

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, March 29, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, I should like to take a couple of moments and pay tribute to those students who are out of school and are taking time to visit the Legislature, and in particular we have five students from St. Francois Xavier under the supervision of Mrs. Poitras. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Highways. And we have 17 students from Notre Dame Collegiate and 17 exchange students from New Castle, New Brunswick, and this school, Notre Dame, is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

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

## PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

**MR. GEORGE MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Petition of the Bel Acres Golf and Country Club, praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Bel Acres Golf and Country Club.

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

**MR. WARREN STEEN:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Petition of The Investors Group, praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Investors Group.

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

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to present the Annual Report for 1977-78 of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, we note with interest the return of the First Minister from the Western Premiers' Conference out in British Columbia. We also note, according to the reports, that the Premier struck out on two items, first the item dealing with the review of the crowrate, after endangering the very concept and, secondly, dealing with the power grid, I'm wondering if the First Minister would like to advise us as to whether there was a third strike not reported in our local media.

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

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, in the jovial spirit of the question posed by the Leader of the Opposition, I can only begin by telling him that there was a third strike which is obvious in the tenor of his comments today, and in the tenor of his comments when I was not here, namely a federal election. And that federal election, Sir, causes most opposition politicians,

especially those whose candidates stand little chance in this province, to try to strike out at any phony or contrived issue that they can, which my honourable friend obviously has done on the first two issues that he talked about.

So in order to complete his education, to inform that the state of the four western Premiers is solid and cooperative as it has been for some time, I can tell him, as I think has been indicated before, that with respect to the western power grid progress was made, the four ministers under the chairmanship of my colleague, the Minister of Finance, who have responsibility for the ongoing studies that are being conducted on this matter are going to meeting shortly. They have been accorded the authority by the four western Premiers then to make a determination about the subsequent studies that have to be done to complete this very, very important matter for all four western provinces.

With respect to grain transportation and handling — although the progress there was not as speedy as we would like to see it because it is a crucial problem that faces all western producers — I can advise my honourable friend that we are in agreement with the decision that was made for the four appropriate or designated ministers from the four Prairie Provinces to meet as soon as possible this Spring to try to arrive at a common position for the four provinces of western Canada if that is possible and for them thereafter to meet with the federal Minister of Transport whoever he or she may be after the 22nd of May of this year. So, I'm happy to report to him and I'm sure he's equally happy to hear that there was marked progress on all of the items under discussion at the western Premiers' Conference and I'm sure that he will join with all other western Canadians in noting that fact.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I then assume that the First Minister noted marked progress in his request for a reassessment of the crowrate structure. I'm wondering if the First Minister intends to campaign and to urge his national leader to also undertake a position of reassessing the crowrates in the unlikely eventuality that his national leader is successful on May the 22nd.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I note from the newspapers and from Hansard which is coming to us that my honourable friend has already been apprised of the five main points which I expect I can elucidate upon in debate, perhaps even later on today if the opportunity presents itself, that Manitoba made as a proposal for a task force study, a task force study, Mr. Speaker, which had earlier been suggested by the Honourable Otto Lang, a task force study which the initial form of it had been agreed upon by the Government of Saskatchewan, a task force study which would look into all aspects of the grain handling and transportation system in western Canada, one item of which of course is rates. And, I'm pleased to be able to tell my honourable friend face to face, across the House, so that he'll be under no misunderstanding we'll give him a copy of the remarks that I made at that conference which were public and have been public for some time, that the position that Manitoba took is that the benefits of the crowrate should remain with the producers of Manitoba and that what we have to be looking at unless we are to become ostriches with our heads in the sands — I'm not saying my honourable friend is trying to be that, but anyone who refuses to look at rates is taking that posture that what we must look at is how to protect the benefits to Manitoba producers while, at the same time, upgrading the handling and transportation system in all of its facets, its myriad of facets in order that we can meet in western Canada the kind of unparalleled export opportunity of 30 million tons of grain moving out of the prairie provinces by 1985.

We can't meet them with the present system. It is the responsibility of federal and provincial governments in this country to give the kind of leadership to ensure that that system is upgraded to the point where our producers will be able not only to produce that grain, but to see it delivered to those tremendously increased export markets that are developing beyond the shores of this country.

That's the kind of debate we are engaged in, Mr. Speaker, and I'm happy to bring my honourable friend up to date on that.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it's certainly very pleasant to be brought up to date, but I would still appreciate it if the First Minister would answer my question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I thought I had answered in spades for my honourable friend, but I'll be happy to give him a copy of the statement that I made. As soon as copies come up, I'll be giving copies of the communiques and all of the items which I'm sure, if my honourable friend reads

them he will find himself much more fully informed than he obviously is at the present time.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister for Economic Affairs to ask him if he will explain to the House why it is that Manitoba has not been represented on the joint federal-provincial metric committee for about a year, assuming that the statement in the Press is correct.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Economic Development.

**HON. J. Frank JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** Mr. Speaker, I read that article in the paper yesterday myself and I'm having an answer brought to me by my staff so I can discuss it and I'll be very happy to take the question as notice and give the honourable member an answer.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable Minister for undertaking to find out why it is that it can be stated the way it has been.

I'd like to ask him further in view of the other allegations in the article about Manitoba's deficiency in participating in the program Metric Conversion whether he can give an undertaking that Manitoba industry and Manitoba consumers will not in any way suffer by the fact that metric conversion may be brought about in other importing and exporting countries and provinces that would conflict with the failure in Manitoba to adapt to metric changes which may mean supply of parts or other materials.

And may I say, Mr. Speaker, I'm not concerned now with temperature or kilometers versus mileages within the province. I'm talking about industrial use and consumer use of metrically converted parts and supplies.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking for a complete undertaking from me, which I'm not prepared to give at the present time. We are monitoring it very closely. I would say to you that the metric conversion could probably cost Manitobans far more than the suggestion that the honourable member makes, and I have said that I only saw the article yesterday and I'm having it looked into at the present time.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that Manitoba is not an island unto itself, and must conform to the exporting and importing countries and provinces in supplies to and from Manitoba, can the minister continue to justify the statement which he is reported to have made indicating that he does not believe that people should be put to this trouble and that this is a great deal of nonsense? Now these are summary quotations; I wonder if the minister would agree that he is correctly quoted, and if it is not a long-range loss to Manitoba if the conversion, which of course costs money, would at the same time put Manitoba behind in both the supplying of goods for export and the importing of goods that are already converted to metric.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I said that it is nonsense and it is nonsense to have dates that are final, which will cost a tremendous amount of money. Things should be done gradually, and as required for the benefit of the people of the Province of Manitoba, which is going to be the least cost to them, and we are watching it, and it is nonsense to have firm dates to make the complete change all at once. That is costly.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr' Speaker, I appreciate the forthrightness of the answer. I must ask the honourable minister whether this lack of acceptance of firm dates will not again put Manitoba even further behind, and if the minister therefore, is prepared to undertake that Manitobans will not fall behind because of his reluctance to accept firm dates, and possibly reluctance to appoint a member to the committee that is supposed to be working on this?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member assumes that Manitoba is not moving along. Manitoba is. I say that it's nonsense to have firm dates. Manitoba is moving along with metric conversion, and I assure you that there is not people being put to great expense.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Economic Development. In view of his remarks, that he doesn't feel that the people or the businessmen of the province should be put to this expense, I'd like to ask him, rather than passing the buck to the Federal Government, is he willing to provide provincial funding for metric conversion?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Government or I don't think any Provincial Government was the one that arranged metric conversion in this country. It was arranged by the Federal Government, and they should be prepared to spend their money on it.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister whether it is a requirement of MHRC that all working drawings for building construction are now done in metric?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member uses MHRC. The requirement that came out from CMHC, who is our parent or our partner in construction of housing, has made a decision that there is a certain date. The MHRC has had some projects going on at the present time and they are not in metric. They didn't have to be and we were told by our architects that if we would have changed when we put those out for tender, the costs would have probably been about 25 percent more. So we preferred to go along the way we were. We will certainly look at any new construction as to whether it will be in metric or not.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Public Works. Is the government continuing the policy initiated by our government that all construction at this time should be designed in metric terms, or has that policy decision been revoked?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice for the Minister of Government Services. I have not been in discussion with him personally on the decisions regarding the provincial construction being in metric. There is a committee of all departments that meets once a month on metric and I'll take it up with him.

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

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he could explain to the House why he did not use the facilities of the Department of Agriculture with respect to the procedures in the Beef Referendum for which the votes were counted yesterday.

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, in reference to that, the legislation, as the member is aware, was enabling legislation for the Beef Producers and they handled the referendum themselves so they didn't have any government involvement in the actual referendum.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, given the fact that historically all such votes were handled by the department, it seems odd that this one was not followed in the same pattern. I would now like to ask the Minister to explain to the House what he is going to do about the irregularities in the counting procedures that occurred yesterday where scrutineers were allowed to handle the ballots during the counting procedures and where there is a near tie in District 9, and now we have the problem of having the results being challenged. Is the Minister going to move to nullify the results of that election in District 9, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, at this time I am not prepared to get involved in the problem that the member brings forward.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, we have a very serious breach of the electoral process with respect to the establishment of a board to function under Bill 25, The Beef Producers Association. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that since the government has passed the legislation giving powers to this group, that they are responsible to make sure that the elections are conducted in a proper manner.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, in reply to the member, if I were to have an investigation of any

of the procedures, I would have to certainly look back to the last eight years of the votes that he had to see that it was handled in proper order and I would think there could be some question in that area.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would invite the Minister to do just that. But we have an urgent problem, Mr. Speaker. We have a situation where there is a near tie in one of the districts and where there were serious irregularities in the counting procedures, under the legislation of this Minister, Mr. Speaker.

### TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet did not have a question. The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** I wonder if I might have leave to table some of the documents at this stage that I spoke of earlier, the communique from the Western Premiers' Conference, the speaking notes of myself from that Conference, and the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet had asked earlier for a copy of any statement that I'd made at the January 8 conference on Grain Handling and Transportation. I have all three. With leave I would be prepared to —(Interjection)— Do I have leave? (Agreed.) Well then, Mr. Speaker, I would table the opening statement that I made at the Grain Handling and Transportation conference on January 8, 1979. I would table the speaking notes for the opening statement on Grain Handling and Transportation at the Western Premiers' conference at Prince George on March 26, 1979, and I would table as well, Mr. Speaker, copies of communiqués that issued from the Premiers' conference at Prince George earlier this week.

### ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable, the House Leader. Can the members of the House expect that the House Leader, or somebody from the government Benches, will be introducing a motion to set up a Committee of the Legislature to consider the alleged problems with regard to the obtaining of information by citizens, or other problems vis-a-vis information, in the Province of Manitoba?

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

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN(Morris):** Mr. Speaker, that matter will be given some consideration.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the Minister indicates that it would be given some consideration, is it possible that consideration would be given to introducing such a motion at this Session of the Legislature?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, when that decision is made we will be happy to communicate it to my honourable friend. Anything is possible, and as I said, we will be giving that matter some consideration and a decision will be made.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this is just not anything and cannot be put into the category of anything, in view of the fact that the House, by what apparently was a unanimous vote, asked the government to give this matter consideration, does the Minister feel that this is a subject which would be elevated from the "anythings" and put into some priority and that we might expect to hear from the Minister during this Session?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, the decision will be made in due course.

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

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Does the Minister feel that the complaints coming from Steinbach that there's very poor service, or no service at all, because of the lack of Public Health nurses is justified and, if so, does he intend to do anything about it, and if the Minister would also reconcile his statement during the Estimates that there was

no problem there, and that of his ADM, who was saying that the partial reason for the poor service is because the restraint program eliminated 85 Community Health positions.

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

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN(Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, there was a problem at Steinbach District Office of the Eastman Region, relative to the transfer of some particular personnel, or a particular person. That matter has been attended to by my department officials. I don't agree that there is any problem in the Steinbach office at the present time.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I wonder if the Minister would be interested in — or if he hasn't seen the report in The Tribune of today because, according to the report, the problems still exist. Could I send that to the Minister, if he hasn't seen it? —(Interjection)— No, the reprint is this: The card of the Minister of Education is a reprint and if he wants it back, to save money, I will send it to him. —(Interjection)— Yes, I can see that — restraint. Probably you spend more money in getting copies made. I wonder if we could collect all these cards and paper and send them back to them.

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

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Can the Minister confirm that the 34 complaints from rural tenants which are now being investigated under Section 28(1) of The Rent Stabilization Act are being investigated because the rent increases were deemed by the Board to be unconscionable?

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I can't confirm that at this stage. There are perhaps various reasons why they are being investigated. Whether the term "unconscionable" is applicable or not, I would not be prepared to say. That depends on what side of the fence that you're sitting on. I suppose that from the point of view of the tenants that may be so; from the point of view of the landlords, it may not be so. But in any case, the Rent Review Board was asked to investigate and to mediate and this is what they are doing.

**MR. PARASIUK:** A supplementary to the Minister in this respect. The only way, according to his own legislation, that rural rent increases can be investigated is if the Board originally deems that they are unconscionable. I would ask the Minister to review his own legislation in this respect and also indicate if the remainder of the total of 87 complaints from rural Manitoba were investigated, as well. You said that there were 87 complaints — 34 are presenting presently being investigated. Were the remainder investigated, as well?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Well, I'm not sure whether they have all been investigated, Sir, but I do know that when a complaint does come in they are investigated.

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

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and I would ask him if the Milk Board has consulted him prior to making the announcement that is in today's paper that the 1 cent per litre subsidy is going to be put into a special fund, pending the decision of The Milk Board. That is my understanding, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs. The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Maybe the Honourable Minister didn't understand me. I wanted to know from the Honourable Minister whether the Board had consulted him prior to making that decision.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, Mr. Speaker. The Milk Control Board does not report to me.

**MR. JENKINS:** Then I would redirect my question then to the Minister of Agriculture, since I think The Milk Control Board reports to the Minister of Agriculture. Was the Minister of Agriculture consulted by The Milk Control Board to set into a special fund the 1 cent per litre that is to come

off this Sunday into a special fund, pending the decision of The Milk Control Board on new pricing?

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier in the session when I was asked the question, I said The Milk Board hearings were taking place and I did not get involved in them.

**MR. JENKINS:** Could the Minister then tell us when he anticipates that the Board will come down with a decision on milk price increases, or is he not interested in what the milk prices are in Manitoba at this time?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am interested but I don't know when they will be bringing down their decision.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister confirm that he has informed the media that he is prepared to order Northwest Smelting and Refining closed if they fail to clean up their operation, and, if that is correct, can he inform us as to what criteria he will be basing that decision on?

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

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, what I said to the press when they interviewed me and they asked me if we had the authority to eventually shut down that particular operation, I said yes, that we did.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister. Is the Minister prepared to immediately table all lead and air surveys conducted at Northwest Smelting and Refining during the past three years, and is he further prepared to table copies of all work improvement and/or stop work orders issued by his department in regard to operations at Northwest Smelting and Refining, including those orders that have recently resulted because of the 10 out of 22 workers having unacceptably high levels of lead in their blood?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member should ask for an Order for Return.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, I will do that, Mr. Speaker. In the meantime, a final supplementary to the Minister. Can the Minister confirm that an employee at Canadian Bronze has been put on workers' compensation for the second time in three months because of high levels of lead, or lead poisoning, and can the Minister further confirm that this employee was operating a grinding machine that had been ordered to be fixed by work improvement orders nearly a year ago, dated June 30th, 1978?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

**MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am rising on a point of privilege. —(Interjection)— My personal privilege. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface is very curious, you know; he wants to know everything.

In the light, Mr. Speaker, of the article in the Free Press, which was printed on March 27th, Tuesday, under the title "Lord's Prayer Act", was a very important — to me, at least — mistake.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. May I point out to the honourable member that quotations in the newspaper are not orders of privilege and are of no concern to the House.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Well then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to then raise this on a privilege of this House. It is a mistake. I would like to straighten out the situation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Mr. Speaker, are you going to hear the matter of privilege raised by my colleague from Point Douglas?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I have pointed out that what is printed in a newspaper is not a matter of privilege of the Legislature.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, whether it is a question of privilege or not, I believe that if a member has been wrongly cited in a newspaper you have given that member the opportunity to get up and say that I am quoted in a newspaper as having said the following; I wish it to be on the record that I did not say that. And regardless 'as to how the point is made, I think the Member for Point Douglas should have the same privileges as all of us have had from time to time, as long as he keeps it brief and just points out the statement which he feels is inaccurate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** If the Honourable Member for Point Douglas will wait until the end of the Question Period, then we will take his statement. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the First Minister, further to his tabling of three documents from the Western Premiers' Conference this afternoon. Would he also be prepared to table the report on the Western Power Grid?

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend will look at the material he will find that there is a communique in that material on the western power grid. The only studies that we have thus far are preliminary in nature and have not been completed.

**MR. WALDING:** Yes, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister of Finance, reporting for Manitoba Hydro at a press conference, reported that he was in possession of a report that showed savings of some \$3.7 billion in hydro construction costs. That is the report that I am referring to. Is the Treasury Bench willing to table that report?

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, in reply to the member's question, the report was distributed to the various governments for their use but it was not tabled for public use at this point by the Western Premiers' Meeting. The reason for it is that some of the governments have not had adequate time to do their own internal analysis of the report. The information that I did give was taken from the findings of the report.

**MR. WALDING:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When does the Minister anticipate that that report can be released to the House?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, it will have to be on the agreement of the four provinces. The probable meeting time of the Ministers for the purpose of dealing with that report, I expect will probably be the end of April or into May, so it may be a couple of months before the report is dealt with in detail by the four provinces.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could address a supplementary question to that to the Minister of Finance, who gave the impression to me last night, on TV, that there would be a saving of some \$3-plus billion dollars, by \$3.7 billion, by the grid. Did that comparison recognize additional power generation at the \$4-some billion and no increased generation of energy because of the grid? In other words, is the differential which have resulted in his study showing \$3.7 billion not a differential which relates to different quantities of energy production by the four provinces, one way without the grid and the other way with the grid?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, what it refers to is the fact that by the end of roughly the Eighties, the total generating capacity of the four provinces required to meet demand would be roughly \$4.3 billion less than it would be without the grid. The cost of the grid itself is estimated to cost in the order of \$600 million, so the net difference being 3.7 is by the end of that time period, the

saving in required generating capacity that would be required in the absence of the grid.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Finance would clarify whether it is not the case that the \$4.5 billion would include the cost of additional generation of energy whereas the grid would not provide additional increased energy production? In other words, that with the grid, with this savings that is pictured, there will in the end be less energy available to be used than there would be on the 4 billion and some figure without the grid.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, we are going to get into a discussion on firm energy or standby energy or whatever you may want to call it. The main asset that comes out of the sharing of some of the facilities is that the standby facility requirements are reduced and basically by that amount and the amount of sharing that could go on will reduce the total requirements by that much. So the answer is that in actual fact, the amount of energy capability at any one given time might be that, but if you have a low water year and you don't have the energy, you are going to draw on the standby energy that is available in the coal, oil and gas facilities. So the answer to his question is at some point in time possibly yes; at another point in time possibly no.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Honourable Minister, in view of the fact that there is this kind of confusion and that the fact that on this continent there is a continuing need, and will be a greater and greater need for energy at the lowest possible rate, and in view of the fact that he made statements last night which seem to simplify the whole matter into terms of large sums of money, that he make every effort to make the information fully available to people in Manitoba so that they could draw their own conclusions.

At the same time, may I ask the Minister of Finance, now that he is back and I hope his budget work is well under way and his speech coming, whether he could now deal with the outstanding Orders for Return, of which there must be at least five, that are within his control either as Minister of Finance or as Chairman of the Treasury Board, and which have been outstanding for probably close to a year.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, with regard to any Orders for Return, the House Leader has been dealing with these as a regular matter of course and it will be brought to the attention of the various Ministers.

With regard to the member's earlier question, the, I think simplest, straightforward answer to it is that the major reduction and the benefits as a result of the reductions in the costs, come about by the reduced total generating capacity, whatever its nature is, by the end of that period of time. In addition to that, it goes on further to of course taken into account the potential of some further consideration with regard to the fact that both British Columbia and Manitoba have north-south ties that can also be used for backup requirements.

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

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland raised a matter concerning an alleged alteration in policy respecting designated and restricted cutting zones. I am informed that there has been in fact no change in policy, as I suggested on Monday. The Regional Forester has the authority to impose a restricted zone up to 500 feet. If there has been some specific change that is of concern to the honourable member, I would be happy to investigate it.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Five weeks ago I asked him whether he would study the allegations in the Ombudsman's Report concerning violations of provincial and federal statutes. I wonder if he can now report on his findings?

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

**HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I am still awaiting that report from officials in my department.

**MR. DOERN:** I would like to also ask the Attorney-General how long he has been looking into the request from the Minister of Health requesting a legal opinion on the plan to include juveniles in the Brandon Correctional? When did he receive that request and when can we anticipate an

answer?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, that manner has apparently gone directly to a solicitor in the department. I will take the question as notice and make some enquiries and advise the member in due course.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Then I would ask the Minister of Health whether he can be more precise in terms of when that request was forwarded to the Attorney-General's department?

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, I can't, Mr. Speaker, but we are examining the legality of that kind of an accommodation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour for questioning having expired, I believe before we go to the Orders of the Day the Honourable Member for Point Douglas wants to make a statement.

### CORRECTION OF PRESS STATEMENTS

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to just straighten out a situation because I was described by the Free Press that I am a Roman Catholic Priest, and I believe this is a very valid thing. I would like to say that I am a Priest and also a Rector of St. Joseph Polish National Catholic Church in Beausejour. This is Number One. Number Two, Mr. Speaker, not so long ago I was also called by the same Press, PC, and I had a problem with my constituents and defending the Free Press I was explaining to them that PC means Polish Catholic.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, before calling the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask if the members of the Private Bills Committee would be meeting. There are some notices gone around. I understand that it may be a greater inclination to meet tonight at 5:30 rather than 9:30 tomorrow morning. It's a very routine matter that will probably take about five minutes, and if that is convenient for honourable members, well then that Committee will meet at 5:30 tonight' Room . . .

**A MEMBER:** How many bills?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No bills. No bills. It's just a question of the extension of the hours for receiving Private Bills. That is a pretty routine practice in this House and has been for a number of years.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** On the matter raised by the Honourable Minister, I'm not sure that I heard him entirely. Not being a member of Private Members, I don't have the notice, so I want to be clarified since I am interested in one of those bills, if it is clear that the only purpose will be for the extending of time for the filing of petitions? Thank you.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** That's right, Mr. Speaker. So that meeting will take place then tonight at 5:30 in Room 254.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to announce that next Tuesday morning Public Utilities Committee will meet to consider their report of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, followed by Manfor and the Manitoba Telephone Systems in that order.

Also, on Thursday it will be desirable if we could call Law Amendments, Thursday morning, to consider the bills that have passed Second Reading. Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill No. 26?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING  
BILL NO. 26 — INTERIM SUPPLY

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 26: an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1980. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the motion to grant Interim Supply, which in this case is \$500 million, is generally a good occasion to review the record of the government and to deal with issues which tend to, Mr. Speaker, indicate the differences to the public of the Province of Manitoba between how the government, under a Progressive Conservative Administration, would handle various matters, and how the government, under a New Democratic Party Administration, would handle matters.

I'm going to today, Mr. Speaker, deal with a matter which perhaps my honourable friends would consider to be very, very minute when one considers the vast range of activities that are being dealt with in the \$500 million. However, Mr. Speaker, sometimes, in dealing with what may appear at the outset to be insignificant matters and how they are handled, that one can truly judge the character of a government.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles Dickens starts his book, *A Tale of Two Cities*, with the statement, as I recall it, "It was the best of times; it was the worst of times", and that appears to be at first glance a contradiction, Mr. Speaker. But it really isn't a contradiction, that it can be indeed the best of times for some and the worst of times for others, at least in the short run. I'm submitting that when a government proceeds on the basis that it will be the best of times for some and the worst of times for others, that in the long run it will spell hard times, difficult times, unjust times, inequitable times, for everyone.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that sometimes a government achieves power and moves on the basis that there has to be a conferring of favour on one group in society, while at the same time a lack of appreciation for the needs of others, and as Charles Dickens' book was entitled, *A Tale of Two Cities*, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to deal with "A Tale of Two Estates", a matter which was raised earlier in the Legislature this year, and which I think is symptomatic and symbolic, Mr. Speaker, of how the Progressive Conservative Party operates.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is well evident from various speeches that have been made in this Legislature that the Progressive Conservative Party frankly believes that there are people of influence, of power, and of superior knowledge and capacity, who have to be favoured by the Conservative Administration or by the government, favoured in such a way that they will do good things for the people of the Province of Manitoba. Their entire approach to the private sector and to the mining companies and to other persons who happen to be in the more favoured spheres in our economic society — and I consider that, Mr. Speaker, without embarrassment, to also be lawyers, doctors — in fact, the people who have managed by one way or another, and usually it's by the way in which society has been organized, to have a greater share of the economic advantages that are available in our society as against others; and I think that the Conservative Administration generally says that the reason these people are in favoured position is that they have the capacity, they have the aggressiveness, they have the capabilities to create wealth, not only for themselves, but by the creation of wealth for themselves, they are able to make the pie bigger and some of the crumbs of this bigger pie will accrue to all citizens of society something which they would not otherwise get.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we've seen legislation and acts of this Administration which confirm that that is the way in which the Progressive Conservative Government intends to operate, and does operate. They've indicated that the people of the Province of Manitoba are not capable of handling their Mining and Resource industries unless they make considerable allowances to the mining companies. They've indicated that where there are tax concessions, these tax concessions should be heavy in the area of the upper groups, including the corporations, on the basis that if these upper income groups and corporations have the money, it will be invested and this will create jobs for others.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that I'm in any way misrepresenting the Progressive Conservatives when I say that this is basic to their philosophy of administration. And, Mr. Speaker, no where is it more demonstrated than by what I say are little things. We have had some discussion on, and the discussion was more detailed in the Committee of Supply when the Finance Minister was dealing with his Estimates than it was in the Question Period.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that it is the widow of a former member of the Legislature is rather irrelevant because I understand that three or four estates were dealt with in this matter. We have a person who is in the area of having received an inheritance of over \$250,000.00.

We know that the Progressive Conservatives during their years in opposition and their years

Thursday, March 29, 1979

in government are very adverse to this tax. They feel that it is an unfair tax, that the money was earned, the taxes have been paid during the lifetime and that the estate should pass untaxed to the beneficiaries. And, the fact that a beneficiary is receiving \$250,000 of what is unearned wealth to the beneficiary has never bothered the Conservatives with regard to the work ethic. They've never felt that this type of inheritance in some way will spoil people, make them less aggressive, remove their initiative or in any other way hamper them as human beings in our society. They feel that if welfare makes a person indolent and, some of the remarks that I get from members from the other side, although not everything that's been said, but I've had it often enough that I can document it, that this kind of state coddling any kind of program which is not individually paid for, makes people indolent, receiving a million dollars in inheritance will not make them indolent, will not in any way have any difficulty in that connection.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we have the Minister of Finance, who sincerely feels that he is doing the right thing, now has acknowledged that this is the way in which he dealt with one widow. A widow inherited something like \$250,000.00. She complained about the fact that she would have to pay estate taxes on a portion of property that was held by her husband which she felt she was part owner of. She complained to the Treasury. And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that we are not now talking about the validity, the desirability or the undesirability of the tax. We're talking about a law which says that the tax is in existence. She complained to the Treasury.

The Minister of Finance acknowledges that he considered various ways of dealing with it. One of the ways of dealing with it was to recommend to Cabinet that this tax be not charged on grounds that it was not just. That was one of the ways that he considered.

Then, Mr. Speaker, he decided on another way. And, by the way, the first way, though I may object to it, though I may say that that person's taxes should not be waived, at least it is a firm statement that taxes are going to be waived, which the Lieutenant-Governor can do in any circumstances and often does and it is recorded and published as an Order-in-Council. But the Minister decided that he would use a provision which I say is not meant for the relief of taxes on compassionate or any grounds of equity, but solely on the basis of law. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it has become abundantly clear that the Minister used that section because it would not be public as to what was done, because that section does not require an Order-in-Council. That section, Mr. Speaker, is a strictly internal matter but as my honourable friends know, nothing in government stays internal. And despite. . .

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

**MR. LYON:** On a point of privilege on behalf of my honourable colleague, the Minister of Finance, who is not here listening to the repetition of my honourable friend's allegations. I remind my honourable friend that the Minister of Finance stood in his place in my presence and denied my honourable friend's allegation as to the motives that are being ascribed by him. So, I would merely ask him if he would accept the word of the Minister as given at an earlier time.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend was not present at the Committee of Finance when the Estimates were being considered, when this matter was further gone into and when the Minister, when asked the direct question as to whether he dealt with it on legal or compassionate grounds said, I dealt with it on objective grounds, and would not deny that the reason, or one of the reasons, was that he did not consider that this woman should be taxed in that way.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the Progressive Conservative Administration would want to deny that. I think that it is wrong to retroactively lift taxes for certain people in our community. But, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, that's what was done and that expresses the gut feeling of the Conservative Administration. I don't think that it's even necessarily a gut feeling. It has been articulated time and time again by the Conservatives that this was an unjust tax and when it came, Mr. Speaker, to dealing with an individual citizen, or several individuals who are taxed in that way, we know how the government reacted. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that they reacted that way because of what I said earlier, that the Conservative administration feels that the people need government when government has a power to do or not to do. And that's, Mr. Speaker, when we find out how the government behaves, because very often the rules are well laid out. But, it's when a person needs a favour, or needs consideration that we find out what is the true stripe of a government.

What the Conservative administration has shown is that that person needed a favour, that those are the kinds of people that need favours, people who inherit over \$250,000, mining companies, businessmen, corporations, doctors, lawyers. It is the economic elite who are in need of favours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to juxtapose that with another widow, Mr. Speaker. Earl McKellar's

wife was in a position of receiving \$250,000.00. I'm going to tell the Legislature of the estate of a widow who didn't receive, I think, 250,000 cents when her husband passed away. Her husband passed away many years ago, she was widowed with two children. She was most of her life bringing up those two children on widow's allowances plus such income as she could make, Mr. Speaker. And if the honourable members want the name of this person, I think it's irrelevant, but I will give it, although I think it really need not be said. I tell my honourable friends that I'm talking about a true position, a true person, a human being. She worked very hard. She devoted, Mr. Speaker, her life for these two children, but she didn't have anything. She lived, as I said, partly on widow's allowance. She was a cook at accamp but she invested his life in those two children. The two children grew up to be very decent people. One of them went on to be a doctor, Mr. Speaker, and is a doctor in the United States. The other one is a bicycle mechanic in Toronto.

When this woman died, Mr. Speaker, and the circumstances were very unusual, she took sick and the children attempted to get her placed in a nursing home which she was eligible for but the list being so long, she was not able to get in. And therefore the children did for her in various places, I think partly in Winnipeg and partly in Cleveland, what the State would normally have done for her in a nursing home, but they expended their time, their money, in doing this because a nursing home was not available. Because, Mr. Speaker, she became sick again in Cleveland while at her son's residence who was assuming responsibility that normally the province assumes, because it was nursing care responsibility, she went to the hospital in Cleveland, Mr. Speaker.

Now for those of my Conservative friends who talk about socialized hospitalization, socialized medicine, mind you they don't do it so much anymore but they certainly used to as being some type of terrible thing, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that she was 79 days in the hospital in Cleveland and incurred an account of \$22,120.00. If she had not had Manitoba Hospitalization, Mr. Speaker — any person in this category in the United States is broken by hospitalization, not person in this category person in my category ' in many of the members categories — fortunately, Mr. Speaker, we have not pursued that free enterprise medicine that they have pursued in the United States, and if the woman was in a hospital in the Province of Manitoba, all of her bills would be taken care of and there would be no problem.

As it was, Mr. Speaker, she was in the hospital in Cleveland and as a result, Mr. Speaker, the bill was \$22,000 and the Government of Manitoba paid their responsibility which amounted to something like \$18,000 which left a balance due for hospital accounts in Cleveland because of a prior account incurred in the same way of \$7,800.00. That is the account that this widow had when she died.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this woman over the years managed to accumulate the enormous sum of \$8,000 in bonds which, if you calculate the interest on it, comes out to about the \$11,700 I think, which was the value at the date of death. The Hospital Board, quite properly, paid the \$18,000 and said when you are out of province, the rest is your own, but where there is need, Mr. Speaker, where there is need, they will pay the balance. And, in this particular case it was demonstrated to the Hospital Board that there was \$8,000 in bonds, there was \$8,000 owed to the hospital in Cleveland, there were \$2,000 in funeral expenses, there was \$800 payable in other expenses with regard to the funeral in Manitoba. One of the reasons that the funeral expenses are so high is that they brought the body from Cleveland to the Province of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not an estate which is being saved money in order to build it from \$250,000 to \$257,000.00. This is an estate where the entire assets are \$8,000.00. Now we have the tale of two widows, and in each case, there's going to be a discretion shown. There's going to be a discretion shown, Mr. Speaker. And the Hospital Board was contacted and here is what happened.

This woman was looked after by her children which is normally something that the province does, this woman was taken to Cleveland, the hospital account in Cleveland if she had been in the Province of Manitoba would have been entirely paid — and I'm not objecting to the policy that we can't pay the total bill when it's in another place, we pay what we would have paid in the Province of Manitoba, I'm not objecting to that — would, in the circumstances the hospital bill be paid so that this woman who accumulated this money would leave something to her children who assumed responsibility for her nursing home care and for the care which she needed between the time that she became sick and the time that she passed away?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hospital Board — and this was also referred to the minister because in each case we're dealing with the discretion — said that where there is an estate they don't feel that that is need. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to now say that that may be a right decision, it may be a right decision. I really think, Mr. Speaker, that if we've got a hard nose government, a government that says, look, the money is there; we don't intend that money shall be left to the children, one of them is a doctor, the other one is a bicycle mechanic, that money is available for payment of this bill and possibly, Mr. Speaker, if one looked at a government which was being

hard nosed across the board, one would say that that's legitimate.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is the best of times, it is the worst of times. It is a tale of two estates, it is not a tale of one estate. The estate with \$250,000 where there's a Ministerial discretion to raise it by \$7,000 so that it will be \$257,000 or more than that is a discretion which is exercised in favour of that widow. The estate where there is \$8,000 and there is an accumulation of services which the people involved provided to the province, there is no discretion and it is suggested that the bill is payable and the Ministerial authority to change it is not exercised.

Mr. Speaker, I could probably accept the hard decision both ways. I would think if the \$250,000 estate has not been helped, that the estate of \$8,000 should also not be helped, even though that is not a comparable situation, that if the \$250,000 estate is being helped, then surely Mr. Speaker, those people who say that a parent's wealth belongs to the children and should not be encroached upon, where are they? Where are they? Where is the Member for Morden? Does he think that this \$8,000 should be taken from those children? Do the other people in this House who kept talking about how the wealth should be passed on from the parent to the children unimpaired, do they say that this particular estate should be dealt with in that way, particularly, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister knows it, particularly when we find that the reason that she incurred this bill, none of it would be incurred, the State would have looked after her nursing home care, the State would have looked after her hospitalization bill.

When the nursing home care was not available, the children assumed responsibilities and I'm sure that the members of the Conservative Party believe that children should assume responsibility; and having done that, and not having abandoned her, the estate does not use its discretion, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this account.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is the best of times, I repeat, it is the worst of times. It is the best of times for those who need government help because they have inherited \$250,000 and that there is some taxes payable. It is the worst of times, Mr. Speaker, for the ordinary unseen, unnoticed, average citizen who the Conservative administration does not feel beholden to. Those people, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says it's not true. I say that every time the Conservative administration has an opportunity of making an allowance or making a discretionary decision favouring somebody, it'll be in favour of the mining companies, it'll be in favour, Mr. Speaker, of the doctors, it'll be in favour of the lawyers, it'll be in favour of the economic elite in our society, it'll be in favour of Great-West Life, and it will not be in favour of this widow because, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of those people over there is that this widow and these people aren't going to do anything for society, they're not needed. If they weren't here the Province of Manitoba would lose nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's their mistake, and I suggest that the attitude of the Progressive Conservative administration as reflected by these two estates, is the attitude that's reflected now on the national scene by the Progressive Conservative party. Mr. Speaker, by no account, by no account, should the Conservative party now lose the election in Ottawa. We have the most objectionable Federal Government imaginable on every indices, on every criteria at which a government could be looked at, on the basis of national unity, on the basis of economic performance, on the basis of the dollar, on the basis, Mr. Speaker, of any Cabinet corruption, if one wants to use that, and, Mr. Speaker, the people are talking about the fact that the Tories won't win. The people are talking about the fact that the Tories won't win. And the reason is, Mr. Speaker, the reason is, the kind of thing that is happening in the Province of Manitoba, and the kind of crazy things that are being said by Joe Clark.

Mr. Speaker, the other day I heard something sensible from Joe Clark. —(Interjection)— I did, I did. Mr. Speaker, look what he said in virtually the same breath. I ask my Conservative friends to look at it. He said that he would get rid of Petro-Can and give it to the private sector, and he would have nationalized Exxon. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that he should trade. He should give them Petro-Can and take Exxon. That makes more sense than anything Joe Clark has ever said because I happen to think that Exxon is better than Petro-Can. So why doesn't he give Petro-Can to Exxon and take Exxon and then we will be in a superior position, Mr. Speaker.

But that's what this man has said, and the danger, Mr. Speaker, the danger — and I put this to the First Minister, because I happen to think that the unity of this country and the nature of Confederation, although it might not be the highest issue in the election campaign, and I'm dealing with the Manitoba position now, which is very important; it is probably the most important one even though it doesn't have the highest profile — and the danger we have, Mr. Speaker, on the federal scene, is that we are being conned or at least the attempt is being made to con us into the notion that Trudeau is a federalist, and that Trudeau will help the nation with regard to energy and resource policy, and that Clark is the one who is going to Balkanize this country.

Mr. Speaker, in that respect, this is a pillow fight — that both Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Clark are saying the exact same thing on both of these questions, and I will prove it to you, Mr. Speaker.

With respect to giving provincial powers to the provinces, Trudeau has outbid Clark on this issue and did so at the last Premiers' Conference. So Trudeau and Clark are both giving powers to the Provincial Governments, Mr. Speaker, and any notion now that Mr. Trudeau is going to protect a strong national government is totally false, Mr. Speaker.

And the other issue is that Mr. Trudeau now says that he is going to protect the rest of Canada with regard to provincial resources and specifically to Alberta oil. Mr. Speaker, who was the Prime Minister of this country when the price of oil went from \$2.75 to something like \$11.00 which it now is, and who declared the policy that the Federal Government will see oil prices rising to the world level? It wasn't Joe Clark. It was Trudeau. And for Trudeau to now say that he is protecting Canadians from the oil-rich provinces is sheer hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker.

Both Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Clark are giving the Premier of the Province of Alberta exactly what he wants. And both of them, Mr. Speaker, and I say this though it is repetitious, both of them are suggesting that they are saving us from separatism, and the country being divided into two, by endorsing policies which are going to divide the country into 10.

So, Mr. Speaker, and I say this to the First Minister who is in charge of the Manitoba constitutional position, that Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Clark are both engaged in a pillow fight, that no matter who wins the pillow fight, they are leading us in the same direction. And, Mr. Speaker, if one looks a little bit more closely with regard to the positions that they are taking, not the personalities which they exude and the remarks that come out of them and the insults that they trade, we will see that the fight that they are engaged in with their hands, their hands are covered by heavy pillows, and that if we look down we will see that they are playing footsie with their feet, because they are both, Mr. Speaker, winding up in exactly the same position.

There has never been a greater opportunity for a party which has always stood for a strong, national position, for a party which has said and continues to say that it will use the fiscal and monetary policies of the Federal Government to equalize conditions across this country. I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that that will be reflected in the results of election day, which my friend, the First Minister, had occasion to refer to earlier today.

But if we go back to the position which I referred to, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Province of Manitoba, I indicate that in granting this Interim Supply — and I can tell the First Minister that although we intend to debate the bill, that we have no intention of causing any problems with regard to the payment of public expenses on April 1st, and that the bill will undoubtedly go through the Legislature in good time for the Province to have its financial affairs looked after at that time — that in debating Interim Supply, it is a good occasion to look at who is favoured.

I do also, Mr. Speaker, wish to deal with one matter which I dealt with on the Estimates of Urban Affairs, but which I think deserves underlining at this stage. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Urban Affairs has suggested that he has devised a program which gives autonomy to the City Government and that as a result of good Conservative fiscal policy and restraint measures, that the City of Winnipeg budget has been kept to 3 mills this year. I'm not sure that I'm doing credit to the Minister in saying that he took entire credit for the budget, but did indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the budget was going up only 3 mills.

And I say this, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Conservative administration, and it will come out more and more when we get down to dealing with the budget which I expect will be brought down, that the suggested 3 mill increase is a lie — and I'm not saying that the members are liars, but I am saying that it is a lie — that the increase, without taking into account any reduction of services such as not picking up garbage and not cutting lawns, that the increase in the City of Winnipeg budget is 3 mills for the rich, 7 mills for the poor. And, Mr. Speaker, I can prove it and the honourable member cannot deny it. —(Interjection)— Then I'm going to repeat it and ask the Members of the House who have constituents who deal with this question, I suggest that the City of Winnipeg increase is 3 mills for the rich, 4 mills for the poor. Because, Mr. Speaker, the 10 cent a day increase in urban transportation, and I'm only dealing with it as if one person used the bus once a day — excuse me, twice a day, you have to go and you have to come back, yes, he who goes must come back, what goes up must come down. Mr. Speaker, that increase is 4 mills which the groups at the bottom end of the economic ladder have to spend and the only difference is that they pay those mills into the fare box instead of putting them on to their real property taxation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is the best of times, it is the worst of times. For the rich in the City of Winnipeg, it is 3 mills; for the lower income groups in the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, it is 7 mills.

Then we come to this genius program, Mr. Speaker, which could only be successful if one is engaged with a government with which you are in collusion with at the city level, that the city councillors, Mr. Speaker, have remained silent on this question because they are trying to protect what they regard as a hopelessly weak government that needs protection. They gave no such protection, Mr. Speaker, during the years of the New Democratic Party administration and I respected

them for it. I went out, Mr. Speaker, to the meetings that they were going to hold whereby they were going to run us into the ground and I fought at those meetings and I said that the municipal councillors are expected to do this. But, Mr. Speaker, this program which they call Block Funding and which is appropriately named Fund Blocking, Mr. Speaker, because that is what it is, will result in losses of provincial revenue to the City of Winnipeg. Because what does the program do, Mr. Speaker? It says no longer is the provincial input into city programs going to be based on certain programs which the province has an interest in such as health programs, social programs, the creation of a provincial park in Greater Winnipeg. No longer are we going to have the funding based on those programs which happen to increase faster than the inflation rate, but now they are going to be block funded and the increases, Mr. Speaker, will be in accordance with inflation and this is supposed to be home rule. It is not home rule, Mr. Speaker, because the councillors in the City of Winnipeg do not have one iota more power of changing programs now than they had a year ago. What they have is less money. And that is what is intended that they will have and I say, Mr. Speaker, it is only because of a collusive government at the City of Winnipeg level, willing to keep quiet in order to protect its friends on Broadway, Mr. Speaker, that they are able to get away with it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends are laughing. We will, Mr. Speaker, during this session of the Legislature, indicate to the people of the Province of Manitoba, all of the increased costs which they as individuals will have by virtue of the Conservative Government position of losers pay, Mr. Speaker, which has been implemented in the City of Winnipeg. They say that the bus program is based on user pay, Mr. Speaker. It is not based on user pay, it is based on losers pay. Because it is those people in society who have for one reason or another lost out on being in the upper end of the economic ladder, the upper rung, who are going to pay for the so-called restraint, and I intend, Mr. Speaker, when the budget comes along, to show that this government is costing the people more money, not less.

But there is a difference and the difference is that under the New Democratic Party administration, the thesis was that there are many things that we are all responsible for. Mr. Speaker, the budget deficit of the Conservative Party in its first year of operation was higher than the budgeted deficit of the New Democratic Party in its last year of operation. —(Interjections)— Well, that's true. Mr. Speaker, we budgeted for a deficit of approximately \$30 million on Current, and \$100 million on Capital. You budgeted for \$114 million deficit on Current. Mr. Speaker, if you tried to do that with the income tax and not show your capital expenses — my honourable friend is a lawyer — they would put you in jail for doing that. You don't regard Capital expenses; you put them into the expense side of the ledger. Mind you, you didn't make them and you didn't enhance our province. Everything that we spent Capital money on, you look at the homes that are administered by the Minister of Housing and Renewal and I say that the people of Manitoba enhanced their wealth by a minimum of \$30 million on those homes alone. That's why Capital expenses were made. And on the mining, we enhanced ourselves by the value of that mine in Trout Lake which will be more than all of the Capital moneys that we put into it. So if my honourable friend is so unbusinesslike as to consider Capital expenses as being an expenditure of money for which the people do not get better than value, that is his problem. That's why Clark says that he'll sell Petro-Can and he'll nationalize Exxon. By the way, I don't know if you were here, that's a good idea. I think they should just trade. I think we should give them Petro-Can and take Exxon and would you carry that forward.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to terminate my remarks . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member's time is up.

**MR. GREEN:** The policy is not one of user pay, I repeat, it is one of losers pay, which is the philosophy of the Conservative Government.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this refreshing opportunity in the midst of our regular session when we can engage again in a bit of a free-for-all debate on general matters affecting the public interest of the Province of Manitoba. I think we all look forward to having a few words to say in this debate and having just been treated to not one of his better efforts, but his efforts are usually always pretty good, but having just been treated to a speech by the Member for Inkster, why, it gives me that little added stimulation to take part and to say a few things that perhaps can usefully be on the record at this stage in our proceedings.

The motion before us, of course, is that the government be authorized Interim Supply so that they can carry on with its works until such time as the Estimates of Expenditure for the total year are approved. This is a traditional motion that we have year by year and one that gives us the

opportunity, as I say, in mid-session to vent some of those general matters that may be afflicting our minds in the course of the otherwise detailed debate that is going on in Committee of Supply.

I noted with a great deal of interest some of the comments made by the Member for Inkster and I regret, you know, that as he and I both grow older, his positions grow, I'm afraid, much firmer and he becomes less elastic in the way that he is prepared to look at things. Usually with the onset of years and the wisdom that is supposed to come of that, you usually find people taking a generally more benign view of their fellow man and of society, but not my honourable friend for Inkster. He has remained as doctrinaire a socialist cum Marxist as any man I have ever known in my life, and I give him credit for it. He is not one of those who is going to run afoul of that expression that I think I have told him of, where a distinguished Liberal Senator said to me late in his life, he said, you know, I sat in the Cabinet with Meighen. Meighen was an arch Tory. He said, we were antagonists for years and yet in the twilight of both our lives, he said, I came to understand that everything Meighen had stood for was right. And you know, most small "l" Liberals, which I would never accuse my honourable friend of being, because he and I share the same view of that ilk as the former Member for Transcona used to say, but most Liberals do have that tendency to come to a little bit more wisdom in their latter years and adopt the general positions that are common, I think, by human nature to most people and that is a small "c" conservative outlook on life.

But my honourable friend is the exception. He is sticking to his view of life as being take from the rich, or make the rich pay, which I think was really the sub-title of his address today. He used such comments as collusion between the City Council of the City of Winnipeg and the present Government of Manitoba. You know, he always looks on the dark side of things as though a council of a city or a municipality couldn't perhaps be a little happier with a government that does not impose conditions on them by statute without consulting them. My honourable member was a member of a government that went around doing that all the time and the city councillors told them then that they didn't like it and they tell us that they like the kind of consultation that is going on with the present Minister of Urban Affairs because they feel that they have a part in determining their own future. My honourable friend should perhaps admit that maybe plays a part in what he would describe as collusion but what I tell him is perhaps a much more enlightened relationship between the present government and the city fathers of the City of Winnipeg.

He describes the present government being beholden to people. You know, that is one of the great old saws of the socialists. When they run out of any other argument, they always say that you are beholden to those who are the producers in society. Well, as I've said so often before, Mr. Speaker, I think we are beholden. The Government of Manitoba is beholden to every one of the citizens of this province to try to provide the kind of government that we were elected to give, by 49 percent of those people on the 11th of October, 1977. I know those are statistics my honourable friend doesn't like to hear repeated but that is the truth, and we are trying to give that government and I think even he has acknowledged, in accordance with the promises and the undertakings that we gave. Such observers even as my honourable friend have said, yes, that's true, you are carrying out what you said you were going to do and we can't fault you on that at all.

Because his debate suffers from it, I wish he would get away from this narrower concept of being beholden to certain interest groups.

We are beholden to all of the people of Manitoba and we do not, to repeat the example that I have used before, we do not hold to the view held by his previous leader that to have had members in the NDP from south of the Assiniboine River in Winnipeg would have been very uncomfortable for them. You can't look at society that way. You can't look at society and say that the Honourable Member for Inkster has to be NDP because he is from that part of this great metropolitan City of Winnipeg. I don't look upon at all. We would be happy to have even the Honourable Member for Inkster sitting in our ranks. —(Interjection)— Yes, and he lives over in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley. —(Interjection)— But why can't my honourable friend rid his mind of what I regard as really pretty puerile and juvenile distinctions that come to people as they are moving through some understanding of political life and by the time they're 18, as Churchill said, most people at 18 are socialists and most people at 30 are Conservatives, and there is something to it — with the odd exception. —(Interjection)— No, I passed through that stage very quickly. My honourable friend, obviously, got stuck in it.

But why is it, Mr. Speaker, that we have to have this kind of doctrinaire nonsense — and that's really all it is — doctrinaire nonsense thrown at us from time to time that members of governments are beholden to this, that or the other group.

You know, you don't hear us standing up here, notwithstanding the evidence that there was, which was patent and on the record, and saying that my honourable friends opposite are totally beholden to the President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour. Yet my honourable friend will have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that the man who sat in this seat up until the 11th of October, 1977,

used to go to the Federation of Labour to make announcements on public matters because he felt that was his constituency. Now, what would my honourable friends think if I made announcements on public matters at a meeting of the Canadian Manufacturers Association? They would stand up quite properly and say, "That's improper", but they think nothing of going over to the Federation of Labour and with the President, with his arm wrapped around them, and declaiming on what is supposed to be public policy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell my honourable friend for the umpteenth time in this House — and we've been in this House together a long time — that we feel as great an obligation to organized labour in Manitoba as my honourable friends do, but that doesn't mean that you have to . . . —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking to the intelligent ones in the House and I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Elmwood does not qualify for that classification. That being the case, if he is finding things that are sailing over his head perhaps he should go out and have some coffee.

Mr. Speaker, if we could just get my honourable friends away from this idea that people are beholden, this, that, and the other thing. My honourable friend knows that that's not the case, and I say, as Churchill once said to Aneurin Bevan, "Why spoil a speech with noseense like that? Why spoil an otherwise good speech?" And I think that's what my honourable friend does. He spoils an otherwise good speech by traipsing out some of these rather juvenile and fanciful doctrinaire comments that seem to sustain my honourable friends opposite, or at least some of my honourable friends opposite, in their rather distorted view of life and of the world.

Well, he talked about people of influence. He didn't talk about the Murdoch case. He didn't talk about the Murdoch case, which was the stimulation, of course, for much of the Family Law legislation that we see going on right across the country today. And I'm not going to talk about the particular case that he mentioned, merely because there is a potential for its becoming subjudice, as the Minister of Finance has already mentioned.

But I would like to hear my honourable friend make the distinction that he was so wont to make when the Family Law legislation was before this House two years ago under his government, that there should be equal sharing for both partners. And I would like my honourable friend to show us how his thinking has changed with respect to any estate in Manitoba of that kind. —(Interjection)— No, he can't because he has been too conveniently looking at the facts of one case without remembering that there is a doctrine of common sharing that his government tried to place into law — tried to place rather badly, I may say, Mr. Speaker, and we had to clean it up.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable member a question.

**MR. LYON:** At the end of my remarks, you'll be welcome.

He made the comment, too, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Manitoba, by actions taken by this government, were being told that they were not capable of handling Mining and Resources, and so on, and that again is an old saw that is always drawn out by our Socialist friends, you know, when they try to put a better light on state or Crown operations. The people of Manitoba, said he, this government says, aren't capable of looking after the resources.

We don't say that at all, Mr. Speaker. We say that this government is the trustee for the people of Manitoba. That's a concept that my honourable friend finds strange, but it's still true. They believe that they were the rulers of the people of Manitoba; we believe that we are the trustees of the people of Manitoba. And the difference, when we sell a Crown corporation, which is a loser, and most of the ones that my honourable friends opposite put into business in their eight years of government were losers — and they were bad losers — when we sell one of those we're not taking it out of the hands of the people; we're taking it out of the hands of government and the bureaucracy who, by and large, under any government, are very bad at running businesses. Governments don't run things very well at all. My honourable friend knows that from pragmatic and practical experience. They don't run canneries very well; they don't build airplanes very well; they don't run tourist boats very well. We have seen all of that. —(Interjection)—

Let me waste a little bit of my speaking time, Mr. Speaker, to reply to the Member for St. Boniface. He says that was one of ours. Yes, but he conveniently overlooks the fact that the previous Manitoba Development Fund did not get into an equity position. —(Interjection)— Well, what difference? Now, my honourable friend from Inkster says, "What difference?" All the difference in the world, and if you don't understand that you don't understand anything.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** You would have lost the whole thing.

**MR. LYON:** No, no' Mr. Speaker. My honourable friends will have to acknowledge that there is the difference between being a banker and there is the difference between being a banker and

being a manager, and they wanted to manage everything with the people's money and, Mr. Speaker, the banker makes sure that he gets items that he can foreclose on. —(Interjection)— And he doesn't ordinarily take a position of trying to run things, as my Socialist friends do. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, if the Member for St. Boniface wants to make a speech, you know, he will have lots of opportunity in the rest of the afternoon or the evening.

So I merely say, let's demolish that old saw, as well, Mr. Speaker, that the people are losing something when a failing Crown corporation, such as some of the ones we got rid of and the losers that my honourable friends established, is sold out or their assets are sold out, the people are gaining because the hemorrhage of their taxpayers' dollar is stopping.

My honourable friends seem to think there is a money tree somewhere, that the money comes from some place other than taxpayers. There is no money tree. Every nickel that we're dealing with in here comes from taxpayers in Manitoba or in Canada — every nickel. There is no money tree at all. —(Interjection)—

He talked, you see, about the indolence of people receiving money through estates. Well, let him make that speech about unearned incremental wealth passing from father to son or mother to daughter, or whatever. Let him make that speech in Saskatchewan with his Socialist brethren present because they abolished the succession duty before we did, they did. So is he now saying, Mr. Speaker, is the Member for Inkster now saying that when the government of Manitoba abolished the succession duty that that's a terrible thing and that we're favouring, we're beholden to the rich interests, and so on? If he is saying that, then he'd better go to Saskatchewan and say to Allan Blakeney, "You're beholden to the rich interests; you're looking after all of your fat-cat farmer friends in Saskatchewan, because that's what we have said to the government in Manitoba. And you know, a funny thing, the government in of Manitoba did exactly the same thing as you: They abolished the Succession Duty Act because it was hurting too many small people and it was impeding the development of this province."

My honourable friends, if they had come back into office . . . Why, their former leader even talked, under the pressure of the election campaign in September of 1977, "Yes, we're going to have to take a look at the succession duty," said the former leader of the NDP. So much for their principle. So much for their principle and so much for the high speech that he stands and makes, the Member for Inkster, in the House today. We know that their principles were just about as bendable as rubber, and that that was the stance that they took on many of these so-called "sacred cow" items, that they would like to try to convince the public that they are the friend of the poor, that they are the only friend of the working man, and so on. And that kind of hypocrisy, that kind of nonsense, can only get you so far for so long and then the people begin to see through it. And they saw through it in spades in Manitoba, and they are still seeing through it.

So I say to my honourable friend, he and his colleagues can make and drag out these old shibboleths as much as they want, but they're really not kidding anyone except themselves.

Well, Mr. Speaker, he talked about people . . . And I'm going to mention this a little later when I talk a little bit about grain handling and some of the other items that are currently before us. "People who need favours", he said, as though the dictates of government policy on this side of the House are merely to search out, as my honourable friends would say, multi-national corporations, the Exxons, and so on, and CPR, as the Leader of the Opposition said the other day, and try to do favours for them.

Mr. Speaker, that's so much hogwash. My honourable friend, I had always thought, is intelligent enough to know that. But they still continue to parade this kind of class nonsense that has no more place in the North American continent in the latter half of the 1970s than has a horse and buggy, and they seem to be mired back in the Marxist horse and buggy stage where they are still repeating these old shibboleths thinking that they're true, even though they aren't.

People who need favours, Mr. Speaker, had better have looked to the friends of the NDP opposite when their candidates used to get favours of high-paying jobs in the permanent Civil Service. I'm not talking about Boards and Commissions. I am talking about the permanent Civil Service, where they looked after their friends, their neighbours and their supporters and helped to destroy, Mr. Speaker, the whole foundation of the Civil Service Commission, which they inherited, which was hiring according to the talent of people, not according to the colour of the card that they carried in their pocket. That's what my honourable friends did to the Civil Service. So don't talk to me at any time about favouritism because we know what that former government, Mr. Speaker, did to the Civil Service of this province, and it's taking us longer to clean it up than we thought it would or should and we are just eradicating some of the weeds that they put in, in terms of doing favours for their card-carrying friends. We know that and any time my honourable friend wants one, two, five, 10 or 15 documentations of it, we will be quite happy to give them to them.

You know, he used the line from "The Tale of Two Cities"; I use the line, Mr. Speaker, from HMS Pinafore, because they hired their sisters and their cousins, whom they counted up by dozens,

and their aunts. And that line, I think, is just as appropriate as the line from "A Tale of Two Cities", when we talk about doing favours for people, because my honourable friends opposite perhaps used patronage in the appointments to the Civil Service and in their appointments to Boards and Commissions perhaps more than any other government in the history of this province. And anytime they want to talk about it, boy, are we ready and welcome to talk about it. —(Interjection)— Now, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend for Elmwood pops up. Is he able to understand?

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer for a few moments to comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in my absence the other day, with respect to the grain handling and transportation system. Perhaps I should make reference to a couple of the statements that he made.

He talked about relieving the plight of the CPR. Somehow or other my comments that Prince George, which he took from newspaper comments, were to relieve the plight of the CPR. You know, again in this business of being . . . Conservatives always have to be beholden to people because they have got their mind set across the way; that's the only way they know to operate. But of course they are holier than the holies and nothing like that would ever occur to them except when they appoint their friends to the Civil Service.

Part of his speech says, "Does any member across the way deny that their First Minister has indicated that their concern is to relieve the plight of the CPR as far as the crowrate policies are concerned?" And then he went on to say, a little bit further, "Little did we realize, Mr. Speaker, that in adjourning the House we were, in fact, permitting members across the way to prepare a little sweetener for the CPR." That kind of sort of high school debating nonsense — I think a proper Leader of the Opposition has got to elevate himself a bit above that kind of nonsense.

I'm glad to see the Member for St. Johns back. He will probably attempt to give us all a lesson in parliamentary ethics again, at which . . .

**MR. CHERNIACK:** You could learn a good deal.

**MR. LYON:** Yes, but not from you; but not from you.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about the grain handling and transportation system because obviously the Leader of the Opposition doesn't completely understand it and obviously he is not up to date in what has been going on in this situation.

Let me tell him first, Mr. Speaker, that at the First Ministers' Conference — and on this motion, Mr. Speaker, I'll be speaking for the government — let me tell him, Mr. Speaker, that at the First Ministers' Conference in November of last year, the 10 Premiers of Canada and the Prime Minister of this country agreed that the problems of grain handling and transportation had to be addressed on an immediate basis. We agreed that there should be a meeting at the earliest practical date to discuss the grain transportation and handling system and that the participants would include the First Ministers of the four western provinces, the Federal Minister responsible for the Wheat Board, the Federal Minister of Agriculture, the presidents of the rail companies, and representatives of the grain industry, the pools, the U.G.G. and so on, and the private companies.

Why was that statement contained and why was that statement agreed to by the 10 Premiers of Canada and by the Prime Minister? Well, it was agreed to, Mr. Speaker, because we were facing and are facing in this country one of the great opportunities that western agriculture has ever faced, namely an opportunity to increase the exports of grain over the next five years by roughly 50 percent. And that is the kind of an opportunity which farmers in this part of the world have been looking at and hoping for for a long time. Yet we realized that in the grain year that was then in progress and we were told by the Wheat Board and by other leaders in the wheat field, that grain sales in the amount of at least \$350 million — and the figure has gone higher — had been lost to prairie farmers last year because of the inability of the handling and transportation system to deliver that grain to market.

So in January, shortly after returning from the Premiers' Conference, we sent an invitation to the various participants to join at a meeting in Winnipeg in January in order to discuss this priority matter of importance for all western Canadian farmers, farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and the Government of B.C. was represented here too because it does have a farming industry and also because it has the western ports as well.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that meeting, by all accounts, was a successful meeting. There was a good interchange of views. Perhaps this was the first occasion on which federal, provincial governments, the rail companies, the pools, Manitoba Pool, Sask Pool, Alberta Pool, were all represented, the U.G.G., all by distinguished leaders in the grain trade. The private companies were represented as well, all of whom have an input into it. The Port Associations were represented. Indeed, I met yesterday in Prince Rupert, the head of the Prince Rupert Port Association who had been in attendance at the meeting in Winnipeg. By general consensus, it was a successful meeting in that it achieved a breakthrough that there was agreement that we had to continue as governments,

federal and provincial, and the industry, to continue to grapple with these problems if we were to enable the farming community of western Canada to meet this outstanding opportunity which is presenting itself for more production, for more income on the farms, and so on.

There were a number of specific initiatives that were developed at that meeting, a number of items that were talked about and the communique that issued from the meeting identified a number of those meetings. But I point out in particular to the Leader of the Opposition, for his edification, that on Page 4 of the final communique from the January meeting, it said: "Participants in the conference discussed the implications of railways receiving adequate compensation for the movement of grain. In turn, the reciprocal obligations of the railways were noted." I ask my honourable friend to note that because I think that his education in this field is singularly lacking. Because of all of the myriad of problems that afflict the whole trade, amongst all of that myriad of problems, is one matter which seems to have attracted his attention the question of rates. And I'll tell him another piece of information that may come as a surprise to him, that all of the current Premiers of western Canada understand that fact and that the Minister of Transport has no difficulty in understanding that fact at all. We feel quite free to talk about compensatory rates without getting all upset about it as though somebody is going to withdraw the benefits of the crowrate from the producers of Manitoba or Saskatchewan or Alberta. Do you realize that the Premier of Saskatchewan can even talk about compensatory rates without getting excited about it. So perhaps my honourable friend should take a lesson from his colleague to the west and understand that in these days of realism and in these days, faced as we are with the obligation to provide a bit of statesmanship leadership to overcome a problem which is fundamental to the growth and the continued growth of western agriculture, yes, we still do have to talk about some of the problems that my honourable friend apparently would like to treat like some of the other socialist shibboleths and say, no, you can't even talk about that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we can talk about it, we will talk about it, and we have talked about and will continue to talk about it, because the interests of western farmers are of a darn sight more importance to this government than I know they ever were to my honourable friends opposite because one reason they are sitting there and they are going to continue to sit on that side of the House for a long time is because they never, ever understood the farmers of Manitoba. The Member for Lac du Bonnet can tell you that; he never understood the farmers of Manitoba. They are sitting now with what? In 23 seats they are sitting with, what? A maximum of three seats that could be described as rural agricultural seats. So, Mr. Speaker, let my honourable friend perhaps listen to some of the farm organizations and some of the others who talk about the problems of grain handling and transportation because from within his caucus, and probably from within the area of advice that he is privy to, he is not going to get the kind of information that represents the vast majority opinion of the farming community of this province. I can assure him of that. By contrast, I think that we on this side of the House can say without any fear that we have excellent farm representation on the government benches.

My honourable friend tries to make a point of distinction between his party or his group and our group — he did in that speech, I believe, where he said that of course we have so many rural members over here, almost as a term of opprobrium. It's not a term of opprobrium for us at all and I remind my honourable friend again that we don't even mind members coming into our caucus from south or north of the Assiniboine River, because we haven't got any class blinkers the way my honourable friend has, or pretends he has. So, Mr. Speaker, whether our caucus members are from the farm, from the city, from the small town, they represent the people of Manitoba. They represent 49 percent of the people of Manitoba and we're going to continue listening not only to the 49 percent, but the 100 percent for whom we are the trustees here.

So, Mr. Speaker, coming out of that conference, there was agreement that we had to continue the consultations that were going on with respect to this major problem in order to improve the physical handling and transportation system for Canada.

Concurrent with the conference, although it became a matter of public debate a little bit later on, was a proposition, and I'll try to summarize it without taking my honourable friends through all of the detail, a proposition from the Canadian Wheat Board which was asking the provinces, from the provincial treasuries for the first time, to participate with them in the purchase of additional hopper cars. Certainly Manitoba and Alberta responded in the negative to that proposition. At the same time, the Canadian Wheat Board asked that a task force be established to look into the narrower problem of rolling stock and some of the infrastructure that is needed for a grain handling system. Again, Manitoba and Alberta declined to participate in that task force on the basis that it did not cover a sufficiently broad area of the problems afflicting the grain handling and transportation system, nor did we see our way fit at that stage, without this kind of study taking place, to involve taxpayers' dollars from the Province of Manitoba, in the purchase of rolling stock of benefit to whom? — of benefit to the railways and of course of benefit to the producers as

well.

But in the meantime, the Member for Selkirk will have remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Wheat Board on its own had gone out and purchased, or placed an order for some 2,000 cars, I believe it was, the cost price of which was to be paid by whom? — by the producers of western Canada. So a number of things had been in the mill and a number of concurrent events were going on, all of which dealt with the deterioration of the railway lines in western Canada, the need for the development of additional facilities at Prince Rupert, the need for a proper interchange being worked out between the CP and the CN to allow an increased flow of grain to Prince Rupert. Very important discussions that were taking place and still are taking place with respect to labour-management discussions to improve operators, harmonize contract agreements, and so on. A number of those initiatives, as I pointed out in my remarks which my honourable friend now has, have been followed up.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour being 4:30, I will interrupt proceedings to proceed with Private Members' Hour. The bill will stand in the name of the Honourable First Minister.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** The first item of business on Thursday is Public Bills. The Honourable Member for Inkster. (Stands)

### RESOLUTION NO. 5 — MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

**MR. SPEAKER:** Resolution No. 5, the proposal of the Honourable Member for Logan and the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Pembina has 15 minutes.

**MR. DON ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this resolution as proposed by the Member for Logan, I think it is important to all members of the House that we realize that we are not only dealing with minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, but in fact we are dealing with wage levels greater than the minimum wage and applying to a greater number of people in the province than only those who are employed at the minimum wage. We are probably dealing with the wage structure, particularly and especially all people below a wage rate, say, of \$5.00 per hour. We are dealing with that, Mr. Speaker, because of the phenomenon called the ripple effect of wage increases in the minimum wage structure in that if and when you increase the minimum wage, you in fact put pressure upon wage levels which have been above the minimum wage level, to also be raised, possibly not to the same degree, to the same percentage as the minimum wage has been raised, but certainly to a greater degree, to a higher level. So what we are doing is raising the wage levels throughout most employed people in Manitoba.

The Member for Logan mentioned in his initial remarks that the Consumer Price Index had increased some 22 percent since the last increase in minimum wage and it is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that when we are considering an increase of minimum wage which if we follow through to the letter of the resolution would increase minimum wage by some 70 cents per hour, it is interesting to note that in a recent report by the Centre for Study on Inflation, that they have indicated in there, and I believe my statement is correct, that better than 60 percent of the retail price of any item is composed of wage costs. So when the Member for Logan complains about the Consumer Price Index increasing by 22 percent and then on the other hand wants to raise the minimum wage by some 25 percent, he seems to be falling into the interesting proposition where he is going to drive up the Consumer Price Index that much further. Because as indicated in the Centre for Study on Inflation, wages compose better than 60 percent of the retail price of any item that a consumer may buy. So that what he is going to do is, if we raise the wage level in general through raising the minimum wage, if we raise the wage levels 10 percent in this province, then we are automatically going to get a 6 percent increase in the Consumer Price Index. It is inevitable, Mr. Speaker, because better than 60 percent of the price of goods is involved in direct labour costs.

So I think he should more carefully consider what he is suggesting as aid and help to those people in the lower income levels in that in fact if he were to deal with it in anything but an emotional proposition and deal with it in the economic reality of what he is proposing, he would find that maybe he wouldn't help the people as much as he is intending to do.

Now, a second area, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to dwell in is what employers will do in the event of being faced with an increase in the minimum wage, particularly employers who may employ a number of people at the minimum wage. They're going to take a look at their books, Mr. Speaker, profit and loss statement, and they're going to find out that their expenses to increase

wages are going to increase. Now, very few businesses — contrary to what many of the members opposite would like us to believe — very few businesses are operating on such a profit margin that they could absorb a 25 percent increase in wage costs and wage payments. And I'm quite sure that in proposing this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the N.D. Party did not want to have people on the minimum wage have their wages increased by taking money from someone else's pocket, from their employer's pocket, particularly. I don't think they wanted to impose any undue hardship upon employers.

So, when an employer who is hiring people at the minimum wage is faced with an increase, he's got to look at doing one of two things to maintain the level of return that he enjoys from that business. He's either going to have to increase his revenues, Mr. Speaker, or reduce his costs. Now to increase his revenues once again, prices are going to rise and that's one of the very items that the Member for Logan cited as being a need for an increase in minimum wage, that the Consumer Price Index had gone up some 22 percent. Well, if an employer of minimum wage people has to increase his prices, then you're feeding once again the fuels of inflation and adding to the consumer price index increases. Now if an employer is faced with the situation where he can't raise prices, then he must reduce costs or go out of business and if, perchance an employer should go out of business, Mr. Speaker, who had been hiring people at the minimum wage, then increasing that minimum wage has not done, I would think even the Member for Logan would admit has not done the employers of that particular business any good by breaking the business and throwing them out of work.

So, the employer is going to try to reduce costs. Now how is he going to reduce costs, Mr. Speaker? Well, there's an excellent chance that he's going to reduce the number of hours that people work for him so he cuts his labour costs down that way so that by paying more money per hour and working less hours, the person is probably going to go home with the same take home pay. That isn't what the intention of the Member for Logan is.

Now another area that he can reduce costs is to cut the number of employees and he probably will do that and that's going to increase unemployment. That isn't going to help the person that's on minimum wage, Mr. Speaker. The person employing those people may mechanize to a greater deal. That will in turn put people out of work at the minimum wage — replace them with more highly skilled people at a higher wage rate to run machines. That isn't going to help the person on minimum wage.

Quite likely in the restaurant business, the garage business, they're going to go to ever increasing levels of self-service. We've seen that, Mr. Speaker, in the advent of such restaurants as McDonalds, Bonanzas, etc., etc., where there's a minimum amount of service of waitress labour. That's caused a direct addition to unemployment. We've seen self-serve salad bars come in, etc., etc., — many moves to eliminate people at minimum wage because they cannot afford to keep them there. They cannot raise the prices sufficient enough to recover the increased costs. And it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note that a recent survey of the National Restaurant Association of the United States — they did a survey of some 2,000 members after the minimum wage was raised in the United States on January 1st. And do you know that survey showed, Mr. Speaker, that 95 percent of the 2,000 members responding raised their prices, which fueled the consumer price index that the Member for Logan was so concerned about. Seventy-eight percent of those 2,000 members reduced man hours. In other words, they reduced the level of employment within their businesses. A further 63 percent of those 2,000 members surveyed laid off people, directly adding to the unemployment. And what caused this, Mr. Speaker, was a raise in the minimum wage that was supposed to help the people at the minimum wage level. What it did was reduce their man hours so possibly they took home the same amount of take home pay at a higher rate per hour but fewer hours and some of them even got laid off so they had no job at all. Now I'm sure that's not what the Member for Logan wants to do. And that is why I said originally, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Logan is dealing emotionally with an economic issue. He didn't present any facts as to how the raise in the minimum wage was going to guarantee the jobs that are there, increase the employment and increase the well being of people on minimum wage.

Now another thing that happens, Mr. Speaker, when minimum wage rates are increased and particularly if we followed this Resolution and increased minimum wages to the \$3.65 per hour level as suggested by the Member for Logan. What we would do is we would probably trigger the entry of housewives and otherwise unemployed people into the labour force on a part-time basis as retail clerks, waitresses, salesgirls, etc., etc. We would probably encourage people who are working on a 9 to 5 job to go out in the evenings and take jobs in some of our stores that stay open until 10 o'clock. And, Mr. Speaker, the real danger in having that happen is that who do the employers hire when we encourage housewives, 9 to 5 employees to come out and take on additional jobs to do a little nightlighting? The employers hire these people, these housewives, probably 40 to 45 years old, 50 years old. They hire them because they know they are probably very reliable employees,

they know that they have a certain amount of experience that is usable. And do you know who the employers won't hire, Mr. Speaker, if they're hiring these people? They won't hire the students who are wanting some part-time income. They won't hire students freshly graduated from high school because, Mr. Speaker, those students don't have the necessary job training because they have never been employed before. The first time entrants to the labour force will not get the jobs, Mr. Speaker, if you raise the minimum wage to \$3.65 an hour. I submit with all due respect to the members opposite that we'll see housewives and people who are not in the labour force presently taking those jobs and they'll probably be using the income, Mr. Speaker, so that they can afford a little longer and a little better holiday in the summer or in the wintertime.

Now I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Logan in any way, shape, or form or any member on that side of the House intends that to happen by raising the minimum wage. But, Mr. Speaker, if they analyze the economics of what they're proposing that is indeed is what is going to happen. It has happened in the past. It will continue to happen in the future. And the people, Mr. Speaker, who get hurt are the very people that the members of the N.D. Party want so dearly to help, the underskilled people, the people who are seeking their first jobs in the labour force, the minority people, our natives, etc., etc. — those are the people it will hurt.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

**MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas):** I would like to ask the honourable member if he will permit a question?

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I would entertain a question after I'm finished.

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

**MR. ORCHARD:** So that, Mr. Speaker, what really we are seeing here and the Member for St. Matthews quite adequately demonstrated it is that the people who this Resolution is designed to help are the very people who are going to be victimized the most by it and it is a very difficult decision for a government to make to raise the minimum wage to help the people who will stay in the labour force to the detriment of the people who will be cast aside by greater efficiencies required by their employers.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note that we get down to the one basic line in this whole consideration, and that being productivity and it's something that we very seldom have considered in the last number of years. And the basic premise being, Mr. Speaker, that if and when you increase a person's wages, you have every hope and desire that his productivity is going to go up at least by the amount that you've raised his wages and possibly more to increase the efficiency to justify the payment.

But, Mr. Speaker, this has not happened and a Professor Bellan at an N.D. weekend conference on economics said, and I will quote: "Bellan added that our contemporary inflation is homemade and caused by wage and profit increases far in excess of total national output." And he singles out wages in particular. He says, Mr. Speaker: "Simple arithmetic will tell you that 4 percent productivity with 10 percent pay increase will cause 6 percent inflation." Mr. Speaker, we all know in this House that inflation is one of the worst enemies on every citizen of Manitoba and more particularly on the people on fixed and lower incomes in this province. And what the Member for Logan is proposing in his Resolution, to raise the minimum wage, is to increase the rate of inflation, to throw people on minimum wage out of work and to require an increase in the minimum wage beyond that of the productivity which will accrue to that wage increase and thereby cause more inflation to the detriment of the people they're trying to help.

I'm prepared to sit, Mr. Speaker, and listen to the very persuasive arguments that I know members opposite must have to justify their request for raising the minimum wage. And I'm not talking about emotional issues. We're all aware of the emotional issues. But I would like to hear some economic justifications, some reasons why the minimum wage increase is needed in this province and how in fact it is going to help those people on minimum wage. I trust that those arguments, Mr. Speaker, will be forthcoming.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Point Douglas with a question.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Yes, the honourable member said that he would accept the question? I would like to ask the Honourable Member for Pembina how he can visualize a person who is working on minimum wage which is \$2.95, I believe, per hour, making \$120.00 per week with two dependants — how are you visualizing such a person that he will support his family? Will you answer that question

please?

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

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I would be very interested in analyzing that situation and I will agree with the Member for Point Douglas that that would be a very difficult situation but I don't think the Member for Point Douglas has statistics to show us the number of families that are in that situation and furthermore, that is not the point. We're getting back to the emotional issue, Mr. Speaker, and what I would like to know from the members and they obviously aren't prepared to address themselves to it, is, if raising the minimum wage is going to preserve that man's job or is it going to throw him out of work. Because maybe he is not going to maintain his job even at \$2.95 an hour if we make his employer pay \$3.65. That is a concern that I have, that is a concern that they obviously will not answer.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I'm sorry, the honourable member's time is up without unanimous consent. The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the other question to the Honourable Member for Pembina. For instance, I know as a fact, that I was paying 20 cents for a cup of coffee two years ago and now I am paying 35 cents for the same cup of coffee which the increase made 75 percent. The same worker, my constituent working at the same restaurant, he didn't get even a half a cent increase. How will you justify this kind of a thing?

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

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, there's something to do with a frost in the coffee growing belts in Brazil which put a very drastic price increase on the price of coffee grinds which contributed drastically to the price of coffee.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member, before the question is put, can he tell us whether the Member for St. Matthews is here today?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, Mr. Speaker, listening to the Honourable Member for Pembina is one of my amusing pastimes in this Chamber. You know, the Member for Pembina says that we shouldn't be emotional about the issue of raising the minimum wage, that, is it based on emotionalism. I would say to the honourable member that, yes, it is emotional. It's very emotional for those people who have to work for the minimum wage. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre made an offer to the Deputy Chairman of this House to go with him one evening. He can come with me one evening. Go into our constituencies, Winnipeg Centre, Logan, Wolseley — one right around this Legislative Chamber.

The Member for Wolseley can take him around. He can show him people who are working on the minimum wage. The members say that they're all High School kids that are working for the minimum wage. What nonsense! There are people who have families and are raising them and having to do it on the minimum wage. And you know the very simplicity of the solutions that are offered, or the lack of solutions that are offered by the Member for Pembina, that if we give his rationale we would reduce the minimum wage, and perhaps when this endment is either adopted or rejected, he should move a reduction in the minimum wage because then — given his rationale that he has put forward — we would do away with all unemployment, pay them nothing, put them in the \$5.00 a month relief camps like R. B. Bennett did. That was his solution for unemployment. What a minimum wage that was too. —(Interjection)— Well, the honourable member wants to know what year was that. Well, I don't know which member . . . Well, maybe the Honourable Member for Gladstone wasn't around when the dirty thirties were here. Maybe he never spent any time in some of those relief camps. I, fortunately, was young enough that I didn't have to, but if I'd have been two or three years older I would have been in those relief camps with the rest of the people that had to go there.

And where did they wind up? Most of them wound up on the battlefields and in cemeteries in Western Europe, because there were no jobs for them under a Progressive Conservative Government and followed by a Liberal Government. The only thing that revived the economy of

this North American continent was World War II because there was no money. There was nothing.

You know, since I last spoke on this issue, Mr. Speaker, there have been further figures come out from Stats Canada. The minimum wage has decreased even more than when I introduced the Resolution. The latest figures from Stats Canada give Manitoba's average weekly wage, no longer at \$244.35 per week; it is now increased to \$246.57 a week as of the month of October. So the decrease is no longer nearly approaching 8, it is now in excess of 8 percent. That has been the decrease in the take-home pay as compared to other members of society in the Province of Manitoba.

You know we all sit here in this Legislative Assembly in a pretty comfortable pew, a very comfortable pew — it's very nice to talk about those people out there — but those people out there are the ones that are suffering. We're not suffering. I don't think there's one member of this Assembly that is financially strapped because the stipend that we receive for our services here and other members have other means of income besides that. But for those people who have to work for that minimum wage —(Interjection)— and you're damn right I'm emotional about it, and so are the people out there who have to work on that wage. I can assure the Honourable Member for Pembina they're damned emotional about it too.

You can give raises in pay to civil servants, and I'm not saying that civil servants aren't entitled to an increase in pay; you can give increases in stipend to doctors — 8.1 percent — and when you look at the average gross pay of what these people are receiving and the annual gross pay of what people on the minimum wage are receiving — 8 percent of nothing is still nothing — but 8 percent of a lot is quite a bit.

When you're talking about \$100,000 it's an increase of \$8,000. When you're talking about an income of \$10,000, it's only \$800.00. So when you want to make comparisons and say, "Don't rock the boat. Don't rock the boat for these employers. They'll all leave. They'll all shut up shop". Well, as I said before, if that was the case they would all flock to Newfoundland. Newfoundland has the lowest wage. It also, by the same coincidence, has the highest amount of unemployed people. Over 17 percent, approaching 18 percent of the population are unemployed. If the message that we're getting from the Member for Pembina that a lower minimum wage is going to bring in this type of industry, well then, all the garment factories, all the resaurants, everything that was dealing with the minimum wage employment would be all flocking to Newfoundland, to the Maritimes. But they're not. They are not.

The clothing industry is based mainly in Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg, not in the Maritimes. So when the member says that a decrease in the minimum wage, or keep it as it is, don't rock the boat. Keep it like it is. Good old Tory status quo. Just don't rock the boat.

But when the power brokers in our society, the doctors — the medical profession is a power broker group, so are the legal profession. These people all have plenty of political clout, plenty of monetary clout. They can make their views known and do it, and do it very well, but the people on the minimum wage do not have that sort of clout. They don't have the monetary clout. They don't have the organizational clout to defend themselves, to get their fair share of the good things in life, and I believe most of the members of this House are not suffering from the lack of the good things of life.

I don't see anyone here that is wearing threadbare clothing, wearing shoes with holes in. —(Interjection)— I'm not looking at the Honourable Minister. If she thinks I'm looking at her, I'm looking over her and past her. I'm looking at the Honourable Member for Pembina. Not that I don't enjoy looking at the Honourable Minister, but if she feels that I'm addressing my remarks to her, then she is free to accept those remarks if they apply to her. But I haven't heard the Honourable Minister take part in the debate yet this year. She took part last year, I know, when I introduced this Resolution and perhaps, maybe she will before this debate is over get up and tell us whether she's going to support her backbencher's suggestion that he personally would support an immediate 25 cents per hour increase in the minimum wage, no ifs, buts or ands.

And it's interesting, my colleague, the House Leader, the Member for Inkster, has asked, "Is the Honourable Member for St. Matthews — is he hiding?" Is he afraid to come in to this House, because when we call that vote, it's going to be very interesting. He has either two options — or he has three options, Mr. Speaker. One, he can duck the vote and stay out, or refuse to answer the bells. Two, he can get up and vote for the Resolution. Three, he can come over and sit over here and abstain. Or he can vote against it — he has four options. But, taking him to be an honourable man and an honourable member of this Assembly, I do not think that the Honourable Member for St. Matthews would knowingly get up and lie to me and other members of this House, because he said he personally would support 25 cents an hour immediately now, not next year, not when this supposedly formula would come into effect, but right now.

**MR. BLAKE:** We might all support it.

**MR. JENKINS:** Well, this is an opportunity. I now have the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, and I hope that he's going to support it. I hope that other members of the backbench . . . I know that the Member for Pembina is not going to support it. No way. He would support a decrease.

**MR. ORCHARD:** You haven't proved anything to me yet, Bill. You've just been rambling and saying nothing.

**MR. JENKINS:** He would support, I imagine, a decrease.

**MR. ORCHARD:** I'm listening for some facts and figures, Bill, and I haven't . . .

**MR. JENKINS:** Well, the honourable member wants facts and figures. Well, I can quote just as many facts and figures as the ones that he quoted' and I quoted the facts and figures to you last time.

**MR. ORCHARD:** No, you didn't.

**MR. JENKINS:** Oh yes, I did. He just didn't read them and the unfortunate thing is that the Honourable Member for Pembina unfortunately — because I like him as a person — a very nice fellow as a person, but he has a closed mind with regard to the minimum wage, and when we call for the vote — their vote will eventually come on this amendment to the Resolution — I want to be sure that my friend, the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, will be here to vote for it because he is the only one, he's the only one, Mr. Speaker, over on that side of the House who has said that he would support a 25 percent immediately, not next week, but as soon as that that . . .

**A MEMBER:** Today. What's the date today?

**MR. JENKINS:** Today is the 29th of March.

**A MEMBER:** All right. Today.

**MR. JENKINS:** And if the honourable members over there can assure me that they can get the Honourable Member for St. Matthews into this House now to vote, then I'll sit down. Bring him in here. —(Interjection)— Ah, he won't be here this afternoon. Now we find out.

Now, the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, I'm sure must have known, looking at the Order Paper when we last sat on Tuesday, knowing that this would be the first Resolution to be discussed today, not any other Resolution. He knew the amendment that my colleague, the Member for Kildonan, had proposed — and a very good amendment, I might add — I think while the Treasury Bench and the members over there are pondering whether they should implement the formula, put in a 25 cent increase in the minimum wage. It certainly isn't going to throw us that much out of line.

You know, when we're looking at minimum wages and their averages to the average industrial composite wage for different provinces, the average weekly wage is rising, the cost of food is rising. I asked the Honourable Minister of Agriculture today about whether he was worried about the increase in the cost of milk, and he's not too worried. The Milk Control Board, who was to take the one cent subsidy — and that is very important to my constituents, and especially those who work for the minimum wage — one cent per litre of milk reduction is a big factor, but now the Milk Control Board, without ever even consulting the Minister that they report to, or even the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and I asked first the Minister of Consumer Affairs whether the Milk Board, before they made this decision to put this money in escrow, that they're going to hold it there pending a solution. I want to know what's going to happen to that money.

The Minister of Agriculture — was he consulted? He doesn't even worry about them consulting him. I don't think he's worried. Maybe he hasn't got too many people on the minimum wage working in his constituency, but members in the City Ridings here, sure, we get calls from them. They want to know when the minimum wage is going to be increased.

The cost of food is increasing all the time, the cost of transportation, you know, and your block funding, you have nice block funding, masters in your own house. What was that? That sounded almost like Ado when he was saying, "Masters in our own house". You know, the tramp, tramp,

tramp with the jackboots. And it's too bad that the Honourable Minister of Health, who was so fond of accusing us of using jackboots, isn't here. But masters in their own house, masters in their own house when they get less money. You know, it's all very well and good to be master in your own household. —(Interjection)— Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But if you have no money to be master with, then you are forced to increase the user fees.

So the people on the minimum wage are going to pay 10 cents going to work, 10 cents coming back, so there's another increase in their cost of living; 20 cents a day — oh, pardon me, 10 cents a day, one person — that's right. So there's another increase. And you know, we're talking about food prices. I wonder how many of the members here lately have been in a supermarket, and looked at the price of red meat. How many have been there and bought red meats lately? —(Interjection)— The honourable member only goes to the sales. Well, that's very nice but even the sale prices aren't that cheap, especially if you're working on the minimum wage because the price of a pound of meat today is more than what they receive in an hour. Oh, I don't know where my honourable friend buys his meat, but I would suggest that he come to some of the stores. Beef, roast beef selling at about \$3.39 a pound. Steaks at about \$3.69 a pound. —(Interjection)— Oh, the honourable member can't afford to eat steak. Well, then what does he eat? Macaroni? He looks fairly well fed to me, Mr. Speaker. But I would say that some of you people want to go out there and try it. Try it for a week. Try and live on \$118. —(Interjection)— Oh, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa says that he can live on \$118 a week. Well, then I would suggest that the Honourable Member for Gladstone go out and try and live on \$118 a week. I would suggest that he try that out here in the City of Winnipeg, ride the buses, and look for the jobs. —(Interjection)— Oh yes, the Honourable Member for Gladstone is the only one who ever mucked around in the dirt in his hands in his life. Oh, I can tell you there are people on this side who have mucked around in the dirt with their hands in this life. And if you think you're the only one who's ever done any bloody work, you're crazy. And I can tell you I've worked just as hard as you ever have.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The honourable member's time has expired unless he has unanimous consent to proceed. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

**MR. ROBERT G. WILSON:** Mr. Speaker, I rise because there may be a vote on this resolution, and I wanted to indicate my position because one of the things that has helped that position is that there's been no indication, or no selling job, or no lobby from members opposite, no lists or any type of people or positions or jobs that they hold, which would indicate, and I'm talking about the Member for Point Douglas and the Member for Logan, talk about \$118 a week. They talk about a man, head of a family with two children, all on the minimum wage of \$2.95 an hour. They have not presented any lobby to support this resolution because my indications, from many of my friends in the needle trade, in the manufacturing trade, is that very few people, except in the service industry, ever work on the minimum wage.

I challenge the Reverend from Point Douglas to stand up and give some indication that there is some people that exist under these type of conditions that he is talking about. And then when you look at the resolution and the reason for them bringing it, it's very clear to me the reason that they're bringing it, because there seems to be an indication that governments when in opposition sometimes clamour for very popular minimum wage issues without any consideration, they're looking for a popular decision without any indication as to whether that decision is indeed going to hurt the very people that they're supposed to be helping.

There would be an indication that this pool of unskilled workers, and this includes many of members opposite, that once they get into the work force, they're going to . . . —(Interjection)— The Member for Logan seems to be a little annoyed about that, but you know, what I did when I was on the minimum wage, I had three jobs, so by time I finished the day's work I had all sorts of income, and that was called the initiative — willing to get out there and work. And I did the very jobs that he's talking about that are now being taken away from the young people because of a minimum wage that is out of sight.

I would think that anyone has to look at the area, the core area, and see that many of the young people who are unskilled, who have dropped out of school early, are clamouring for the jobs that used to be available in Eaton's cafeteria, clearing tables, preparing salads in the kitchens, and all the type of things that the service industry has. And how can the restaurant continue to offer a product if you're going to continue to raise the minimum wage. They used to pay \$7.00 for a case of lettuce, now they're paying \$31.00. The corporate citizens of this province are doing everybody a favour, and hiring these people, and creating student employment, and you're saying to them, well, because of a very popular, unthought of resolution by members opposite, we are going to put these part-time student help people out of work and allow you to serve salad bars, allow you to have a cafeteria style to cut out all your labour. What once used to be a labour-incentive

industry, cut it out altogether, and have one particular manufacturer prepare all the salads, like they do for the Northwest Airlines and for Air Canada, where it's all done in one building.

This is the type of thing that they would like, and I have no indication at all that these particular people that are in the unskilled labour pool, in my opinion, they will be hurt. And I, for one, have stood up and said that I propose that I think, that in one particular area, that is practically the opposite to what the Member for Logan is suggesting, that in the service industry, if you want to create more employment for the unskilled worker, that you should be seriously looking at the tip credit system, because you know, in the service industry it's common knowledge for anyone that has travelled anywhere, whether it's to our sister provinces or to the south, and especially to the south, the service is like night and day.

When you go down to southern United States, and certainly if you're fortunate enough to travel to Europe, or like the Member for Burrows, to Ghana and all the European countries and the Member for Elmwood, who's very extensively travelled, these people all travel around and they know, and they can tell you that service is better. It isn't just the educational process because Red River Community College has had a course for years. What it has to do with is you know in a particular club that I visited not too long ago, Pierre, the gentleman, the Maitre d' received a zero salary per day, and the bartender received \$5.00 a day. These people had to put in a full day for that type of money. But not one of them made less than \$50.00 or \$100.00 a day, and as high as \$200.00 and \$300.00 a day because they gave service, and they were willing to use the tip incentive, learning a skill — even though it is somewhat of an belonging in an unskilled pool — but I am saying that these particular people in the service industry, I'm using it as an example to the Member for Churchill. I am quite sure that anyone, if they were in a booth in the north selling moccasins and polar bears or whatever, if they were in a novelty bar and they were selling to tourists, if they smiled and they were on a particular percentage of sales in addition to a wage, that the sales would go up. But when you're regiminted into a forced, bare existence by a politically popular resolution, you become drones of a state, without any imagination, without any incentive.

I'm really concerned, because I think that one of the reasons that I'm reluctant to support this resolution is because there are too many unskilled people who will be hurt by those very corporate firms that are in every province of our Dominion and certainly some of them that are here from other parts of the North American Continent, who will find ways and means to cut out the minimum wage person altogether, the student help that we're trying to create more employment for. The Member for Inkster wanted us to close all ticket-taking booths entering all the parks — Falcon Lake and everything. These particular booths employ students, on a summer job, at a low wage. And what he will do if they continue to raise the fact that everyone has to make \$5.00 - \$6.00 an hour or \$4.50 an hour, they are going to have governments as well as the private sector look at eliminating all these unskilled jobs that could be automated. And I think really, that you have to look at the motives of members opposite. I would like to help these people, I really would, but it's the motives of this resolution, I think we left the Minister of Labour to look at this thing, there was an indication there was going to be a move, but there was a study being conducted by the former Minister of Labour, and now the current Minister of Labour, they are going to come in with a report, and I think that they are very skilled in their positions. I think they have very high paid civil servants, and I think they have an outreach, members of their staff that are going into the business community, and acting. Is this going to hurt the unemployment figures in this province? Or is it going to act as an incentive for others to locate here? What would happen if we put our minimum wage out of sight with our sister provinces and the rest of Western Canada? Would we have a McCain's Potato Chip place in Portage la Prairie? Would we have a Tupperware plant in the Member for Pembina's constituency? We don't know.

Well, they don't pay minimum wage, but minimum wage is a guideline and an attraction for industry. One of the many selling tools that you have to bring people in. —(Interjection)— I'll give you an example. There's one particular gentleman in this town, who is threatening to move his entire factory to Los Angeles because he has 25 empty machines.

Already two or three people, and one of them was a former roommate of mine, have moved into the U.S. market, and this is done because of the climate that is created that puts a minimum wage, which is not an incentive, because we all know, and I challenge anybody, that if somebody is only making the minimum wage in the needle trade or the garment industry, it's very, very, a rare animal indeed because the figures are there that the hourly rate is well over \$4.00 an hour. And I would suggest to members opposite that let's find out where these people are. I invite them to write me if this resolution doesn't pass, but I would ask them before writing me to wait and see what our Minister of Labour is going to come up with because I think this resolution is a red herring. They're trying to get the jump on us, and I don't think that they should succeed. They shouldn't be allowed to succeed because there's been no study by members opposite as to who they are going to hurt by the resolution, and I would suggest that our Minister of Labour will be

coming in with a well-researched suggestion as to what the minimum wage in Manitoba should be. Well, you know the Member for St. Boniface is one that I'm sure would agree with me because, you know, we got this spread syndrome. Are the trade unions going to follow suit or are they going to in their usual pompous ways, say I'm not going to turn around and go to Red River Community College for two years and study carpentry to have somebody on minimum wage get 25 cents an hour without me getting 50. Is the old spread syndrome going to take effect, the ripple effect.

Well, this is something our Minister of Labour will tell us because he is obviously talking to the trade unions, as one of the many people he's talking to. So I don't know, I would think that the Member for Logan should give me a general type of job that pays minimum wage and give me some examples of heads of families that only make \$118.00 per week supporting two children. I don't think that he can come up with more than possibly 100 in the entire core area of the city, and that's giving him a good area to choose from. I mean that sincerely, I would like to see him do that. So, I'm going to end by suggesting that I don't think because of the motives of members opposite that I can support the resolution, and I will await for my own Minister of Labour to come up with a properly researched minimum wage for the Province of Manitoba.

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

**MR. DOMINO:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry that in the earlier part of the Private Members' Hour, I missed some of the debate and I missed some of the remarks from the Member for Logan. I was, however, busy with some constituents dealing with the problem not at all very far removed from this very question of minimum wages, and how indeed you go about supporting a family on low income in this province. But I think some of the members opposite here have assisted me a little bit in filling in some of the gaps and from having heard the Member for Logan and others on that side speak, I'm sure that I didn't miss any new ideas. At this point, I understand one of the things that he mentioned was that he challenged myself to speak and to make a decision on this matter of exactly —(Interjection)— The members opposite are suggesting they want to vote on it. We'll get a chance to vote, don't worry. We'll get lots of chances to vote.

I'm a little disappointed that before we get to vote, we really haven't had a chance to hear from some of the other members opposite. I haven't heard from the Member for Churchill on this, I don't think we've heard from the Member for Transcona, I don't think we've even heard from the Member for Inkster, and we hear from him on everything, but not on this.

When I spoke, I often get the impression that people in this House — some of us are better than others — but that we're pretty good at talking, but we're not very good at listening and I'm sure that no one listened to what I said. I'm almost tempted, I'm almost tempted now to pull out the notes and give you the same speech again. I made reference to the Economic Council of Ontario, I made reference to the Brookings Institute, I made reference to groups of economists who I suggested were working, who didn't have any axes to grind, were not biased, and who took a look at the situation of what happens when you raise the minimum wage beyond the traditional 40 to 50 per cent of the average industrial wage. What happens when you raise it to 60 per cent as is being suggested in the majority part of this resolution. Those institutes, the Brookings Institute, the Ontario Economic Council of Ontario and others suggest that what you do is you hurt the very people that you're trying to help; that raising the minimum wage is a simplistic answer.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, I'm speaking on a point of order. The honourable member is speaking to the amendment, not to the original resolution. The amendment calls for an immediate 25 cent increase in the minimum wage, which is what the member called for.

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

**MR. DOMINO:** Speaking on the same point of order, I don't know what's so exercising the Member for Inkster. He, of all people, wanders everywhere in his discussions. But the point I'm making, I'm talking about what happens when you raise the minimum wage and the amendment to the original resolution also calls for a raise in the minimum wage. I would like before we get down to voting on this, I would like for some of the members opposite rather than sitting back there and making the same, simplistic vote-getting, politically sexy speeches about helping the poor, I'd like them to try and come up . . . —(Interjection)— they disagree with what I've said, if they disagree with what the Brookings Institute said, if they disagree with the facts and figures from the Ontario Economic Council, let them bring forward some other research, let them propose something. Let's hear something other than the Conservatives are mean and horrible and that NDP people are terrific.

Let's hear something a little more substantive. Let's hear something a little closer to the actual facts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the major part of this resolution calls for raising the minimum wage to 60 per cent of the average industrial wage. The amendment that we're now considering which was tacked on at the end calls for the 25 cent raise. Mr. Speaker, I said at the beginning of my original remarks on this, I said I supported an immediate 25 cent raise in the minimum wage —(Interjection)—and Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the members opposite. I'm sure that's one of the rare occasions on which they're going to thump their desks for me, and I thank them very much, and I note that they all were , and Mr. Speaker, let me say that I still believe there is need for a 25 cent raise in the minimum wage immediately. And Mr. Speaker, I'm not at all sure how I'm going to vote on this yet. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, I notice they're not thumping their desks right now. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to give it some consideration because I want that 25 cent raise. I want that 25 cent raise in the minimum wage, but I don't like having to buy the 25 cent raise along with the other trash about the 60 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that I won't be able to finish my remarks today before 5.30 pm and I'm sure that I'll have the opportunity to consult with some others who are a little more skilled in parliamentary debate, and the rules of this House. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to investigate whether or not it's possible for me to remove everything from this resolution except for the 25 cents because then I would feel a lot more comfortable voting for it.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster wants to know whether I'll vote for it. I've already told him I'm going to investigate it a little more, and I may —(Interjection)— but I would like to hear, Mr. Speaker, some substantive arguments from the members opposite. Mr. Speaker, I'm not at all worried, I would like to amend this, but if I was forced to vote on it as it is today, I would vote for the amendmett and I would vote even if I had to accept the preamble which I don't agree with and even if I had to accept the first five of the whereas's which I don't agree with them either. I think they're going to hurt the people, they're going to hurt the poor people, they're going to hurt the low income wage earners. And, Mr. Speaker, there's been a lot of laughing and a lot of jovial attitude here today — a great deal of happiness the Member for St. Boniface suggests — the Member for Inkster is almost besides himself with laughter, but let me tell you if we support this and if the government was foolish enough to take it under consideration and actually bring it in, there wouldn't be any laughing amongst those people who are working at or close to the minimum wage who would be replaced by machines.

Now you people are fortunate, we're all fortunate in this House that they haven't invented a machine to replace us yet. The Member for St. Boniface suggests that some machine could do, I quote, "a much better job than we could," at this job. —(Interjection)— I don't think so. It would take an awfully big machine for him, right. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour is 5.30 pm, but before we close the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MR. James R. FERGUSON:** Yes, Thank you Mr. Speaker. I've got a couple of changes in committees. We'd substitute the name of Mr. Gourlay for that of Mr. McGregor on private bills, and the name of Mr. McGregor for Mr. Ferguson in Law Amendments.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 5.30 pm, I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8.00 pm.