

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 24, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 75 students of Grade 9 standing of the Isaac Newton School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Ferens, Mr. Zilkie and Mrs. Palley. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Burrows, the Minister of Colleges, Universities and Education. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable First Minister.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere) introduced Bill No. 55, The Centennial Projects Tax Status Act.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q. C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. It relates to the statement made yesterday concerning the granting of funds by the Province to the business group who were attempting to purchase the Jets so that it would remain in Manitoba. I wonder if he can indicate, at this time, the reasons for what appears to be a withdrawal of an offer or a commitment by the government to the businessmen that money would be available for them if they were to proceed on an attempt to purchase the Jets from the present owners.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there may well be a misconception on that point. In the discussions previously, all we had were very preliminary and very exploratory discussions. I did not bring the matter for consideration of Cabinet until late last week and therefore no commitment could have been given other than an indication of the nature of the proposal that I was prepared to bring to the Executive Council.

MR. SPIVAK: One other question of the First Minister. Then I take it the position of the government is that there was never a commitment given to the business group that the government would be prepared to provide an interest-free loan of \$300,000.

MR. SCHREYER: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there could not have been a commitment by the government since the government did not deliberate on the matter. What I indicated was that the proposal, when it was received, would be brought forward for consideration and I have indicated in the letter that I sent to the chairman of the group, the primary reasons why we do not feel that it's in the province's interest or in the sphere of obligation of the province at this time.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, by way of another question to the First Minister. I wonder if he would be in a position or be prepared at this time to table the correspondence between the businessmen's group and his reply in the House, so that we are at least in a position to understand the apparent negotiations that were taking place prior to the formal announcement yesterday.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd be prepared to table whatever communication exists on file, and I might add that it would be, however, not in the nature of negotiations since all we had were very preliminary discussions.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the First Minister another question dealing with another matter, and it relates again to a statement made yesterday with respect to the impending strike at the Health Sciences Centre. I wonder if he can inform the House at this time why all major City of Winnipeg hospitals have curtailed their elective surgery.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of question which certainly would not be proper for me to answer, certainly not without taking the matter as notice in order for

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER Cont'd) it to be checked specifically. I would refer it to my colleague the Minister of Health in the event that he may be able to provide some degree of answer at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, because of the possibility, however remote, that in fact there may be a strike at April 30th, the hospitals in the Winnipeg region which are formed into a council - and this is an existing council - realizing that this may come about, are taking the obvious necessary steps of concern for people who may be affected and are therefore working in concert and in consultation with each other, as I understand it, to assure that in the event that a work stoppage does come about, that those who must have medical care will be provided medical care, and these are the discussions that are taking place at the present time.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, a supplementary question, I guess, to the First Minister or rather the Minister of Health and Social Development, relating to the first question. I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to indicate at what point the government will be prepared to enter into this matter in view of the fact that the impending work stoppage has already affected the way in which health care is being provided and hospital services are being provided in the City of Winnipeg at the present time.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the only thing I would indicate is that in matters of this kind contingency plans are desirable for the simple reason that contingency plans are desirable, and that I certainly would not lend myself to any of those who would try to advance the suggestion that there may well be a work stoppage or a strike. If that happens that is one thing, but to aid and abet the probability of that happening, is something which we will not knowingly lend ourselves as party to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Then I wonder if the position of the government or the First Minister can confirm that in his opinion, or the government's opinion, whether it is the government's belief that there is really no work stoppage at the present time. Is it not a fact that there is a work stoppage with respect to the operation of the City of Winnipeg hospitals?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there has been no indication brought to the attention of the government and my colleagues that that is the case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question's to the First Minister relating to answers given with respect to this government's announcement on the loan to the Winnipeg Jets. Is it now then the government's position that the subject matter is closed, or is the government prepared to continue negotiations to make counter proposals to the group seeking to save the Jets from leaving?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly I would not want to say that the subject is closed, but on the other hand I would not want to create any, or be the cause of any false hope as to the circumstances under which the province would see fit to become involved financially in the acquisition of this particular professional team; and what complicates the matter further is that there are, there is at least one other community in the province where a professional team is being purchased, semi-professional, and that is being dealt with and necessary moneys raised on strictly a community basis. We have to be aware of precedents elsewhere in this province of Manitoba.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Was it a fact that the proposal made to the government did not require the government to subsidize subsequent losses, but rather had a discretionary provision to that effect, and that the only commitment of the government was a loan, an interest-free loan of \$300,000, and not a commitment to share future losses?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that may well be a position or an indication that the group may wish to bring forward, but certainly in the discussions previously there was -- in the last discussion previously there was certainly full reference to annual deficit and the basis for the handling of that deficit, which did involve the community, the city and the province.

MR. ASPER: Has the First Minister examined the arrangement in writing between the City of Winnipeg and the Jets wherein it was provided . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. ASPER: Well Mr. Speaker, I'll put it another way. Has the First Minister had an opportunity to examine the written documents involving the Province, the City and the Jets, wherein the reference is made to a permissive rather than a mandatory kind of annual support, should there be any further deficits.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it was not put forward as something that was permissive or an invitation to share since that would, it seems to me, remove the whole point of discussion in the first place. Nothing definitive is settled on the basis of an invitation to consider "possibly," maybe, sharing some deficit at some future time. I have not received a copy of any written documents as between the City and this group and accordingly I will inquire as to the possibility of obtaining same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a final supplementary. Could the First Minister confirm or correct the statement that the annual amount of revenue loss to the City and the Province particularly, the Province mainly, should the Jets move out, is approximately three times the amount of the loan?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The question's hypothetical.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member wish to rephrase it?

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Could the First Minister indicate how much tax revenue currently in income tax, sales tax and amusement tax, comes to this Province of Manitoba from the presence of the Jets in Winnipeg?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, those figures have been roughly guesstimated by those who have discussed the matter with us and I, however, would not want to put on the public record a figure which has not been specifically arrived at but is only being guesstimated. In any case, whatever the outcome of that particular aspect, I would have to say that whatever the province does will have to be consistent in terms of availability of treatment to other communities in the province that may be considering or actually carrying out similar purchases of professional or semi-professional sporting teams.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the Minister confirm that contingency plans are to close down the Rehab Centre due to the pending strike?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot confirm that. As I indicated in my earlier remarks, the Health Sciences Centre, knowing that there may be a stoppage, is discussing the matter with other hospitals and trying to arrange for services for those who will be in need, but I'm not aware of the closing down of the facility or a curtailment.

MR. BROWN: A supplementary question to the same Minister. Can the Minister confirm that in order to facilitate evacuation of the Rehab Centre contingency plans are being set up for early discharge of patients?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, certainly this is a possibility that the Health Sciences Centre Board would have to deal with if in fact a strike does occur. There'll have to be patients transferred elsewhere as those patients need care and I would assume that the hospital board is responsible enough to concern itself with that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. I wonder if the Minister of Labour would consider personally entering into the negotiations at the Health Sciences Centre to help avert the strike in view of the circumstances that it appears that preparations are undertaken that there will be a strike.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Really, Mr. Speaker, the only way I can answer that question is that I have personally entered into them by delegating certain responsibilities to members of the Department of Labour staff, namely the conciliation officers, the director of the conciliation officers and labour relations. And if it was deemed advisable or a request was made by the parties concerned for a personal input into discussions I'd be more than pleased to accommodate them to that degree, I would possibly become personally engaged. But I have confidence in the way negotiations are going on at the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAULLEY Cont'd) present time as I have indicated to the House.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Can the Minister give us a report or report to the House from his staff, as is there any progress being made at all or can he give us some information?

MR. PAULLEY: Well all I can answer, Mr. Chairman, I haven't any firm documentation that I can give to the House except to say that the parties are talking and while parties are talking insofar as their differences there is a chance that they will be resolved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thanks Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services. In view of recent statements by the Manitoba Milk Producers what action has the Minister's department taken to ensure that there will continue to be an adequate supply of fluid milk in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the possibility of a shortage of milk within the Province of Manitoba is a great concern to the department but at the same time I don't think that the Department of Consumer Affairs can impose limitations on producers within the province or requirements on the producers of the province to supply milk if in fact those producers wish to withhold milk.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. In view of the present flood conditions can the Minister tell us whether officials of his department and the Water Resources Branch had undertaken in the last 12 months a review of the water control systems in the Interlake and in the Souris River Basin and the Red River Basin to determine their adequacy or their efficacy to meet the kind of flood conditions that we're not facing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Well, Mr. Speaker, there are both internal studies and interprovincial studies with respect to various water control facilities, whether they be for reservoir purposes, for flood purposes, irrigation purposes or purposes which I have not been able to mention. I do not think that there is a specific study relative to flood conditions such as have now resulted, and I think that it's safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain flood conditions which are just beyond economic feasibility of dealing with. For instance, one of the problems this year, Mr. Speaker, had nothing to do with river flows, had to do with the amount of snow on the land and then the fact that drainage ditches did not unfreeze in time to catch the water that would normally flow into these ditches.

However, I do tell the honourable member that there are studies, that the implacement of facilities is always done on a priority basis and on a cost-benefit assessment. There are certain facilities that are sort of put on a shelf and brought in as soon as the agreements are made as between the federal and provincial governments for their installation. That is a continuing procedure.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. In view of his answer to that question can the Minister tell us whether the recommendations or proposals for new water control measures which were put on the shelf are now being taken off the shelf and being implemented or plan to be implemented, or is the government now prepared to provide a major review of water control systems in those areas with a view to providing major new capital works in the water control area?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the various speculated or imagined programs, or programs that are devised that can have certain works are not dealt with until there is a considered priority for dealing with them based on cost-benefit studies. And I have to tell the honourable member that because a flood may occur which may cause a certain amount of damage does not mean that the province immediately installs a facility to deal with that flood. There is then an assessment as to the possible damage, the possible cost of the facility and it's done on a cost-benefit basis. It is not the fact that one immediately builds every possible program that can deal with flood amelioration because there happens to be a flood.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister then tell us that

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. AXWORTHY Cont'd) . . . what he is saying is that there presently are measures that would provide remedy to the flood problem and that if we receive heavy snows next year we can't necessarily expect the government to introduce them because of cost-benefit reasons? And in that respect I would ask him specifically whether he is now prepared to pursue directly or renew his pursuit of the feasibility studies of the Souris Basin that were undertaken with the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we have been sending urgent letters to the Minister of Environment Canada relative to the Souris Basin study and the Minister of Environment Canada has thus far not contributed to this program. And I have to tell the honourable member that it is a fact that there can be certain things done for floods which the province of Manitoba will not do. It is possible to extend the Red River Diversion all the way from here to the American border and that will have effect on ameliorating some floods, but it would not make financial sense to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just would have one final supplementary. Is the Minister prepared to table in this House some of the studies and the proposed recommendations so that this House would be able to assess what the cost factors are and make some judgement in relation to whether they would be a priority or whether they are affordable under the present budget?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, those various studies have been dealt with from year to year in this House. They are not a secret. The Honourable Member for Pembina has dealt with the Pembilier Dam which has certain flood benefits. The Vermilion Dam is one that has been dealt with, the Patterson Dam is one that has been dealt with, the Shellmouth Dam, the Pleasant Valley Dam. All of these programs have various types of benefits and I am not able to say, Mr. Speaker, that each one of them has a flood control benefit, but the cost-benefit studies and the consideration of those programs are all then dealt with with the Federal Government which has a 50-50 sharing agreement when they feel that an installation should take place, and they have all been dealt with as part of the Estimates of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources from year to year, and I assume if we get to that department this year they will be dealt with on the same basis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable First Minister, and I would like to thank him for his personal call to the St. Norbert flood site overnight. Can the First Minister suggest a recourse of action that a flood stricken municipality might be able to take in a localized emergency when a municipality feels that its budget for purchase of flood-fighting equipment is already exhausted?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how one can answer a question that really is very generalized in terms of the information it seeks. The Manitoba Flood Fighting Plan exists in practically unrevised form today as it has existed for quite a number of years. At the time of the March - sometime in March when the flood forecasts at that time of the year are brought forward the procedure is for the representatives of the Water Control Branch and Emergency Measures Organizations to meet with local municipal authorities to explain to them and indicate to them the probability of flooding and the stage levels of flooding. The local authorities are then advised that until a state of emergency is declared that the municipalities are responsible for taking the preliminary steps of preparedness for flood fighting, and they are further advised that in the event that their costs prove to be very high that there will be financial support by senior government.

I might indicate that many municipalities, if not most municipalities did take appropriate preliminary steps to prepare for flood fighting and some did not. In any case, all that can be done at this point in time is to reassess the Manitoba Flood Fight Plan to ascertain whether any change in procedures would be advisable in the future.

MR. SHERMAN: I thank the First Minister for his information, Mr. Speaker, but could he advise whether in the case of a sudden and localized emergency in any flood stricken municipality, an unpredictable overnight emergency requiring the obtaining of additional equipment in a hurry, can be handled through any line of authority to his office or to the province rather than having to go through a municipal authority which at that point may

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SHERMAN Cont'd) either be unreachable or may feel that its budget is exhausted?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry is referring to the procedure that is followed after a limited state of emergency is declared and an emergency order is approved, then I would indicate that it is open to the Emergency Measures Organization to, preferably to consult with local authorities of course and also to liaise with the Canadian Forces so as to take whatever steps are deemed to be necessary in the circumstances.

Now, as a case in point in the area that my honourable friend is referring to, there was a substantial supply of sandbags provided, I believe some 85,000, and substantial quantities of sand. Whether or not this got used in the most effective manner possible is something that I'm unable to answer at this time. But I believe it's true to say that the City of Winnipeg had 200,000 sandbags available, and the Rural Municipality of Richot some 85,000 sandbags more than a week ago.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the House Leader. I wonder if he could advise or give an indication when the Committee of Municipal Affairs will be called?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, at the moment I can't recall legislation being referred to that committee. It may be that I'm not correct, but I was thinking of calling committees relative to legislation after we had dealt with the administrative committees. If there is a particular urgency then we've accommodated that as we did with the Law Society Act. If the honourable member has an urgency I suppose he will let me know about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the First Minister, and it's basically for clarification. The areas that are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Northern Affairs, do they qualify for the same benefits as the other municipalities, the problems where property damage or flooding at the same - the areas that come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Northern Affairs, are they entitled to the same benefits as the rest of the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the matter is handled by means of designation through the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management, Water Control Branch, of those watersheds that were according to local advice and reports and according to photographs obtained from earth sensing equipment, earth satellites, aerial photographs, etc. etc., the designation of those watersheds that were deemed to be in a state of flood in any given year and that any municipality, local government units and individuals suffering property damage in declared watershed flood areas are eligible under that formula.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the First Minister. Could he indicate in terms of weeks or days or months when the compensation formula to flood victims will be settled and perhaps presumably made public, and the first claims will be in a position to be processed by the Compensation Review Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there's only slight variation in that in terms of past practice. I recall for example - I don't know why I recall but I happen to recall that in 1970 this Order-in-Council activating the flood assessment mechanism was in the latter part of May; in 1969 it was mid July and in '66 it was earlier than July. So all I can say is that it would seem quite logical to suppose some time between the middle of May and the end of June is when it will be open to carry out its function. And frankly I don't think that before the middle of May it will be all that feasible for it to proceed in any case, since really it requires the full abatement of flood waters before proper assessment can take place.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, given the First Minister's answer, I wonder if he has considered or is willing to consider establishing some mechanism to handle claims immediately in cases of hardship for loans, if not grants, to permit those farmers who have suffered property damage to be able to get on to the land and do their planting at a time prior to the board meeting to settle damage which may take several months?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose there are permutations and combinations to every problem. Insofar as agricultural damage is concerned I would say that the degree of damage attributable to flooding is in a different dimension than is the structural damage involved in the cases of those communities that are inundated.

If we're talking about the loss of livestock or seed grain, that's one tangible. If one is talking in terms of delayed seeding operations, there's no way that can be measured in a compensatable way at this time. I think that those familiar with agriculture would agree that one thing that farmers are very accustomed to doing, Sir, is to arrange for lines of credit or for credit in order to take them through as interim period, and of course the compensation formula such as it exists will be activated and operational so as to bring them results by summer or fall. There may have to be reliance on interim credit I don't deny that fact.

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker, on a related subject. Could he indicate to the House whether in advance of the flood, any material was distributed by any agency of government to the homes of people in the general areas expected to be flooded dealing with safety measures and precautionary steps that were recommended by government to protect life and property should a flood occur. And if so, would he table that material.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is a question to which there is no standard answer. As I indicated earlier today, in the interface and the bringing forward of flood forecast reports and information by Water Resources Branch personnel and Emo personnel to local municipalities, starting in March, after the 20th of March, some municipalities did subsequently proceed to make arrangements for the obtaining of sandbags and fill material. And as a case in point, I think it could be said that the community of Carman for example, did make all reasonable preparatory steps, so the matter was looked after there as well as could be looked after in the light of the flow conditions on the Boyne River.

The City of Winnipeg for example, did take steps to obtain 200,000 sandbags with additional amounts on standby if necessary. The R. M. of Richot did take steps to obtain 85,000 sandbags. These were delivered. So that preliminary steps were taken in accordance with the flood fight plan.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I may have not made my question clear or the First Minister may not have heard the portent of it. I wasn't speaking of the municipal governments but the individuals, and the kind of information I'm speaking of is not sandbagging but health information, the provision of radios, pure drinking water to be placed on the second floor - the usual kind of flood protection information that's given individuals who may be hit.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a matter which is under the Manitoba Flood Fight Plan, remains with the discretion and judgment of local government authority and thus far I've not received any indication that there has been any serious or any significant lacking insofar as local government authorities' ability to liaise with its citizenry is concerned. I'm not aware of any shortage of drinking water. I'm not aware that there was a blackout of communications by the normal use of telephone, matters have not come to that stage, nor was there any reason to suppose that there would be looting and none has taken place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to redirect the question to the First Minister, a question I asked the other day, and wonder if he'd now be able to provide for the House the criteria on which the disaster funds would be allocated. I asked him this question the other day. He said he would undertake to find out what that criteria was so that it could be placed on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'll try to have that information for the honourable member by Friday, perhaps tomorrow, but not later than Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Thanks Mr. Speaker. My question's for the First Minister. When will the Committee that is to deal with the flood damage be established?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would estimate that it will be formally established by formal instrument either next Wednesday or the Wednesday following.

MR. HENDERSON: I have a supplementary question. Should people that have received

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. HENDERSON Cont'd) damage go ahead with the repairs before they've been contacted by this Committee?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, I would think so, Mr. Speaker. If there is urgency of repair, and in most cases that too becomes a matter of degree, that repair should take place and the invoices should be kept - some record of the amount of repair materials and costs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Could he explain to the House the reason for a \$65,700 twelve month holdback to Me Ke Se Construction for winter road construction during the 1972-73 period?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): One of my colleagues suggested, because they didn't want to buy any votes. Mr. Speaker, that's in accordance with the contract that we had with the Me Ke Se Construction Company, that a holdback is made until all their commitments have been made in regard to that contract. It's a normal procedure.

MR. MOUG: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister. What can possibly go wrong with the roads after they disappear with the spring thaw?

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, either the member doesn't understand or - I won't say anything else. It's not a matter of whether the road is there or not, it's a matter of in fact whether the company has met all its legal obligations before it can receive final payment from the province.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. I wonder if the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MINAKER: Can the Minister confirm that the Forestry Complex at The Pas is not assessed in the standard assessment for property taxes by - correction - by use of standard taxation formula for a Crown Corporation for the Town of The Pas? Is it the standard assessment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there was an agreement between the Provincial Government - rather the Town of The Pas and the Complex, I believe, ratified by legislation. Well I believe it was ratified by legislation in this House, I could be wrong about that, whereby there was a special assessment for this particular Complex; in view of the fact that it was situated some miles north of The Pas there was a special tax allowance made to that Complex. I believe that three of the facilities are assessed in the normal way. That doesn't mean much of an assessment for Bertram because if it was assessed for the equipment that it got the Town of The Pas would have to buy it for taxes and then have the same responsibility for it as anybody else.

The Churchill Forest, the pulp mill does have a special assessment, it has paid more than that assessment and it is now being considered as to whether it should pay still more in light of the policy that this government has made relative to other Crown installations, that under this government for the first time all Crown installations, government owned property was made to pay its full assessment. I believe that is a change that was instituted after the change of government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James. Order please.

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the First Minister. I wonder can the Minister confirm that he has received a letter from the Mayor of The Pas requesting that the Forestry Complex be reassessed in line with the other Crown Corporations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have received not only this year but last year, and year before, communications from the Town of The Pas indicating their great dissatisfaction with the tax agreement that was entered into between the Town of The Pas and CFI Complex in 1968, and asking for assessment or for reassessment - in effect for a departure from the agreement to take place. In the discussion to date what has been agreed to by the Board of the CFI Complex was to make certain grants or payments in lieu of taxes so as to bring the total amount actually paid to The Town of The Pas very much closer to full taxes

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER Cont'd) were it normally assessable and were the agreement not to have existed at all. And that process of adjusting is continuing, and I might express the optimism that within the year it may be possible to de facto, to be at virtually full normal taxation levels.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General advise the House whether the Human Rights Commission is still functioning?

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

MR. SHERMAN: I'll rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Attorney-General advise the House whether the Human Rights Commission of this province is still reachable in terms of the public of this province, and is still responding to inquiries made of it from the public?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I don't know the motivation behind the question but the answer ought to be self obvious.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In view of the fact that there have been some complaints that I have received of inquiries directed to the Commission that have not received any response, I'd be interested in what answer the Attorney-General thinks is obvious.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would think that the common sense thing to do if the honourable member **does** have inquiries which have been made of the Human Rights Commission and they have not received a response, that he provide me with the particulars of the unanswered inquiries and I will certainly ascertain as to reasons why those inquiries have not been responded to by the Commission. I certainly have received no indication that there are any unanswered inquiries directed towards the Human Rights Commission.

MR. SHERMAN: Well a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Attorney-General take my questions as notice of that situation and investigate the machinery for responding to inquiries made of the Human Rights Commission by Manitobans.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be much more important and worthwhile if the honourable member rather than asking questions in general would draw to my particular attention any specific inquiries which had been made of the Human Rights Commission which have gone unanswered. If there are one or more then I would appreciate receiving that information and the honourable member can rest assured that I will find out whether or not there is any legitimate reason for the lack of response that he's referring to.

MR. SHERMAN: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm prepared to do that but that brings me back to my first question. Before I can do that I have to ask the Attorney-General whether the Human Rights Commission is still functioning?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question's to the Attorney-General. I wonder if he can indicate whether there have been changes made in the composition of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been an Order-in-Council which has been processed in fact today by the Cabinet which I hear from the House Leader likely has not yet been signed by the Lieutenant-Governor, but it in fact reappoints many of the present members of the Commission and appoints some new members to the Commission.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Attorney-General would indicate to the House who the new appointments are and who they are replacing?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that will be by way of Order-in-Council. I would think the Order-in-Council would be available to the Leader of the Opposition tomorrow for his perusal, once it's received the signature of the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney-General. Is it the government's position that the request by this House to determine who will make up the composition of the Human Rights Commission, Cabinet having arrived at a decision, is not going to be made available in this House at this time and we have to . . . Well then I ask the Honourable Attorney-General can he indicate to the House who are the new appointees to the Human Rights

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) Commission and who do they replace ?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. On a strict interpretation of questions which are asked in this House, which I know allowance is made for, the honourable member should not be permitted to ask a question, because the information is available to him in a way which is readily available and my understanding of questions is that questions may be asked to determine information which is not otherwise readily available. However, I'm not suggesting that we argue . . . a strict interpretation but I think that the honourable member's observation that the Minister has in some way not made himself responsible to the House, reflects on his own attitude in asking a question which is not strictly speaking, a question before the Orders of the Day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: There is also a very practical reason why I would not be in a position to effectively confirm any appointments as one of the appointments is being confirmed prior to signature by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

MR. SPIVAK: I have another question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he can indicate to the House the last meeting, official meeting of the Board of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, it may be that the Attorney-General may not be in a position to indicate that directly but I wonder if he would be prepared to take as notice and inform the House of the last meeting of the Human Rights Commission, that is of the Board of the Human Rights Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection in doing that. Let me advise the Leader of the Opposition that insofar as reappointments of board members are concerned, consideration was given not only to the contribution that individual members had made, but primarily the primary concern is to attendance of board members. I think it is important that members when selected to sit on boards that their attendance record be more than adequate, more than fifty percent, and my basis for any changes in respect to that Commission was based upon attendance or lack of attendance at Commission meetings.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer of the Attorney-General, the comment just made by him, then he would be in a position . . . I wonder if he could inform the House when the last meeting of the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission took place ?

MR. PAWLEY: I'll take that - certainly be pleased to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed to Orders of the Day I would like to make two announcements. One is in respect to the photographs. Due to technical difficulties which the members saw and also we had nine members missing that day who apparently didn't deem it necessary to be here we'll have to have another day. Now --(Interjection)-- fine, if the members don't want it that's okay with me too. The other item is that tomorrow we will have the pleasure of having His Excellency The Governor-General here. He will be coming in approximately 10 minutes after the opening, so therefore we will just go through the first items before we get to questions of the day, then we'll recess; we'll have him for about 10 minutes I believe and he'll leave, then we can carry on with the remainder of the business. So I would like to ask all members to make an attempt to be on time tomorrow.

The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was rising on a different matter, Sir, but since you've raised it and since there will be a degree of ceremony in connection with tomorrow afternoon's sitting, at least during the time of the presence of the Governor-General, that it may be advisable to have the photograph problem looked after at 2:15 or 2:20 and thus combine the matter. It may commend itself to your attention, Sir.

The reason I was rising in my place, Sir, was really to amplify on one question that I answered, on one answer that I gave and to correct another.

In answer to the Honourable Member for St. James, I indicated that I was indeed in receipt of communication from the Town of The Pas in which they expressed their great displeasure with the local municipal tax agreement between the Town of The Pas and CFI. I

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER Cont'd) indicated that that agreement was signed in 1968. I find the statutes indicate that it was signed in 1966. Be that as it may, Sir, we have proceeded to make adjustments upward so as to bring it closer to normal taxation, if normal criteria and assessment were applied.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, is to reply in further amplification to the Member for Pembina that in the case of those who are living in what is obviously a watershed that has been afflicted by flooding, that the common sense way to proceed in the case of repairs that simply must be done and which must be done just as soon as is possible to be done, would be for those persons to carry out set repairs and to keep a formal record or receipt or invoice, which would then be something that would be submittable to the flood damage assesment board.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet I might indicate to honourable members that in the light of conditions over the evening and earlier this morning that it is now fully expected that along all the communities in the upper Red River Valley in Manitoba that the water levels will be approximately $\frac{1}{2}$ foot to 1 foot below the 1966 crest stage. Which is by the way, Sir, just about exactly right on in terms of the forecast.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, speaking on part of the same topic that the First Minister spoke on I'd like to state that we had . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question period now. No statements. I'm sorry. The Honourable member will have to get leave of the House if he wishes to make a statement. Does the honourable member have leave? Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON: Well thank you very much. What I would like to comment on is that you were talking about taking a photo again tomorrow. We have taken one photo now in which there was five missing. There was adequate notice sent out and we had eight missing. Now I think there'll be just as many maybe missing tomorrow and I think we should dispense with that part of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may rise on a question of privilege. Yesterday I was asked a question or two by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and in my remarks I referred to a question that was directed to the radio program that was referred to by myself and I referred to a councillor of the City of Winnipeg and went on to say that she should have her head examined. I did not name that particular councillor, Mr. Speaker. I do find, however, that reference was made in one of the papers today, one Councillor June Westbury. I have been in touch with that honourable lady, I've had clarification of the exchange between the station and her in reference to the payment of moneys to welfare recipients. Her participation was to inform the station that there is a payment under the collective agreement with the City of Winnipeg for casual labour somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$3.67 I believe.

I indicated to Councillor June Westbury that if I have caused here any inconvenience I apologize to her for so doing. She appreciates the fact, Mr. Speaker, that each of us agree that where welfare recipients are put in a job achieving what is our mutual desire that they should be taken off of the roles and receive payment for their input in the work, as they are doing at the present time under a collective agreement. I thought I should explain this to the House now that an individual is referred to and want to repeat, I had no intention of causing any embarrassment to her and she has accepted in full the results of our conversation this morning.

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

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is an Address for Paper and Order for Return that have to be dealt with and then we would want to proceed with the adjourned debates on second reading in the order in which they appear on the order paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River:

THAT a humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence between members and officials of the Government of Manitoba, and members and officials of the Government of Canada respecting the question of the legality, under the Criminal Code of Canada, of the Manitoba Golden Lotteries.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, certainly there is no objection to concurring with this Address for Paper, subject of course to the usual caveat insofar as approval by the other level of government that is involved.

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye:

THAT an Order of the House do issue for Return showing the total amount of monies paid out to The Pas Forestry Complex or their Receiver from May 8, 1972 to April 19, 1974 by:

1. M.D.C.
2. C.E.D.F.
3. Government of Canada.

MOTION presented and carried.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - BILL NO. 27

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 27. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to take much longer. I just feel that the comments I made last evening can be summarized fairly quickly. That is that the apprehension that we feel on this side may be allayed in committee. It may be that the Minister will make statements that indicate that our concerns are unwarranted or, Mr. Speaker, alternatively those who come to committee to present contrary views to those contained in the bill may be able to persuade the Minister that he has sufficient ammunition to go back to his colleagues in Alberta, Saskatchewan and say to them that he is unable to obtain approval for the plan at this particular time and perhaps we will rediscuss it in a year or two. All of which would be extremely helpful to the local lotteries. And, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons we take a strong apprehensive position on the bill is in order to perhaps arm the Minister and fortify him in his deliberations and his negotiations with those other provinces, in the hope that perhaps, just on the off-chance, Mr. Speaker, that he has not been able to negotiate strongly or from a position of strength with those other provinces, we wish to add some fibre and some muscle to the argument that says that we want the position of Golden Sweepstakes and other Manitoba lotteries protected.

Mr. Speaker, overnight I reflected on a couple of points in the debate, one of which was that perhaps we are doing the Minister an injustice, perhaps he is not the author of this mess. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, he inherited it from that other Minister, the former Minister, Mr. Desjardin, because, Mr. Speaker, I can't believe readily that the present Minister of Tourism and Cultural Affairs would willingly or under sound advice make this kind of an arrangement, the kind of arrangement we suspect has been made. And which has not been denied, Mr. Speaker.

The other thing I reflected about, Mr. Speaker, was why is it that we feel so constrained to debate on an issue like this. I searched for several hours last night and this morning, why in my own mind, why I feel so strongly about it, and I concluded that the main reason . . . I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that I was exercised last evening and I tried to determine why and it's this. Because we on this side have a very deep suspicion that we never get all the facts. That we are not getting all the facts on this bill. And I explained why last evening. I said that I didn't like being told softly and gently that this was permissive legislation and it was in case we should make a deal and perhaps we need some machinery to make a deal, but that over the period of weeks I became convinced as many others on this side have become convinced

BILL 27

(MR. ASPER Cont'd) that there is a deal and that deal will work to the detriment of our own lotteries which have been so successful.

And a classic example of why we feel that apprehension and why our frustration comes to the surface as mine certainly did last evening, is that only last evening the First Minister announced that his government would make no offer of financial aid to keep the Winnipeg Jets in Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, rightly or wrongly we were lead to believe, been given the impression, all of us I believe on this side, I think all of the public of Manitoba, that something was being done by the provincial government to join the group of concerned Manitobans who didn't want to see the Jets potentially move out of the province. And then last night we were told that this was off. So that's why, Mr. Speaker, often we regard government action or government statements of what they intend with some apprehension because the history has shown that they are not always carried out.

In summary on that aspect, Mr. Speaker, we believe that certainly interprovincial co-operation is valid, interprovincial setting of standards and so on is valid, but we don't know what deal has been made and we do not want to pass the legislation as a blank cheque where the Minister will in the off-season commit us to some action or inaction or compromise of the Golden Sweepstakes Lottery that would effect the organizations who depend almost solely on that as a source of income for the good work they do in this community.

Mr. Speaker, the Lotteries Commission last year was able to grant I believe to each community committee in Winnipeg approximately \$15,000 for local sports and recreation. If the Minister will come to committee and indicate that he will, as the Finance Minister made the Finance Minister of Canada do in the tax discussions, negotiations on equalization, if the Minister will come to committee and guarantee to those organizations the same revenue that they have had up to now, never mind growth - although the Minister of Finance insisted that the Minister of Finance of Canada guarantee to him the same rate of growth of revenue - then, Mr. Speaker, we would find it far more acceptable to vote for the bill. And we'll wait for the Minister in committee. Perhaps he may say those things, perhaps he may say to the community committees that built the sports centres, the recreation centres, that we'll guarantee you the same \$15,000 you got last year; or Mr. Speaker, to the St. Paul's College or the St. Boniface Hockey team and to the other organizations that rely, the Legion, for their community works. If there is some underwriting, some assurance then we will be less apprehensive about the bill. Because we believe as we said last night, that for reasons that we don't know, that the Minister was driven into a bad bargain, and so, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the debate in this Chamber will assist the Minister in going back to his colleagues to get a better deal. If not then, Mr. Speaker, if there is a compromise of Manitoba's prowess in this field, it's primacy in this field, then what we're being asked to do is as unlikely to happen as if the state of Arizona, the state of Oregon came to Nevada and said, I can remember 20 years ago when you were a desert and I see all these hospitals and I see these schools and I see all these magnificent rises in your standard of living and how did you get it. And the government of Nevada would say we got it through the legalization of a certain form of gambling which we police very carefully and so on. And Arizona would say, Gee let's share that. Mr. Speaker, I don't think Nevada would do it. And I make no pleas for Nevada. I simply say that Manitoba has established a primacy of the three provinces in this field as a revenue raising source. Something we don't want to see compromised. --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works from his seat says "for how long will we have that primacy." Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not worried. We had the head start. We have established a reputation. We're running a good game and, Mr. Speaker, I will trust the organizations of Manitoba to withstand any competition from Alberta and Saskatchewan in this area. We heard earlier in the day, we heard it over the news last evening and today that a very important athletic organization, now and in the future important, may find it necessary to leave Winnipeg. I'm speaking of the Jets. And we heard that the Province of Manitoba had said they would not make an interest-free loan, not to a group of businessmen, Mr. Speaker, but to a group of people who were prepared to put up \$300,000 and give to the community, give to the community the ownership of the Winnipeg Jets. Just as the Bombers are owned by the Winnipeg community, anybody who wants to pay the membership, just like a co-op. Not a corporate rip-off, Mr. Speaker, not a profit-making motive, a purely community spirited charitable, philanthropic motive. Just like the Ballet is owned, and the

BILL 27

(MR. ASPER Cont'd) Symphony, the Theatre Centre and Rainbow Stage.

The Government of Manitoba in its wisdom has indicated that it doesn't want to participate in the making of financial assistance available. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we enact Bill 27, then our ability to go back to the Winnipeg Jets or the Ballet or the Symphony and say, look if you want to raise money to run a community operation, we'll license you under this arrangement. No, Mr. Speaker, Bill 27 will require the Minister to go to his counterparts in other provinces in effect to get permission for the Winnipeg Jets to launch a lottery which might keep them in Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, this is not a small issue, and if I hear him correctly, that the Minister of Mines is saying that that is not a correct interpretation of Bill 27, then perhaps an amendment to Bill 27 saying that nothing in this Act shall exclude the right of community groups to raise funds within the province to keep the Winnipeg Jets or the Brandon Wheat Kings in the province for that kind of recreational or athletic purpose, that I will feel an awful lot more comfortable with the bill, Mr. Speaker, because I don't know that deal is being made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: I just wanted to ask a question if the member would take one. I mean, the member says a statement in the bill that nothing should preclude something which is legal; does a bill require a statement in it ensuring what is already legal, or is the honourable member suggesting that the bill should contain something which says that the government couldn't agree to do something which it could agree to do.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the suggestion is quite appropriate. It focuses on exactly the point I'm trying to make. This bill allows the government to make an agreement, an agreement which can exclude, limit, restrict any kind of lottery operation in the province without the permission of the counterparts Alberta and Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, therefore this government could without recourse to the House, enter into an agreement which precludes the Winnipeg Jets from holding a lottery to keep them in town. And I'm saying, that the Lotteries Act is an appropriate time to deal with this particular point, because one of the ways, if the government refuses to aid the hockey team in staying here, one of the ways very likely to be pursued would be such things as lotteries by community groups who believe that the Jets should remain here.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'm not speaking of a profit-making organization. I'm speaking of saving the Winnipeg Enterprises, because if the Winnipeg Enterprises does not receive the \$156,000 per year rent from the Jets, and approximately another 100,000, I understand, in parking and concession fees, then the Winnipeg Enterprises' arena will become a white elephant, because the Winnipeg Convention Centre, to which we in this House pay tribute and expect to see built with provincial money as well, will take all the action away, and so the Winnipeg Arena and Winnipeg Enterprises will not be able to meet its commitment. Now, Mr. Speaker, what that means to the people of Winnipeg is more taxes to take care of the lost revenue, estimated at half a million dollars a year. But let's say that the City of Winnipeg should look after its own problems, the Province of Manitoba will look after its; Mr. Speaker, if we take that detached and calloused view, what's involved for the Province of Manitoba, approximately a million dollars a year, Mr. Speaker. Approximately one million dollars a year.

Now there are two ways to get that million dollars, to keep that within our community: We can allow them to have a lottery, if this bill were not to provide agreement to restrict it, or the province could have made the loan or some other kind of arrangement. And by the way, Mr. Speaker, I make no case that the answer was for the province to make a loan. I don't know what the appropriate technique is that the province should have followed in this case. One thing I do say though, is that there is sufficient business purpose, not a motion, business purpose, economic purpose, for the government to take a very strong position in maintaining that hockey team in Winnipeg, and whether it's through this bill, or through the loan, or through some other device, we say the government is charged with a very heavy responsibility, and we have a bill before us which denies one of those alternatives.

--(Interjection)-- Well, it doesn't give us that alternative in any event. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared, when I said that it's a million dollars a year loss to the province, I'm quite prepared to document my figures.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I estimate that this government receives approximately \$200,000

BILL 27

(MR. ASPER Cont'd) a year in income tax alone from player's salaries; Amusement Tax, \$140,000 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am not so much challenging as pointing out that if rules are to be interpreted so broadly as to allow for debate on hockey teams, etc., of a specific context to be debated under a bill having to do with interprovincial lotteries agreement, then it would seem, Sir, that there is in fact no parameters to relevance in terms of debate under the rules of our House.

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the point of order the Honourable Minister raises. I must admit that I was allowing a lot of latitude in respect to relevancy. I was hoping the honourable member would leave the topic of the Jets and get back to Bill 27, but if he's going to insist on discussing the Jets only then I will have to indicate to him that it is not proper procedure.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: But before we go on, let me indicate that in the loge to my right, we have a visitor, a former member of this House, His Worship Mayor Stephen Juba. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

. continued next page.

BILL 27 Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how one can separate the question of maintaining community organizations, community sports activities from the Lotteries Bill, the two are so intertwined. Last evening I gave certain figures as to the relevancy of this bill to each year not less than five million dollars, according to the last figures as to pay-out, to those organizations that are the beneficiaries of the Lottery-selling activity in the province, which we feel that the bill might curtail or limit. Mr. Speaker, the Winnipeg Jets happen to be the most current example, but what I meant, what I applied when I said to the Winnipeg Jets, I applied that to the Brandon Wheat Kings. I also applied it to the St. Vital Bulldogs . . .

A MEMBER: The Portage Terriers.

MR. ASPER: Or the Portage Terriers, or the Wolseley Wolverines . . .

A MEMBER: Who are they?

MR. ASPER: I thought I'd better get that in.

Mr. Speaker, we the community benefit extraordinarily in ways that we can measure tangibly or we can measure intangibly, whether it's jobs, and, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry the First Minister felt that there was some lack of relevance to the reference to the Jets, but whether it's in the development of farm teams, whether it's in the development of further television rights, the development of tourism, the bringing in of people to play hockey, whether it's the Jets - and, Mr. Speaker, just on that score I calculate, and I hope I'm wrong, and I hope the First Minister or the Minister of Finance will provide us with the actual audited figures, but I calculate the Amusement Tax on that one item, the Jets alone, at 140,000 a year, maybe 130. And the Sales Tax, Mr. Speaker, that the people who come into town to play hockey, the sales tax at approximately \$100,000, and I think I'm being conservative on that figure, because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think that the honourable member, with due respect to him, is now debating the desirability of the province doing something for the Winnipeg Jets, which is a current issue. And I know that he would want to debate that under the guise of debating the Lotteries Bill, but having made the point that the lotteries are a way in which the Winnipeg Jets could be assisted, I do not think that it is within the parameter as the Premier put it, of debating relevance for him now to take the issue of the Jets as to whether it should or should not be a part of the complexion of greater Winnipeg. I sympathize with what he is trying to do, but if we permitted that kind of a debate to take place, as the Premier put it, then there would be no area of relevance in any talk. I can envisage the honourable member using his ingenuity to debate the same thing under the next bill on the Order Paper, and I don't even know what it is, an Act to amend the Public Schools Act. Just let your imagination go for two minutes and the honourable member can fit that in to the Jets and the Public Schools.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the bill deals with a potential limiting by interprovincial agreement of lotteries, lotteries used to raise funds to promote sports, culture, and so on. Mr. Speaker, I only allude to the Jets because it happens to be a current situation, but it's not the thrust of the speech when I - and even if it were, Mr. Speaker, that would not be out of order. If I want to isolate and zero in on one aspect of what could happen if this bill were enacted as written, I would think it would be perfectly in order.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll take the honourable member's point of order as well, but let me also indicate that repetition is one of the things that we do not allow in respect to procedure. So therefore since he has made his point in respect to the Jets, would he carry on with Bill 27.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't deal with the Jets. I will deal with the Winnipeg Symphony; I will deal with the Winnipeg Ballet; I will deal with the Manitoba Theatre Centre; and I will deal with the Symphony, Ballet, Theatre Centre and Rainbow Stage. Mr. Speaker, in all those cases these are community-owned operations, they are not profit makers. These organizations come to the government each year, each year, not once, not once for a loan or assistance to be able to keep their doors open, they come to them each year. The Province of Manitoba gives each year something in the order of \$50,000 to Rainbow Stage; 77,000 to the Ballet; 79,000 to the Symphony; 72,000 to the Manitoba Theatre Centre; and each of those is matched by \$40,000 grant by the City of Winnipeg. And, Mr. Speaker, I happen

BILL 27

(MR. ASPER cont'd) to belong to all of those organizations. I have been on the board of three out of the four, and I am one of a very small group who attend these concerts; I am not in the majority. Only a fraction, perhaps 10,000 people per year out of a million, 20,000 at the most, different people attend those functions, but we give them grants because it's good for our community; it is culturally enriching, it takes some of the brutality out of life having them here, they add to the urban environment. And, Mr. Speaker, they're in no different position than the Jets who play to 240,000 people, and we must take in this House every act that is reasonable to ensure their survival, because they are what urban living is about as well as giving an economic contribution to the city and to the province.

Mr. Speaker, whether it's grants for the cultural, loans to the sports or lotteries, we must not shorten our arsenal of weaponry, we must not reduce our inventory of things which allow us with a very minor widely disparate population to still enjoy the cultural richness, the athletic, the recreational richnesses that life offers. And that's our apprehension of the bill and there will come a time I am sure. . . There are precedents, Mr. Speaker, for everything I've said. I saw a headline today in the Winnipeg Tribune. It said: "Premier refuses the Jets' deal", for example, "because it would set a precedent." The word was "precedent" in the headline I didn't hear him deny it, so I assume that seems to characterize his position. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are precedents. We didn't have lotteries in the day of Assiniboia Downs; but we have Assiniboia Downs today because a Liberal government in this province loaned Assiniboia Downs the money to stay in, or to start up and to go into business. And that little act by government has repaid itself, not only in the loan but in hundreds or thousands, if not millions of dollars, in tax revenue, in sales tax revenue, in income tax revenue.

Tourism. And, Mr. Speaker, I say that if Bill 27, if the government, and I'm quite sincere when I say, Mr. Speaker, I'm not, my thrust is not the Jets. My thrust is that if the government says on one side that it can't set a precedent by doing something to keep the Jets here, in spite of the fact that we profit by a million dollars a year by their presence, then if that's true, then for heaven's sake in Bill 27, make sure that we don't bargain away another method of producing that kind of commercial recreational action in the city.

Mr. Speaker, I've made my point, I hope. I hope that when we get to committee with the bill the Minister will make some further clarifications as to the extent of the agreement he intends to reach; perhaps an undertaking that the agreement he reaches, that he proposes to make under I believe Section 10, or I think it's 10 or 19, will first be submitted to a session of the Legislature or committee, anything that can allay our concerns for the dependent organizations of the good work they do to enrich our lives, will go a long way to ensure passage without any further debate on third reading. But failing that, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party reserves its rights.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Yes. Well, Mr. Speaker, I had not really intended to speak on this bill which I thought had a rather simple principle to it, and I must admit that I was rather motivated yesterday by the concern which was demonstrated first of all by the Member for Lakeside, and secondly, by the Leader of the Liberal Party, although the Leader of the Liberal Party appears to have moved somewhat from his position of last night when he used the term "sell-out" and "we'll lean on them" and "if they lean on us, we'll lean on them", and things of that nature. It still came as a shock to me the kind of position that was put by the Member for Lakeside. In particular, Mr. Speaker, I recall the Member for Lakeside making quite an impassioned appeal to the effect that this should be a Private Members' Bill, it is not a matter of government policy, it is not a matter on which the New Democratic Party sought power, and that surely the Whips should be off and that this legislation should be dealt with as a matter of individual members rather than a government position. Well, Mr. Speaker, of course in the last analysis that is true of every piece of legislation. Each member in this House has to in the last analysis examine whether what is being suggested is of such importance to himself that he has to take a position on it entirely related to other considerations; or whether he considers the ongoing position of a government and its ability to operate and to make transactions even though he may not be 100 percent in accord with each one of them, that he is in accord with what is generally being done and therefore he should take the position relative to the group which he is a part of. That is, of course, the position on every single piece of legislation and I would be frankly surprised if on this one there wasn't general support from government

BILL 27

(MR. GREEN cont'd) benches on the basis of the Minister being given ability to operate within this sphere in a manner which makes more sense than the position which would be the case if he did not have that ability.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that happened yesterday was that the honourable, the Leader of the Liberal Party said that he took what I consider to be a peculiar position on second reading. Now you know, everybody to his choice; you can make whatever rules you want for yourself. The position that the Leader of the Liberal Party took was that they are absolutely against the bill, that they want the public to come in and shove it down our throats and make us take it back, and that the purpose of voting for the bill on second reading was to let it go to committee so that the public would sort of put such pressure on the government that they would have to withdraw it.

Now I repeat--(Interjection)--Pardon me? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member says that this is my interpretation. That indeed is my interpretation of what he said, and I will have to go back to Hansard to see whether my interpretation is wrong, but that is the position that I heard the honourable member take with regard to second reading of the bill, and if I'm misinterpreting it, I will read Hansard and I will try to see in what way he did not say that. I gather that he was speaking strongly against the passage of the bill, said that he would vote it to go to Committee for the purpose of the public bringing such pressure on us that we withdraw the bill. Now the--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, that's today's position. I'm talking about yesterday's position Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker yesterday's position was entirely different. As a matter of fact, today's position I find myself, if not in total agreement with the honourable member, at least I find myself considering that the honourable member has made a sensible proposition. Yesterday I did not regard it as a sensible proposition. I heard "sold out," that we should fight at all costs, that no matter what happens we are prepared to take the competition, that it's not a question of what's going to be in the agreement, but that we should be talking at all, that we are involving ourselves in some type of western conglomeration, and all of this was bad. Now that's the way I heard the honourable member's speech.

I heard a different speech today, and on today's position I say that I find it much more rational, at least the honourable member is doing something which at least is plausible. He's suggesting that he doesn't trust what the administration is going to do with the agreement. Whether I disagree with him or not, he is now involving himself in saying that he doesn't trust the administration; that it's not the Act that he is opposed to, but he feels that the administration will not do a good job, and I think he said today that one of the things that we would like to do is lean on the Minister or - I don't know if he used that term but that--(Interjection)--Yes, give the Minister support so that he will strike a harder bargain. Well, Mr. Speaker, I accept that as the role of the Opposition at all times. The Opposition cannot administer the province; the Legislature cannot administrate the province, administer the province. But what is said in the Legislature can and should have a great deal of effect on how the province is administered, and I accept that as one of the Legislative tools for having a more satisfactory administration, and I'm not really going to argue with that.

Now that was yesterday's position; that's what I conceive of to be the difference between yesterday's position and today's position, which I think is an improvement that proves that with the passage of time there is improvements of position.

I want to deal with the basic problem that I consider to be involved here because, the Honourable Member may not know it, but I voted against the Lottery Bill. The first Lottery Bill was presented by the Honourable Member for - at that time he was the Member for Elmwood. At that time he was the Member for Elmwood. It was introduced as a private member's bill. It was before the Member for Elmwood was sitting as a Cabinet Minister. I got up and I said that I do not believe that the public should raise its revenue through a lottery. I have nothing morally against lotteries. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I don't care how moral I was against lotteries, I believe that the people will participate in lotteries, that they have participated in them as long as history records, and that they will participate in them as long as history records, or continues to record. But I believe that as a means of raising public revenue it is in my opinion not something which I can agree with in principle; and secondly, it is very inefficient. That when we think that the public revenue from lotteries - I think the first year was a half a million dollars - we are talking about 1/40 of one percent of the income tax, 1/40 of one percent of income tax for which we set up a bureaucracy involving thousands

BILL 27

(MR. GREEN cont'd) of people running all over, selling these tickets and giving prizes, and making people have dreams of how they are going to go to the Barbados, etc. To me the whole thing was not a thing which I could endorse, and I voted against the first lottery bill. The second lottery bill came up, it was introduced by a government member. It was introduced by, I can't remember who - I think it was the Minister of Tourism and Recreation at that time, perhaps the Member for Dauphin, the Minister of Tourism, although I can't recall, but it was a government measure. I got up and I ate crow. I never said that I agreed with lotteries. I said that I am part of a government, that the government has a certain thrust, that not everything that it can do I can agree with, not everything that it doesn't do am I satisfied with, but that as a general principle I cannot see myself saying that I opt out and abdicate from responsibility in this government because there is one measure that they are taking which I disagree with. But I indicated that I felt that it was a very inefficient system of collecting revenues and that if we feel that the things that the money is going to are worthwhile, that we should budget for them and put it in the budget and regulate it budgetwise, and the same way as we do with other programs, and if it has to be grants, or shared costs, or complete budgetary control, those things can be argued about, but that I prefer that we raise that through an ordinary mechanism of taxation rather than through a lottery.

Mr. Speaker, I did not prevail. The government said that to this limited extent, it is going to make use of the lottery, and it did it for several reasons, and one of the reasons was, and the honourable member should remember, is that we were being invaded by lotteries from other places, such as the Province of Quebec, such as the Irish Sweepstake, and our people were purchasing the lotteries and supporting these type of institutions in Ireland and in the Province of Quebec, or wherever it was, we felt that if it was all done under one government umbrella that they would purchase the lotteries, and the same money that they are now spending would be used for things in Manitoba rather than in Ireland.

That was one of the considerations which I still do not accept as a valid principle but I repeat, I did not have my way on the thing, we are in it. But it was always recognized that being in it from the first doesn't give you an open door forever. After all we closed off one door; Manitoba coming in stopped a certain amount of revenue from going elsewhere, and we realized that lotteries was a diminishing return, that eventually the tickets that you are selling, if everybody does it, it means that the scope that you had before you do not have now.

Now the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Liberal Party yesterday made a great point out of the fact that we've got the expertise, we've got the organization, we are away ahead of the others, we've got a competitive advantage, that we should sit with that advantage and if they lean on us, we lean right back.

I want to discuss the Minister's proposition in those terms, because I think that the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party has drawn it down to its basics. Now put quite bluntly, Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in the numbers racket. What we are doing is the numbers game. We know that there are a certain number of people who want to participate in the numbers game. We know that they are going to buy tickets. We know that that money will then be available to somebody, so we say we are going to be involved in the numbers game, and to the extent that Manitoba will be able to have some revenue from that, we will use that revenue. Now that may sound terrible but, Mr. Speaker, I don't know any other way of saying it, that is what we are involved in. And just like anybody else who is engaged in the numbers game there comes a time, Mr. Speaker, when the people who are engaged in the game say that we have to carve up the territory. Well, Mr. Speaker, call it a combine, call it what you like, there has to be a rationalization as to what is to occur. Because while we are in the game, and as the honourable member knows selling tickets now from here to the West Coast, eventually the Province of British Columbia says the same thing as we said, eventually the Province of Saskatchewan says the same thing as we said, eventually the Province of Alberta says the same thing as we said, and then one of two things can happen, and has happened by the way, historically, in the numbers game, that those people who are in it say, that you stay on the north side, I'll stay on the south side, and if they don't keep the arrangement, what happened of course under the illegal numbers game, the racketeers, is that they fought with each other. One leaned on one and the other leaned back. And, Mr. Speaker, those people who said that we have to rationalize the industry and make sure that it is done on a sensible basis, made it, and

BILL 27

(MR. GREEN cont'd) those people who said that we don't care who's in it, we are going to fight, they didn't make it.

And the only question that is being asked here is, whether everybody should go to his own, in which case, Mr. Speaker, everybody loses. This is what happens: British Columbia says Manitoba's giving out a prize for \$200,000, we will give out a prize for \$300,000, and our tickets will be \$2.00 instead of \$2.50. In which case we have to come back and say that our prize will be \$350,000, and our tickets will be \$1.75, until he who is strongest, holds on the longest, until it starts again. Now, Mr. Speaker, you can do that, and I'm not really, I am not really suggesting that we are going to be closed because my understanding as to what is being arranged is that we will have a right to go in to rationalize the territory, or we'll have the right to fight on our own. In which case, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that there will be all losers and no gainers, that if there is an opportunity to rationalize . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I believe we're going to have Royal Assent. Can we take a pause for a few minutes?

ROYAL ASSENT

His Honour, W. J. McKeag, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour in the following words.

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of this Bill:

No. 8 - An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the same.

MR. CLERK: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill in Her Majesty's name.

BILL 27 Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, after that pomp and ceremony and the language that has just been used, it would seem inappropriate, and I'm sure that His Honour does not realize that what we are talking about in this House is how we are going to carve up the territory in the numbers racket. But, Mr. Speaker, that is the point that I was trying to make earlier that sometimes, you know, we should try to put ourselves into perspective, that the type of thing that we are discussing is exactly the type of discussion that was held with respect to that particular business, and, Mr. Speaker, since that was done in the underworld, the mechanisms that were used to enforce agreements, or to decide whether or not somebody had or had not spilled over, were of course very crude, and the only forces that were available. We will adopt much more sophisticated methods of dealing with complaints I am sure, or dealing with violations of what happens to be a court--(Interjection)--Well the honourable member says that it won't be efficient; it'll probably be less bloody too, so that there are - but as to principle, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we're talking about exactly that type of thing and that what the Minister is saying is that he wants to be able to make an agreement relative to rationalizing lotteries in Western Canada, that if it is not rationalized it's true we may be a winner or we may be a loser. I am suggesting to you that without a rational lottery system in Western Canada that everyone will lose.

And the same rules that I am talking about did not only apply to the illegitimate behaviour in the numbers racket. Mr. Speaker, anybody who reads the history of Standard Oil will see that the same type of rationalization took place within that industry. What did John D. Rockefeller do? He had the foresight to see that with an industry which combined and which could regulate the market, and which could supply only in relation to the market being profitable, that he could get the greatest efficiency and the greatest good out of the industry, and that if everybody was fighting for themselves everybody would lose, including, he said, the consumer, and I'm inclined to think that he was right. So what did he do, Mr. Speaker? He went around and he said to everybody, you are now engaged in the refining business; we will give you in shares of the Standard Oil Company the equivalent of the value of your works as they stand today, and

BILL 27

(MR. GREEN cont'd) and you will then share in the efficiency of the total Standard Oil Company. If you do that you will make money; if you don't do that we will ruin you. Everybody who went in, Mr. Speaker, made money; everybody who didn't go in was ruined, just as he said.

And all that we are talking about, and let us realize that it relates to a lottery, Mr. Speaker, which I have to repeat, I find the whole procedure as being something which I have never been able to accept, never been able to accept as a proper government function, but one which the government was involved. And you know that comes as a contradiction but everybody who has had any involvement in administration knows that that contradiction is a very normal thing. You know I happen to think that a general sales tax is better than a tobacco tax. But we levy a certain amount of money by tobacco taxes. Why is that? I mean, why is it that the smoker is told that he is going to pay for the education of the non-smoker? Because somehow way back in somebody's mind smoking was a sin, and anybody who smokes should pay for the guy who doesn't smoke. But really a general sales tax is much more equitable than a tobacco tax, much more equitable than a liquor tax. But liquor is taxed for the same reason. So we all have to accept the fact that nobody achieves their ultimate ideals, that what you do has to be tempered with things that you don't entirely agree with.

And with regard to lotteries, Mr. Speaker, my position is fairly well known, and it hasn't changed, and I predict that in the long run we will not be getting the great benefit from lottery revenue that people think of. But nothing that the Minister is doing to my way of thinking jeopardizes any of the money that now goes to the Ballet, that now goes to the Theatre Centre, that now goes to Rainbow Stage, that now goes to any of the groups that are dealing with lotteries. It may jeopardize it if we don't do it. What is the alternative? What if it were the fact that the others became so strong and so organized that they moved in on the eastern territory and made it impossible for the eastern territory to operate financially sound, and that hurt the revenue.

Well the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party says we'll stand any competition. You lean on them, they will lean on you. And I'm saying that it's in this area, in this area it makes more sense if you are involved in it to have a rationalization of the territory. And the territory is western Canada. And as I understand it from the Minister's bill there will be nothing to prevent the Manitoba Government from conducting its Golden Sweepstakes - is that what we call it? That there will be nothing to prevent them from selling in all territories where we are not involved in agreements. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that in the last analysis there will be nothing that will prevent the Manitoba Government from going out altogether. The only thing that can hold such an agreement is mutual self-interest. And if it is mutually self-beneficial to rationalize the industry, as was hinted later by the Leader of the Liberal Party, yes it probably could make some sense to have some rules as to how it will occur, when it will occur, where tickets are sold, that that is what the Minister is going to have the power to do. And as to whether he will have a strong negotiating position, I say to the honourable members yes, raise whatever points you want but realize that you have to stay within your legislative bounds; that ultimately your position is one of pressure, of making the government realize the implications of its position, of ultimately saying that if you don't behave properly we are going to use that as an effort to show that you can't administer properly. All of which I accept - not that I accept that you are right, I accept that that is your right to do, not only your right to do, but that is your responsibility to do.

But ultimately the government has to administer its affairs, and the Minister in this case I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that really I don't think it needed legislation. That really there could be an agreement between the Government of Manitoba, the Government of Alberta, the Government of Saskatchewan, the Government of B.C., saying that with respect to lotteries under our control, etc., these are the things we are going to do. But the agreement would permit a total western lottery, for us to be involved in such a thing. I'm looking over at the Minister to see whether he is - he indicates we need the legislation. I sort of rely on my own legal training to think that it's possible sometimes to accomplish these things without legislation, but I'm not going to argue with the Minister he needs the legislation. The legislation only permits him to do that type of thing. It's nothing to do with the Jets. It's nothing to do with any of the organizations which are funded. If anything it's designed to try to protect Manitoba funds in lotteries by having a rational industry rather than to hurt Manitoba. Because the

BILL 27

(MR. GREEN cont'd) alternative, Mr. Speaker, is to suggest that we engage in an all-out war, which could be a price war, it could be a prize war, it could be a war as to the setting up of agents, and if somebody is more powerful they can lose more money for a certain length of time in order to drive you out of business and then take over the field. And it just doesn't seem reasonable for the governments in western Canada to be involved in that type of thing.

Now there will still be the option of doing so. If at any time the government feels that we can do better on our own, that we don't mind leaning on them and have them leaning on us, etc., I am advised that that option will be available. It's not an option that I think is one that should be so greatly prized. There may be an argument. Some will argue that you could do better on your own. Some will argue that you should be involved with the other. And ultimately it's a question of judgment. What the Minister is saying is that he wants the option of dealing with it in that way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party indicated that certain organizations get benefits from such a lottery; the Winnipeg Jets may benefit; that involves a million dollars a year. I think that the honourable member should apply his economics to other areas. If it's worth sustaining provincial grants or operating deficits to maintain the contract of Bobby Hull, who gets several million dollars, are we next year going to be looking for a contract of Phil Esposito because we haven't filled the rink. And the following year how much will the contract of Bobby Orr cost us, and what do we then rely on, the Government of Manitoba, or if it's only the city putting up the money, then how is it that the city is coming for the money which they are putting up? I mean, I never heard anything from the city except that we don't get enough money from you. So if they invest \$300,000 in the Jets, don't they come next year and say we're \$300,000 short, you the province are responsible. On account of Unicity we've had to buy into the Jets and therefore we need the money from the Province of Manitoba. Isn't that ridiculous.

The question is whether the province considers that in every respect it is a wise thing to become involved in this thing, and the Premier has indicated by letter to the people what the position was. But it will not then be open within the existing lotteries rules, and I don't know whether that the Jets could apply within existing rules, it has something to do with the type of organization that can apply. But if they can apply within an existing rule they can apply within the other rules, and what they are able to know is that the Minister, to use another underworld word, has bought them protection; that they know that their territory will not be infringed upon by the territory of British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, that he has given them that kind of protection down there. He hasn't yet done it and the ultimate negotiations I take it are still to be concluded, but certainly a bill giving him the power to do it is something which a Minister is entitled to request, and to request a government position on. I say the last merely with reference to the remarks that were made yesterday by the Member for Lakeside.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister sounds to me, in my opinion anyway, that he is explaining away another situation of not really wanting to support the legislation but because it is government legislation and not private members' legislation that he has to in this case, and it might be one that he doesn't agree with. And as I say it's my opinion that the Minister is explaining that situation and did it in a very nice way.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have long until 4:30 before we hit Private Members' and I don't intend to take very long.

Mr. Speaker, the problem we have with the Minister with this bill at the present time is that he wants to jump off the cliff before he has to, and he may never have to. That he may never have to jump into the situation that he's going into as far as lotteries are concerned because the other provinces that he is speaking about may never be in the lottery business. All the argument that we're speaking of at the present time is surmise, the Minister was telling us about things that could happen but he was defending a surmise of what might happen or might not happen. Mr. Speaker, the province of Alberta has no legislation to be in the lottery business whatsoever. Their Minister last year presented a statement that said they wouldn't be, and I'm told they may have a bill before the Legislature at the present time which would give them the privilege of maybe or maybe not being in the lottery business. Saskatchewan is not

BILL 27

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) in the lottery business, and B.C. is not in the lottery business. So all of a sudden we build a great big case of why we should ruin the Manitoba Lottery which would in effect harm people that are selling tickets and making commission right now, and we may never have to harm them. But yet our government, our Minister, moves right in, and the whole problem involved here, Mr. Speaker, is that when the Minister talks about Rockefeller making a decision, he owned a company and he was the one that made the decisions. You know these provinces may never be in it, Mr. Speaker, because the people will make those decisions in the provinces. They will present bills before their legislature, which will go to their Law Amendments, and they may or may not be defeated; they may or may not go through. There may be a good argument given, the same argument that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources gives us about the Province of Manitoba being in the lottery business, and the real gain that we get from the lottery business of making a half a million or \$900,000, and the great expenditure we have to have to do it. Do you know that the people of Alberta or the Government of Alberta with their wealth and everything that they have, just may think, it's not really worth it; why should we be bothered? So Alberta may not be there. Probably never, from what I understand. Saskatchewan . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member will have an opportunity to continue another time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - RESOLUTION NO. 20

MR. SPEAKER: First item is Private Members' Resolution No. 20. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party has 14 minutes left.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I don't need anything like 14 minutes. I will conclude the remarks I made a few weeks ago. It seems like a long time ago, but whenever it was, Mr. Speaker, I think I made a very elementary point and that is the only point. But I appreciated the willingness of the Minister of Finance to introduce an amendment to the resolution which was acceptable to him, I believe, and therefore to his party. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that with the amendment that the Minister of Finance, or one of the government members introduced, he has said everything I need to hear. And that is, that there are anomalies, that there are inequities, that with any new piece of legislation, and I am not prepared to ascribe any evil motives to the Minister of Finance in the manner in which the legislation was drafted. I do state, as I stated a few weeks ago, that the Minister of Finance should not dwell as he seems to have on the fact that the Liberal Party offered amendments during the debate on the bill itself and voted for the bill, because, Mr. Speaker, while we in the Liberal Party agreed with the concept of a Mineral Acreage Tax Act, we also said at the time that the Act must be worded and implemented, primarily interpreted, in such a manner as does not affect the person who happens to have mineral rights but whose primary purpose in the ownership of land is farming, or recreation, or non-commercial use.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think that was the understanding of the House when we passed the bill originally and it was an anomaly. It was an inequity that was created through the interpretation of what is a farm. And, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance is prepared to follow the spirit of the resolution as he appears willing to do, then the problem should be ended. And of course if he's not then the legitimate concerns of my honourable friends from rural Manitoba are shared by me, and are shared by the Liberal Party, and I'm sure are shared by the members of the New Democratic Party.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think we can bring this to a close by passing the resolution, as amended, and giving the Minister of Finance reasonable time in which to produce his amendments following which, or at that time we may then determine whether the anomaly has been cured adequately and if not perhaps at that time further amendments will be proposed by us. And I commend the Minister of Finance for not taking an unduly defensive position on his legislation, and for showing the reasonableness to be willing to accept the amended resolution. And I urge all honourable members to pass the resolution so that we can get on to other private members' business.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a resolution that started off very quietly and generated a lot of heat at one time in the debate, and it seems as if we've got down to an even keel on it now and are prepared to talk sensibly. I believe there's been a lot of good

RESOLUTION 20

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) come out of the discussion, and I don't believe that anybody possibly meant any more than to probably try to get around to amending this resolution from the beginning because it became very apparent from the time that the notices went out that the definition of a farmer was very poorly defined, and that there would need to be changes in it. My only hope is that I wish I knew the change that was going to be proposed. We'll certainly be looking at it, but I personally feel I want it to affect corporations who are not engaged actively in farming. So if we have oil companies or other people like this that are sitting on oil rights, or mineral rights, on large tracts of land that they'll be the ones that'll be taxed. And I certainly don't want to see some widow that's still living on the farm and getting a crop share and maybe owns the land yet having to pay mineral tax, because even though there was some criticism from members on the other side that many farmers haven't got too much money now, it is still true that many farm people have really a small income and it isn't very great. In fact we have people - I think it was half of the number of the farmers yet are still without water works in their homes. So, I'd be very much in favour of seeing no tax on these people who are out in the rural areas yet.

I can go over different people who are affected by the definition. We have people who live on the farm and hire the work done and yet they own all the machinery. We can talk about people who have part-time jobs who possibly drive a van and most of their income is from the van yet they may farm land besides. We have people who are even MLAs and they aren't actively farming the land themselves although it's their farm and maybe they're involved in a crop share but where do they come in; and if you take the principal source of income why one year it could be farming and the next year it could be an MLA, so I see a problem there.

I can see a lot of problems and I can see problems within corporations where there's one or two of the individuals farming it and the rest aren't but they're involved in it too. So there's no doubt in my mind that there's been nothing but a lot of misunderstanding and a lot of things to sort out; that if we were to try to do it any other way than to tax corporations who are actually not engaged in farming, there'd be nothing but a mixup on it. So I think for all the revenue that the government can get out of it that the best thing to do is just to tax the corporations who are not engaged in farming. I certainly hope that this is what the Minister and his supporters come up with on the other side.

I don't believe I have anything more to say, except that there has been a good discussion on this bill. I feel that the Minister of Finance has as much as committed himself that he's prepared to deal with this in a sensible way, and I'm looking forward to this happening, and on that basis I'm prepared to let it go to a vote. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the resolution as amended.
(Agreed)

Resolution No. 29. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition is absent. Resolution No. 30. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

RESOLUTION NO. 30

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Member from Gladstone that

WHEREAS physiotherapy is instruction of the patient, family, employer, teacher, doctor, volunteer, etc. in the physical methods of prevention and treatment of disease or trauma affecting the moving parts of the body;

AND WHEREAS the Legislature of Manitoba has recognized by statute, by regulation, that the provision of physiotherapy services to every Manitoban is an important right;

AND WHEREAS the Health Services criteria have so limited the equal provision of these services that at present physiotherapy services are provided to a very few Manitobans in an unequal and inefficient and costly manner;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Health Services Commission be directed to provide every Manitoban with equal access to physiotherapy services by:

(a) funding physiotherapy services in proprietary and non-proprietary personal care homes;

(b) providing in consultation with a physician, outpatient physiotherapy services to urban and rural Manitoba on an equal basis;

RESOLUTION 30

(MR. BROWN cont'd)

(c) fully utilizing the recognized expertise of the physiotherapist, practitioner in Home Care and in community based Health Care Programs.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to make some comments on the scope of the practice of physiotherapy. Physiotherapists have received the academic and clinical training to treat patients suffering from a variety of disorders and diseases where such patients are referred to them by a qualified medical practitioner.

I would like to enumerate some of the conditions physiotherapists are required to give treatment to patients: (i) Orthopaedic conditions. These are conditions affecting the muscles, bones or joints.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I'm perhaps somewhat delinquent, but it doesn't change matters. I don't wish to have the honourable member not proceed with his speech, but we had looked at this resolution and it appears to involve the expenditure of public revenues - which shouldn't change anything except that if there could be the appropriate words "that we consider the advisability of providing for physiotherapy services," it would mean paying money out of the Public Revenues. As I recall seeing it, I don't have it in front of me but I remember observing it before and I did not realize that it was coming up that quickly since there was another resolution in between.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable Minister for bringing that to my attention. He's perfectly correct. It does require the advisability of. Now with that amendment, if it's the will and pleasure of the House, may we proceed?

MR. GREEN: Yes. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we should put the actual words in. My impression is that it should be in the resolution part: Resolved that the government consider the advisability of requiring the Health Services Commission to provide every Manitoban in need, etc. If that's agreeable?

MR. BROWN: This would be agreeable with me, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable? Very well.

MR. BROWN: (ii) Neurological conditions - and these are conditions resulting from dysfunction of the nervous system. (iii) Respiratory conditions, those affecting the respiratory system. (iv) Cardio-vascular conditions, those affecting the heart and general circulation. And you have burns and plastic surgery and obstetrics.

Preventative and treatment programs are also carried out by physiotherapists in addition to the conditions already mentioned, such as (i) Sports Medicine - education in the prevention of common athletic injuries; immediate treatment of athletic injuries.

(ii) Specific follow-up programs - education and counselling of stroke victims and their families; education and physical fitness programs for victims of heart attacks; education in counselling and home treatment programs for victims of chronic obstructive lung diseases.

(iii) Industrial programs - education in accident prevention in industry; treatment of common industrial accidents.

(iv) Educational programs - school health programs particularly in relation to the integration of the physically handicapped into the present educational system.

Now nothing inherent in either the education and training of physiotherapists or in legislation which provides for the licensing of qualified physiotherapists prohibits them from engaging in the treatment of patients in settings other than hospitals or health care institutions. The only restriction is that the patient be referred by a duly qualified medical practitioner. A minimum of equipment is required and much of this equipment could be constructed from materials available in a home. Therefore physiotherapists could practice their profession in any of the following settings: The patient's home, schools, factories, private clinics, nursing homes, hospitals.

I would like to give you some of the educational background of physiotherapists. The School of Medical Rehabilitation at the University of Manitoba has a three-year diploma course in Physical or Occupational Therapy. A degree program which is the diploma course plus one additional year taken after two years of clinical experience is also available. The minimum academic standing of applicants who were accepted for the first year was students from high school with an average of no lower than 78 percent. Students transferring from other university

RESOLUTION 30

(MR. BROWN cont'd) courses or holding previous degrees must also have a good academic record. Hours required for a degree (Bachelor of Physical Therapy) are 2,250 hours. This is very similar to the hours required for a Bachelor of Nursing degree. Many physiotherapists however are continuing their studies and going on to the Master's level.

In addition to this continuing educational programs are constantly sponsored by the Manitoba Branch of the Canadian Physiotherapy Association to help physiotherapists keep up to date on the latest methods of physiotherapy. Some of the courses held in the last 12 months were: (a) A seminar on cerebral palsy and adult hemiplegia - this is stroke. (b) Seminar on connective tissue massage. (c) Symposium on the management of patients who have undergone a low friction athroplasty - this is hip replacement. (d) Seminar on the management of chronic obstructive lung disease. (e) Communication and sexuality.

In addition to this weekly or semi-weekly inservice education programs are held in various hospitals.

Presently, physiotherapy services are available to members of the public in Manitoba who are patients in a hospital which employs or shares the services of a physiotherapist. These services must be requested by a duly qualified medical practitioner and must be provided by a physiotherapist who is registered under the Physiotherapists Act.

At present there is a very limited outpatient usage of physiotherapists mainly because in most cases outpatients are not covered by the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission, and it is a direct cost to the patient if indeed he could acquire the services of a physiotherapist. This is particularly true in the rural areas of Manitoba. The Canadian Arthritis and Rheumatism Society (CARS) provides insured inpatient physiotherapy services on a part-time basis in some hospitals in rural Manitoba. CARS will also provide physiotherapy to a resident in a nursing home when requested by a physician. These services again may present a cost to the patient directly or they may be covered under various Health and Welfare budgets.

Manitobans may also receive physiotherapy treatments from a private practitioner. Presently there is only one in Manitoba eligible for Canadian Physiotherapy Registration and the cost of this is borne entirely by the patient unless he is covered by some insurance such as Workman's Compensation.

Presently there are many inadequacies in the health care delivery of physiotherapy services. These services should be made available to all Manitobans, and outpatient and personal care homes should be covered. The Manitoba Health Services Commission's criteria for physiotherapy is that if possible physiotherapy should be under the direction of a certified physiatrist. Since there are only six certified physiatrists in Manitoba members of the medical staff and CARS are also accepted as meeting this criteria.

Many hospitals in rural Manitoba are serviced by a CARS therapist. I believe that an administrator should be given choice of hiring a staff therapist or using the services of CARS. By hiring a therapist he could pay him or her \$5.00 to \$6.00 an hour instead of the \$11.00 per hour that CARS charges. Under the present system no therapist living in the rural areas of Manitoba could provide services in a local hospital or health unit unless he or she is employed by CARS.

Many patients require daily services of a therapist and it is essential that the physiotherapist should be located at strategic points throughout Manitoba. Many outpatients at present are receiving no treatment at all. If treatment is not available in rural hospitals patients have to come to Winnipeg for treatment where they become inpatients in hospitals rather than outpatients in the area from which they came. This creates a lot of waste of tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that physiotherapy services be provided to every Manitoban in need in the most economical and efficient manner. Outpatients should be covered by the Health Services Commission. Home visiting services should also be covered. Services provided by a physiotherapist in a private practice and services of a physiotherapist in a community clinic should be covered by the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House sometimes have criticized the government for spending too much money on Health and Social Development, and I believe it is a matter of priorities that we are speaking of, and to me, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the top priorities that we should be paying attention to, and I certainly would recommend this resolution to the House. Thank you.

RESOLUTION 30

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that people like to see me getting up to improve and to bring . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: . . . more insight into some of the resolutions that are put forth by the Opposition. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter of record over the past four years that a tremendous effort has been made and continues to be made to improve accessibility of health services in all parts of the province. I mention specifically the introduction of the insured nursing home program and the ongoing development of home care services throughout the province.

There is some irony in the fact, Mr. Speaker, and I call it a fact not an assumption, that were it not for the existence of a government supported nursing home program and a government supported home care program, it is not likely that my honourable friend, the Member from Rhineland, would have been inspired to stress the importance of physiotherapy services in those settings. I venture to say that the availability of public funds for nursing homes and home care services have been given encouragement to endeavours to improve those services among other things by the greater employment of physiotherapists.

Mr. Speaker, I think this House should be informed that physiotherapy services in nursing homes is already funded by the Manitoba Health Services Commission. The Commission does require the nursing home to demonstrate that these services will be applied effectively within a proper care plan for the residents. These services are of course also available in hospitals and are provided as well in hospital outpatient programs, except that up to this time such services on an outpatient basis were only provided where the consulting services of a specialist in physical medicine could be available. I understand that some modification of this restriction is under the active consideration by the Manitoba Health Services Commission today, Mr. Speaker. Such a modification might be to allow physiotherapy outpatient programs to be carried out under the supervision of a medical practitioner without the specialist qualifications.

Mr. Speaker, physiotherapy services have been available in home care programs in the City, and I understand will be available in the future in the home care program under development in rural areas as well. Just think, Mr. Speaker, a few short years, the type of home care that was provided and what the changes that have been brought about since this government came into power. Even now physiotherapists employed by the Canadian Arthritis and Rheumatism Society visit rural areas and provide some service to people in their homes. It should not be denied that these services are perhaps less than adequate, particularly in comparison with those available to city dwellers.

This, Mr. Speaker, brings me to a point to which I would like to address myself very briefly. I think the real issue here is the maldistribution of services between the city and the country, and we're all aware of this fact, whether it be doctors, dentists - but this is a problem that all parts of the province do experience and are finding it difficult to get people to locate. In fact, Mr. Speaker, a year or two ago in the Professional Associations Committee we did venture to find out the type of personnel that was available in the various parts of the province and the various municipalities, and the figures were very abysmal compared to the number of people per capita available right here in the City of Winnipeg.

This is something that is very difficult to cause people to locate in areas like say, Churchill or--(Interjection)--Ste. Rose. Well Ste. Rose does have a hospital and has had one for a period of time, but I suppose the problem of getting dentists is still evident. But this is something that I don't know if you can blame any government. It's individuals that seem to desire to locate in the city setting where there are many advantages - some consider it disadvantages, but there are those things that seem to attract people. And this problem does not - I've talked about the doctors, but this problem also pertains to physiotherapy. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say although important, physiotherapy services are not the single most important health service lacking in rural areas, it is one of those that is lacking throughout the rural areas, parts of the province. Although the total ratio of doctors to population in Manitoba seems quite adequate if you take it into consideration for the whole province, comparatively speaking, it is to me a shocking revelation that out of some 1,100 practising physicians, over 800 are in the Metropolitan area and less than 300 in the rest of the province. Now the population distribution is approximately 50 percent in the City of Winnipeg and 50

RESOLUTION 30

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) percent throughout the rest of the province.

Now the situation with dentists is even worse, and the fact that rural hospitals and other care institutions have traditionally been unable to recruit their full complement of nurses is well known to all residents of the rural region.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the interest and energy evidenced by the Physiotherapy Association, and I've received letters, and I'm sure all members have received letters, I have a constituent, two constituents have written to me, you know, sort of asking for my support in the Resolution that was introduced by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, and I don't deny that there is some basis. However, I would say to them, Mr. Speaker, that the best way in which they could demonstrate the sincerity of their purpose, and I don't deny that they are sincere, and be an example to other health workers would be if they were able to respond to the demand for their services in rural areas of the province. It's basically - and I can't fault the people again, they want to be here in the City where they see a lot of attractions.

My honourable friend the Minister of Health and Social Development informs me, Mr. Speaker, that positions for physiotherapists in his department will very soon be available in rural areas. He also informs me, Mr. Speaker, that he foresees some difficulty in filling these positions because of the reluctance of health workers to seek careers in service to rural people. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in the end the individual response of members within any group of health workers the demand for their services, even in remote locations, would be more germane to the improvement of health services than in resolutions that can be passed in this House, or any edicts that might be issued by any agency or government.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the proposed resolution No. 30 be amended by striking out all the words following the words "and whereas" in the fifth line thereof, and substituting the following: "physiotherapy is recognized by the people and the Government of Manitoba as an important health service; and whereas the provision of physiotherapy services under the Health Service Programs of the province throughout hospitals and nursing homes has been constantly improved and developed to the extent that personnel and other resources would follow; and whereas it is deemed desirable to continue this development; therefore be it resolved: (a) that physiotherapy services continue to be recognized as an important component of health services provided in the care of patients both in institutions and in the home, (b) that this House recognize and endorse the continued efforts of the Department of Health and Social Development to improve access to physiotherapy services, particularly in rural areas of the province, to alleviate the maldistribution of these services; and (c) that the Canadian Physiotherapy Association (Manitoba Branch) and its membership, receive encouragement to make their services available in rural areas to co-operation with community and government health agencies."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MOTION presented.

. . . . continued on next page

RESOLUTION 30

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on the amendment and the resolution. I had hoped that this might have been one of those occasions, very rare that they may be, when a resolution and its merits were so obvious that the Lord High Executioner opposite might have defrayed from applying his - I think the word he said is "insight", I would say his "incision" into another resolution. But I suppose we should learn that that is too much to expect. I think it's almost becoming no longer a matter of judging the merits of a resolution, it's becoming a matter of routine, that I would suspect that the member shows up daily in the Caucus Room and says, "What next Chief?" and then they hand him the scissors and say, "Resolution 30", and he says, "What's the topic?" and off you go. I suppose it's too bad that we have now acquired a government by rote where in fact even the simple exercise of applying a certain amount of appraisal or assessment to relative merits of resolutions has now become simply a matter of that machine-like atmosphere that we see opposite where everything is sort of, kind of homogenized down to the same level and nothing sort of is allowed to stand. I suppose that the kind of --(Interjection)-- I'll get to that. I have 20 minutes. I would like to remind the member I have 20 minutes and I fully intend to take it, and if the member would be quiet long enough he might be able to listen to exactly whether I do intend to propose and support it.

I know that it's difficult for him to hear himself above his own bellowing but perhaps if he would try he might find from time to time that a few things are said on this side of the House that are worth listening to.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the point of this resolution I think directed itself to one of the most serious and pressing problems that this House has had to face over the last two or three months, and that is the basic and ever-increasing shortage of facilities in our hospitals. While it is ostensibly directed toward the improvement of physiotherapy care in both urban and rural centers, the fact is that one of the major benefits that would result from the implementation of the proposals put forward by the Member from Rhineland, would be a saving on hospital beds, a saving on the actual time afforded for the most serious cases by patients which now are unable because of the malfunctioning and the inadequacy of the present delivery system to provide the accesses required. And if the member opposite before he had sort of risen himself to his feet with his scissors in hand, had looked at the resolution, not simply as another exercise of rhetoric or debate, but looked at it as a very serious proposal put forward by a member of this House, designed basically to answer one of the more pressing problems of health service needs in the province, then I think that he might have refrained himself from simply following the dictates of the front bench in providing another kind of generalist, sort of applause to services which are without question inadequate in their present state. Because the fact of the matter is that if the position of the Physiotherapy Association and the position of the Member from Rhineland are to be taken with any merit, what they simply point out is that under the present criteria established by the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission, that criteria prevents many rural hospitals from operating physiotherapy services. And I find it somewhat surprising that the member from Radisson would provide some kind of admonition, or admission rather, that he agrees that there should be better services in rural areas, and then admonishes the physiotherapists for not getting themselves out there and doing their duty, when in fact it's the very criteria set down by the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission, is an agency of the Provincial Government, which prevents many rural hospitals from applying those services. And I suppose, I suppose that if the member had taken a little bit more time, and applied himself a little bit more to the Resolution at hand, he would have recognized that the inhibition or difficulty in providing those services lay within the correction of that government and their application in the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission, which we know is not an independent body as it is oftentimes made out to be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I just wonder if . . . the honourable member's position, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge what his position would be on community health clinics, which would then be able to look at all the services and try to attract the type of personnel to serve the communities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

RESOLUTION 30

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd be very pleased to first indicate to the Member that on a general principle I am in favour of community health clinics. I am not necessarily in the way that they have been implemented because - and this is by the way another area of debate. I think what's happening now is we are getting community health clinics without having a policy on community health clinics. It's coming in the back door like to many policies do, and I think it would be much more honest and open if we would be able to clearly see what the exact specific program of the government is.

But regardless of that, the fact is that under the criteria presently established by the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission, Community Health Clinics themselves cannot offer those services, because I believe that they require a certain designated physician, they have to demonstrate a certain hourly request for it, and as a result many rural patients who require physiotherapy services are now required to come in to the City of Winnipeg into outpatients departments of the two or three major hospitals in the City of Winnipeg which now offer those services. And the fact of the matter is that in the St. Boniface Hospital right now, the outpatients' department which offers physiotherapy services, has a waiting list of four to five weeks simply because the requirement is far overloaded according to what is available. Even in hospitals in the City, because they don't quite fit the criteria, hospitals like Grace, is not able to offer the physiotherapy services in the outpatient's area, again because of these criteria that are in operation. So the fact of the matter is the onus for change, the onus for amending the situation, the onus for providing that variety of services, that equalization in services, which the Member for Radisson paid lip service to, in fact directly lies within the hands of the government and the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission. If they begin to alter their criteria, then we will begin to get a better offering of these kind of services in rural areas and in other hospitals in the City of Winnipeg.

The consequence of which would be to release more hospital beds for more serious surgical cases and the consequences of that act would be to provide a correction of what is becoming one of the more serious problems in health care in the provinces, and that is the increasing inability of people to get their acute care beds when they require them. And I don't have to repeat the cases. I had a case in my own constituency last week which I brought to the attention of the Minister, where a constituent of mine whose husband who literally was sitting out in the hallway without finding care. After the intervention of hospital authorities, and I pay full compliment, that care was finally given. But the fact of the matter that there had to be a problem in the first instance is wrong. There should not have to be that kind of initial concern and worry caused simply because the beds are not available.

Now the fact is that this particular proposal as proposed by the Member from Rhineland would be in its basic benefit, aside from providing a better utilization of physiotherapy services, also indirectly provides more utilization for acute care problems in major hospitals in the City of Winnipeg. That would be one of the results of implementing this kind of resolution. And therefore it is extremely unfortunate that in this case the government saw fit to dilute, or water down, or amend, or eviscerate, whatever kind of words they describe it, but it simply is to take away a good idea and replace it with a bunch of homilies and platitudes to themselves.

Let me point to another matter which the Member from Rhineland brought up, and it was briefly mentioned by the Member from Radisson, about the physiotherapy profession in the Province of Manitoba. I believe that we have one of the finest schools and training programs in the province, and I think that the University of Manitoba's system is one that has gained recognition throughout the country. Unfortunately, unfortunately --(Interjection)-- you just have to learn a little patience. Unfortunately most of the graduates of that program are compelled to leave the province.

Why? First because of the salaries that are offered to them which in general is about the lowest, one of the lowest salary ranges in Canada. In fact the salary the supervisor, or director of physiotherapy services, receives in one of our major hospitals in Manitoba is exactly the starting salary of a first year graduate physiotherapist in the Province of British Columbia. And therefore by the normal demands that go on, is that it is only natural that where the Province of Manitoba is spending a good deal of money to train highly skilled health workers, that they are compelled by economic facts to leave the province. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, they're compelled by lack of opportunity, that by putting the restrictions on

RESOLUTION 30

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) that the Health Services Commission has applied - in fact it has restricted the opportunities for physiotherapists to gain the kind of occupational opportunity that they require. And therefore the problem is that many of our best physiotherapists, many of whom we are paying the full costs, which is an expensive program, are leaving the province. And therefore we are losing the value of their services as well as the value of the investment that we have placed in them. And that itself is a serious problem, and one again which I think that the original resolution provided by the Member from Rhineland sought to solve; and one that the Member from Radisson again in his blindness and inability to see the merits of the issue has wilfully gone ahead and taken away. And that is, you know, that is becoming a chronic case that if there is any probable source where a form of therapy is required it's in this Chamber in the second row, three seats to the right. So that's probably where we should start some form of therapy so that we could get some ability and recognition of what's required to bring about good and decent proposals that would be to the service of people in this province. And that is the kind of resolution that was before us today, and that's the kind of a resolution which is now been amended sort of out of existence by the amendment put forward by the Member from Radisson.

And I just begin to wonder, Mr. Speaker, when we can finally convince, if not the Member for Radisson, who I think is simply taking orders, but finally convince at least some of those who are giving the orders, that if they could cease and desist at least once a week to allow one of the resolutions of merit to get through that phalanx sort of obduracy so that we are able to provide in this province the - as we have talked about before, there are members in this House who from time to time have an idea, and that idea deserves sort of being discussed on its own merits, and that is exactly what we're trying to do today. So I would suggest that if the spirit of the Private Members' Hour is to be recognized and honoured as it should be, then the present activities of sort of hypercensorship that we see being exercised most predominantly by the Member from Radisson, but he has a few crew members who I guess have been assigned to the . . . squad over there to destroy everything in their sight. If they would only change their spirit at one point, then we might be able to resurrect and return to what the Private Members' Hour was all about. And if that's the case--(Interjection)--Well the Minister from Mines and Natural Resources is so concerned about what goes in Ottawa. I keep having to remind the Minister and members of that side, that the members of this House were elected by the people of Manitoba. What we're concerned about is the operation of the Legislature of Manitoba. I am not a member of parliament in the House of Commons. I'm a member of the Legislature of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. AXWORTHY: And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I simply point out that I would judge the standards of this House by this House itself, not by all of a sudden picking out and saying, "Boy those other guys are just as bad as we are". I'm simply saying look at our own House, and look at the spirit that's applied here, and look and see how it's treated. And that's what we're trying to deal with at this point. It is the kind of motivation and the kind of - I think it's fear in fact - I just think that what's really at the base of all this is that basic fear that in fact that they're going to be so, that all those lovely promises and platitudes that we've seen being pumped out by the Department of Information just don't really hold up when they're subject to the examination. And the private members' resolutions are the ability of providing that kind of base of judgment.--(Interjection)-- Well pass it up, please do. If the Minister's prepared to pass it, we're prepared to go along with it. We can end the debate now and we can get on to do something which makes some good sense.

So to conclude, Mr. Speaker, the point we're trying to make is that the Member for Rhineland has a good resolution. It makes good sense for the people of rural Manitoba who are now deprived of services. It makes good sense for the people of Winnipeg who are requiring and desperately need more acute hospital beds, and this would provide some alleviation of that. It makes good sense from the basic point of providing a stimulus and incentive to the physiotherapy profession in the Province of Manitoba, so that they can apply their services to the maximum of their ability. On every count that original resolution was a good one; the amendment that was proposed sort of dilutes it out of existence, and as a result we can only say that the people that we're looking at, and the Member of Radisson specifically, is not interested in good resolutions or good ideas, but simply sort of in defending the faith. And

RESOLUTION 30

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) that's the problem with true believers, they're more interested in defending the faith than looking at what is good. You know, there's an old play called *The Rainmaker* where an evangelist preacher stands up and is preaching the faith, and one of the people said in an aside, "The problem with that man is that he is always so concerned with what's right, he forgets what's good." Well, Mr. Speaker, the problem with that government is they're always talking about what's right and as a result they forget what's good, because this is a good resolution and it deserves to be supported and not amended.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, you know, we have to from time to time listen to nonsense because the fact is that the rules are that anybody can speak for 20 minutes, for a certain length of time, and one has to permit each member in their seat to make whatever comments they want. The fact is that the honourable member has talked about Private Members' Hour as if somehow in this House it is treated in a negative way by the members of the government, and that we should go back, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. What is the point?

MR. AXWORTHY: The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that I believe we're debating a bill on physiotherapy not on Private Members' Hour, and if the Minister is prepared to speak to the bill, we're prepared to listen.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member cannot have it both ways. He cannot get up and tell us what the spirit and idea of Private Members' Hour is, say a bunch of ridiculous, undefendable things, and then get up on a point of order and say that you cannot answer those stupid asinine, unintelligent, ignorant things that I have said. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that is not a point of order, that I am now dealing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge indicate his point of order.

MR. AXWORTHY: The point specifically is - the previous one is that I'd like to know when the Minister plans to speak to the resolution on physiotherapy services.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, again the honourable member, you know, he would like to have the ground work laid so that he can say whatever he pleases, and then rise on a point of order and prevent it. I am dealing with a Private Members' Resolution; I am dealing with what a Private Members' Resolution is; I am dealing with the honourable member's statement that the government is afraid to pass this resolution. If we were afraid, Mr. Speaker, if we had something to fear, and if we were trying to protect our position, and if we were not trying to be forthright, we would pass the resolution. Did the honourable member read the resolution? What does the resolution say, Mr. Speaker? It says that the government shall consider the advisability of - Mr. Speaker, the government will consider the advisability of having the Manitoba Health Services pay for physiotherapy treatment.

Now if, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member was correct and we were afraid of something or had something to hide, then we would pass the resolution, we would go back and consider the advisability, and we would decide not to do it. And, Mr. Speaker, that is entirely in accordance with what the government can do on an abstract resolution, not on my say so. But, Mr. Speaker, you read any legislative set of rules and they say that the words "consider the advisability" mean consider the advisability. The Honourable Health Leader of the Liberal Party is going back to the days when somehow the Conservative administration thought that the rules consider the advisability mean that you have to do it. Now just because, Mr. Speaker, they couldn't read English doesn't mean that every other Legislature in every jurisdiction could not read English. But that's not what I'm dealing with. I'm dealing with the honourable member's statement that somehow we over here have something to fear and therefore we have taken out the resolution. The reason that the resolution has been amended is so that there would be no difficulty about ascertaining what the government's position is. And the government's position, Mr. Speaker, is that physiotherapy treatment, as much as we can do it, should be provided on the basis of physiotherapists working within the institutions that are set up for them, working in such a way that they are part of a medical team, and not forcing and inducing and inspiring the physiotherapists to go out on a fee for service basis. That's the basis of the resolution.

Now, you can agree with that, you can disagree with that, but to get up in your seat and say that we are afraid of something is absolutely ridiculous, because if we are afraid we would

RESOLUTION 30

(MR. GREEN cont'd) go back to the physiotherapists and say, "Yes there was this resolution and we passed it and we want you to be happy with it." Who is pushing for the resolution?

Mr. Speaker, I have received several letters on the resolution. They are from physiotherapists, and I'm not blaming the physiotherapists. The physiotherapists have tried to get as good a deal as they can, just like anybody else; just like I do, and I'm a lawyer, just like the honourable member does when he's a professor, to try to get as good a deal as they can. But we in the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, have to think of the total situation, and the total situation, Mr. Speaker, is that we are trying to develop a method of service . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: . . . a method of medical treatment that does not rely solely on the fee for service basis. Now the honourable member who does an awful lot of talking doesn't want to do any listening, and I suggest to the honourable member that the reason he has two ears and one mouth is so that he should speak half as much as he listens, and that's what he should start doing. --(Interjection)--That's right, because the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, got up in the House and said that we should go back to the spirit - go back to the spirit of Private Members' Hour; that's one thing that he said. Well, where is he talking about? In the House of Commons, in any Legislature across this country, or in Lloyd in Wonderland, because, Mr. Speaker, there is no way where Private Members' Hour is dealt with on the basis that he says, except in Lloyd's Wonderland. Maybe some day, maybe some place in some university, he set up a mock parliament which operated according to Lloyd's rules, not Roberts' rules, not Bourinot's, not--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, when he is the government we know what he will do if he is the government. He was the executive assistant for Mr. Paul Hellyer, was a member of the Liberal administration, and in this the Conservative administration is the same, and by the way I admit that the New Democratic Party administration will be same, that Private Members' Hour is to deal with Private Members' bills. That seldom, if any - if at any time do they come to a vote, that they are almost always talked out and if they are voted on they are defeated. That is the general situation, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not saying the universal situation, that is the general situation. In the Manitoba House I was here as a private member; I presented very good resolutions in my opinion. I never once criticized the government because they didn't pass the resolution because it was a Private Members' Resolution. I criticized them, Mr. Speaker, because they didn't pass the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member having made a faux pas. having made a stupid statement, would now like to go away from it, and would now like to say, debate the resolution. Well we are debating the resolution, and I have indicated what the situation is with the resolution, and I'm trying - and the honourable member does not want any education, he will not listen, he wishes to continue in Lloyd's Wonderland where the government and the resolution . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: . . . where the government and the resolution and the adoption of bills is not done by the elected majority but is done by the defeated minority. That is Lloyd's Wonderland. He thought, Mr. Speaker, he thought that when he was elected to a party composing five members, that that gave him not only the right to govern, but, Mr. Speaker, during Private Members' Hour, that that gave him a preference to the government, because a private members' resolution in the spirit of things should be adopted by the government because that's what private members' resolutions are for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, has any person in this House beside Lloyd in Wonderland ever advanced such a proposition? I've had the opportunity of talking to the Leader of the Conservative Party on this issue. He knows what private members' resolutions are. He knows that they are a period for debating, for private members to put forward their positions, to try to make an impact on the press, but it is not the hour in which the minority governs Parliament, which is the suggestion that is made by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Now I suggest that he can go through the Legislatures across this country, see whether I'm wrong; go to the House of Commons, see whether I'm wrong; go to the House of Commons in Ottawa, see whether I am wrong, but he says, let's not go anywhere, let's stay in Manitoba, let's stay in Manitoba and let's see whether I am wrong under Manitoba precedent, because I was a private member on the other side and I know what it is to be on both sides. And the fact

RESOLUTION 30

(MR. GREEN cont'd) is, Mr. Speaker, that we did not govern from the opposition when we were private members and we have passed certain resolutions and we have defeated certain resolutions. And this one, Mr. Speaker, this one, if we were afraid, which is really what annoys me because I - you know, when we caucus these things we say, well maybe we can consider this and that's the best way of disposing of the resolution. We just vote for it, consider it, and dispose of the resolution. You know, that's open to us. But there are times, Mr. Speaker, when it is felt that it is better to crystallize what the government position is, to be forthright about, to be courageous about it, and not as the honourable member said that we are afraid, and to indicate this is our position and on this we will fight, and we are not going to try to lull anybody into a false sense of security by thinking that we will pass the resolution

Now, the honourable member's definition of that is cowardice, that's the honourable member's definition. Well yesterday, or two days ago we heard his definition of what is smart. Smart is to hide the interest that it cost you to fund an organization rather than showing frankly what the government is having as its expense. Mr. Speaker, that was his definition, that was his definition. Mr. Speaker, when I said that the Federal Government is funding a fund by \$200 million which shows no interest and therefore they don't have to show a loss on that fund, the honourable member said "that's smart"; and therefore his definition of what is smart is to hide the interest. The Manitoba definition of what he would call stupid is to show what it is costing him.

So we have in Lloyd's Wonderland dictionary: smart, hide the interest, don't let the people know what it is; cowardice, forthrightly putting the government's position; bravery, hiding behind the resolution even though you know that you are not going to consider it. This is the dictionary of Lloyd's Wonderland, because that's the only place, Mr. Speaker, where this proposition is known, I mean I haven't heard of it anywhere else. No, nowhere. The only place, Mr. Speaker, where I have heard those definitions applied, where that idea as to Private Members' Hour is advanced, is from the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I must presume from that that he knows of a place where this--(Interjection)--Well, the honourable member, he's the one who can't take it, he's the one who says, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order don't let the Minister talk that way. Why are you letting him, Mr. Speaker, show that I am an idiot. It was on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order you are not permitted to do that.--(Interjection)--Well, you're the one who - you're the one who's scared.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister will have an opportunity to continue the next time we get to the resolution. The hour being 5:30, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned till 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)