



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

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



Vol. XXVI No. 50A

10:00 a.m. Friday, May 26, 1978

Manitoba Legislative Assembly

Thirty-First Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

<i>Name</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Political Affiliation</i>
ADAM, A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANDERSON, Robert (Bob)	Springfield	P.C.
AXWORTHY, Lloyd	Fort Rouge	Lib.
BANMAN, Robert, Hon.	La Verendrye	P.C.
BARROW, Thomas A.	Flin Flon	NDP
BLAKE, David R.	Minnedosa	P.C.
BOSTROM, Harvey	Rupertsland	NDP
BOYCE, J.R. (Bud)	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	P.C.
CHERNIACK, Saul M., Q.C.	St. Johns	NDP
CORRIN, Brian	Wellington	NDP
COSENS, Keith A., Hon.	Gimli	P.C.
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CRAIK, Donald W., Hon.	Riel	P.C.
DESJARDINS, Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DOERN, Russell J.	Elmwood	NDP
DOMINO, Len	St. Matthews	P.C.
DOWNEY, James E., Hon.	Arthur	P.C.
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	P.C.
EINARSON, Henry	Rock Lake	P.C.
ENNS, Harry J., Hon.	Lakeside	P.C.
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FERGUSON, James R.	Gladstone	P.C.
FOX, Peter	Kildonan	NDP
GALBRAITH, James	Dauphin	P.C.
GOURLAY, Douglas	Swan River	P.C.
GRAHAM, Harry E., Hon.	Birtle-Russell	P.C.
GREEN, Sidney, Q.C.	Inkster	NDP
HANUSCHAK, Ben	Burrows	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd G.	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
JENKINS, William W.	Logan	NDP
JOHNSTON, J. Frank, Hon.	Sturgeon Creek	P.C.
JORGENSEN, Warner H., Hon.	Morris	P.C.
KOVNATS, Abe	Radisson	P.C.
LYON, Sterling R., Q.C., Hon.	Charleswood	P.C.
MacMASTER, Ken, Hon.	Thompson	P.C.
McBRYDE, Ronald	The Pas	NDP
McGILL, Edward R., Hon.	Brandon West	P.C.
McGREGOR, Morris	Virden	P.C.
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin	P.C.
MALINOWSKI, Donald	Point Douglas	NDP
MERCIER, Gerald W.J., Q.C., Hon.	Osborne	P.C.
MILLER, Saul A.	Seven Oaks	NDP
MINAKER, George	St. James	P.C.
ORCHARD, Donald W.	Pembina	P.C.
PARASIUK, Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Howard, Q.C.	Selkirk	NDP
PRICE, Norma Hon.	Assiniboia	P.C.
RANSOM, Brian, Hon.	Souris-Killarney	P.C.
SCHREYER, Edward R.	Rossmere	NDP
SHERMAN, Louis R., Hon. (Bud)	Fort Garry	P.C.
SPIVAK, Sidney, Q.C., Hon.	River Heights	P.C.
STEEN, Warren	Crescentwood	P.C.
URUSKI, Billie	St. George	NDP
USKIW, Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WILSON, Robert G.	Wolseley	P.C.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, May 26, 1978

Time: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my right, where we have 70 students of Grade 5 and 6 standing from Alexander School under the direction of Mr. Wareham. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

In the gallery on my left we have 30 students from the Inglis School under the direction of Mrs. Dora Fingas. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Roblin.

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

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. MORRIS McGREGOR (Virden): The Petition of Oo-Za-We-Kwun Centre Incorporated, praying for the passing of An Act to exempt the Oo-Za-We-Kwun Centre Incorporated from certain Provisions of The Liquor Control Act.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I just want to report verbally to the House that on an earlier date last week, I indicated that we had some preliminary information back with regard to the effects of the sales tax reduction. I am advised by the staff that we won't have good solid statistically calculated data until probably the end of June or the first of July on the complete retail sector in the province but the preliminary indications from the larger department stores and such would indicate that the sales rate for the first months during which the reduction in sales tax has been effective indicates an increase in sales, which is substantially above the predicted increase for 1978 over 1977. For revenue purposes prior to the introduction of the sales tax reduction, the department had calculated on an increase in sales in Manitoba in the order of 10 percent, 1978 over 1977. The indications are that the sales rate in the department stores, as one single indicator, Mr. Speaker, which may or may not be representative, is that the increase is probably more of the order of 20 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I indicate this to the House only because I have indicated it to some members of the media, late yesterday, and I had told the House last week that I would at the first opportunity, report here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, in terms of the rules it's rather an unorthodox way to proceed, but perhaps we should just take note of that and attempt to avoid causing ourselves unnecessary difficulty in terms of interpretation of the rules and procedural hassles.

With respect to the substance of the statement by the Minister of Finance, I take it that there is as yet no definitive firm data, but I can readily join with him in expressing the anticipation that when there is a definite short-term fiscal policy followed, which is one of reducing a taxation measure, letting it be widely known that it is only a period of a few months and then discontinue, that it is likely to have a short-term effect. Whether or not this is significant in terms of long run development of fiscal matters' is of course an open question. But I, for one, would not be surprised if a period of approximately April to the end of September or early October, that there will be some surge in retail buying; whether this in turn will result in almost a consequential reduction or fall-off in the months following that, also remains to be seen.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Friday, May 26, 1978

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON, in the absence of the Attorney-General, introduced Bill No. 38, The Marital Property Act, and Bill No. 39, The Family Maintenance Act.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS introduced Bill No. 35, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2), and Bill No. 36, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (3).

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West) introduced Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask, in the absence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, ask the Minister responsible for Emergency Measures Organization, whether the provincial government is undertaking any investigation out of respect to the storm pattern last night, to determine whether or not there is damage of sufficient magnitude to warrant consideration of local government assistance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister in charge of EMO is the same Minister as the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and so, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take the question as notice to report specifically for his department. As the Members of the House are aware there are a number of problem areas across the province, a lot of them involve both the telephone system and the hydro system and of course the flooded basement problems. There are a large number of problems that are existing and have been caused by the storm, but to answer the question more specifically I'll have to refer it to the member in charge of EMO.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to direct a question to the Minister of Finance, who is also responsible for the Energy Council, and ask the Minister if he could indicate whether any representations have been made or considered or contemplated to be made to the Government of Canada with respect to oil and gas pricing — gas pricing in particular — given recent revisions in terms of estimates of reserves of oil and natural gas?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Energy Council staff have been involved for some time with regard to the oil pricing problem, particularly the impact of the extension of the line from Sarnia to Montreal and the impact that it has on the oil price here in Manitoba, in the redistribution of costs of the extension of that line, and the impact on Manitoba, and there has been a statement issued on that particular issue.

The Natural Energy Board has been hearing the representations with regard to oil policy — the major gas policy hearings are not scheduled yet to begin — will be sitting probably most of the fall of 1978, this year, and we expect to make representation at that time. We will also be preparing, and are preparing, to make representation with regard to the Polar Gas Pipeline.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: A supplementary. To ask the Minister whether he can indicate whether he has information as to when the next meeting is projected of Ministers across Canada relating to energy pricing, that is to say, oil and natural gas pricing.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there is no date at this time that has been set for the meeting of the Energy Ministers across Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance as Acting First Minister. Will the Minister of Finance protest to the Federal government its use and misuse of Indian people in northern Manitoba, which after having used them in a despicable way to take unreasonable positions by financing a pressure group in northern Manitoba to fight against the provincial government — because the Federal government was abdicating its responsibility to represent the Indian people — has now thrown them aside and said that they are no longer of

use to the Federal government? Will the First Minister protest this terrible misuse of native people by the Federal government in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he rephrase his question and leave out the derogatory remarks about another government.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult for me to speak without being derogatory towards the Federal government. Having heard my remarks with respect to the Federal government, would the First Minister protest this despicable misuse of native people in the Province of Manitoba, that went on for something like two years, with the Federal government now saying that now they are being thrown aside. Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister, let me make it quite clear that I believe the Federal government is right in not financing a pressure group in northern Manitoba, but they have been doing so for three years and now that use has been made of them, they are throwing them aside similar to what governments have done to Indian people for many, many years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I want to be sure what the member is referring to, and I presume he is referring to the financing of the Northern Flood Committee. Mr. Speaker, there has been an application and I presume that's what the member is referring to by the Northern Flood Committee for further financing of their interest in their work. Mr. Speaker, I realize there has been application made to the Federal government by this particular group. I believe, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to the Federal government itself that their position has been that the northern flood agreement has been signed and that the work of the committee was basically to terminate and the northern flood agreement was to take over after that point. I will however though, Mr. Speaker, check on that and as far as possible reply to the member's question.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the honourable member when he is replying would he look into the correspondence between our government and the Federal government, when we, at all times, said that the citizens in Manitoba of Indian descent are represented by the Federal Government and that we dealt with the Northern Flood Committee only under protest because we were forced to by the Federal Government, who were using these Indian people as pawns in the Federal Government game.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, by taking the question as notice it would appear that some examination would have to be made where there is not evidence already available, but I don't want to, Mr. Speaker, in doing so to indicate that.

By the recognition of the fact of the existence of the Northern Flood Committee over the some three years of negotiation, it's to some extent an after-the-fact commentary and after-the-fact question. The work is finished. The committee was recognized, whenever it was started, some three years ago, and culminated, principally, the end of December — not the end of December but perhaps March when the vote was taken in the communities. So the member's comments may be an important observation as far as he's concerned, but the observance of the reality of that committee was recognized by the former government at the time of its institution.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that's exactly why I put it to the Honourable Minister. Will he see to it that he examines the documents because the Government of Manitoba, which continues regardless of which administration recognized the Northern Flood Committee only under protest, and said to the Federal Government, at all times that we recognize your government as representing these people and we are dealing with the Northern Flood Committee only because you are requiring us to and not because we recognize them as being a governmental representation of citizens in our province. I would ask the honourable member to check the correspondence in that connection.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll check the correspondence. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to in any way imply in doing so that there is anything of any substantive nature that is going to change the present picture except to allow for some observations.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it would appear to me that this sort of concern and observation and position may and ought to have well been made by the member when he was in the position of having some influence over that decision and not, Mr. Speaker, to raise it at this point in time when it's well after the fact and is really a fait accompli.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a third supplementary question.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask the honourable member to determine whether, in fact, what he is saying should have been done at the time, was indeed done at the time. The Manitoba Government at all times protested the existence of having to deal with a committee rather than the Government of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Inkster that he is not asking a question, he is entering into an argument which is highly illegal at this particular time.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Renewable Resources. It relates to the Snow Lake fire and the destruction of some 30,000 acres of prime forest land. Can the Minister confirm that this fire was started by a lightning strike during an electrical storm on Tuesday, May 16, 1978 and was not reported until Saturday, May 20, four days later; and that this fire was out of control on Saturday, Sunday, Monday and Tuesday and in the process of burning destroyed some 30,000 acres, as I have mentioned?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I join with the Member for Rupertsland in his sincerity in his concern for the waste of the forest that has taken place in this particular instance. It's absolutely nothing unusual for a lightning strike not to appear for a two, three or four-day period; in fact, it's not uncommon for it to go unnoticed for in the vicinity of sometimes a week. It has been determined that the Tuesday was the storm that they believe initiated the fire. It was not observed for approximately four to five days. The figure of 30,000 acres, I suppose, is somewhat in dispute. The significance of the amount certainly isn't. The report that I received yesterday was that they felt they were holding it, they were mopping up the small hot spots, and hoped, prayed, I suppose, that the thing was really under control, and the closest figure that they could estimate at that particular time was 24,000, but it could be somewhat larger, there's no question about that.

MR. BOSTROM: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. My concern relates to the adequacy of the government's fire detection program which is necessary to discover fires soon enough to be able to handle them before they get out of control. My question is, given that this fire did start on Tuesday, May 16 and was not detected until Saturday, May 20, can the Minister confirm that this late detection of this fire was due to the fact that the department is no longer using twin engine aircraft with a sufficient range . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that repetitive questions should not be asked in this Chamber. That question was asked on a previous day by another member.

MR. BOSTROM: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is the second question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that if he doesn't like the way I rule he has a perfectly normal way of challenging that ruling.

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. BOSTROM: My point of order is that this question that relates to the fire detection program of this government was not answered by the Minister. I did not ask this question before and it's the first time that this particular question was asked, and you have not waited until I've asked the question in order to make a ruling on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he check Hansard and he will find out the question was asked; it is repetitive, and I recognize the Honourable Member for The Pas.

The Honourable Member for The Pas. —(Interjection)—

Order please. The Honourable Member is challenging the ruling of the Chair. Has he support for that? Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? (Agreed.)

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Northern

Friday, May 26, 1978

Affairs and Renewable Resources. I would like to ask him, in regard to the specific fire in the Snow Lake region, whether or not twin-engine surveillance might not have reduced the time of discovery of that specific fire?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I think the question is so hypothetical that it's close to being ridiculous. I have said to the Member for Rupertsland, who should know and apparently doesn't, as the former Minister responsible for this type of thing, I have said that lightning strikes often, it can go two, three, four days, sometimes seven days, without being discovered, regardless of whether you have DC-3s or jets or helicopters or whatever you have.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister acknowledge that the design of the fire prevention program is to catch fires before they get out of control, and could he indicate to the House what is the reduction of surveillance in the region where this specific fire took place? How many less hours are flown; how many less miles are flown now under this government?

MR. MacMASTER: The Member for The Pas is trying, Mr. Speaker, but he's not going to succeed. The fire prevention program is in place; it's adequate; the exact number of planes and hours, the differences, if you wish, from this year to last year, and they're not there, will be available to the members opposite during my Estimates. I appreciate them attempting to establish a point which will be shot down during the Estimates.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could tell us, not only in relation to this specific fire, then in the relation to the whole program, how many miles have been reduced from the fire surveillance program, how many hours have been reduced from the protection program, how many less people there are as spotters in terms of the program, whether students will be available as assistant surveillers under this program? I would like to ask the Minister whether or not the total approach of him and his government is not detrimental to the people of northern Manitoba, is not detrimental to the forestry resources in northern Manitoba; whether or not their cutbacks are not affecting the survival, the economic survival of northern Manitoba; whether or not the incompetence of that particular Minister is not hurting the forest industry in northern Manitoba?

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

MR. JORGENSEN: Surely, Mr. Speaker, that question is so obviously out of order it should not be tolerated.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for The Pas that he use an order for return?

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Renewable Resources, and I'd like him to confirm that his reduction in the type of aircraft that are being used for fire detection programs is having a detrimental effect on the forest protection of this province, as evidenced by the Snow Lake fire.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, that's absolute garbage. While I am on my feet I would like to answer a question that the Member for Rupertsland asked the other day. He wanted to know if there was any difference in policy relating to the per capita allotment to the communities on the unconditional grants and there is absolutely no difference this year than there was last year, but there has been a problem pointed out with the 1976 Statistics Canada where 29 communities were not included, and at this time we're working out those details.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the Minister confirm that a Cessna 180 is being now used for fire detection in that Snow Lake area whereas there used to be a twin-engine aircraft with longer range and better speed in order to detect forest fires?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That also is a repetitive question. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I sense that there is some difficulty on the part of members

Friday, May 26, 1978

on this side to receive answers on questions put to the Minister of Renewable Resources. I would like to ask him whether there has indeed been a reduction in the department's effort in the fire detection field from that of a year ago — yes or no?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: . . . I don't know how many times I have to say it, Mr. Speaker, but I guess I can say it to every member opposite if they all choose to stand up. I'm satisfied that the detection services being provided in Manitoba today is of such similar nature to what was previously provided that that is adequate.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the honourable Minister hasn't heard the question. I simply wanted to know whether there has been any reduction in the service of the department with respect to fire detection in Manitoba.

MR. MacMASTER: Well again, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there is no reduction. The reduction is of very similar nature to last year. If he wants further details I hope he's present when the Estimates come up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labour responsible for Workplace Safety and Health, a question regarding the handling of anhydrous ammonia. Has her department learned anything from an industrial accident which occurred last year in the City of Brandon and from subsequent investigation thereof of the lingering death on one employee of Paul's Hauling Limited at Brandon and also the treatment of half a dozen Brandon firemen in hospital resulting from this particular accident. Is there any report that she could give us on the investigation? Has there been anything learned on the handling of this very dangerous material?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA PRICE (Assiniboia): I believe, Mr. Speaker, that after that — I think it was in 1975, was it, that this happened? Last year. It was due to the wrong size hose being used and there have been rules and regulations put down that have made it that this will not happen again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: I thank the Minister for her answer, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate that there are a number of limited engineering regulations that do exist. Is the Minister, in amending regulations, however, is she requiring her department to review the matter with regard to safety regulations in the handling of the anhydrous ammonia, the storage of that material, the inspection, the siting of plants, and the training of personnel which goes beyond the engineering aspects into the safety non-engineering aspects?

MRS. PRICE: With regard to the adjustment of the hoses, Mr. Speaker, there is a new piece required put on to connect with the hoses so that it is impossible that they will have the incorrect size now on their machines. With regard to the moving of the plants there's just Imperial Oil left and as I mentioned yesterday they are in the process of moving and will be fully moved by the end of the summer. I believe the Honourable Member for Brandon East knows that the season is over now pretty well for the operation of these plants and before it goes into high gear again they will be moved and everything will be as you like, yes, hunky-dory.

MR. EVANS: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. While I appreciate the Minister's answers I wonder if she would undertake or whether she could advise us whether she has required the committee on Workplace Safety and Health to look into this particular area, not just with regard to the engineering, the size of hoses and so on, but also with regard to the training of personnel in the handling of this material, the actual geographic siting of plants, not in urban areas but outside the towns or the cities, and also with regard to storage facilities. These are questions that are much broader than mere mechanical or technical or engineering devices. Would she undertake, if she hasn't already, to have her committee on Workplace Safety and Health investigate this matter and perhaps come out with the recommendations to ensure that such accidents don't occur in future or to help ensure that they don't occur in future.

MRS. PRICE: The inspectors from the Workplace Safety have been out there. They have had

with the fire chief and the people that are operating the plants and the secretary-treasurer, I believe, for that particular location in Dauphin and they are all of the opinion that they are satisfied that everything is being done.

A MEMBER: In Brandon, not Dauphin.

MRS. PRICE: Oh, well, in Brandon it has been, and I can check with my department to see what has been done so far as Brandon is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to draw the honourable members attention to the gallery on my right where we have 26 students from Warren Collegiate of Grade 11 standing under the direction of Mr. Wiebe. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Highways. On behalf of all honourable members we welcome you here this morning.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment whether he has any additional information with respect to the source of water pollution in the village of East Selkirk.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I have no additional information but I can tell the honourable member that there have been discussions with people involved with possible sources and that some actions have been agreed upon to attempt to remove those possible sources.

MR. USKIW: Could the Minister indicate, Mr. Speaker, just who the possible sources are and the discussions taking place with.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe I have probably named the possible sources perhaps four or five times in the House and one was the sewage holding pond at the school, and one was the abandoned quarry into which surface runoff from the surrounding area could accumulate and hence get into the ground water system, and the other possibility was the local sewage disposal systems.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, then the Minister today suggested there is a variation from his last statement. Can he tell me then that the farm itself, the Right Angle Farm is now excluded as a possible source?

MR. RANSOM: No, Mr. Speaker, I say that the abandoned quarry is a site where runoff from the surrounding area can accumulate and get into the ground water. The Right Angle Farms is in the surrounding area as are a number of other sites as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a third supplementary.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate then what their findings were as a result of the colouring that showed up in some of the wells that was poured into the abandoned quarry? What conclusions were drawn from that finding?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: It's difficult to draw a positive conclusion from the test, Mr. Speaker, beyond that the dyes that were placed in the abandoned quarry later showed up in some of the test wells. It doesn't necessarily mean that pollution came from that particular source — it certainly indicates that there is a positive route with regard to surface drainage and the ground water. The discussions that have taken place since that time I believe have led to some agreement as to the action that will be taken — the Right Angle Farms are taking some action to prevent runoff from getting into the quarry. I believe the quarry itself is owned by Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, and some action will have to be taken to seal that off, and in addition I believe there is action being taken with respect to the holding pond at the school, as well. So action is being taken with respect to all possible sources.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Renewable Resources.

Can the Honourable Minister confirm that ManFor held timber rights for the timber land recently burned in the Snow Lake forest fire?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: No I can't, but I'll take it as notice.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Honourable Minister then also undertake to take as notice and confirm that ManFor logging crews were scheduled to shortly begin logging operations in the areas surrounding the general area burned by the Snow Lake fire?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, I'll take that as notice.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps while he's undertaking to answer those two questions, can he also undertake to determine the dollar value of the commercial timberland burned in the 24,000 acres in Snow Lake fire?

MR. MacMASTER: I'll get a total report on the area and the fire and the damage, and the related people — I think that possibly would answer it.

One particular question I have that was asked yesterday, I have an answer for, for the Member for Churchill. His question was: Was the Aztec previously based in The Pas and used for detection now being terminated, the lease for it? My information is that that particular plane, the lease is being terminated, but that particular plane itself hadn't been previously used for detection, it had been used for passenger hauling. So that's a portion of what you asked yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education, whose department funds the Special Mature Students Program at Brandon University, which assists people on low income or who are disadvantaged in obtaining a higher education. Can the Minister advise the House whether it is the policy of his department to transfer the Special Mature Students Program away from Brandon University?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Brandon East, I believe that was covered during the Estimate process, and the only program that was being transferred of course is the Winnipeg Centre Program. I think that was discussed quite adequately during the Estimate process.

The program in question that the Member for Brandon East mentions — there is no policy to transfer it at this time.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for his answer. I appreciate we did discuss the Winnipeg Centre project, but there are concerns. I'm asking these questions in response to concerns that are now being raised by members of the faculty. Would the Minister advise, if it is not being transferred out, is there any policy to phase out this particular program in the near future? If not to transfer it away, is there a policy to phase it out, to terminate it, if not this year within two or three years?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, there is no policy at this time to take the type of action that the Member for Brandon East mentions.

MR. EVANS: A final supplementary then. Can the Minister advise whether it is the policy of his department to reduce the level of that program this year by not advertising for applications for that program?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, the intake has been reduced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question respecting House business to the Government House Leader. And that's to ask him with respect to the long awaited bills on The Family Maintenance Act and The Marital Property Act, can the House Leader indicate approximately when these two bills will be distributed, and also as to the likelihood when they will be spoken to at second reading by the Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, those bills are expected to be distributed today, and just as soon as they're distributed, it is anticipated that they will be introduced for second reading early next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Education. The Honourable Minister undertook during Estimates to get the amount of computer time that was logged out by his department, and to whom, and I wonder if he has that information for me at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Logan will receive that information today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Just a further statement on the Snow Lake fires, seeing that there is some sincere interest in it. They are holding the fire in check, they believe, effective ground action is now taking place, and mopping up is taking place, and they are predawn infrared scanning the particular area right now because of the mossy area and the possibilities of additional flareups.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Renewable Resources. When he makes his report on the fire to the House, could he include in that report a report on the number of detection flights flown in that general area over that four day period from Tuesday to Saturday, and what kind of aircraft was used on those detection flights?

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

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Renewable Resources would also undertake to indicate to the House just the size and proportion of damage that has occurred because of that fire.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: I would think that's all part of it. The size is somewhere between 24,000-up of acres. I might as well say to the House, so that there is no misgivings on the type of report that I will bring in, that when we're talking about the value of the forestry area, you must talk about the value of where it is at. Now if you understand what I'm saying — I'm not going to bring in some fictitious statement that says because of x amount of timber put into lumber, it's worth this on the market. I'm going to give you a realistic value of how we see it, where it's at now. If it's inaccessible, it might not be worth that much. We can talk about what the product could be, but to bring it in realistically.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This question is to the Minister of Tourism. Given that the Minister is following the practice of the previous government in giving park permit passes to honourable members, I wonder if he can assure the House that this park permit will assure honourable members access to the Jarmoc Road which is in the Whiteshell Park.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the member look at the agreement and the different documents that he or his colleagues tabled in the House and I am sure he'd get his answer from that. May I just point out that the permit that was given does not however allow any rowdiness in the parks, and should a member of the Legislature be found to be rowdy in the parks, the rangers will be treating them equally like they will other people who are causing disturbances within the parks.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope while honourable members on this side are following the advice of the Minister, that the Minister and his colleagues will also follow his advice.

My second question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Tourism. Can the Honourable Minister report when he will be tabling the documents which he indicated in the last Friday Question Period he undertook to take as notice regarding the Attorney-General's department's opinion and the legal opinions with respect to the Jarmoc Agreement, and also the questions which were put to him which requested the date when the Jarmoc Agreement was revived after department officials had advised the Attorney-General's department that this agreement would not be proceeded with until October 26th. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that those questions may better be asked when we consider Estimates. The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, last week I undertook to get those answers to the questions and I should have them the beginning of next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Education whether he will be tabling the report usually referred to as the Outlook on Employment, that he undertook to table on my request during the Estimates. During the Estimates, we asked if the Honourable Minister would table this year's report on employment prospects, employment outlook, that is prepared by his staff and in co-operation with other departments. I believe he answered in the affirmative and I wonder if he could advise when he is going to table that report or provide it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Brandon East, I am attempting to clear that report through the other departments that are involved, and as soon as I have been able to do that I will be able to have it for the Member for Brandon East.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, if you would call the bills as they appear on the Order Paper beginning with Bill No. 11.

GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 11 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE RETAIL BUSINESS HOLIDAY CLOSING ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, An Act to amend The Retail Business Holiday Closing Act. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to take part in the debate on this bill, personally I say that I don't know whether the Minister really knows what the principle of this bill is, because on May 10th when she introduced this bill, she said in Hansard of that day, "proposed amendments before you reflect some of the concerns that were expressed at the time of dealing with the bill when it was passed last year, and the proposed amendments," — the ones that we have before us now, — "could not be considered major amendments since they do not detract from the basic intent of the Act, and I believe they will clarify and improve the legislation."

Well, Mr. Speaker, in saying that the amendments to the Retail Holiday Closing Bill that the Honourable Minister introduced are not — as she says — minor amendments, they are major surgery. They are right back to square one, and to deal with the principle of this bill after the way the Minister introduced it, and I don't know whether she does this deliberately or through ignorance, but she starts dealing with the bill in sections of it, which she did on the day that she introduced the bill for second reading, which puts subsequent speakers to that type of legislation at a bit of a disadvantage, because to refute what the Minister has been talking about we have to more or less go into some of the same type of topics that the Honourable Minister has been involved in.

But she says that the legislation will protect small shopkeepers. By small shopkeepers, I imagine she means the mama and papa stores, which we have in the City of Winnipeg and in other parts of Manitoba and who are rapidly becoming an extinct species, because we see what is happening with large major chains across the country which are cutting down the need for the small Sunday

stores, which in the main, the mama and papa stores, is where they get a major part of the revenue. I don't look upon Fairview out in Charleswood as a mama and papa store; this store is employing 30 or 40 employees. If you call that a mama and papa store, well then, the Minister and I have a different idea of what a mama and papa store is.

She says that the legislation will clear up some misunderstandings that were created by the legislation that was introduced last year, and the main representation against the bill was made by not major chains, not mama and papa stores, but by the middle types of stores, many of whom are employing 20 to 30 people. These are the people who are opening on Sundays, or had been staying open on Sundays; these were the people that forced the major chains into opening on Sundays, and I might, just for the Minister's edification, tell her that I have been speaking to Bernard Christophe of the Retail Clerks Union, who hold contract with major chains such as Safeway, Loblaw's, Dominion, and various other chains in the City of Winnipeg, and they have already said — I don't think this is anything very startling — but they had said that if the Sunday business which will result if this bill will pass in its present form, if it cuts into their profits, they will open on a Sunday.

And the Minister has confirmed that, because in replying to a question from the Honourable Member for St. Johns, she said. . . I think the honourable member said the first question he would like to direct to the Honourable Minister is to clarify the amendment which would be limited to an employer regardless of the number of outlets that the employer may have. In other words, if there is an owner of an operation which has two outlets — let's say in two parts of Winnipeg — that the regulation will apply. Four people will be the total employees working on that day and not for outlet.

What evolved then, Mr. Speaker, was a hassle over the rules and one of those funny things we get involved in in the House here at times, but eventually the Minister came up with an answer about a dozen or so lines down, and she says: "As long as they live up to the amendments of this Act." Well, Mr. Speaker, if they live up to the amendments of this Act, I can assure the Honourable Minister that Safeway, Loblaw's, Dominion, Shop-Easy, any one of these large chains, will open. What we will have is back to the jungle that we had prior to this legislation coming in. If the Minister thinks that she is going to rely on the Lord's Day Alliance Act of Manitoba, or the Lord's Day Alliance Act of Canada, those are two pieces of toothless legislation. Because there is no way . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Paper tigers.

MR. JENKINS: They are paper tigers. The Honourable Minister of Health is quite right, they are paper tigers, and toothless paper tigers at that. They mean nothing because the large chains opened and showed you exactly what they thought of it. And the Minister has said that she's going to make these amendments.

Well, if she wanted to do the surgery on the bill that she did, why didn't she do just the same thing as the government did in December of last year when they repealed The Marital Property Act and The Family Maintenance Act; repeal the legislation altogether, because that's what she's doing with this so-called amendments that she's bringing in.

If she's going to rely on the legislation that they have — this is quite similar to the legislation that they have in Ontario — and I can assure her it doesn't work down there either, it doesn't work. They fence off an area at the back and draw a screen over it; but the major chains can stock their shelves, they can cut their meat, pre-package it, and with the scope that they're given in this Act, with the proposed amendments, the manager and four employees can operate quite an efficient operation on a Sunday.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this will not be the end. This will not be the end because we will have seven days of grocery shopping in the Province of Manitoba; next we'll have extended hours and next, and last but not least, we'll have 24-hour shopping; 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Here's a government that professes to deal with restraint, but they don't want to restrain the shopping hours that people in the shops are going to have to work. Oh no, seven days a week, 24 hours a day, that's fine. And you know when it all boils down, Mr. Speaker, the cost of the end product that people buy on the shelves in the grocery stores, is paid by the consumer. If you are going to have stores open seven days a week, and eventually 24 hours a day, the operating costs are much higher. You don't have to be a great mathematical wizard to figure that out. You don't even have to be one of those great entrepreneurs that we see over on that side of the House.

MR. JENKINS: You know if you operate 24 hours a day, 20 continuous operations, do you mean

to tell me that your costs of operation are not going to be higher?

People have only so much money. Once they've spent it they're not going to go. I can recall going out to Polo Park many a night, when they had night-time shopping out there, especially nights when Simpson-Sears are not open, because they are one of the big drawers out there, I think, and you could shoot a cannonball down that Mall and not hit anybody. You might hit some of the arcades, and whatnot, that are stuck down the mallway, but as far as people being there . . . You know when people have so much money to spend, they have spent it, they can't spend any more.

The same thing applies to the Minister of Finance, I heard on the radio, and then today he made an announcement in the House which incidentally seems to be the method by which this government operates. They make their statements outside the House and then come into the House and tell us all about it afterwards.

Perhaps the Minister without Portfolio, the Honourable House Leader, should give a crash course to some of his Cabinet members, that this is the place you make your announcements first. The Minister of Labour is also one that could take heed of that, too, because she — on this bill, when it was tabled in the House or when it was introduced for First Reading, in fact, even before the bill was tabled in this House — quickly hied away to the news media telling everybody all about it when her responsibility was, first and foremost, to make those announcements in this House. She subsequently apologized, I quite realize that, and I'm not holding that against her.

But I am just saying that members of the Treasury Bench over on that side seem to have a facility for making these statements outside the House and then coming in here and apologizing afterwards. And one who should have known better was the Minister of Finance, because God knows he's been in this House long enough, 12 years . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he make his remarks pertinent to the bill that's before us.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am making my remarks towards the bill. I'm just pointing out some of the things that are happening in this House that are pertinent with legislation that is being dealt with in this House. I think the first place that any bill, when it's given First Reading in this House, I take strong exception to a Minister running out to the press and telling them all about it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Again I suggest to the honourable member that he make his remarks pertinent to the bill that's before us, and I hope that he stays within the confines of that bill. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: I thank the Honourable Speaker very much, and I have assured him I'm going to speak to the bill. You have allowed a certain amount of latitude and I'm quite thankful for that. I'm trying to make my point and I'm not going to belabour the point any more; but I will reiterate once again — and if you want to rule me out of order you can do so — I think that the first and foremost place for people, when they're introducing legislation in this House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he make his remarks pertinent to the bill that is before us and stick to the subject matter of that bill. The Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

MR. USKIW: It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the member is trying to point out that the Minister has given information to the media before she has supplied the information to the House, and I think that's a valid point of debate when her bill is before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to belabour the point any more; I think the point has been made and I will go back to the bill. The bill, as it stands before the House, is one that we on this side of the House do not intend to support. We do not intend to support this bill because it is not going to solve any of the problems that the Honourable Minister indicated in her remarks, when she made her remarks with regard to this bill in the House. She said that this bill was going to clear up misconceptions and interpretations of the bill. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, there was no misconceptions in the bill that was introduced in this House last year. The bill was . . . to give one day of rest to people who worked in the retail trades. The Honourable Minister and the party

that she represents, the government, has seen fit that they are now going to open up grocery shopping seven days a week; that is something that they will have to bear on their heads. And it's going to be very interesting; with the restraint program that this government operates under, who is going to police it? Perhaps when the Minister is closing debate on second reading, she can tell us how she's going to police it; how she's going to charge people who illegally operate on a Sunday, because under this bill and the way that you have it set up right now, any Safeway, Shop Easy, Loblaw's, Dominion store in the Province of Manitoba is open on a Sunday; there's no way that you're going to close them down. And if you think that they're going to stay closed while other competition is cutting into their profits, then you're sadly mistaken. You'll probably be back here, maybe in another year, making some more amendments.

The best thing you can do, I would say to the Minister, is that you should just bring in the bill with about two lines; the bill is repealed; go back to square one. Because that's all your legislation does. You have taken the guts out of this bill, the bill that . . . Any teeth that were there are null and void, and by your own words in reply to the Member for St. Johns, you have said, "As long as they live up to the amendments that we have in this Act, then I would say that any major chain in Manitoba can open on a Sunday." If that's the type of legislation you wanted then you should have had the courage of your convictions and you should have come in here and said, "We are going to repeal this bill, period." Don't tinker around and try to fool the public by making some amendments; don't think that you're going to try and fool the public with that type of nonsense, because that is exactly what you're doing. As I said, if you had had the courage of your convictions you would have repealed the bill, period.

You know, to talk for any length of time on this piece of legislation is really —(Interjection)— not that much, because it's a very, very small bill. It really doesn't say too much, but what it does, has . . . And perhaps it's part of the debt; perhaps it's part of the election debt of the Conservative Party. Perhaps that's the debt that the Minister of Labour had, was to repeal the Retail Holiday Closing Act. We've had other Ministers over here who had their election debts to pay; perhaps that's her election debt.

So, Mr. Speaker, once again, I say that if the Minister had had the courage of her convictions she would have come in here, moved to repeal The Retail Closing Holiday Act; abolish it, take it out altogether; go back to square one, because that's where we are anyway, we are back at square one; we're nowhere else. The major chains will be able to open on a Sunday; that's quite evident; and they have already served notice that when their profits are hurt they will open. And they won't open just a Safeway here and a Safeway there, and a Loblaw's here and a Dominion there; they'll open the whole works. And your friends out at Fairview in Charleswood will face the competition. I imagine they are the people who are perhaps the prime movers in the . . . And perhaps that's an election debt that the First Minister is paying off, too — who knows? After all, that big store is out in his constituency, so perhaps that's his election debt. —(Interjection)— Oh, I understand he even toured the store.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would have had far more respect for the Minister of Labour if she had come in and said, "Look, I'm going to repeal the bill, period, take it off the books," but to come in here with this flimflam of pretence that she's making some finer, minor tuning adjustments to a bill which is nothing but a bunch of nonsense, she's absolutely done major, radical surgery on it, amputations — the bill is going to be toothless; it will be just as toothless as those other two pieces of legislation, The Lord's Day Alliance Act of Manitoba and The Lord's Day Alliance Act of Canada, because neither one of them are enforceable, never have been and never will be.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Logan has a very short memory when he talks about election debts; he doesn't remember the fact that when this bill was brought in by the Minister of Labour last year, the bill that was brought in, how it was debated in this House. It was debated in this House very strongly, and the opposition said at that time that if we had any powers at all, we would change it, and as a matter of fact, we suggested many amendments to the bill at that time that would be very close to what we have suggested in the bill at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what the member thinks about the man that's born in Manitoba and went to the bank and borrowed money; pays the interest on it; built up his business; and how does he feel about that man, that the previous bill closed up? How does he feel about the man,

the private owner, the man who owns his own store, because he wanted to compete, and he didn't make the rules; he didn't make the rules at all. The other people made the rules; the other people made the rules that said, you've got to have aisles in a store; you've got to have people do their own personal shopping. And to go to the bank again and make his store modern enough to stay in business, borrowed from the bank and paid it off himself, a small independent businessman. How do you feel, that when you passed that legislation last year, you closed him up? Maybe the honourable member would like to come down and hold this debate in front of a Shell Oil grocery store on Sunday morning. How do you feel about the Shell Oil Company with their chain of grocery stores in the City of Winnipeg at the present time? Open all day Sunday, how do you feel about that? And you tell the independent businessman that he has to close. What did your bill say before, that if you open on Sunday, you close on Saturday. Why did he have to close on Saturday? Why couldn't it have been Tuesday or Wednesday? You took the biggest day of his life away; that's what you did to the small, independent businessman. You talk about the chain stores opening up, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you this; that the volume of business on a Sunday in the City of Winnipeg is not such that it will pay, and I'll tell you another thing. The big chain store looks at the bottom line; if they see a loss in profit by staying open, they will not open. And I will tell you also, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons that they're going to lose, because the union contract they have is double time-and-a-half on Sunday. That was probably one of the reasons why, you know, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and I said last year, it was pretty obvious when this legislation came in that somewhere along the line, somebody didn't want to stay open because they were paying double time-and-a-half, and somewhere along the line, somebody was able to negotiate a double time-and-a-half contract for Sundays.

Mr. Speaker, we could certainly see what was happening when that legislation was passed last year. Mr. Speaker, why does the member say that people will have to work on Sundays — give them a day of rest? I would be willing to bet the honourable member right now, that if he goes to any one of the chain stores, and they probably have 50 employees in each store, and the manager puts up a sign and says, "We are opening on Sunday. I need four people to volunteer to work on Sundays at double time-and-a-half." Volunteer. If he doesn't get half of them volunteering to work on that day, I'll eat my shirt. So the fact that he's saying, people will be forced to work just doesn't wash, and he knows it. He's been part of the labour movement for a long time and he can be proud of being it, but he also knows that when some people get the opportunity to earn extra money, they volunteer to do so very quickly. Don't use that argument; it's a poor one.

Mr. Speaker, then we have the situation where the chain store could stay open, or can stay open, and the member says that the Minister said, "If they abide by the legislation, they can." Do you know what the Minister said? "If they don't break the law, they can." If you don't break the law, you can too. Anybody that doesn't break the law can do what they want to do, so that argument doesn't really have anything to wash.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that went through this House last year was a piece of legislation that was brought in, and there's no question that the chain stores liked it, and the unions liked it because it gave them the opportunity to sign a contract for double time-and-a-half on Sundays, holidays, and it gave the opportunity for the chain stores to say, "Well, we'll agree to that, as long as we don't have to open," and the legislation's here; was he brought here? Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, Ontario's legislation is very clear; the small stores are open on Sundays. They have legislation on square footage, which we could very easily take a look at. As a matter of fact, the Minister and I were speaking about that just the other day, that possibly, possibly, we take a look at square footage, the same as the Ontario legislation does. There is no problem to taking a look at that particular thing and that is available.

Mr. Speaker, the member is just shooting in the dark. He knows damn well why that legislation was brought in last year and I tell him now, since that legislation has been brought in, I can name you independent businessmen that have broken that legislation so easily it isn't even funny. All you did is give them the opportunity to go to lawyers that were smarter than yours, and tell them how to stay open. One man got prosecuted, but I can name you three or four that are open and they can't touch them, and they can't touch them.

So, Mr. Speaker, why are you saying, why is the member saying, all of a sudden, the chain stores would be able to stay open? We are saying that if you have more than four employees in that store on that day, you can't open. That takes care of the independent businessman and everybody else. It makes it darn tough on these chain stores. If we go to a square footage, it would make it tough on the chain stores. You know very well that people would work to earn the extra money at double time-and-a-half; they'd have volunteers lining up to do so. There's no way you're forcing people

to. Mr. Speaker, let's go down and have this debate in front of the Shell Oil grocery stores that are open all day Sundays, and then walk down the street and tell a guy that was born and raised in Manitoba that had borrowed money from the bank to build his business that you can't.

Mr. Speaker, then we talk about Sundays. He talks about the day of rest in the retail business. There are people open all over this province at the present time. If you want to be so high and mighty on that side of the House and get back to Sunday closing, let somebody get up and put a Private Member's bill in that we go back to Sunday closing, and we will close, we'll close. If you believe that the movie theatres, the hot dog stands, the bowling alleys, the pool halls, the garden supply house, hardware stores, drug stores, all of the people who were eliminated in that bill last year; I can go out to a garden shop on Sunday and I can buy lawn chairs, bird baths, flowers, anything I want, anything I want. But you're saying the guy that's an independent grocer, running his own business, can't sell a loaf of bread? You're saying he can't sell food? You're saying he can't, and Shell Oil can? You're saying 7-Elevens can? What kind of nonsense is this? What kind of freedom are you talking about that you single out one particular group; you single out one particular group, that said you've got to close.

You didn't hurt the large chain store with that legislation you brought in last year. You did them a favour, and you knew it. Just so a union contract could be signed at double time and a half on Sundays. —(Interjection)— Nonsense, my foot. It happened. Coincidence doesn't happen that easy. We said it last year in the House, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and I, and I'm saying it now and I stand by it.

Mr. Speaker, let's not single out one particular group. You know the honourable members on the other side seem to have some fantasy in their mind that they hurt the big businessman, that they can hurt the big businessman, or do him some harm or stop him from operating. Mr. Speaker, you don't hurt large businesses. They have capabilities of maneuvering any way they want because they're international, a lot of them, and national. You hurt the little guy. You hurt the Manitoban. That's what you did with that bill. That's what you did. You practically told him that he couldn't buy anything in his own store, or open his own store, and if he wanted to buy a quart of milk on Sunday, he'd have to go to Shell Oil. That's what you did to him.

You also told a lot of people who prefer to go down and pick up their groceries on Sunday, prefer to pick up their groceries on Sunday, that they couldn't do it. You also told a lot of people that had part-time jobs on Sunday working for them, that they can't work there anymore. You also told him if he had more than a total of three employees, at any time, that he couldn't open, and many of them laid off people to come around that rule. That's what you did with that bill last year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill says, if you have no more than four people working on a Sunday. I'll tell you that the Dominion Stores, the Safeways, and everybody that you mention, when they take a look at their costs of turning on the lights in those stores, and the overhead of just opening that door, and paying people double time and a half, who volunteer to work, and they take a look at the volume that they have to do just to open that store, and if that volume is not there, they won't open.

I'll also tell you another thing. They won't open for another reason, for another reason. In many cases four cash registers, unless they're going steady all day, can't maintain those stores, and they have it all on computer, they'll tell you their costs better than you know them.

So, Mr. Speaker, if they do, they'll be doing it and they'll be obeying the law, and you'll be allowing the local man, who's in independent business for himself, to do what he wants to as well. So, I say, Mr. Speaker, let's go and have the debate in front of the Shell Oil grocery stores on Sunday morning.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 14 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE INCOME TAX ACT (MANITOBA)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish you would have been with me for a short while last night to tell those fellows to go home. I was just maybe commenting that I should have gone

to bed earlier being such a day. —(Interjection)— As a matter of fact — oh no, I didn't sleep in, I would have loved to.

Mr. Speaker, thank you again. I would like to continue my remarks on this bill. At the time that I was just finishing up I was making some comments on the statements by the Honourable Member for Burrows, and I had pointed out to him that there are many many recreational areas and that type of thing in the City of Winnipeg at the present time and young people in all circumstances have availability to them.

Then I wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Burrows was saying that, how do you approach a young fellow who has to have an increase in his university charges, how do you tell his "old man" who is on the minimum wage that he's got to pay more money, while you are reducing taxes for the rich? Mr. Speaker, I will tell you honestly, I have trouble understanding the Member for Burrows.

Mr. Speaker, I will bet him and guarantee him that any young man going to university for the past two years or three years whose father is earning the minimum wage has been working to pay for it himself long before now. And what are we asking him to do? We're asking him to pay approximately 1 percent more.

A MEMBER: No.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, we are. We're asking . . . Let me put it another way; he was paying approximately 9 percent of his total education fees at the university. That's what he was paying, the province was doing the rest. I hope I'm not wrong, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks seems to think I am, but the Provincial Government carried most of the costs of the university student. —(Interjection)— And the increase that we're asking them to put in, is very small.

At my figures here, he was paying approximately 9 percent; he's going to be paying a little over 10 percent now. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, let me add this, his increase? His increase is the same as anybody else's; if he'd been working for the summer he would probably have an increase in wages over last year in summer employment. It happens every time he goes out and gets it, but, Mr. Speaker, what the Honourable Member for Burrows doesn't know, and he should have known because he was the Minister of Education, is that anybody in that circumstance could have applied for grants, could apply for grants and probably would have been accepted on that basis.

So you know, Mr. Speaker, he's being asked to pay a little bit more and he probably can apply for grants anyway. —(Interjection)— Hallelujah, is right. You know, if he'd said Hallelujah when he got elected and quit, we'd be better off.

Mr. Speaker, money doesn't know any boundaries. You know, I would be willing to bet the honourable members on the other side — I'm in a betting mood this morning — that when they go down to their stockbroker and they buy stock . . .

A MEMBER: Which they all do.

MR. JOHNSTON: . . . and I'm sure they all have, or most of them have, you know, their broker says, "You know, I'd like you to invest in this particular stock. It's a company operating in Holland or United States or wherever it may be, and you will see a profit. I think I can recommend this because there'll be a profit." You know that's where you probably would buy that stock, no matter where it is. Do you really think that the head offices of corporations, when they're turning around looking, looking at where they're going to invest their money, don't say, "Well, you know, if we invest it here we'll make more of a profit than we will if we do over here." Do you really think there are any boundaries to financing, or money? There are no boundaries. There's only competitiveness, and that's all we wanted Manitoba to be, is competitive. —(Interjection)— We wanted Manitoba to be competitive.

I will tell you this, that you don't hurt the large companies. The large companies in this province can turn around tomorrow, as I said earlier about corporations . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hesitate to interrupt at this time but I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on the left where we have 58 students of Grades 7 and 8 standing, from Wabigoon, Ontario, under the direction of Mrs. Neill.

We also have in the loge, to my right, the Honourable Member of Parliament for Brandon, the

Honourable Walter Dinsdale.

On behalf of all honourable members, we welcome you here this morning.
The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, a corporation in Manitoba that is getting hit too hard by taxes, it's very easy for them. They put their corporate office in another province, leave the warehouse open here, all we've got is a warehouse with some stock, they're not paying the taxes they should be in Manitoba, they're paying them somewhere else, simple. Very simple to do.

You really don't ever hurt the large businesses. You know, these great big businesses that the honourable members opposite have so much hate for, and that's what it is. You mention a big business to most of them and they just hate the name. They just can't stand it. Then all of a sudden they don't realize that they're not harming those people, and they never have and they never will, but you harm the small guy in Manitoba who's the backbone of the business in this province or any other province. He's the backbone of the business in Canada. He's the guy that the large business also says, "Look, I'll come to Manitoba if I've got enough small manufacturers available there to support my industry. Is there enough of those small manufacturers there that I can send out "locally" to have parts made for the thing that I'm manufacturing? Is there enough people in Manitoba with the skills required, to support the industry?" That's what he says. Then he looks and he says, "Now, can I make a profit by going into this province? Or would I be better off putting my factory somewhere else? Or, worse still, would I be better off when I have a factory, moving the corporate offices somewhere else?"

Mr. Speaker, as I said, financing investment and money, there's no boundaries. There's no boundary line on a dollar bill, but there are boundary lines in provinces, and all provinces have to be competitive. We have to be more than competitive, if possible, in the Province of Manitoba. We don't have the most beautiful winters in the world. —(Interjection)— We all enjoy them, we love them. Ask some fellow who's going to put a factory here and he walks around and he says to somebody, "Well, we'd like to move you to Manitoba." The fellow says, "My God, I've got to buy a bunch of overcoats and everything. I'm going to pay more taxes if I move to Manitoba."

A MEMBER: We've got the best looking girls.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes. Well, that I agree, there's no question about that. We've always said that you walk down Portage Avenue and down Main Street in Winnipeg, and you see the most beautiful girls in the world. —(Interjection)— Well my colleague from Fort Garry has reminded me that they are much more beautiful in Sturgeon Creek.

But Mr. Speaker, I can tell you this, that you have to be at least competitive in the Province of Manitoba; you have to encourage those smaller businesses and keep them here first; then you will encourage the large ones to come because they will have the support industries that they need. And don't get any idea that you'll ever hurt the big businessman, because he'll outmanoeuvre you. It's just like the tax system, Mr. Speaker, the tax system federally or provincially. We sit around and we come up with a new tax, and the lawyers of the corporations sit down and they say, "By gosh, if we do it this way, we'll be able to avoid that." Next year, the government comes back and says, "We'll plug that loophole," and another loophole opens up. And then you make it so discouraging for people to come and open up in Manitoba, when we have the Member for Inkster saying to one industry, "If we get back in power, we're taking it, Mac. If we get back . . ." And he says, even if it's better, even if there was changes in the insurance industry today and it was better, the Member for Inkster says, "If we get back in power, here's the road to Toronto, Mac." That's encouraging. So, that's really great. So Manitoba has always been in a tough position from a business point of view. I've been in it since I was 18. We used to have the best distribution system in the Province of Manitoba for western Canada, than any other province. Right now that distribution system has an 80 percent moved to Alberta. And lots of it has moved to Saskatchewan because Manitoba discouraged them from being here. We have to bring them back. —(Interjection)— You will; you'll bring them back. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Seven Oaks says, "You can't outbid Alberta." Mr. Speaker, you can; you can have small business in Manitoba that can ship into the larger markets, that can make a profit, but they're discouraged from coming here. Mr. Speaker, all you need is something that you can load up a truckload of — don't make the bicycle, make the spokes; make the components and ship them; you've got a market to the south of you. Work on things that you can ship a lot of in a small carton, if you want to put it that way. But it's discouraging here, because no matter how hard the guy works in Manitoba, you take it away from him. You

discourage them from staying here; you discourage the people that he wants to work for to come here.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge was getting up and saying it, he was blaming us for them leaving; I don't know why. But he recognizes it also. The Liberal Party also recognizes that you can't hurt big business; they never try. They just say, "We'll give you whatever you want," and the big businesses gets everything they want — "but we'll tax you and you pass it on to the consumer."

But Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I, as I said when I started out in this debate, in this speech, are really only saying, "Let's get Manitoba competitive." Let's not discourage —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface says, "At any price." Mr. Speaker, if we don't become competitive, if we don't start to encourage people to want to be in Manitoba, the price will be so high that we will never pay it. We'll never pay it with that attitude. Mr. Speaker, it's pretty obvious that you're talking to deaf ears. They have their philosophy, we have ours. They just will not realize that we have to be in a position in Manitoba to make the climate right to build this province, and those honourable gentlemen have got their ears closed to it, so we'll go along doing it and we'll prove what we were doing was right, the way you proved what you were doing was wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member has time, and if so, would he entertain a question?

Mr. Speaker, the member seems to feel that Manitoba has somehow lost private investors over the last six, seven or eight years. I am wondering whether he knows, and whether he'd care to comment on the fact that in fact, in the years 1969 to 1976 the private sector investment in Manitoba more than doubled, which is a greater percentage of increase than the previous seven years?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if he's comparing. . . The Member for Seven Oaks says, "the previous seven years." He's getting back into the sixties, he's getting back into those days when I'm sure the honourable member was in business himself. Investment the past while to build a building costs you double that it did then; naturally investment's going to be bigger.

MR. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks on a point of order.

MR. MILLER: I think I indicated, in case he didn't hear, these are squeezed-out figures, these are to allow for inflation.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, there's another answer for that, too. The smaller people in Manitoba, the younger people, or the large group of younger people that we had moving through the system, as all provinces had, naturally during the seventies created more investment in all areas, in all provinces. But Mr. Speaker, how long will they stay, and how long will they continue if they're discouraged to the point where they say, "There's no sense carrying on; I'll go out and get a job or I'm moving." Once the small businessman learns or gets to the size where he can become mobile, the same as other larger business, or when he gets to the size when he is more mobile, when he gets to the size where he can hire a good corporate lawyer, when he just gets to that size, you'll find out that he'll move from the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On Bill No. 20, An Act to Amend The Garage Keepers Act; the Honourable Member for Brandon East. Stand?

MR. EVANS: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs; Bill No 24. Stand?

MR. MCGILL: Stand.

THE CATTLE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 25. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, The Cattle Producers Association Act; the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to conclude my comments on this bill today. Mr. Speaker, would you indicate the amount of time that I have left?

MR. SPEAKER: If you carry on, I'll have that.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was listening to the Honourable Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Fourteen minutes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was listening to the Honourable Minister without Portfolio who, in this session does not have to work to defend his salary, on the previous bill —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, you may not be aware of this, but this was clearly indicated in Committee of Supply last night, that the Honourable Minister without Portfolio does not have to defend his salary because he rode in on the coattails of his colleague, the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Task Force, with his salary . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing on a point of order.

MR. JOHNSTON: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member is saying that I do not have to defend my salary. In that respect, technically he is right; it is voted. But one of the reasons that I didn't have to is because the honourable members of the NDP Party last Thursday night, wouldn't stay when I could have moved in to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a point of order. May I also suggest to the Honourable Member for Burrows that he keep to the text of the bill before us.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to do so and I merely wanted to properly describe the Minister without Portfolio, that I wanted to make reference to, who made two comments which I believe are equally applicable to this bill, when he asked the House, Mr. Speaker, "What kind of freedom are you talking about?" speaking to us. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues, what kind of freedom are they talking about in this particular bill?. When the Honourable Minister of Agriculture introduced this bill, he said that it would provide for the establishment of an organization similar to that in existence in four other provinces: British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario. And when I heard the Honourable Minister's comments, I took them at face value; I took the statement at its face value, that the organizations, or that there are similar organizations in those four provinces with similar powers. Well, Mr. Speaker, in order to speed up the process and hoping that the Honourable Minister would assist, call the honourable members in the House, I did attend at his office the following day requesting copies of the legislation that allows for the establishment of similar organizations to which he had made reference to in a press conference following the second reading of his bill. Well, to this day, I have not received copies of that legislation. Now he says that it's a matter of public record, that I could obtain it in the library. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what legislation he is comparing it with. If he is comparing it with the — you know, there may be a Lion Tamers' Association Act in some province which may be similar in content; I don't know. There is none in Manitoba because we don't need one over here; we can find other ways and means of dealing with our "Lyon" over here without organizing that type of association. So I don't know what bill he was comparing it with.

And then, I asked him in the House, would he fight the legislation that it's similar to? Well, he then said, "No, it's not legislation, but it's legislation that allows for the establishment of organizations similar." So I said, "Well, name the organizations." Well, he wouldn't name the organization, in any

of the provinces, and then eventually he said, "Well, it's similar to the Ontario bill." Well, Mr. Speaker, over the past week and a half I did make the effort to compare Bill 25 before us with what the Honourable Minister refers to as legislation allowing for the establishment of similar organizations in three provinces, three of the four, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario. And yes, Mr. Speaker, I did find some similarity; there was some similarity. And the similarity is in the fact that the three of them are printed on paper, and that's where the similarity ends, Mr. Speaker. And in none of those three provinces is there provision for the establishment of an independent organization responsible to no one, with the power to initiate action to send you or me to jail. In none of those provinces. In every one of those provinces, Mr. Speaker, the beef checkoff process is within a scheme under the control of a board which is answerable to the Minister of Agriculture, who is a member of Cabinet, who is a member of a Legislative Assembly, answerable to his colleagues in the House, one who is answerable to the people of the province, but not to an independent board such as this bill allows for the establishment.

Now, during the debate, Mr. Speaker, I have heard mentioned time and time again that there is provision for checkout in this bill. Mr. Speaker, there is no provision for checkout, for opting out. There is no provision for opt-out in the bill. All that there is provision for is for refund of the checkoff fee. But every person, every buyer — Mr. Speaker, if you should buy a side of beef from a farmer, you become subject to this bill. The Beef Producers' Association may want to check on some farmer to determine whether he is paying his dues on all the cattle that he slaughters and sells. And they may want to double check with you to determine how much beef you have purchased; to determine whether the producer from whom you have bought is paying his proper dues. And Mr. Speaker, if you don't comply you can be fined or sent to jail. —(Interjection)— Now someone says, "Better read the bill." And I would suggest to honourable members that they'd better read the bill. Now the Minister later said that oh, nothing of this kind is going to happen until a board is elected — until a board is elected. Mr. Speaker, the bill doesn't say that at all. The bill doesn't say that at all. The bill, Mr. Speaker, merely states that no regulation imposing fees shall be made until the election of the members of the association is held within the time prescribed unless — unless, Mr. Speaker — unless it provides and sets out the procedure for refund of fees which the provisional board, you know, the 14 wise men can do.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister is wrong again when he says that this will not come into effect until there is a properly elected board and we had debated that point the last time that I've spoken, Mr. Speaker, a week and a half ago, when I did indicate to you that who knows what the terms and conditions will be, that will be laid down as prerequisites as to who will have the right to elect the 12 to 15 members that this bill provides for and what their powers will be.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Honourable Member for Pembina that he would be well advised to read this bill, and read it carefully, and read it to some of his constituents who probably will have a better appreciation of the intent of it and the consequences and the ramifications of it than he does. Let them explain the implications of the bill to him so that he would understand so that when this bill comes to a vote in this House he would be able to vote upon it intelligently despite the fact that some members of his caucus may not be fortunate enough to do so, and let him learn what the implications of this bill are — that it is indeed a frightening bill, Mr. Speaker. It's a frightening bill; it's a dangerous bill. Mr. Speaker, the Cattle Producers Association is a very respectable title. You know, what finer organization could there be for organized crime to seize upon and use as a front. —(Interjection)— Ohhhh! You know, my goodness, it's more respectable than florists shops, more respectable than pin-ball machine shops to operate behind — you know, a private organization not responsible to anyone, having the power to do what this organization has — it's a beautiful arrangement.

A MEMBER: They'll love it.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Of course they'll love it. Of course they'll love it — with the blessings of this government, Mr. Speaker. Now, if the cattle producers want such an association to give effect to some of the objectives, aims and objectives that they've set out in this bill, Mr. Speaker, let them form one. Let them form one. There are many avenues open, by way of private bills, under the Companies Act, other ways and means by which they could bring themselves into being as a legal entity.

Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to support a private bill for the incorporation of such an organization on two conditions, Mr. Speaker: (1) that nothing contained within that bill will encroach upon the freedom and the rights of the individual. (2) that that bill will not give one group not answerable to this Legislature the right to send people to jail, which this organization has and

members know it. And if the Honourable Minister of Agriculture would read the bill that obviously someone else had drafted for him, which he did not draft nor even read, he will find that the regulations passed by this board have the force and effect of regulations under the Regulations Act, and read the Regulations Act and the Honourable Minister would see what can happen to an individual who violates a regulation of government; that there is provision for sending the Minister if he should violate one to court and fining him or sending him to jail. Let him read his own legislation.

And that is the power that he wants to give to a few to pay off an election promise — to pay an election debt which he had incurred in the months of September and October, and which has now become due and owing. That, Mr. Speaker, is his IOU.

Mr. Speaker, as I've said, this is indeed a frightening piece of legislation. It's frightening to think that in this free world, in our society today that a Party which claims to be the defender of freedom, the champion of freedom, is going to bring in a bill such as this, bring in a bill with overtones of syndicalism which was the forerunner of facism.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. DOUG GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that debate be adjourned.

MMOTION presented and carried
The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: I wonder, as acting House Leader, if I can now ask the Speaker to now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MMOTION presented.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, just by way of information before you put the question. It would be our consideration to run the Committee in this Chamber only, or are we running it . . . I believe so, by agreement — till 12.30 anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to minimize any delay here I repeat what my understanding is that between now and 12.30 only that there will be only one Committee of Supply, and that at 2.30 we will proceed automatically in here and in Room 254.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the Motion?

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY — HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: I would like to draw the honourable members attention to Page 38, Health and Social Development. We are on Resolution 59, Clause (h) Dental Services. (h)(1)Salaries—pass — the Honourable Minister.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, when Committee rose last night the Honourable Member for St. Boniface had made a number of comments with respect to the children's dental health program and I would like to take a minute to respond to them and hopefully perhaps to lay to rest some fears that he has expressed with respect to that program and with respect to the future of that program.

I want to say initially, Mr. Chairman, that he doesn't have to sell the quality, the calibre or the qualifications of the dental nurses being employed in this program to me. He doesn't have to sell me on the high level of training that the student dental nurses going into the course under the aegis of this program at Wescana College in Saskatchewan, in Regina, are receiving. I know that those student nurses receive an excellent training. I know that they come out of that course well trained, well qualified, and dedicated to the professional work that they have decided to undertake. I've had excellent reports both from lay and professional people as to their qualifications, as to the standards that they have achieved and as to the work that they do. So we don't need to debate

or argue that point. I am in full accord with what the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has said about those nurses and I have said the same things myself, both during the life of this Legislature and indeed prior to the life of this particular Legislature, during the election campaign leading up to the constitution of this House.

I know that there is concern on the part of honourable members opposite and many members of the community for the future of the Children's Dental Health Program because, as with a number of other programs introduced by the previous administration during the past eight years, the present government comes to them with some caution, with some questions, and certainly with a determination to examine and assess the results, the benefits, and the costs of such programs before either endorsing them wholesale, determining whether or not to continue with them, modifying them, or making any decision as to their disposition and their future. The Children's Dental Health Program is one of those. It was not, and I candidly admit it, one of those concepts, one of those ideas introduced by the previous administration, that had the wholesale 100 percent enthusiasm of members of my Party when we were in opposition. That isn't to say that there was ever a determination on the part of my Party that the program was no good, that it had no value, and that it should be dismantled at the earliest opportunity. There was no such determination on the part of members of my Party. There has never been that determination on my part. I'm on record in my own constituency, in the election campaign prior to reaching the point at which I had the privilege to be sworn into this government, as saying that I believe in a children's dental health program, that I recognize that the proper and judicious pursuit of good dental health and good dental habits has a tremendous influence and a tremendous impact on preventive medicine and proper lifestyle for the future. It has a tremendous impact on the well-being of individuals, has an immeasurable impact in terms of health benefits and probably a highly measurable impact in terms of down-stream cost benefits.

I know from at least second-hand experience through other members of my family, if not first-hand experience of the wide number of cases of small children who suffer from various ailments and health disabilities coming into facilities such as the Children's Clinic at the Health Sciences Centre, who suffer their illnesses and their disabilities in substantial degree from the fact that they have had no proper dental health, and no proper dental treatment, and that a good proportion of the health difficulties that they are now experiencing can be laid to the fact that those problems originated in their mouths, with their teeth, and with the fact that they've never had the chance or the opportunity to achieve good dental health. Had they had that chance or opportunity, some of the difficulties, some of the illnesses that have afflicted them in later years unquestionably could have been prevented; certainly they could have been minimized.

So I don't for one moment discount the value of a proper preventive program in the dental health field as in all health fields, and I recognize the ramifications and the impact that good or poor dental health can have on general health, on one's general physical condition. I do endorse the concept of a children's dental health program; I have endorsed it outside and inside this House, and it's my intention to work to produce and maintain a universal children's dental health program.

The difficulty that I have had, Mr. Chairman, and some of my colleagues have had, has been with the concept of a state run, entirely state operated, children's dental health program. Part of the caution and the scepticism that has been articulated by us relates to the costs of such a program. My honourable friend cannot dispute the fact that since its inception a couple of years ago, the Children's Dental Health Program has carried with it a high unit price tag — a unit price tag that has been calculated at least in the beginning — approximately \$250 per child. That may be high by ten or twenty dollars; I'm not trying to fix a specific figure, but that certainly has been the unit cost that has been roughly calculated by commentators who have some knowledge of and association with the program, in the neighbourhood of \$250 per capita. Now that's a high unit cost.

My friend from St. Boniface refers to Saskatchewan's program, in which he says — I think he suggested last night — that the Saskatchewan program had the unit cost or the per capita cost down to something like \$85; I may be wrong on that but I think he said that. I know that the Manitoba Dental Association going into Turtle Mountain this year in the pilot project to which I have referred, is guaranteeing a per capita cost of \$125 per child. I know that personnel and professionals associated with the current Manitoba Children's Dental Health Program, have projected that on full utilization over the total parameters of the hoped for age range — that is from age three to age twelve inclusive in the ultimate — that we could probably expect to have the unit cost or the per capita cost down to a point in Manitoba where it was about \$70, perhaps even slightly less than that. Let us say we could get the unit cost down to \$50; that would be a considerable achievement and it may not

Friday, May 26, 1978

be beyond the range of possibility. Let's say we could get the unit cost down to \$50. If we're looking at every child in Manitoba between age three and age twelve inclusive, and that is what a universal children's dental health program means, by definition, we're looking at 183,000 children ultimately. At a unit cost of \$50, and that seems a highly desirable target to shoot for, we're looking at an annual budgetary expenditure of between \$9 and \$10 million. Now, all the Progressive Conservative Party in opposition was saying, at least all I was saying, as a member of the opposition, and all the Progressive Conservative government of the day is saying through the Minister responsible, namely myself, is that no matter how desirable, no matter how laudable a universal children's dental health program may be — and we have no quarrel with that concept — you still cannot slice it, shape it, present it, in any way in which you can avoid the reality of the economics. No matter how you shape it, no matter how you sell the argument, you're still talking about an annual operating cost of between \$9 and \$10 million to be supported by the taxpayers of Manitoba.

Now I'm not saying the taxpayers of Manitoba don't want to do that; I'm not suggesting they don't want to do that, but what I am suggesting is that the government has approached the subject with some caution because that is a major expenditure. Certainly it's good; certainly it's desirable. Lots of things are good and desirable, but we can't always have them, achieve them, accomplish them, as quickly as we would like — either in our households or our private business or professional lives, or in our public lives, through our governments. We cannot rush wholesale into a concept and into a program that has an annual price tag on it of approximately \$10 million until we decide, yes, Mr. Chairman, as the stewards of the funds of the taxpayers of Manitoba, and looking at the revenue projections and the cost and expenditure projections that the people of Manitoba face down the road, we can see where there is going to be \$10 million available every year for a children's dental health program, and we are going to ensure that that \$10 million is directed towards that objective.

The government simply has not, in this year of exercising care, caution, and what we deem to be fiscal responsibility over the Public Treasury, been able to come yet to wholesale endorsement of the ability of the taxpayer and of the Treasury of the Province, to meet that cost; to meet that price tag. The concept is one with which I have no argument, and what I want to do with my colleagues is to attempt to move as quickly as we can into a program that would be universal in concept in the manner that I have suggested but that would naturally carry with it the lowest possible, the most practical, the most manageable price tag. If it is not possible to do it for less than \$10 million a year, then we make the decision, all right, it has to be \$10 million a year, and we'd make the decision as to whether we'd go with it or not on that price tag. But we're not convinced that it can't be done for something less than that, provided a proper structure and format can be developed that takes advantage not only of the abilities and the professional ambitions of persons associated with the current government operated program, but takes advantage too of the private practitioners and ancillary practitioners in the field, and their expertise and their qualifications and experience.

So what we have done in the seven months in which we have been in office in this field, is initiate close consultation and discussion. We have, as this government, initiated between this government and the Manitoba Dental Association, close consultation and discussion to determine to what degree, if any, — to what degree, if any — the private profession, the private practitioners can participate in this plan, can contribute to this plan, can possibly operate this plan. I don't suggest that we start from the premise that the private profession should operate the plan but in examining the range of questions and the range of options that has to be an option. Can the private profession operate a plan of this type more effectively, more productively, and in a more economic fashion than we, the public, can do? If not, are there things that the profession can do in participating in and contributing to the plan that will produce a mixed kind of structure, a mixed kind of program that will have the same benefits that we're seeking — that is, full utilization, proper quality preventive dental care for all our children, and the lowest possible and practical price tag for the taxpayer to carry.

Those are the questions to which we're pursuing answers; those are the objectives of the consultations. I can't tell you how those meetings or consultations will turn out. It may be, it's conceivable, that there proves to be no practical viable role for the private profession to play. But I want to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that this government is determined to at least involve as fully as possible, in meaningful discussion, meaningful examination, of subjects such as this, those members of the community who are relevant by reason of their profession and reason of their qualifications to be involved in the program. Thus we're talking about the private dental practitioners and ancillaries in that field including dental hygienists and others of that capacity. It's our impression,

and I underline the word impression, that the profession as a unit feels frustrated and disappointed with the manner in which the current program was introduced and imposed in recent years by the previous administration. I know the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is going to say that he had all kinds of meetings with the Dental Association and he may well have done, and I take his word for it. All I can tell him is that the dentists, collectively, perhaps not individually, but collectively, through their professional organization or professional association, feel that whatever was done was window dressing, that there was no meaningful consultation; they were never given a chance meaningfully to participate, to be involved, to be included in the discussions, to make any contribution of a meaningful nature to the formation and the conceptualization of a children's dental health program.

Now I can take my honourable friend's word for his impression of those conversations, and I do take his word for it, and that being the case — because I take his word for it — I want to assure him that I'm not putting myself into any position or allowing myself to be put into any position of being perhaps confused or cornered through pressure tactics or through propaganda by the dental profession or any other profession. But I have to show the articulators, the spokesmen for the other side of the coin, the same courtesy. I have to take their word for the fact that they don't feel they ever did have a meaningful opportunity to participate or contribute, and as a consequence, my government colleagues and I, through me, have invited that kind of consultation and conversation with the profession, and we are in the process of trying to work out a structure that will deliver what the previous administration, and what this administration wants to deliver for the children of this province, but one in which our professionals in the dental field will have a role to play that they feel, and that we agree, they can play and that they don't currently enjoy.

That's the purpose of those consultations and those meetings. It ' doubtless will take considerable time — well into this summer, I would suggest, — before I can have conclusive suggestions or proposals to make to members of this Legislature, but that's what I'm working toward.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface suggested last night that we had caved in to an element, a group in the community, who had supported us politically. I want to assure him that that is not the case, that has not happened, there has been no sell-out, there is no cave-in. I am not misled by the blandishments or the entreaties of the Dental Association, and I would say that I don't think there's any intention on their part to confuse me. I think that they sincerely and earnestly feel they didn't have the opportunity that we're hoping to give to them. I would agree with my friend from St. Boniface, that there are individual dentists you can stop on the street and ask about the program, and they will endorse it — the Children's Dental Health Program as it's currently constituted — and they will endorse it 100 percent, but taken professionally, collectively, in their professional association, the posture has been one of resistance. —(Interjection)— Well, my honourable friend says, "The union part of it." I prefer to describe it as the political part of it.

MR. DESJARDINS: What's wrong with the union? I'm not ashamed of unions, they have the right

MR. SHERMAN: Taken at that level, they have demonstrated continuing scepticism and resistance, and it's my impression that that scepticism and resistance, as I have suggested, stems from the fact that they felt the program was superimposed on them. It was not the product either of mutual respect or meaningful discussion.

The situation with respect to the program at the moment, Mr. Chairman, is that it has been frozen geographically, but it has not been frozen in concept. We are maintaining it in the 29 School Divisions in which it currently operates, we are funding the School Division of Turtle Mountain to the extent of between \$32,000 and \$37,000 or \$38,000 to operate, or to finance the operation by the Dental Association of a project in that division which will run for a year and serve school children of certain age groups in that division, starting in September of this year and running through to the end of August, 1979. At that point in time, that project, that pilot project, will be evaluated for its effectiveness, for the degree of utilization, for the unit cost and for the reaction and response of the parents in the communities in that school division in particular.

There has been considerable concern about the future and the status of the dental nurses who are currently enrolled at Wascana College in the course, and I want to advise members of the House that the 28 student nurses at Wascana who are graduating this June will be absorbed and accommodated in the program. Those 28 dental nurses will be absorbed and accommodated in the program. The age expansion in the geographic areas in which we currently operate will make

Friday, May 26, 1978

that possible, in fact it will make it necessary. There are close to 40 student nurses who are just completing their first year at Wascana — I think the total is now down to 37 because of some drop-outs, but it started at 40, it's still close to 40 — they are due to graduate a year from this June.

I cannot at this moment, Mr. Chairman, offer them a guarantee that positions in the system and in the program will be available to them when they come out of their courses at Wascana, but I can say this, that I, as Minister of Health, would like to see them continue in their courses. Their government support will be continued and maintained, their bursaries will be available to them for their second year on the same basis as in the past, there will be no change in that' and I will extend to them my guarantee of good faith — if that's worth anything to them — that I will do my very best within these next two to three months to produce a finally structured program that will no doubt include the private profession, the members of the MDA, but may not depending on what they're able to work out with us, but a finally structured program that will provide opportunities for them when they come out of their course a year from this June.

That is a promise of good faith and relentless effort — and I mean that — untiring effort to achieve that. It is not an absolute guarantee, it would be misleading of me to try to make them that guarantee at this juncture, but I can guarantee them of my most intensive efforts, and I am confident that I can work this kind of a program out with the private profession that will involve them, but will be a mix of private and state operated programming and that will permit opportunities — either working with the private dentists out of their own offices or working in the form in which the dental nurses now operate under the program — will permit all those students currently in Wascana to find meaningful work, up to the level of their training, up to the level of their training, when they graduate. We're not talking here about saying to those students, "Well, we'll give you a job in a menial capacity in a dentist's office." No, not at all. What I'm talking about is a job up to the level for which they have been trained, and that will be the objective of my efforts this summer, for those who are in the first year of the course. The ones who are graduating this June, I guarantee today will be absorbed at that level in the program when they come out this June. They won't be employed immediately, but they will be guaranteed that when they come out in June we will have them in place sometime during the calendar year 1978.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 12:30 o'clock, I am now leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 p.m.