runs into the problem of adequate funding, and I'll have to try to work this out with

the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Some weeks ago, I asked the Minister if he had received any communication from the Manitoba Branch of the Canadian Consumers Association, and he replied in the affirmative. The question I have for the Minister today is, has the Minister received petition from this group expressing opposition to the introduction of computer pricing in one Loblaw and one Westfair store in the city of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from them. I'm not sure whether I would classify it as a petition, but they did make some representations to me with respect to the matters that my honourable friend has raised.

MR. JENKINS: A further question then to the Honourable Minister. Was there a list of names attached to this communication that the Honourable Minister received from the Consumers Association?

MR. JORGENSEN: There was a list of names. I invited them to bring me representation from those people who would be most directly affected, that is those people who had been shopping at these two stores, rather than people who have had no experience with them at all. I would be interested in knowing what the comments were of the people who have actually been shopping at stores that use the universal product code and the scanning systems. And as soon as I've had an opportunity to discuss with them the results of that survey, I want to meet with them again.

MR. JENKINS: A final supplementary then to the Minister. When the Minister gets this information from the Consumers' Association, would the Minister be considering taking under consideration that there might be the introduction of legislation such as exists in, I believe 6 American States, which states even though computer index pricing is in place, that articles sold will still be individually priced? Would the Minister be considering that type of legislation for this current Session, or a Session maybe next year?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, that would be a decision that would be made by the government, and if a decision is made along those lines, my honourable friend will be one of the first to know.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. On Friday, I directed a question to the Minister of Finance concerning whether the province was prepared to put into motion a flood assistance policy. Could the First Minister indicate whether there will be a flood compensation policy, in view now, that it is known that severe damages to very many residences throughout the province has occurred as a result of the spring flood?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend will appreciate that it would be premature at this stage to be getting into details of flood compensation, but I can say to him that in terms of the federal policy, the cost-sharing with the federal government which locks in after a million dollars has been expended, that that \$1 million figure has already been surpassed. Our concern of course at the present time, and I'm sure it's shared by all members of the House, is to ensure that everything that needs to be done for the protection of life and property is done, and this is in effect what we have said to the reeves and the councillors in the lower Red River Valley, to keep track of all expenses incurred. They have been advised of the fact that the \$1 million figure has already been surpassed, and that we will then work on that policy afterwards to ensure that it is dealt with equitably.

MR. URUSKI: Could the First Minister indicate whether he would be prepared to put the machinery in motion of the, whether it be the Flood Board or whatever, mechanism that the province now

wishes to use, to notify people to do exactly what he has said, to keep track of all the expenses, because that's always a usual problem in terms of identifying the costs after the fact.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I presume my honourable friend is referring to individuals, not to municipalities. That is a good suggestion that he has made. The Cabinet committee, chaired by my colleague, the Minister of Highways meets on a daily if not even more regular basis with the officials and that is one item, one suggestion that will be carried forward. I thank the honourable member for it.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to follow up on the same line of questioning, I would ask the First Minister whether it has been established between his office and the federal government that they have recognized this as an emergency for which there would be cost-sharing arrangements?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Highways could better answer this question. As the Member for Lac du Bonnet will appreciate, however, on the emergency footing that EMO finds itself in at the present time, there is federal representation through both the Army and the federal EMO representative. Ottawa, I'm advised by my colleague, the Minister of Highways, has been informed, and we are presuming of course, that the arrangements that were set forth in letters that were exchanged some eight or nine years ago between the then Premier and the then Minister of Finance, still obtain. We are under no doubt that they do obtain and we have already advised the municipalities with whom we met yesterday morning that the threshold figure had already been passed and we are making the presumption, without any suggestion whatsoever that there is any down-side risk on it, that that same formula still obtains.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the very point of my question. I realize that the government is making that assumption. I wonder whether it is isn't a bit dangerous to make that assumption, rather than have a formal communique go out to confirm that there will be federal dollars involved?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, some reference was made earlier in the Question Period to the magic date of the 22nd of May. We would like to have the confirmation, naturally from the present government which will be in office up until at least the 22nd of May, and then thereafter, maybe my honourable friend could suggest to whom I might write.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour in view of some strong comments made by a city manager saying that Manitoba is acting like a metric ostrich and that we're clinging tenaciously to the old imperial units. I would ask him whether he had any comment on his government's intention to introduce a metric building code in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I've had no correspondence or no comment on that particular issue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the Attorney-General since one of the measures that would encourage metrication in the province would be the acceptance of metric measures in the Land Titles Office, whether he intends to introduce legislation this Session to allow that type of a procedure in the Land Titles?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for raising this subject matter because I can clarify the situation and advise him that the Land Titles Office for some time have been accepting plans and documents in metric.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Urban Affairs could pass it on to the City. I

would also like to ask the Minister of Economic Development whether he has any comment on the City Manager's remarks that Manitoba, as a result of foot dragging on the metric system, will be left out of the national economy and that we'll pay premium prices for non-metric products.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): No, Mr. Speaker, we won't be.

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

MR. USKIW: I wish to ask the Minister of Highways whether he can report to the House the question of bridge relocation studies that were done, I believe completed sometime ago with respect to a new site for a new Selkirk bridge, given the fact that we have again a flooding situation which has resulted in the closing of that particular Provincial Highway and which occurs so frequently, can the Minister tell us at what stage of the relocation study he is at or whether he's been in a position to make a decision on a new location?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I did not hear and I was listening to the location that the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet was interested in.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, four or five years ago location studies were established for the finding of a new location for the building of a new bridge linking Selkirk and East Selkirk. I believe those studies have been completed and I'm wondering whether the Minister is in a position to indicate what his views are with respect to that report, given the fact that we have frequent flooding in the area almost every year which results in a great deal of inconvenience to quite a number of people.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it is correct that the Department of Highways has had under study and review for some time now several locations considering the possibility of an alternate bridge construction in that general area. However, we have arrived at no specific decision at this time and when that occurs I'll be happy to inform the member.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister could indicate whether the department's study is complete and whether it's merely a government decision that we are waiting for, or is he still looking for more technical information?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the decision to location has not been made within the department. Several locations are being considered having concern about tying into the surrounding area of a Trunk Highway System, one that is still very much in the planning stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister for Economic Development again, who is personifying this metric ostrich attitude, and ask him if he would be kind enough to answer assuming he can get the sand out of his ears and his nose, on what basis he can sit there and say that when all the other provinces are converting to metric that Manitoba can afford to be the last and the least among the other provinces, and that this will not hurt Manitoba manufacturers and Manitoba market. I'd like an answer rather than just a no or a yes. Perhaps he could enlighten us on why it will not be detrimental to the economy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if a company in private industry, which the honourable member doesn't understand to begin with, when asked to sell something in metric he has every right to. If it's metric in Ontario, if it's metric in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, or anywhere in the world, if the gentleman wants to quote on a product, he has every right to quote on it in metric. There's nothing to stop him from doing so. And if he finds that he has to do that to get the business, there's nothing

to stop him from doing so. And there's nothing to stop him from quoting on jobs in Manitoba in metric, but I can assure you that Manitoba, before we accept jobs in metric we want to know that it's not going to cost us more than the present system, or the people of Manitoba much more.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I then ask the Minister this; if the private sector is moving towards metric, why is it that the government, which should be providing some leadership, seems to be out of step with the rest of the country? Does the Minister not intend to offer some leadership to the construction industry, the manufacturing industry and so on? Does the government not intend to do anything to encourage Manitoba manufacturers to convert to metric, which is something that everyone else is doing?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member well knows that the decision to go metric was not the Province of Manitoba's decision. It was the Federal Government's decision. And there is absolutely nothing to stop private individuals from quoting in metric. You know, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member on the other side still only believes in the system whereby you tell people what to do instead of letting them do it on their own initiatives if it's necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister for Economic Development realizes that a firm that's doing business both in Manitoba and outside of Manitoba will be faced with higher costs if it has to manufacture on two bases, the Imperial Measurement and the Metric Measurement, that if you're exporting a product which has to be acceptable in Ontario, and selling that product within Manitoba, that your manufacturing costs will be higher. Conversely, that if government is buying, and is still buying using the —(Interjection)— I am asking the question. Is the Minister — doesn't he realize since he's the businessman — you know, he's the businessman — does he not know, and I know he knows, that if he's buying on behalf of the Province of Manitoba and he stipulates Imperial Measurement —(Interjection)— I am asking a question. The question is very simple, Mr. Speaker, if those gentlemen there will listen. The question is this; do members opposite not know that when they are asking a quotation for certain measurements based on Imperial Measurement, that if they ask that they will get quotations in the measurement even though they will pay a premium if that product is manufactured outside of Manitoba?

MR. JOHNSTON: The honourable member's entirely wrong, Mr. Speaker. Most of the exports in Manitoba that go outside of the country go to United States, and there are companies that also right now, they've just changed their feet and inches into metric and they've arrived at the same thing and they're shipping in metric but it's the same length as it was before. They didn't change a thing. And Mr. Speaker, it's just a little chart that's involved, and again we're talking about free enterprise, and we are saying that the Province of Manitoba is not against being quoted on in metric. We're not against anything. If it is a necessity it will be done, but we don't force things.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to some questions in my Estimates and pursued by the Member for St. Johns the other day, I would like to table the answers to a number of questions and perhaps, since there are a number of members that did ask questions, I could table a number of copies and perhaps lodge them with the Caucus Chairman for the Opposition, primarily.

REPLY TO THE MEMBER FOR ST. JOHNS

RE: CORPORATION CAPITAL TAX

Hansard - page 1165 2:30 P.M., Friday, March 16, 1979

- The Member for St. Johns requested information on the numbers of corporations filing corporation capital tax returns for comparable periods before and after the increase in the corporation capital tax exemption to \$500,000 announced in the 1978 Manitoba Budget.
- The following table shows the status of the corporation capital tax roll as at March 31, 1978 prior to the increased small business exemption and as at March 26, 1979.

	<u>March 31, 1978</u>	<u>March 26, 1979</u>
Active Taxable Accounts required to file returns	15,000	13,710
Exempt Accounts generally not required to file returns	8,200	11,462
Accounts for which status had not been determined on date shown	4,000	5,165
Total on Tax Roll	27,200*	30,337

*Up to March 31, 1978, the tax roll stood at approximately 33,000. To update the roll for the 1978/79 fiscal year, some 5,800 accounts were deleted as being redundant, etc.

- While the total tax roll increased by 3,137 in the year following the increased exemption, the number of exempt corporations increased by 3,261 and the number of active taxable accounts decreased by 1,290.
- The Taxation Division of the Department of Finance estimates that of the companies surveyed thus far, some 2,000 have been exempted because of the increase in the small business exemption.
- The bulk of corporation capital tax revenues is accounted for by some 1,500 large corporations. The balance of the 13,710 corporations are required to file for two reasons:
 1. The definition of taxable capital is based on total world capital employed by the corporation. Consequently, small amounts of taxable capital - equal to 1/5 of 1% of less than \$500,000 - would be allocated to Manitoba.
 2. In the case of related corporations, the \$500,000 exemption is applied to the aggregate taxable capital of all the related corporations.
- The 11,462 exempt accounts remain on the tax roll, but will not receive instalment forms or be required to complete capital tax returns unless their previous year's filed taxable capital was close to the \$500,000 exemption.

RESPONSE TO THE MEMBER FOR ST VITAL

Hansard - pages 1177 and 1178 2:30 P.M. Friday, March 16, 1979.

PENSIONERS' SCHOOL TAX ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

- . The Member for St. Vital asked for an indication of the numbers of pensioner homeowners receiving payments under the Pensioners' School Tax Assistance Program and for an indication of the total value of assistance provided.
- . The Pensioners' School Tax Assistance Program was instituted in 1978 to provide pensioner-homeowners with additional provincial assistance over and above their property tax credit entitlements to cover on a dollar for dollar basis any school taxes in excess of the \$375 maximum property tax credit.
- . At that time, it was estimated that the new program in conjunction with property tax credits would assure 33,000, or 75% of Manitoba's 44,000 pensioner homeowners, of sufficient provincial assistance to cover their full school taxes.
- . Based on the applications for pensioners' school tax assistance payments processed in 1978, it would appear that only 2,363 of Manitoba's pensioner homeowners received additional provincial assistance not sufficient to cover their full school taxes.
- . Following is a tabular summary of applications processed under the Pensioner School Tax Assistance Program.

	<u>Winnipeg</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total Number of Applications Approved	4,930	984	5,914
Number Receiving Assistance of \$100	2,007	356	2,363
Number Receiving Assistance of Under \$100	2,923	628	3,551
Total Value of Assistance Processed	\$346,178	\$62,591	\$408,769

RESPONSE TO MEMBER FOR ST. JOHNS: VOLUME OF TAX ASSISTANCE OFFICE ENQUIRIES
 Hansard - page 1173 2:30 P.M. Friday, March 16, 1979

- The Member for St. Johns asked for some additional information on the volume of enquiries received by the Manitoba Tax Assistance office during the January/April, 1977 and 1978 periods and the January to March 15, 1979 period. Specifically, he requested a breakout of the number of people who received in-person assistance in comparison to those assisted by telephone or letter.
- In response, the following tabular summary has been prepared.

	January/April 1977		January/April 1978		January/March 15 1979	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
In-Person Assistance:	13,916	(49.7)	14,325	(57.3)	3,105	(42.9)
Telephone and Other Assistance:	14,084	(50.3)	10,675	(42.7)	4,132	(57.1)
Total Assistance:	<u>28,000</u>	(100.0)	<u>25,000</u>	(100.0)	<u>7,237</u>	(100.0)

NOTES:

- The experience to date in 1979 is indicative of an overall workload/number of enquiries of about last year's magnitude with the major portion of the workload occurring in March and April each year.
- While a much larger portion of the workload this year is over the telephone lines, it should be noted that many of these calls involve helping credit claimants complete the tax credit application form and income tax return on a line by line basis.

RESPONSE TO THE MEMBER FOR TRANSCONA RE:
COSTS AND IMPACT OF INDEXING THE PERSONAL INCOME TAX SYSTEM

Hansard - page 1163 2:30 P.M. Friday, March 16, 1979

1. The Member for Transcona asked for an indication of the cumulative annual cost to Manitoba of the federal government's indexing of personal income tax exemptions and income tax brackets since 1973. (Indexing took effect January 1, 1974.)

2. In response to his request, before-indexing personal exemptions and tax brackets (for 1973) were applied against updated computerized personal income tax records for 1979. The results indicated that Manitoba's personal income tax would yield some \$173 million in additional revenues for 1979 if the 1973 exemptions and tax brackets were still in effect.

3. The Member also requested an indication of the beneficiaries of indexing. In response to that request, the following table has been prepared to show provincial income tax payable in 1979 under the existing system and a "notional" calculation of the provincial income tax payable by a married taxfiler with two dependants, under 1979 personal income tax rules, but with personal income tax exemptions and brackets at before-indexing 1973 levels.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF INDEXING
MARRIED TAXPAYER, TWO DEPENDANTS

Gross Income	1979 Provincial Income Tax Payable*	Hypothetical Calculation If No Indexing**	Indexing Saving	
			\$	%***
5,000	0	0	0	0.0
7,000	0	223	223	100.0
10,000	247	527	280	53.1
12,000	437	753	316	42.0
15,000	735	1,130	395	35.0
20,000	1,310	1,902	592	31.1
25,000	1,966	2,766	800	28.9
50,000	6,243	7,654	1,411	18.4
100,000	16,423	18,949	2,526	13.3

* Based on actual 1979 income tax system.

** Based on 1979 income tax system with personal exemptions and tax brackets de-indexed to 1973 levels.

*** Savings as percentage of tax payable.

RESPONSE TO THE MEMBER FOR ST. JOHNS

RE: MINERAL ACREAGE TAX ACT (QUESTIONS IN COMMITTEE) SUPPLY-FINANCE

. 2:30 Session March 16th, 1979

QUESTION: From Hansard, Pages 1178 & 1179.

MR. CHERNIACK: "But since all taxpayers should be treated the same way, then I question why there are still arrears shown of almost three-quarters of a million dollars. It seems to me that people having had the opportunity to either pay up the arrears or give up their land, it should have been done and eliminated so that again, those people who paid their tax should in all fairness not be adversely treated and those who have not paid their tax and retained their mineral rights. So, I would like to have a report on what is being done and when, and how will it be a completion;"

"As long as I see that there are arrears on the books for over a year, then it means to me that some people have not given up their rights and have not paid; and that shouldn't be after all this time. I think that it should be one way or the other and I would like the minister to undertake to give us a report on whether this is up to date, a report on where the department stands in foreclosures, and as to by which time the whole account will have been eliminated by either payments received or rights given up, or rights foreclosed. Is that a fair request?"

MR. CRAIK: "I will check into that, Mr. Chairman, I think probably it's just a case that the action has not been taken in the Land Titles Office with regards to them and it probably shows still as an arrear."

MR. CHERNIACK: "I think that's quite possible, the only question in my mind is, was the action taken that proper notice having been given, which has to precede the action in the Land Titles Office."

MINERAL ACREAGE TAX ACT (QUESTIONS IN COMMITTEE) SUPPLY-FINANCE

2:30 Session March 16th, 1979

REPLY

Of the \$722,259 shown in arrears as at February 28th, 1979, the owners of a significant proportion thereof have indicated they have no interest in paying the arrears and maintaining their mineral rights. Currently, negotiations are being conducted to transfer the mineral rights to the Crown on a voluntary basis rather than utilizing the enforcement procedures provided by the Act as the former technique is less costly. In addition, less costly transfer techniques are being considered for the transfer of mineral rights, the owners of which have indicated they are not interested in paying the arrears or in the voluntary transfer thereof.

The balance of the arrears(after consideration of the first paragraph)represent accounts under \$500 who have not replied to the Minister's or Branch's letters and further follow-up action will be taken in these cases. Of course, any time requirements of notification etc., provided by the Act, will be adhered to.

RESPONSE TO THE MEMBER FOR ST. VITAL

RE: NUMBER OF PERSONS ON FINANCE DEPARTMENT PAYROLL

Hansard - page 1143 10:00 A.M. Friday, March 16, 1979.

1. The Member for St. Vital asked for the actual number of persons on the Department of Finance payroll as of January 1st, 1978 and January 1st, 1979.
2. This question was further to an earlier question which was answered by a statement tabled March 16, 1979 and headed "Status of Permanent Positions as at January 1, 1978 and January 1, 1979". (Hansard - page 1202 - Addendum No. 2).

Reply

The actual number of employees on the Department of Finance payroll as at the requested dates was as follows:

	<u>January 1, 1978</u>	<u>January 1, 1979</u>
Permanent Staff	306	301
Term Staff	<u>20</u>	<u>9</u>
Totals	<u>326</u>	<u>310</u>

RESPONSE TO THE MEMBER FOR INKSTER

RE: AMOUNT OF GUARANTEE FOR CCIL (CANADIAN CO-OPERATIVE IMPLEMENTS LTD.)

Hansard - page 1140 10:00 A.M. Friday, March 16, 1979

1. The Member for Inkster inquired regarding the government's exposure on the amount of the CCIL guarantee.

Reply

I would like to point out that the guarantee is for \$2.8 million and not \$1.8 million as indicated by both the Members for Inkster and St. Johns. This \$2.8 million is the maximum liability as established by the guarantee between the Province and CCIL, including any accruals for interest or any other charges.

RESPONSE TO THE MEMBER FOR ST. JOHNS

RE: FURTHER LIABILITIES YET TO BE PAID

Hansard - page 935 8:00 P.M. Tuesday, March 13, 1979

1. The Member for St. Johns asked if there are any other liabilities of the nature just discussed that have yet to be paid in this coming fiscal year. (The liability discussed was the \$23.4 million held in trust for the Manitoba Health Services Commission).

Reply

I have been advised by my staff that the Public Accounts which were audited by the Provincial Auditor contain all liabilities which should be reported in this manner and they are not aware of any other liabilities of this nature. As the question was rather vague, if this answer is not sufficient perhaps the Member for St. Johns would like to clarify his question.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want to address a question to the Attorney-General and ask him to respond to the apparent criticism by both the Manitoba Bar Association and the Manitoba Trial Lawyers' Association of his acceptance as to the adequacies of the notice given by the Chief of Police of Winnipeg to his police personnel in dealing with prisoners who have not yet obtained and interviewed counsel. Would he indicate whether he is prepared to review, look at again, the statements made by the Chief of Police and these two Associations of lawyers, or is he still satisfied to accept the Chief of Police's statement as being sufficient for his needs, as the person responsible for the administration of justice in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, what the Winnipeg Tribune editorial states is not acceptance with the existing law but I believe a request for an expansion of the existing law to include, prior to a police charge and caution, that advice that the accused or person in detention be advised of the right to counsel. That goes further than the existing law, Mr. Speaker.

The existing statement of policy by the Chief of Police is in conformity with the existing law and is a very broad policy.

I am, however, Mr. Speaker, in receipt of a letter of explanation from the Manitoba Bar Association of their Resolution and my office either has been in touch with the President this morning or will shortly be this afternoon. I am indicating to them that I would be prepared to meet with the President and the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Section of the Manitoba Bar Association to discuss their proposal for a change in the existing law further.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Attorney-General for making the statement. I have to point to him, I did not refer to the Tribune editorial, nor did I refer to the law as it is. I am talking about the administration of justice and this Minister, who is charged with the administration of justice, should be involved in the procedure, not necessarily the law but the procedure that takes place with people who are in custody and how they are dealt with. I appreciate the fact that he undertook to meet with the Presidents of the Manitoba Bar and of the Trial Lawyers, and I am looking forward to his responding to the questions again in the Legislature, after the meetings have been held. But I would rather like to hear a statement of policy from him relating to how you treat prisoners when they are apprehended, rather than what is the law of the land, which is not quite the same thing.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure which article the Member for St. Johns is referring to. I believe he is referring to police treatment of persons in detention when they are requested to make statements. I believe I have answered that question and I will be pleased to discuss the matter further with them, after I have met with representatives of the Manitoba Bar Association.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am satisfied with the answer, as it stands now. I am looking forward to a further report from the Honourable Minister. If he is not clear on the articles I referred to, I will send him copies; they are not the editorial but actually I have the Tribune news reports on statements made by the Manitoba Trial Lawyers' Association, represented by Mr. Brodsky and by the Manitoba Bar Association, represented by Mr. McJannet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour. Some ten days ago his Acting Minister took as notice a question from myself dealing with the increase in time lost due to work stoppages, due to strikes and lock-outs, a 1000 percent increase over 1977. Has the Minister a response as to whether or not those calculations are accurate or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I can get and file, if the Leader of the Opposition so desires, a statement on those specific numbers, but in general terms there was a substantial increase last year. Being the first year coming out of the AIB controls certainly had something to do with what happened statistically and it might be of advantage to the Leader of the Opposition if I gave him something that indicated that type of thing that took place across the country. I can do that for him also if he would like.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the situation across the country, would the Minister at this point then be prepared to confirm that whereas in 1977 the total number of days lost due to strikes and lock-outs, Manitoba in ratio to the rest of Canada, was some 1 percent increasing to 4.5 percent in 1978, the first year in controls, that in fact there has been that change insofar as the ratio of Manitoba to the rest of Canada between 1977 and 1978?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I will get those statistics and I will table them for the information of the Leader of the Opposition.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

be granted to Her Majesty. The Department of Education will be sitting in the Chamber and the Department of Fitness and Amateur Sport will be sitting in Room 254.

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on my one opportunity of a grievance during this current Session. I hoped I wouldn't have to rise on a grievance, but since Friday afternoon the Minister of Labour saw fit to make his announcement to the House with regard to the raising of the minimum wage here in Manitoba I feel it is incumbent upon me to at least make a few remarks on the proposal that the Minister tabled with the House Friday afternoon. Unfortunately, I wasn't here, Mr. Speaker; I had a dental appointment and I couldn't have been here lisping with my upper plate missing in any case.

However, I understand that the Minister did not make his usual announcement during the opening of the House, under the Ministerial Statements, but waited until late in the afternoon, and I had asked the Minister during Question Period on Friday whether he was going to make his announcement the following day. If the Minister had replied in the affirmative at that time I would have made sure that I was available and in the House at the time that the Minister had made his statement, but the only answer that I got from the Minister on Thursday afternoon was soon, which seems to be the stock answer that we receive from the government when we ask them questions on matters of policy, which have been pending before the House for some time.

I also want to comment at this time, Mr. Speaker, on the lack of participation by the Honourable Minister of Labour in the resolution that has been before this House for some time. I know part of the time that the resolution was being discussed that the Minister of Labour was not able to be here, but even subsequent to his return back from the hospital, the minister has made no attempt to take part in the debate that has been taking place in this House and is still under debate and will be debated to its finality sometime during the Session. Now I think that the Minister of Labour, sometime or another during this debate either today or on the debate of the conclusion of the resolution dealing with the minimum wage, that the minister should at least come up on the floor and tell us what he thinks of the formula idea. We've heard from other members of his back bench, what they think of it, but so far we haven't heard anything from the Minister of Labour himself.

The minister has created now, by his statement of Friday afternoon, three classes of people working at the minimum wage here in Manitoba. Prior to the minister's statement we had just for those people under the age of 18, a 25 cent differential between those and those people, who are on the minimum wage. The minister has now seen fit to keep the people at \$2.70 an hour, especially those people who are under the age of 18, and he gives his rationale for it, but what he is doing he is supplying cheap labour for places like A and W, MacDonald's, Salisbury House and these fast-food chains, and I find this kind of hard to visualize since this Minister of Labour has been, and I understand perhaps still is, a member in good standing of a trade union, I don't know if he is at this present time, he can tell me later on. But I understand that he has been a member of a trade union for many, many years. I cannot understand the minister's rationale of not making any increase for those people under the age of 18.

The discrepancy when the final adjustment made in the minimum wage in January 1980 will be in the vicinity of 50 cents an hour, which is twice as much, Mr. Speaker, as it is at the present time. I mean if the minister wanted a differential, I think that yes I have reluctantly accepted over a period of years arguing with a former Minister of Labour, that there had to be a differential. But I certainly figured that 25 cents an hour was sufficient, but this Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, has now decided that at the finality of his implementation of his minimum wage increases, that these people under the age of 18, are now going to be 50 cents an hour less, and I find that very hard.

You know, when I introduced this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I made the suggestion at that time to the press and to this House, that the increase would be in the vicinity of five to ten cents. Well, yes, the first initial stage is ten cents. I have a new name for the government now, they're no longer the Regressive Conservatives, they're now the F.W. Woolworth Party — 10 cents, nickel and dime — that's the kind of increases we're getting from the Minister of Labour and from the Conservative government on that side of the House for those on the minimum wage. —(Interjection)— Real chintzy is right.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, not satisfied that the minimum wage for those under 18 is going

to have a discrepancy of 50 cents an hour, the minister now has singled out another group of citizens in our province, who happen to work at the minimum wage. Those who serve liquor are now going to just remain at \$2.95 an hour. I guess the minister's rationale for that is that these people are supposed to subsist on tips. Maybe he has taken into consideration the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, that these people should subsist on tips. I think the Honourable Member for Wolseley, when he was making his contribution in the debate on the minimum wage resolution suggested, I believe what is in vogue in some of the American states, where you go and buy the cigarette concession. You buy it from the owner and you operate on selling the products plus tips. Well certainly I don't think that the Minister of Labour, being a trade unionist, would go for that.

But when I see that the minister is incorporating that those who serve in bars are now going to have to make up the rest of their salary on the goodwill of the tips that they're going to receive from their patrons and clients, then I find that very very hard to understand, especially from a minister who has been a member of a trade union for many many years. I could suggest to the minister that if you really wanted to carry this out, there are people working in restaurants that get tips and working at the minimum wage. Why didn't he carry it that length? But I won't suggest that, Mr. Speaker, because he may take me up at it.

I feel that this House, and as I have stated on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, this House has had the opportunity, and God knows we had the opportunity when we were government and I don't say that we did right, but just because we did wrong once, there's no reason why it cannot be corrected. And what I mean by that, Mr. Speaker, is this: that the fact that we're going to have this argument year after year after year in the political arena on the minimum wage. And you know it's a terrible thing, that people have to be subject to the political whims and the whims of political fortune in this House, to determine what their rate of pay will be.

And if the minister wasn't prepared to accept this formula, he could be prepared to accept other formulas. There are other formulas that could be worked out. One that seems to be gathering quite a bit of popularity nowadays in current wage settlements, they go for a wage increase and then as the cost of living increases, they introduce what's known as a Cola Clause. Well, if it's good enough for those in organized situations, it certainly should be good enough for those people who work where there is no organization there to speak on their behalf.

I can assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that this isn't something that I enjoy every year, getting up here and making the pitch to the House, to have the minimum wage put on a basis that would take it out of the political arena. I think it should be out of the political arena. And I would hope that the minister at sometime or another is going to give us an answer. Unfortunately, he seems to think it's not worth while even staying around listening to what is going to be said, so he leaves the House and that seems to be the method that this current Minister of Labour operates under. He operates in a vacuum — I don't know who with I don't know who with — the front bench, or maybe it's with the Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturer's Association and the Manitoba Hotel Association — yes when we see the recommendation that the Minister has brought down that the \$2.95 per hour will be maintained as a minimum for liquor services. It certainly by all appearances seems to be that was the wishes of the Manitoba Hotelkeeper's Association and he took that into consideration far more than the cost of living, the rise in the cost of living to the people who have to work at the minimum wage and when you realize, Mr. Speaker, that since the last time that the minimum wage was increased in September of 1976, that the cost of living in Manitoba — and this I guess would be about the only group of people — this group of people who work at the minimum wage who have not been able to have any adjustments made in their earning power to take care of the rise in the cost of living, food, rent, transportation, and by the very methods of the financing of the present government to the municipalities and to the City of Winnipeg in particular, the cutting back of the transportation grants has forced the City of Winnipeg to increase its transit fares. These people who work at the minimum wage Mr. Speaker, are not driving automobiles. They are not driving automobiles at \$118 a week and you know the magnificent increase that they are going to get, Mr. Speaker, of \$4.00 a week, \$4.00 a week, and you know that by the end of the year it has been predicted that the cost of meat will perhaps be up at around \$4.00 a pound, so for this big magnificent increase that they are going to get, Mr. Speaker, they are going to be able to buy one pound of meat by the time the end of the year comes. One pound of meat that is what they are going to be able to buy with this magnificent increase that the Minister of Labour has introduced into this House.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how the Minister even had the nerve to come into this House and to introduce this change in the minimum wage. Yes, the honourable member says the third highest in the country. That may be, Mr. Speaker, but because other people stick their head in the sand all around the rest of the country doesn't say that we have to here. You know there was a gallop pole taken just here recently which was published in Montreal on April the 18th,

on one of the local radio stations and it was a survey, not a political survey, but it was a gallop pole survey taken here in Canada and it stated that Canadians told surveyors that they believe an average family of four now needs a minimum of \$250 a week each week to contend with the rising cost of living. To put that into perspective, Mr. Speaker, a similar pole 10 years ago put that weekly cost at exactly half of today's amount, \$125 and you know when the Minister's first increase comes through, this magnificent sum of \$4 a week is going to bring it up to \$122, \$3 less than what it costs an average family of four to live on in the minds of the public who go out and spend the dollars in the marketplace, \$3.00 less and when, low and behold, Mr. Speaker, the first of January 1980 comes and they're going to get another magnificent sum of another \$4, they'll be \$1.00 above what it cost 10 years ago, in the minds of the public, and these are the people who have to go out and buy the groceries and pay the rents, and everything else.

So when we see the magnificent increases that this government has brought forth, laboured long and hard, struggled to come forth with, and what was it? Twenty cents in two stages. A real nickel and dime party, that's what we have over here. The F. W. Woolworth party of Manitoba.

You know, Mr. Speaker, one would wonder what rationale that the Minister came up with. You know they had the opportunity when we were debating the Resolution and I will say to the credit of The Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that he did honour his word to this side of the House that he would vote for an immediate increase of twenty-five cents an hour. But the members across — the government — saw no way that they were going to support that, not twenty-five cents. Well, we see what they are prepared to support — 10 cents an hour. Ten cents an hour in July, ten cents an hour in January, and in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, the cost of living is going up. These people have not had an increase in their cost of living, not since September of 1976, and the 10 cents is an absolute insult to those people who are working at the minimum wage today. It's an absolute insult how this Minister and how this government have the unmitigated gall to stand up in this House and to announce a chintzy, as the Honourable Member for Elmwood says, a chintzy 10 cents an hour.

It brings us back to the days of the Dirty Thirties, as the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre said, "Brother can you spare a dime?" And that seems to be about all that this government can do is spare a dime, effective July 1st, 1979.

But if you sell liquor in a bar then I would say you are better off maybe 7 a r3\$eeving the tips, Mr. Speaker — could I have S some water please — if you're not receiving any tips, Mr. Speaker, you're going to be working at \$2.95 an hour, has the Minister done any research on just how much in tips these people receive a week? I know he'll have had some input from the Hotelkeeper's Association, yes they will be saying these people are receiving x number of dollars per week in tips. But has he had any conversations with the people working in bars, how much they're receiving a week in tips? I doubt it. I doubt it very much, Mr. Speaker. I think the only conversations that the Honourable Minister has had has been with the Manitoba Hotelkeeper's Association. The Manitoba Chamber of Commerce, the Manitoba Branch of the Canadian Manufacturers Association; these are the people that he's been in contact with.

I'm sure that he hasn't been in contact with people working at the minimum wage and if the minister wants to contact these people, there's a very simple method for him to do. He can take out a very small ad in the newspaper and ask for comments from those people, but he hasn't done that. These people over here, Sir, are paying off their political debts; they're paying off their debts to the Manitoba Hotel Keepers Association; they're paying off their debts to the Canadian Manufacturers Association; they're paying off their debts to the Chambers of Commerce, that's who they're paying off their debts to. And you know, the unfortunate thing, Mr. Speaker, is that perhaps some of the people on the minimum wage even voted for them, but I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, after this chintzy deal that they're getting, I don't think that you're going to be finding very many of them that are going to be voting Progressive Conservative or Regressive Conservative in the next provincial election; or maybe not even in this federal election.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how long we can keep talking about this minimum wage. —(Interjection)— As the Honourable Member for Emerson has stated, yes, it's all over, the Resolution now is anticlimactic but I can assure the members that next Session, there . will be another resolution; I can assure you as sure as there are death and taxes, there will be another resolution on the minimum wage next year. It won't be the same as this year, it'll be a different one, but it'll be dealing with the minimum wage, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker. I can assure members of this House that as long as I'm a member of this House, it is my responsibility because I have those people living in my constituency who are constituents of mine who do not have, as I have said before and I will say again and again, they do not have the political clout nor the monetary clout to be able to defend themselves in the workplace. I will keep introducing resolutions in this House until we do get something that takes it out of the field of politics and puts it into some

realm where these people can be able to get increases without this three-year year wait.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when we were government in the Province of Manitoba, when we took over the minimum wage was \$1.25 an hour, \$1.25 an hour. When we left government, it was \$2.95 an hour with a 20 cent an hour increase slated to come into effect. The present government saw fit not to implement it, the new Minister of Labour, not the present one but the former Minister of Labour the Honourable Member for Assiniboia; last year the government saw fit not to increase the minimum wage, and I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that if we hadn't pushed and shoved this year, there still would not have been an increase in the minimum wage. There would not have been an increase in the minimum wage; they would have stayed at \$2.95 an hour. It is only because of the pressure that has been brought to bear upon this government that a niggardly, 10 cents an hour has come into effect, and then 10 cents in July, 10 cents in January. How cheap can you get, Mr. Speaker? How cheap? It will buy a pound of beef probably in the month of November or December — these people will be able to buy one pound of beef at the forecast prices of red meats towards the end of this year. That is the increase that these people on the minimum wage are going to receive.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they think that all the people who work at the minimum wage are single people, none of them have families, well I think of the some 40,000 that work in Manitoba on minimum wage, at least 10,000 of them are heads of families and supporting families. But these people are told — "don't rock the boat, don't rock the boat, don't rock the boat anyway, just eep cool, you're going to drive industry out of this province." Well, Mr. Speaker, surveys were taken in Ontario, New Brunswick, British Columbia and in Manitoba in 1972 to 1973 and the consensus was that the layoffs were negligible because of the increase in the minimum wage; and you know, if the 8 years that we were in office increasing the minimum wage by over 100 percent, going on almost 140 percent increase in those 8 years. The increase that we're getting today, Mr. Speaker, 10 cents an hour, I haven't done a calculation, but this would be somewhere around a 3 percent increase, somewhere around 3 percent, that's the increase.

Yet this government saw fit to make an offer to its employees of at least 6 percent or more, what was it? 6.1 is the offer that they have made to their government employees; 8.1 to doctors, but to those at the minimum wage — and you know, Mr. Speaker, not all these people work in private industry; some of them work for this government. They work as Home Aides under the Department of Health; the department itself is paying a chintzy \$2.95 an hour because I guess those people who work as Home Aides are not covered under the MGEA contract. They work, I guess, on a part-time basis for the Department of Health, and these people are at the minimum wage level. So the government isn't even treating its employees all equally. Those who are at the minimum wage are going to get a chintzy 3 percent increase, while those who happen to be organized within the Manitoba Government Employees' Association are going to receive 10 cents an hour; 10 cents an hour in July. Well, I guess that's one way of cutting your Health costs, keeping them down. No wonder the minister is having problems with his Home Care Program.

Mr. Speaker, once again before I sit down, I can't see much sense in arguing this minimum wage increase anymore at this time. The government has apparently made its mind up — 10 cents an hour is all that they're going to give in July and 10 cents in January of next year, but I hope that sometime before his Session is finished that we will hear from the Minister of Labour to give us his reasons why he came up with such a small sum of money for those at the minimum wage. Perhaps that's all he could squeeze out of his Front Bench; I guess maybe at that, these people are lucky, but I would say to the minister that if I couldn't squeeze anymore out of the Front Bench and given his background in the trade union movement, I would resign; I would resign, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Labour. I couldn't remain as the Minister of Labour in a government that would come up with that kind of a cheap, chintzy offer to the people who have not had an increase in their cost of living since September of 1976, it's now going on 32 months since these people have had an increase. And you know, Mr. Speaker, if the formula would have been in effect, these people would have had at least 70 cents an hour increase. If the cost of living had been applied as a formula for increasing their wages they would have had at least 60 cents an hour increase. And if they had operated under the AIB guidelines which some units will not be out of in the bargaining units until October of this year, they would have had approximately 56 or 57 cents an hour increase.

But what are they going to get? What are they going to get from this government? 10 cents — brother, can you spare a dime? It might be interesting for some of the members — at the minimum wage in Manitoba which is presently set at \$2.95 an hour in the following table which records the Amendments since 1970 and demonstrates that unlike the wage exemption, the wage factor is subject to constant revision. In October of 1970 the minimum wage in Manitoba was \$1.50; it increased November 1st to \$1.65, 15 cents; in October, 1972 it increased 10 cents to \$1.75; October 1st, it increased to \$1.90; July 1st, 1974 it increased to \$2.15, 8 months later yes, 8 months later;

January 1st, 1975 it increased to \$2.30 an hour; October 1st, 1975 it increased 30 cents to \$2.60 an hour 6 months later, no a little more than 6 months, about 9 months later; September 1st, 1976 it rose another 35 cents an hour to \$2.95 an hour, where it stands at the present time. Nowhere except for one time when the cost of living was a heck of a lot less than it is today, from November 1971 to October 1972 it rose 10 cents. But not with the cost of living increases that we've had and what we have today. No, so I believe in 1976, at that time we were approximately somewhere between 55 and 56 percent of what the formula would have given these people today. These people, even with this 10 cents an hour increase in July, the cost of living and the composite industrial average wage will still fall behind.

They probably won't even at the 47.87 percent of the industrial average composite wage, which I believe is the latest figures that I worked out, they probably won't even be there and what do the Chambers of Commerce and the Manufacturers Association say is their ideal? Oh, somewhere between 40 and 50 percent, but perhaps, better still it should be around 40 percent. Well, given the way that this government has been increasing the minimum wage and its record, we will perhaps by the time these people are voted out of office, and they will be, Mr. Speaker, voted out of office

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. By the time they are voted out of office, be it '80, be it '81, be it '82, the minimum wage will probably be less than 40 percent of the average industrial composite wage, and so, Mr. Speaker, I can say that I can feel nothing but utter disgust for the recommendations that the Minister of Labour tabled in this House on Friday afternoon. He should be ashamed of himself, as a trade unionist, to get up in the House and offer a chintzy, measly ten cents an hour, after some 32 months. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

Time: 2:30 p.m.

SUPPLY — CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Morris McGregor (Virden): Committee will come to order and we'll refer you to Page 22, Co-operative Development. The Honourable Minister.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, it's a pleasure to introduce the Estimates of the Department of Co-operative Development to the members of the Committee. Before entering into the main body of the few words I have to say, I would like to express my appreciation to the staff and to the Department of Co-operative Development for the support and assistance they've given to me over the last six months that I've been Minister.

I would also like to say that the new Deputy, which started with the department at the first of the year, is doing an excellent job and his knowledge in the Credit Union movement has helped greatly in preparing these Estimates as well as helping in providing the proper support staff and assistants to the different organizations that we look after.

The role of the department is to respond to the needs of the co-operative enterprise in Manitoba, and this response is expressed either by the provisions of adequate legislation, or assistance and encouragement where those involved are committed enough to their philosophy to stand behind their convictions with a viable and a businesslike attitude to self help.

The co-operative enterprise in Manitoba covers a broad spectrum of economic activity ranging from Credit Unions, Caisse Populaires, to the centrals, Consumer Co-operatives, Agricultural, Manufacturing, Producer, Service, Fishing, and many other co-operative endeavors. It relates to a large section of the total population of the Province of Manitoba. The government, Mr. Chairman, has responded to several of the needs by, as members will recall, passage of some proclamations of Co-operative Acts and Regulations, as well as the Credit Unions and Caisse Populaires' Act which will also be proclaimed very shortly as soon as the necessary regulations are completed.

The administration, research and personnel services for this particular department have been assumed by the Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sports, and funds for this consolidation approach will show up in the Estimates of the Fitness, Recreation and Sport Department Estimates.

The main reason for a certain amount of staff reductions is geared to the fact that these services will be provided for from the Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sport. Another area which has accounted from some rationalization of staff is the fact that about three years ago the Stabilization Fund, the Credit Union and Caisse Populaire movement, took over their own auditing functions which meant that the auditors that were previously hired by the Department of Co-operatives are now no longer required, since the movement itself has taken over that particular responsibility.

The Auditing Section in the Estimates provides for auditing services to qualifying co-operatives which, by reason of location or financial difficulties, are unable to obtain professional auditing services elsewhere. This Section also performs special audits as requested by the Registrar and acts as a resource to various boards which relate to the department. The Credit Union Section maintains the capacity for special statutory inspections and audits of Credit Unions. This Section also examines the annual returns for the Credit Unions.

The Central Registry Section performs administrative functions of the Registrar's Office and assists over 450 co-operatives and credit unions in Manitoba to comply with the respective Acts. It relates closely with the Development Branch and Audit and Inspection Section of the department.

The Co-operative Development Branch has been reorganized through the combining of the Northern Development Section and the Southern Development Section into one unit. This was done to recognize the fact that both perform similar functions. The Branch conducts two basic programs. These are Co-operative Development and Finance and Control.

The Co-operative Development Section provides assistance with organization, development, operations, management training and financial management assistance to non-affiliated co-operatives engaged in commercial fishing, retailing, manufacturing, agricultural and other activities. Emphasis in this section remains northern-orientated in recognition of the need and development roles co-operatives fulfill in northern Manitoba.

The Finance and Control Section provides services in the area of financial statement preparation, budgeting, accounting systems, design and report accounting programs. Here, again, the bulk of the services are directed to northern co-operatives, particularly fishing co-operatives, who do not have the access to these from other sources. In addition to the Development and Finance and Control Sections, the Co-operative Development Branch is responsible for the maintenance and operation of the Resource Centre.

Mr. Chairman, through certain economies and through the reorganization that was taking place six months ago, we have been able to achieve certain economies within this department and we feel that with the commitment of the staff that we have at present and the people that are in place we will be able to meet and fulfill the mandate of co-operative development in the Province of Manitoba and help the co-operative movement, as a whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1) — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a few general comments before we get into some specific questions on the departmental Estimates, Mr. Chairman. I believe, from what we are witnessing since the Progressive Conservative government has been elected in Manitoba, is the elimination in successive years of various parts of the Department of Co-operative Development and in fact, Mr. Chairman, by the looks of it, it appears as though this Minister will probably be the one who presides over the demise of the Department of Co-operative Development, since they are obviously giving much less attention to the affairs of co-operatives in Manitoba, as witnessed by the severe cuts in the staff and severe cuts in the funding attached to the Department of Co-operative Development.

If we look over the past year since this department has been taken over by the Conservative administration, Mr. Chairman, we witness a reduction from the year ending March 31st, 1978, which was \$2,241,100, to a reduction from that year to the budget which the Conservative government brought in for the year ending March 31st, 1979, to \$1,113,700, and over the period of the year 1978-79, Mr. Chairman, this amount had been further reduced to \$1,200,000 according to the reconciliation statement on Page 21 of these Estimates. So, Mr. Chairman, there was a very severe reduction in the first year of the Conservative administration for this department and now this year we see a further reduction to a level of \$6,000 which is before us today. So, Mr. Chairman, what we have witnessed is a total reduction in the department of over two-thirds of the moneys that were formerly allocated to the Department of Co-operative Development, eliminated from the budget of the Department of Co-operative Development. So, therefore, Mr. Chairman, it's pretty obvious to the New Democratic Party Opposition Group that this government intends to downplay co-operatives, to downplay the development of co-operatives and credit unions in the province of

Manitoba, certainly to not take any kind of significant government role in the development of co-operatives and the promotion co-operatives, and the assistance of existing co-operatives in the province of Manitoba.

I understand from information that I received from northern Manitoba that the department is now either intending to or has indeed already begun the process of charging the Northern Co-operative Fishing Co-ops for the audit function which they formerly used to provide on a free basis to these co-operatives. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a step in the wrong direction since many of these co-operatives operate in communities which are certainly not the richest communities in Manitoba and the fishermen who operate these co-operatives as members and as boards of directors and recipients of the income from the co-operatives are some of the lowest income individuals in Manitoba.

So, Mr. Chairman, this results in this being a tax, a most regressive form of tax, because it hurts those who are least able to pay. So, Mr. Chairman, it's obvious from that and from the opening statements from the Estimates that we see before us that the government is certainly cutting back very severely in all areas of co-operative development in Manitoba. Now the Minister may make statements to the effect that the co-operatives can develop on their own. Well, Mr. Chairman, we know from our own experience in the co-op movement that co-operatives need assistance both at the initial stages of informational assistance to individuals and groups who are considering whether or not they would like to form a co-operative, the advantages and disadvantages of a co-operative as opposed to other forms of organization. Mr. Chairman, we had a small group in the department who were doing that kind of thing and particularly in northern Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, where co-operatives are being established and even those, Mr. Chairman, that have already been established. There is a need for continued support and assistance of a technical and informational and accounting nature, particularly to these co-operatives, to assure that they continue to be a success. And the cutbacks can only hurt these co-operatives. So you really have the two things operating in northern Manitoba, you have a reduction in the services offered by the department, and at the same time you have the department beginning to charge for the services which they are providing to these co-operatives.

Now, granted, it may not be a high amount to pay, relative to what other private groups may charge these co-operatives for a similar service, but any amount, Mr. Chairman, represents an increase in the amount of money that these co-operatives have to pay out of limited funds, and it thereby represents a decrease in the incomes of those individual fishermen who are operating in those co-operatives.

So Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a shameful way of to operate in northern Manitoba with respect to these individuals that are working within the co-operatives. It's a question of not giving them any choice because they will have to pay that amount, they don't really have any choice in the matter, they need to have an audit performed on their books each year, formerly the department did that on a free basis and now they will be charging for it. And we see, in all areas of the department, Mr. Chairman, significant cuts. The administration area has been chopped, the co-operative development services section has been reduced, the audit inspection and central registry area has been reduced, and Mr. Chairman, the Estimates that are before us show a reduction over the previous fiscal year ending March 31, 1979, but if we look back to the year before that, Mr. Chairman, there has been a very significant reduction.

The administration section of this department used to be at the level of \$457,000.00. It is now reduced to \$69,600.00. The co-operative development section of this department used to be at the level of \$856,000 with an additional amount of \$327,900 for extension services, and this has been reduced to \$638,800, so Mr. Chairman, it's obvious from the areas in which the cuts have been made that this government is intent on reducing the services to people who are desirous of establishing co-operatives as a form of enterprise in the province of Manitoba. They only intend to give it, at best, a token effort, and if this process of cutbacks and reductions continue, you may as well eliminate the Department of Co-Operative Development, because there really will be nothing left for this department to do, given the severe reduction in the numbers of people who are involved in the department. Am I running out of time, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I'm just wondering if we're on the item, 1.(b)(1) is really the item, and we are going further afield.

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, under Administration I believe it covers the general operation of the department, and that is what I am speaking of, the general policy of the department, and in fact, Mr. Chairman, we could theoretically and practically ask most of our questions under this section as well, covering the whole department, since it really is concerned, I assume, with the overall administration of the department. And therefore, under this section, Mr. Chairman, I am referring

to the policy of the government, which appears to be a severe reduction in the desire and the opportunity for the development of co-operatives in Manitoba.

There is another area, which I believe is of significant interest to myself and to other members on our side of the House and certainly to all people in Manitoba who are members of credit unions, and that is with respect to the audit inspection of the credit unions in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I know from when I was a Minister in this department that this was a concern and it was a concern of people at that time that we should be beefing up that section and certainly not reducing it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I see significant reductions in this area since this government has taken over this department and I fear for the kind of service that is now being provided by the government with respect to the audit and inspection of credit unions in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, this government, the government in Manitoba, has a responsibility to the membership of credit unions in Manitoba, to ensure that the credit unions are properly inspected, that their reserves are carefully audited so as to make sure that members' deposits in credit unions are adequately protected.

Mr. Chairman, I see, from the decreases that we see in this item, that this is possibly an area for concern. It is also an area for concern given the indication we have that this government intends to down-play the role of government in terms of developing co-operatives, overlooking the operation of co-operatives and providing assistance to co-operatives where it's required and where it's needed. And this is one area, Mr. Chairman, where the government has a statutory responsibility to audit and inspect the credit unions in Manitoba. Although the central funds have a responsibility here, it's a responsibility that has been delegated by the government and by the department. The department has a responsibility to ensure that that audit and inspection has been carried out adequately and it is being carried out sufficient to ensure the protection of members' deposits.

So, Mr. Chairman, I really haven't left much time for the Minister to respond, but at this late hour, the lateness of the hour, perhaps he could take a number of these concerns as notice and respond to us after the dinner hour. And I would come back to this after he has had the opportunity to respond.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, let me first of all say that the policy with regards to charging northern co-operatives, the auditing and accounting fee policy was established in January, 1975, by — I don't know if he was the Minister at that time, but that's when that particular policy was enacted. To date, I understand, Mr. Chairman, from staff that the policy has not been implemented and that no northern co-ops are paying that particular accounting fee at the present time. We are having a look at that right now, since that policy, neither by the previous government nor this government, has been acted on. But the policy, the original auditing and accounting fee policy, originated in January, 1975.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rupertsland, on a point of order.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, that policy may have been discussed in the department in January of 1975 but the Minister is responsible for establishing policies, and I was the Minister in January of 1975 and this policy was not accepted by the Minister of the day, nor was it ever accepted, to my knowledge, by the New Democratic Government Ministers. It may have been an internal discussion of the department but it's up to the Minister to accept or reject those internal recommendations and I certainly did not even consider that possibility, and I am quite confident that none of the other Ministers following me — I think there was only the one Minister following me — had accepted that policy. So it's up to this Minister now to either accept or reject it, but it certainly wasn't in place before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Gentlemen, in accordance with Rule 19(2), the hour of 4:30 having arrived, I am interrupting the proceedings of the Committee for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to order please. I would like to refer the members of the committee to Page 30, Resolution 42. 3.(a)—pass - the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, when we left off this item on Friday last, we were discussing the grants and other assistance in general, and the Minister had given us a list of the grants. With reference to the general area of public school finance in the province, one of the comments that was made was that this item is in chaos. And in looking through the past files we see that in some areas there hasn't been any change since 1967-68, and I understand that there has been some recommendations made to the Minister that a formal look be taken at the grant structure and financing education in general.

We wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is in a position to advise us what his intention is in this regard. I know that it is contemplated that legislation will be forthcoming, and is it the Minister's intention to deal with that subject under legislation or should we discuss it under this item in the Estimates?

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, if there are specific concerns of the Member for Winnipeg Centre, we certainly could entertain them at this time.

MR. BOYCE: Well, there are a number of specific concerns, Mr. Chairman, and I had wondered whether it would be better to deal with this under legislation than under the Estimates, but if the Minister would like us to deal with them now, we can.

The authorized teaching grants, I understand, haven't been changed since 1967-68, so perhaps the Minister could advise us what his intention is in this regard?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, this particular grant item is one, of course that has not been changed for some ten or more years, and I might tell the Member for Winnipeg Centre that the interorganizational committee on school finance that makes recommendations to the Minister each year has recommended that there be no change in this regard in their last particular review.

MR. BOYCE: The Minister makes reference to an organizational committee on finance, I wonder if he could advise us who comprises this committee?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, that committee is made up of representatives from the various educational organizations that make up the complete educational community, the trustees organization, the teachers, superintendents, representatives from the department as well, I may have forgotten one organization, the organization of school business officials also has representation on this committee.

MR. BOYCE: Well, I understand the Minister is saying it is the advisory committee on educational finance and there hasn't been any change in the makeup of that committee in the last year. Is that what the Minister is advising us?

But on the grants that were referred to by the Minister, one of the ones that he referred to was the declining enrollment grant, and I wonder if there is any relationship in arriving at these figures, in light of what the Minister had told us last year, in working up some of these figures he passed over it rather lightly by saying that he had used some rather unorthodox procedures in arriving at the figures. Has there been any attempt to relate the amounts requested this year to what the actual cost is for the operation of the systems who are suffering a declining enrollment?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the formula that we use in computing the declining enrollment grants does in part, just that. If the Member for Winnipeg Centre is saying does it provide enough money, well of course that is a matter of opinion on the part of those who are operating the system. I suppose if we were to ask school boards who are facing increased costs and so on, they would say no, we could use more money in this regard, but it is based on a formula that attempts to provide an equitable distribution of moneys in that regard.

MR. BOYCE: Well, of course this is one of the specific areas. When the Minister says it does, in part, reflect the additional costs of declining enrollment, I read into the Minister's answer that they don't know at this time whether in fact it does reflect the actual cost or not. I'm thinking of the government's position once again where they said that the provincial government should pick up 80 percent of the cost of financing education and 20 percent should be left to the local taxpayer. So at this time the Minister is not in the position to advise us whether the funds that he's asking to be spent during this fiscal year will, in fact not be a diminution of the 71 percent provincial financing, 71 or 73, whatever figure you want to use. Some people suggested 71 percent, I think

the Minister's position is that they are picking up 73 percent, which of course, Mr. Chairman, is far removed from their platform of 80 percent.

But Mr. Chairman, the grants for nutritional programs — I understand that this grant has remained constant, 1977-78, 1978-79, at \$169,600.00. And of course, once again when inflation is ever with us, this is actually a diminution of the program in that in constant dollars, it is a decrease so that the Minister says that they are maintaining their level of support for the system, but yet when we come down to some of the specifics, we find that the decrease in actual dollars is to the detriment of some of the programs.

Now, the grants for declining enrollment is but one example, Mr. Chairman, that the government is not in a position to advise the House that this in fact is helping the divisions, and when we take this grant in juxtaposition to some of the other grants, the Minister perhaps could advise us how the government can maintain the position that they're not decreasing the level of support for education in the province. When we think of such things as declining enrollment I think the Minister might try to argue that they are maintained, but nevertheless for such things as school nutrition and the small school grants, northern area grants which, Mr. Chairman, we feel is actually decreasing the level of provincial support.

And of course, when we get around to native programs — during the 1978-79 Estimates, the Minister said, and I wish to quote him, "I share a very genuine interest in the education of native people of this province. I sometimes think this has been an area that has been neglected, I really feel it is an area we have to focus on." In 1977-78, it was funded at \$534,200; in 1978-79 it was \$500,000; and then 1979-80 he's asking for \$407,000. So, Mr. Chairman, they've gone from \$534,000, \$522,000, down to \$407,000.00. So how can the Minister suggest that this is, you know, having a focus on the needs of native education.

When we get further down in the Estimates we will see that the department and the government is actually decreasing their assistance for anything which is other than the old type of educational philosophy, where it's reading, writing and arithmetic in an inculcation system, and anything which doesn't fit in with that particular pattern is going to be diminished.

if MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member would like to collect his thoughts for a minute, I could reply to the three points that he's raised at this time.

He mentions the Declining Enrolment Grant, and suggests that somehow this is not helping the school divisions. I point out to him that an increase from \$500,000 to \$1 million this year, is certainly a sizable increase and will be of assistance to those divisions that are incurring extra expenses because of a rapid decline in enrolment. I don't think that can be interpreted, at least I would suggest that \$500,000 increase cannot be interpreted as a decline in assistance.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre also mentions the School Nutrition Program, and says that in some way we are falling back there, that we aren't increasing. I would refer him to the actual figures. Last year, \$169,600 in the School Nutrition Grant, this year \$185,100, which represents an increase of over nine percent, Mr. Chairman, which I would suggest is not an insignificant increase.

He also identifies the area of native para-professionals as an area where he says that we are not financing at the same level, and I can also clarify that situation, Mr. Chairman. It's quite true that the amount in this year's Estimates is not as large as last year, but there is a reasonable explanation for that — that we have a number of Indian Bands who have opted out of the Master Tuition Agreement. And once having opted out of that agreement, then the arrangements that are made are between the school division and the band directly, and do not involve the province in the transfer of moneys. So, in fact, the figures that the Member for Winnipeg Centre has before him, although they show a lower amount than last year, certainly indicate no diminution in service. As I say, Mr. Chairman, this particular amount takes into consideration that a number of bands have opted out of the Master Tuition Agreement, and now negotiate directly with the school divisions involved. I repeat again, this does not indicate any diminution in the amount of money that is being paid towards native education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, one brief question with respect to the Declining Enrolment Grant. Could the minister indicate the number of students by which the enrolment declined, that the \$500,000 was meant to compensate for, and the number of students decline in enrolment that the \$1 million is meant to compensate for?

MR. COSENS: I think the Member for Burrows, Mr. Chairman, is well aware of the figures in student decline for the last two years; if not I could get those for him once again. If he is wondering about

the particular formula that we use in computing the Declining Enrolment Grant, I can give him that. I'm not clear on what particular figures he wants in this regard.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, I want the figures, the drop in enrolment figures upon which the \$500,000 was based, and the \$1 million is based. Those are the figures that I want. Because it's one thing to talk about in terms of a general decline in enrolment, but the minister knows as well as I do that just a general across-theboard decline in enrolment may not necessarily make a school division eligible for a Declining Enrolment Grant. So I want the figures that the minister used upon which he based the \$500,000 for the last fiscal year, and the \$1 million for the current one.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, it will take me a minute to get that particular information as it applies to all of the school divisions. The formula is applied to the enrolment drop in each school division individually, of course, so it will take some time to get that information for the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the minister doesn't have those figures readily at hand. But I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that after the minister does obtain his figures, that he will likely find that the number of students figuring in that formula upon which the Declining Enrolment Grant is calculated, has probably doubled. I've forgotten the exact details of the formula, but the enrolment has to drop below a certain point per school division or per school, in order to qualify for a Declining Enrolment Grant. So, I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Chairman, that the minister will most likely find that the number of school divisions or schools qualifying for declining enrolment have increased, perhaps doubled, and hence a doubling in the allocation. It must be, because otherwise the minister would have said, well, no, we're simply becoming more generous to the school divisions and we are realizing that a declining enrolment creates a greater cost impact upon the school division, and hence we're prepared to subsidize the school divisions to a greater degree.

Again, I suggest to you that it's because of an increase in the declining enrolment, which has brought about the . . . and the minister agrees with me. So, that being the case, Mr. Chairman, that is no sign of any type of increased generosity on the part of the government, of any sort of increased benevolence on the part of the government to the school division. The facts of the matter are that the enrolment in some school divisions is declining to a greater extent or is anticipated to decline to a greater extent in the forthcoming year than it did last year, and hence the greater allocation. So really that is not putting any more bucks into the school divisions' pockets.

On matter of nutrition, Mr. Chairman, we must repeat again that the level of support has decreased from last year. It's true that in the figures we see before us that it seems to show a nine percent increase, but you must remember, Mr. Chairman, that here we're dealing with a nutrition program, and we're dealing with inflation, and we're dealing with 17.5 percent inflation. So in actual fact, Mr. Chairman, the program has been reduced by 8.5 or 9 percent, and not increased by that percentage. It's been reduced, Mr. Chairman, because the number of dollars of 1979-80 dollars will buy less food than the lesser amount, than the \$169,000 of 1978-79 dollars.

Now, it might also be worthwhile, Mr. Chairman, and of interest to the committee, to obtain some figures which would enable us to do a more meaningful comparison and analysis of the level of financial support for native para-professionals. The minister had indicated to us that a number of Indian Bands that opted out of the Master Agreement, and hence the number of native para-professionals whom we fund has decreased, and we would be interested in knowing whether the decrease in number of para-professionals that are being funded, is in some proportion to the reduction in the dollar amount or whether the number of para-professionals that are being funded are perhaps somewhat greater, are more than the ratio of the monetary decrease, and hence the level of support has in fact, decreased.

Speaking of level of support in the school divisions, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk for a minute or two about the grants for print and non-print materials, and those, Mr. Chairman, I would want to suggest to you, are away out of line. All the minister need do is compare the current school year's Manitoba Text Book Bureau Catalogue with that of two or three years ago, and find the dramatic increases in the cost of textbooks. Increases up to 100 percent on some textbooks over a three-year period are not uncommon. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I did do that this morning, and a reading kit to accompany a Grade 1 reading program, in one of the series, and 75 sets that sold for \$20.90 in 1978-79, it's up to \$28.95. An accompanying reader in that same series, which sold for \$3.05 in 1975-76, this year is selling for \$4.55, a 50 percent increase. And so it goes. And then, I just flipped through the catalogue and moved from Grade 1 to Grade 9 — there I find the same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. In accordance with Rule 19(2) the hour being 4:30 p.m. I'm interrupting proceedings for Private Members' Hour and the committee will reconvene at 8:00 p.m. Call in the Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are now in Private Members' Hour. On the sub-amendment of the Honourable Member for Roblin is being held for the Speaker. We will move to the next resolution, which will be Resolution No. 7. The Honourable Member for Logan has 12 minutes. The Honourable Member for Logan.

RESOLUTION NO. 7 — CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the problems when you start a debate one day and three or four days later you have to pick it up, you've kind of lost thread of what you were talking about the day before. However, I think, as I stated the other day, that I agreed with some members who said, Yes, there was a deterrent in capital punishment, it was a deterrent for those people who were executed. But I tried to point out to honourable members that since we had had capital punishment in one shape or form or another all through the ages, we certainly have not been able to eliminate heinous crimes of murder and others, that call for capital punishment. And, the introduction of this resolution, again by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, calling on the House to support a move by this Legislative Assembly to ask the Federal Government, I'm not sure if it's calling on the Federal Government, that the Criminal Code be amended to provide the death penalty upon conviction dealing with first degree murder. The honourable member said that members of the Conservative Party have not taken a stand on this issue, I have yet to hear one member of the government side get up and take part in this debate that has spoken in opposition to this Resolution. I know one of the things that was banded about in Ottawa when the debate on Capital Punishment took place, that the Federal Liberal Party put on the whips, and that caused the abolition of Capital Punishment for first degree murder. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, I have yet to hear one of the honourable members on the government side of the House get up, take part in this debate and state emphatically that he or she is opposed to Capital Punishment, and so we can practically say the same thing that the Conservatives accuse the Liberals of, that the whips are on for this Resolution because I have not heard one member of the government benches state that he is opposed to Capital Punishment.

And, you know, interestingly enough that the Leader of the Liberal Party, or the Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, is a wellknown abolitionist, the Honourable Joe Clark, the Leader of the Conservative Party, is an abolitionist, and the Honourable Ed Broadbent I believe is also on record as an abolitionist on the so-called, as the Tories put it, the so-called free vote that took place in Ottawa dealing with the matter of Capital Punishment. Also too, some very prominent jurists are opposed to Capital Punishment, and I think one is the former Prime Minister, the Right Honourable John Diefenbaker, who is on record as being opposed to Capital Punishment.

I think another very well-known jurist, one who is held in very high esteem, Justice Emmett Hall, and I listened to him being interviewed on the Patrick Watson Report, I guess that's what it's called on CBC some months back. Here's a man who has had the experience of looking and having had the duty of sentencing people to death for first degree murder and murder as it was over the years until it comes to the present day. And he was asked if he thought that a return to capital punishment for first degree murder would be a deterrent. Would this deter people from committing murder? And the Honourable Justice said in his opinion — and I would have to say that I would respect the opinion of Justice Emmett Hall, who is a man who's had to deal with this problem far more so than anyone here in this Chamber — well, the Honourable Member for Emerson says, "That's one man's opinion", but that's one man's opinion that I would take, I'm afraid, much more than I would take the Honourable Member for Emerson because this man is one who has had the experience, who has had the opportunity to observe over the many years of service on the Bench, that this capital punishment is not a deterrent.

I think that the Honourable Member for Point Douglas made perhaps the best speech that I've heard him make in this House when he spoke on capital punishment. He spoke with deep feeling, and I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Point Douglas when he said that we have to look at some of the causes of why these crimes are being committed. They're being committed in the main by those people who are the underprivileged in our society. I think if you look in the records and you check the inmates in the provincial jails, the Federal Penitentiaries, you will find that in the main these people come from the lower socioeconomic section of our society, poor education, and that's not always the case, but you know for those who have the money and who are able to commit crimes, be they white collar crimes or be they crimes of passion, if they spend enough money they can make things happen that those at the lower end of the scale cannot.

And you know, what we are stating when we talk about the Old Testament the Lord says, "Vengeance is mine", but you know we have graduated from the Old Testament; we've graduated to the New Testament, and I think that when that Friday on Calvary Hill when Jesus Christ was crucified, and what were his last words? They were not words of vengeance, no. He said, "Forgive them, O Father, for they know not what they do." Now if a person was in a vengeful mood under that cruel method of capital punishment, and that was one of the cruelest I would imagine that was ever devised, the death by crucifixion, and if anyone would feel in a vengeful mood I'm sure that Christ on the Cross would have been one, but he said, and I think his words are very timely and as timely still, "Forgive them, O Father, for they know not what they do." I believe I've asked the Honourable Member for Point Douglas to correct me if I'm wrong, but I think I'm fairly close. Maybe I've put it into the modern day vernacular.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I agree sometimes I feel that capital punishment should be returned, but when I look at the thing in the long term I don't see a return to capital punishment as a deterrent — no, I cannot agree with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. It's a personal thing with me and I think that's what it all boils down to in the long run. But I have not heard, as I have said before, from the Conservatives, not one on that side of the House get up and say that he is opposed to capital punishment. Now I cannot believe that all those people are of a similar mind because regardless of what political party we belong to, we all have differing opinions upon certain things. We only belong to a political party because within that spectrum we believe in certain things that we have within the political . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Within that scope we have a Left Wing, a Right Wing, and a Middle of the Road, and I'm sure not all of you are pro capital punishment. Surely there must be one or two of you people over there that are anti-capital punishment, and I would like to hear before this Resolution comes to a vote one member of that side at least get up and say that he's opposed and would vote against this Resolution because otherwise all I can draw from that then is this conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution is introduced at this time because they figure that they will embarrass certain Federal candidates because there's an election on and the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, his brother is a known pro-hanging, or pro-execution. He's engaged in an election at this time, and that's Dean Whiteway in Winnipeg-Birds Hill. That's the only conclusion I can draw, and so the government has decided that the whips are on and until I hear otherwise, that's the conclusion I'm going to draw and I'm going to vote against the Resolution.

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

MR. WILSON PARASIUUK: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to present my views on this particular issue. It's a complicated issue. It's one that somehow found its way into this Chamber having been the subject of a great deal of debate within the Chamber where it's properly debated and namely, the House of Parliament. I wonder why it's ended up here' I think that the member who introduced this is really trying to abuse the Legislature and I think he's grandstanding for public attention. To use the terms of some of the members opposite, if ever I've seen a case of headline hunting within this Legislature, this surely is that instance, and unfortunately this issue, which is complicated, and I want to get into the complications later on, has been brought forward with a whole set of wild exaggerations as justification for its implementation by the Member for St. Matthews who's introduced it.

I remember going over the whole issue of capital punishment surprisingly in a Philosophy class because the issue indeed is at one level very philosophical. It's a theoretical issue. It relates around the concept of freedom of the will versus determinism. Do the conditions in society, in a sense, make people do things, and the previous speaker, my colleague, the Member for Logan, in fact tended to take that position, sort of a social pathology position. If you clean up society you won't have murders. Well, I don't think that holds completely.

I believe that there is free will, that that will is constrained often, but that ultimately people are and should be held responsible for their actions and are indeed accountable for their actions. And within 20 minutes, Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to get into all the nuances of freedom of the will versus determinism. A Lord Devlin and Barbara Wooten in England carried on this debate for a number of years in the '50s and the '60s. Volumes have been written on it. And it's not the type of philosophical debate as most philosophical debates, one can come down cleanly on one side or the other, but it certainly has been debated and discussed and I would think, will be discussed for many years into the future. That's the philosophical side.

I think people find it a moral issue as well. I've heard within this Chamber people quoting whatever convenient religious text they could to support their particular position. "Thou shalt not kill" is put forward by some people. "An eye for an eye. A tooth for a tooth" is put forward by others. There's a golden rule saying, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you". The question is, do civilized societies kill their members even if some members within that society for various reasons kill other members or kill another member? Frankly I think that as with any debates on the Bible, First Testament, Second Testament, the antecedents of these Books, that one can find whatever quotation you're looking for to rationalize your particular position. So, I don't think they provide the final ultimate authority in this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I think the whole issue of Capital Punishment is an empirical issue as well as a matter of fact. Does Capital Punishment act as a deterrent? And again here one can search out those factual statistics which indeed will support the position that you would like to put forward and you can keep looking for the statistics to justify your case and if they don't exist in Canada for a particular historical period then surely they would exist in one of the many other countries in the world to support your particular position. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that again you cannot come up with cut and dried statistics which really would present conclusive evidence that Capital Punishment should be abolished or that Capital Punishment should be maintained by the state as an instrument in, I guess coming down to crass terms, maintaining some type of law and order in society.

I haven't been able to really look at these three facets, the theoretical or the philosophical ones, the moral facet, the empirical facet, and come down conclusively on this matter. I do say that I believe in free will. I do say that people ultimately have to be accountable. But at least in Canada empirically the evidence doesn't seem to support the claim that Capital Punishment acts as a deterrent, and most abolitionists have used that statistic and that empirical piece of evidence to justify their position and I think that creates a problem for them because they say that since Capital Punishment isn't a deterrent we will not use it. Their consciences in a sense are salved and in a sense they have then washed their hands of the matter and they can walk away from it. No one carries it further and says well what happens to the convicted person who is incarcerated? And if in fact you will not use Capital Punishment what will you do with that person? You will not parole them. You will in fact keep that person in captivity until their natural death. And what does that mean in practice?

Well, my colleague the Member for Point Douglas says, that's punishment. Incarceration for life is a horrible punishment. In fact there are many people in the United States who have said I would prefer to die than to have that punishment and yet if that is the situation that they are being punished then we are talking about retribution, and if we are talking about retribution then frankly Capital Punishment does fit into the scheme of things as a measure of retribution.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Cain wasn't killed, he was punished.

MR. PARASIUK: Well as I said before my colleague came in, I think that one can seek out quotations from both the First and Second Testaments to justify whatever position one would want to take on this, and some people do it as a rationalization, perhaps other people do it as part of a very definite, sincere, building of this particular case. But frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do have an incredible problem in trying to conceptually deal with how the state incarcerates someone forever. Because we've witnessed in Canada and elsewhere a situation where a person is convicted, told he or she will not have parole, and languishes — and some people may in fact accept that fate stoically, but others really cannot live with it. They really see two choices for themselves and in their own mind they think that they either have to be free, that is they have to get out, or they will take whatever chances are required to get out.

We've had a case in Quebec a couple of years ago and I can't remember the name of the person but I think we can recall the person. He'd escaped from jail a number of times. He had been convicted of killings about 4 or 5 times. He was a gangster. It wasn't Rivard it was Blais I think. I can't remember specifically but I can recall when he was captured the final time having escaped from jail countless times, having bragged that no jail could contain him, having in fact killed people on his escapes, and the last time he was captured I think he was captured with about 45 bullet holes in him and unfortunately that is a problem. It's a problem that occurs very seldomly but it creates to me a very large moral problem for the state. Namely, what happens when a police force loses respect for the judicial system and possibly in this instance takes justice into its own hands having seen what has happened with this particular individual. That's one case.

The other case is more known I think to Manitobans and that's the axe murders that occurred near Lockport a few years ago. The people were convicted. They were found guilty. They were convicted and since that time I think the individuals involved in that killing have been involved in

about two or three hostage taking incidents in penitentiaries, one of which resulted in the killing of a hostage. In this instance it was the police or the guards storming the hostages plus the criminals who supposedly shot that hostage, but another life was taken, and I don't know what we do with those individuals. I don't know what we do if someone says I will not be contained by a prison. —(Interjection)— Well my colleague the Member for Flin Flon says ultimately you hang them and I have a great deal of sympathy for that particular position because those people who say don't hang them want to pass the buck and put the whole matter of looking after these people into someone else's hands, prison guards, and the prison guards generally who are stuck with that position, they agree with the Member for Flin Flon. They say why are you passing this particular virtually impossible job onto us with respect to not hundreds of individuals, and I don't want to magnify the problem as the Member for St. Matthews does, but with respect to the 4 or 5 individuals that might arise in a generation who are virtually impossible to contain, and I have raised this with people.

I have raised this with legal people. I have raised this with philosophers, and they in a sense fantasize an answer. They say well you know I wish we could put these people in isolation forever. Let's not even deal with them. Let's lock them up. Let's feed them food somehow without human contact. Let's look after them. Let's examine them medically. Let's, in fact, dehumanize them in a sense. If they could somehow have robots as prison guards that would in fact deal with the problem virtually completely because they might beat up a robot or kill the robot, but they really wouldn't be able to take another life. And to me that whole process is incredibly dehumanizing. I don't think we as a society have really come to grips with that problem and I think that is the problem with respect to in a sense eliminating Capital Punishment as an instrument of the state.

A movie that moved me very much was the movie, *One Flew Over The Cuckoo's Nest*, and a person was put in there wrongly but within that mental institution it was impossible, impossible for the institution to control him. Now I don't want to debate whether people are put in jails wrongly or not. I assume that if a person is convicted of first degree murder, that given our judicial system they have not been put in there wrongly, and that these people are very analogous to the person in the movie, *One Flew Over The Cuckoo's Nest*. Those uncontrollable inmates who want to get out and who would do anything to get out. And you know how they solved the problem in *One Flew Over The Cuckoo's Nest*, they solved it in the most frightening way that I could ever imagine. They dehumanized that inmate and they performed a lobotomy on him, and that terrified me, Mr. Speaker, because if in fact ultimately or logically we can only control certain people by either keeping them under continuous sedation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has two minutes.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. . . Keeping them under continuous sedation with drugs or if we have to ultimately perform a lobotomy on that person, I don't think we as a society can live with that and I think we have to do much more investigation as to what's happening in our mental institutions with respect to this type of matter. But if those people who have seen the movie, *One Flew Over The Cuckoo's Nest*, also remember what took place afterwards, I think it's quite indicative. There was a deaf and dumb Indian in the movie who seeing this person after the lobotomy was performed upon him suffocated him, because that person was dead already and I could sense within the cinema a tremendous sense of relief, a tremendous sense of relief.

I don't think we can wash our hands of the whole matter of incarceration. I do think ultimately that dehumanized incarceration which sweeps the problem under the carpet for the abolitionists can really hold, and ultimately with a Resolution like this despite the fact that I disagree completely with the motives for introducing it, I think ultimately what's required of us is to state our position with respect to whether in fact Capital Punishment should or shouldn't be an instrument of the state and I wanted to take this opportunity to explain my position on it and to indicate that I will be voting in favour of the Resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: I'd just like to say a very few words, Mr. Speaker, on this subject. I, like my colleague, am at a loss to know why this was brought up.

I don't think the provincial government have very much input into capital punishment or support in the negative factor. I do hope he doesn't go in for abortion like my friend Borowski and refuse to pay his income tax. I'm 100 percent in favour of capital punishment and I'll tell you why, and I'll just throw a few cases out that stick in my memory ever since I was very young.

I'll refer you away back, Mr. Speaker, to the Leopold and Loeb case; two young students, not mentally affected in any way, maybe too affluent became bored and they wanted to commit a perfect

murder. And they did, almost. They were defended by, I think Darrow, Clarence Darrow at that time, one of the best labour lawyers in the world and he was successful in getting these people 99 years. Leopold was actually knifed for homosexual tendency, and Loeb today is still alive.

A case that was very very popular or unpopular or whatever you want to say was Jack the Ripper. If you remember, Jack the Ripper killed 60 or 70 prostitutes. That was murder of the worst kind.

Another person who made it later on the scene was Charles Manson. Charles Manson was a murderer who not only murdered himself, he had the power of persuasion to have other people murder for him, or with him.

Mr. Speaker, my son is a policeman and I'm not ashamed of that; he told me of a case in Calgary. Two young men in a new car set out to kill a "pig". A pig is a policeman, fuzz, now a pig. They set out to kill one; that was their afternoon's recreation. A rookie cop stopped the car to check on the tail light or whatever small offense and give them a warning, and they blasted his head off at point blank range.

I've been in Dorchester, Mr. Speaker, not as a prisoner but I have been in there for several hours with a problem of a young man who committed murder west of Winnipeg, was transferred to Dorchester, and wanted to get back. He was telling me about the jail society. He said that if he had to stay in Dorchester for the rest of his life, he'd prefer death. The society goes like this — a murderer is high on the totem pole; he and his friend, he's very young 17, 18, but he was a big time operator, he'd murdered a girl with a knife; the boss of the penitentiary was a murderer and armed bank robber, he ruled the society; next they come down the scale right down to the petty robber, down to the perverts who are the very lowest on the totem pole.

Mr. Speaker, those prisoners ran that jail; you could almost sense the fear of the guards in that particular jail.

I'll give you an example. There was 20 people unemployed with that Springhill disaster, if you remember; 20 were employed as guards. Today, there isn't one of those people guarding in a penitentiary; they just can't stand the strain and the pressures of dealing with these type of people.

Mr. Speaker, a good case in Winnipeg, if you want to use it and I will, is this gentleman who raped an 82 year old woman, worse than rape — he killed that woman just as surely as if he had cut her throat. Maybe it would have been more merciful to cut her throat, and not one bit of compunction or mercy in him at all. She probably wanted it, he said, maybe she was a prostitute, he said. Now, the do-gooders will say "we'll put him in place and we'll control him and we'll teach him" and after a year, he'll go in front of a Parole Board and he'll be a good prisoner, he'll get to be a trustee, and after two years he'll be up again; the third year, he'll be out to commit the same offense.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, and I don't like to disagree with him, from St. James, he said "Who will drop the pill? Who will pull the switch? And who will spring the trap-door?"

Mr. Speaker, in these particular cases, I'd volunteer to do it for minimum wage. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? —(Interjection)— He will be closing Debate. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a few words — I've heard the last two speakers on this side of the House who seem to be in favour of capital punishment.

You know, Mr. Speaker, all through history society or history has taught us that people turn to capital punishment or punishment of some kind or other because of fear. Fear of some foreign element, if you want to call it that within our society which acts beyond what is considered the norm. And, Mr. Speaker, if you look back in history, the society and its method of dealing with these matters usually reflects the culture of that society. We don't have to go too far back. We are now seeing daily before us in countries of the world, Iran for example, where suddenly an event has taken place and the culture of that society obviously dictates almost that a certain form of punishment be re-introduced; a form of punishment which I think most of the civilized world has turned its back on' but no, this is their way of now expressing their concern with change, wanting to go back to a more secure if you want to use that term, feeling of security.

Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned that it's a false security. I'm concerned when a society decides consciously that it wants to protect itself, it takes a simple way out; the simple way being get rid of that blot, expunge that cancer, do away with it.

Now some go to more extremes than others; I agree, but the question of degree is not really what is involved. To say ' that because some countries will as a punishment chop off someone's hand and we say that's terrible, we revolt at that because we won't go that far and we pat ourselves

on the back and say that's not for us. On the other hand, we will however, consider taking a man's life because he is a menace to society; he has acted against the accepted norms of our society, and I think it's a natural, human instinct; it's a natural reaction, but I would hope and I think it's always been the hope of mankind that we can somehow overcome these basic instincts if you want to call it that.

You know, we all agree that war is horrendous, yet we know that wars have taken place, are taking place right now and that perhaps the only reason there hasn't been a much greater war, a World War III is because there's a standoff as between the great powers and there's a fear that if I push the button, what will happen to me? In other words, wars are inevitably launched by countries that feel that they can in fact achieve victory; that their people can achieve victory over the enemy without too much harm to their own country. That has always been, that is traditional, it has always been the accepted view of why countries launch wars.

Now, we're not in that position and that's why perhaps there hasn't been a major world war since the last one. But wars do, as we know reading the paper, there's various levels of war going on throughout the world and yet those of us living in Canada can look at it and say well, it doesn't apply to us, it's unfortunate these people don't know any better; we can almost wish it away and simply say well, it's happening somewhere else.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, no one, I don't think, can quarrel with the fact that there are people in our society who are misfits for whatever reasons — I'm not going to go into whether they're from poor families, or rich families, or whatever they are; there are aberrations and we don't know enough about why these aberrations occur. We don't know why someone who has every reason to be "normal" if I want to put that in quotation marks is acting abnormally.

But the idea that somehow if we kill him that that is going to deter the next one; no figures, no statistics anywhere have ever proved that to be the case. There isn't a country in the world, even the most repressive countries where as I say, they don't only just take your life for taking somebody else's life, but for many reasons, it hasn't stopped whether it be thievery, or adultery, or breaking the code, whatever it is of that particular society, it has never stopped it, it has carried on.

Sure there's something wrong with someone who will take somebody else's life, no question about it, but to join in the parade, to jump on the bandwagon and say if he kills, we will kill him, I regret to say that what we're doing is sinking to that level. Now we can cloak our actions by saying, we are simply doing it to protect ourselves, to protect our fellow citizens, they need protecting, but I'm afraid it goes deeper than that; I'm afraid that there's almost a vindictiveness getting even with someone who has dared to break this law of "Thou shalt not kill." And if we do that, if the State does the killing, well then we'll feel better about it. Probably very few people would undertake to kill somebody outright, out of hand, but if the State does it somehow it's okay, it's proper and we got even, we got even for what this man did or for what this person did.

Now if this was going to eliminate murder, even though I dislike it, it horrifies me, I might be persuaded; but as I say nowhere has it proven that in fact it has deterred, that in fact it has meant less killing, because most murderers as most people I think agreed during this debate, recognize that most murders are in the heat of anger, of whatever motivates a person to lose control, lash out and end up murdering. You know, many murders, and I think the United States figures show this are carried out by people who, in the process of an armed robbery, a murder is committed.

And so you say, well he committed murder because he held somebody up and he was frightened, he's tense, he was afraid the police are going to come, he's afraid he's going to be jumped, the tension must be great, I've never held up anybody so I don't know but I imagine that if I tried it, I'd get an ulcer standing right then and there because the tension would be so overpowering.

So most murders of that kind come about in the heat of the moment. So what do we say? We say, he killed, therefore let us kill him. Shouldn't we go back a step further and say, since the murder was created during an armed robbery, then if that man didn't have a gun to do the killing with in the process of the armed robbery, no killing would have taken place. —(Interjection)— or a knife, which is another lethal weapon. We have this dichotomy. We say you're caught in the process of an armed robbery, that's an offense, you go to jail; but if as a result of that armed robbery you kill a policeman who happens to walk through the door or is called because an alarm is sent out, then of course, that should lead to capital punishment.

No distinction is made between the pulling of the trigger and the holding of the finger on the trigger itself and that's a fine line, Mr. Speaker. You know, I'm not suggesting as I said earlier when I started, I didn't say that murders should be ignored or that we can ignore the fact that there are always a certain number of murders are taking place in a society. And I imagine it will wax or wane with the conditions of the time, the kind of times one lives in, just as suicides wax

and wane with the conditions under which people live.

So that I recognize it's there. I don't believe for one moment that if it's reintroduced that the numbers of murders will decline. I do believe that a lot of people are just going to say, I feel better for it. Good, he did it; let's do it to him, that sort of retribution. But, as I say, I don't think it will decline at all. I can appreciate that something has to be done with those people, and if I understood some of the members here, they were saying that imprisonment is not sufficient because after two or three years they are let off on good behaviour. I would agree that that is where we should look; that if in fact a murder has been committed I agree that unless it's a blatant case of manslaughter, not murder, that there should be great care taken as to who is permitted out on parole and who isn't put out on parole, that people should be incarcerated until there is absolutely no doubt that they cannot . . . —(Interjection)— Castration won't stop you from pulling a trigger. That there should be no doubt that in fact the murder will not be committed again.

And you know the suggestion that somehow once a murderer always a murderer isn't so. I think, again, statistics will show that the vast, vast majority of cases of . . . murders were done as a result of some, as I say, personal relationship between the person who is murdered and the person that did the murdering, whether family reasons, marital reasons, economic reasons or what have you.

And I would agree that people once incarcerated must be kept in incarceration. And I won't be moved by the argument, well, look at all the money it costs to keep them incarcerated, because on that same basis why don't we do more about, generally, anyone who breaks a law because it does cost a lot of money to incarcerate people. I think the figure was given a few weeks ago, during Corrections, in the Headingley Jail, something like, what was it, \$12,000 a year or \$20,000 a year, I forget. It is very expensive and if you're going to do it for financial reasons then maybe all our laws are really too mild. Maybe we should eliminate anyone who breaks our laws. I know people will say, "That's terrible", and I would agree; that would be impossible. That would be horrendous, and nobody could support that. But we stop and we make a distinction between murder, the taking of a life, and any other crime.

So if they're talking in terms of keeping somebody away from society to protect society, I'll agree. I think my colleague made reference to the Leopold and Loeb case, where he mentioned that one of the young men was killed in the jail itself and the other one was released. Yes, he was released many, many years later and he is still living and —(Interjection)— Or he has maybe just recently passed away — but he lived very quietly in his declining years, I don't know what he was trained to do but I gather he had some skills and he worked at it.

To have said, well, why bother, why not have killed him in the initial instance? That is an argument, but it's an argument that I fear entraps us, entraps society, because if society thinks in killing, in taking a life, then I think it reflects on the society. It reflects on our entire attitude towards life. It reflects on our entire attitude towards those who don't fit into the mainstream of life. And as I indicated earlier, we're not all identical we know that everyone of us in our own way is different, we have different ideas and different values, and there are certain basis assumptions but within those there are broad differences. And I fear a society which says, we have established a law "Thou shalt not kill", and we will pursue that and we will eliminate anyone who breaches that law. I am afraid that with that kind of a society the hope of mankind that it becomes civilized; that killing for the sake of killing is eliminated from people's minds, thoughts, urges; that so long as the state sanctions killing then killing will always take place, whether it's legal killing by the state, whether it's illegal killing in the heat of passion through the fear, as I say, of someone who is holding up, who is in the middle of a hold-up, panics and proceeds to fire a gun which then kills somebody.

Those killings cannot be countenanced in our society, and every effort has to be done to remove that person from society, just as we remove people from society for many reasons. And if we were arguing here that in fact these people should be removed from society for more than just the four or five or six years until they earn parole, I think I might concur because I know that our abilities to analyse why are still very, very inadequate. The psychiatrists, the medical profession, the scientists don't know to this day what it is and why it is that one person will do something that another will not. They don't really know.

And so I would agree that society has to be protected. Fine, but to protect society by taking someone else's life I don't think will protect society. I think that murders will continue, as they have been, and as they are. And as I say, in countries where they are even more severe than we are there is no dearth of murders; there is no dearth of violence; there is even more violence than there is here because it's almost accepted as part of their culture. And surely in this society, achieving the maturity that we have, the education that we have, the standard, our concept of life that we have, surely the objective has to be to move more and more towards the idea that the taking of a human life is not acceptable, that society has to be protected, in which case a person has to

be removed from that society so that he is not a danger to society and he is not a danger to himself. But to go the route that's being proposed here that society must go back to the eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth is just a beginning, I feel, of going all the way back.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes.

MR. GREEN: Thank you. It's going all the way back to a point where I think the next step would be the reintroduction — because I think this Resolution basically speaks about prison guards and police —(Interjection)— Or this is all-encompassing, I see; this doesn't even talk about prison guards and police; this is just anyone. In other words, if there is first degree murder then that person shall be penalized by hanging or by whatever it is, that Section 218(1) of the Criminal Code be amended to provide the death penalty upon conviction for first degree murder. So therefore they're simply saying if you kill you will be killed. It is as simple as that. It's a straight proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I think this would be a backward step. Of course, we mustn't lose fact of something else, that this is a provincial Legislature. We're talking about something that this House really cannot do. It hasn't got the legal power to do, any power to do; it's entirely a federal matter and the federal parliament did vote and they may vote again at some future time, I don't know. But they voted, and obviously the majority voted in favour of the present law that exists today. And it's my recollection that all the three Leaders of all three Parties all supported abolition — I may be wrong in that. —(Interjection)— I'm true, okay, if it's true that is true.

So really to say to all these people who voted for abolition and against capital punishment, you are all dunderheads; you don't know what you're doing; you're stupid; you're assinine; listen to the people because the people want it.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes when you accept public office you have to accept that you have to assume a leadership position and simply not be a puppet to people's emotions, that you don't live by referendum. Even members of the Opposition — I know the House Leader, in particular is a man who believes that you do not govern by referendum. And, Mr. Speaker, if I had to vote every time the way the majority of my constituents voted on every issue I wouldn't be in this House; I would have been voted out long ago, to the Minister of Highways. I have taken positions, based on my intelligence, my concept, my idea, and I have said to the public, that's it; I believe in this; I'm here to represent you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up. The hour being 5:30, Private Members' Hour is over. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways, that the House do now adjourn. Committee of Supply will be meeting both here in the Chamber and in Room 254.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Tuesday afternoon.