

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 7 March, 1980

Time: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have 28 students of Grade 11 standing, from Daniel MacIntyre School, under the direction of Mr. Rohf. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington.

We also have students from Grade 2 to 7, from Gunton Community Christian Academy, under Mr. Hamberg. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education.

We also have 23 students of Grade 3 standing from Anola Elementary School, under the direction of Mrs. Hadden. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield.

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

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: The Committee of Supply has considered certain Resolutions, directs me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a number of documents: Return under Section 20 of The Public Officers Act; Return under Section 66 of The Legislative Assembly Act; Return under Section 13 of The Special Municipal Loan and General Emergency Fund Act; and the Statement of the Public Trustee of Manitoba; and the Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1979; and the Report of the Provincial Auditor for the year ended March 31, 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement which I would like to make, and I have copies here for distribution.

Mr. Speaker, this government's commitment to the family farm in Manitoba's agricultural sector is evident through the many programs, not the least of which is a decision to lease hopper cars to improve the grain movement on the prairies.

This morning, I am pleased to invite all members of the Legislative Assembly to participate in a ceremony, on Monday morning, introducing the first of the hopper cars leased by the Province of Manitoba which will assist in the movement of the grain off the prairie provinces to the port facilities.

It was just last November that we finalized agreements for this important investment to not only western farmers, but to the economy at large. And I am very proud of the Agriculture Department, which has expedited the matter to the degree in which they have. So that on Monday morning, complete with Manitoba decals, the first of these leased hopper cars will be in service.

Friday, 7 March, 1980

The movement of grain has, Mr. Speaker, been a problem for many years, and there have been many meetings and task force assigned to deal with this specific situation. There have been many improvements, but many more improvements are needed for the agricultural sector to ensure the future of the significant aspect of our economy and the province.

Premier Lyon will assist in the loading of the first of these cars at Fort Whyte at 11 o'clock on Monday morning, and I would like to invite you, Mr. Speaker, and all members of the Assembly, to join in this ceremony.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the fact that the Minister is in a position to indicate that the Government of Manitoba is in a position to assist in the movement of grain to western and eastern ports, presumably mainly the Lakehead ports. But I would like to suggest to the Minister of Agriculture, and the government, that what we witness here is a responsibility in the movement of grain placed upon the shoulders of the Legislative Assembly, indeed, the Parliament of Canada, notwithstanding the fact that there is a statute in the books of Canada that require the railways to move grain at statutory rates.

Now it is sad, Mr. Speaker, to note that the Government of Canada, over many many years - in fact, in the last decade-and-a-half - has been unable to enforce the statute to the extent that the railways, since that period of time, or during that period of time, have neglected their statutory responsibilities, in effect have been on strike for lack of compensation as they allege, Mr. Speaker.

I believe this is not the way in which we should be proceeding. I believe that while it is an interim measure, what is required is either reinforcement of present legislation so that the railways would be put in a position of having to fulfill their obligations pursuant to the statutes of Canada. And failing to do that, Mr. Speaker, then the responsibility, obviously, of any government, is that they assume the responsibilities that the railways refuse to carry out.

Mr. Speaker, I, in making those comments, welcome the fact that in the interim we have to have something. But this is certainly not the way that the business of this land should be carried on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make and I have copies. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is International Women's Day. It is an event which grew out of struggles by New York garment workers, and out of the campaign by women of all political stripes for the right to vote. In recent years, Canadian women have recognized this day by keying in on the problems with crimes of violence and rape which women face.

This year, women in Manitoba have expanded their program to include a Law Conference at the University of Manitoba, and there are activities at the International Centre in the YWCA.

I think this is a good time to remind ourselves that, as legislators, we must continue to work on behalf of women. We must never forget that women still face special problems. Society itself must continue to improve the opportunities for women to work wherever they want, and whatever job they want, whether it be in the home or in the private and public sectors. Every member of this Chamber has a wife or a daughter or a grandmother. We all had mothers. We are fortunate that two of our colleagues in this House are women.

As the Minister responsible for the Women's Bureau, and as a husband and as the father of a teen-aged daughter, I want to recognize the contribution and the accomplishments of women of Manitoba, and I want to pledge our government's continuing support to help the Manitoba women meet their special problems and concerns.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Well, myself and my colleagues on this side of the House, of course, want to join in offering congratulations and pledges of support to the women of the Province of Manitoba, and indeed to the women of Canada, in the whole. I think we must make special note that this is International Women's Day, and extend our congratulations and our support to all women throughout this world.

It is, perhaps, an appropriate time to review some of the contributions that have been made by women to this society, and also some of the contributions that we have made, as

Friday, 7 March, 1980

legislators, to enable women to share, to take their fair place, to take their fair share, in the goods and the services that society produces.

I speak quite proudly right now as a member of the New Democratic Party, a party that brought the best Family Law legislation to this Province of Manitoba, and also as a member of a Legislature and a member of a party that is committed to furthering the cause that women so strongly fight for in these days.

I think it is an appropriate time, as we are discussing the Women's Bureau today in the Estimates procedures, and I look forward to carrying this conservation on during that discussion that will follow the question period today. Thank you.

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

MOTIONS OF CONDOLENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I have three Motions of Condolence to present to the Assembly this morning.

Perhaps the House would permit me to make a brief preliminary comment, mainly for the benefit of our three new members of the Legislature who have joined us since the last session, to indicate that during each session where former members of the Legislature have died in the intervening time, it is the long custom of this House to move Motions of Condolence to the relatives of the deceased.

It is significant, as the new members will notice, Mr. Speaker, that each Notice of Condolence is moved in precisely the same wording, and the motion is customarily moved by the First Minister, seconded by the present member of the House who sits for the electoral district for which the deceased sat, and then responses are customarily made by the Leader of the Opposition and other members of the House who may have known or who may wish to make some contribution to the Motion of Condolence.

So, with that brief word of explanation, Mr. Speaker, I should like first of all to bring to the attention of the House, the death of Mr. Joseph Wawrykow, who was first elected to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in the general election of July 27, 1936, as the CCF Member for Gimli. He was re-elected in the general election of April 22, 1941, and he was not a candidate in the general election of 1945.

Mr. Wawrykow was born on April 25, 1908, in the District of Dneister, near Gimli, where he obtained his elementary and his secondary education. After graduating from the University of Manitoba in 1932 with a Degree of Bachelor of Science and Agriculture, he taught school before returning to the university to obtain a further degree in Education.

He was the principal of the Fisher Branch High School from 1934 to 1936, a member of the CCF. As I mentioned, he was elected first to the Legislature in 1936 for the Constituency of Gimli, re-elected in 1941, and his contemporaries at that time reported that he served ably as a member until 1945, when he retired from active politics. In 1943, he joined the Seeds Department of the Manitoba Pool Elevators as a director of seed purchasing and public relations officer. He held various positions with the Manitoba Pool, and retired only in 1973, having acted as Manager of the Seeds Department for the previous seven years.

He was a devoted member of his church of the St. Nicholas Ukrainian Catholic Church for over thirty years, and held a number of positions in the councils of that church.

He was survived by his wife, by his daughter, and by his son.

Mr. Speaker, in not having known Mr. Wawrykow personally, I bring to the attention of the House the death of this member who served this House faithfully for the period when he was in this Chamber, and I have the responsibility and the honour to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that this House convey to the family of the late Joseph Wawrykow, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement, and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, as the present member for Gimli, I feel honored to have been asked to second the Motion of Condolence for Joseph Wawrykow. Although I did not have the pleasure of knowing Mr. Wawrykow personally, his contribution to his constituency and our province certainly indicates an outstanding career of service and achievement to others.

Mr. Wawrykow, as has been mentioned, was born in the Dniester district, some four-and-a-half miles northwest of Gimli, and attended the school of that name.

It is interesting to note the great emphasis placed on education by the early Ukrainian settlers of the Gimli area. The Dniester School was built in 1909, Mr. Speaker, one year after Mr. Wawrykow was born, and it became a two-room school in 1920. One can imagine the excitement and pride of Joseph Wawrykow and the other students when the second room was added to their school.

He continued his education, as has been mentioned, at the University of Manitoba, graduated with a degree of Bachelor of Science and Agriculture, went on to take a Bachelor of Education degree, and subsequently became a teacher and principal in the Interlake region.

Joseph Wawrykow, Mr. Speaker, exemplified a large number of young Manitobans of Ukrainian descent who recognized the value of education and pursued it in the face of great hardship and personal sacrifice. His election at the age of 28 years to this Legislature marked the third time in Manitoba's then short history, that Gimli constituency had sent a Manitoban of Ukrainian ancestry to this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant that up to the year 1941, 10 legislators of Ukrainian descent had been elected in Manitoba. Joseph Wawrykow was one of those ten legislative pioneers. He served his constituency well from the years 1936 to 1945. Upon retirement, he joined Manitoba Pool Elevators, and of course his ability was well-recognized there and he rose to the position of Manager of the Seeds Department.

A dedicated community worker, Joseph Wawrykow was a long-time member of St. Nicholas Ukrainian Church, and served on the church council and as a faithful choir member. His other community services included work on the Board of Directors of the Progress Credit Union.

Joseph Wawrykow's outstanding record of service to the people of Manitoba, as a legislator, his unselfish dedication to his community as a citizen, his efforts to improve the society in which he lived, are the mark of a man who took his responsibility as a citizen of this province seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the members of this House and all citizens of Manitoba, in expressing my deepest sympathy to his wife and members of his family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words in respect to the Condolence Motion in honour of one Joseph Wawrykow.

Joseph Wawrykow was one of the pioneers in our movement. He worked hard during the 1930s on behalf of the forerunner of the New Democratic Party, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. Having been born in Gimli, and having taught in Fisher Branch, much of his early political activity took place in working on behalf of the CCF during those years.

In 1938, he was elected to the Manitoba Legislature, and in the period 1938 to 1945, they were difficult years - members are fully aware it was the years of the Second World War, the years in which there was a coalition government in operation in Manitoba - and Mr. Wawrykow's leader at that time, S.J. Farmer, in fact, sat as a Minister of Labour during a portion of the period of time in which the late Mr. Wawrykow served in this House.

After 1945, Mr. Wawrykow contributed the remainder of his working life toward the co-operative movement and towards the credit union movement. And there is no question that through the endeavours of Joseph Wawrykow, the political field, the early construction of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, his service within the Legislature, in proposing legislation that was of benefit to Manitobans, his later work and his church, the credit union and in the co-operative movement, that in fact he contributed throughout his life towards developing a spirit of co-operation, a spirit of brotherhood, the service towards a better provincial community for all to live in.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Friday, 7 March, 1980

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY : Mr. Speaker, on behalf of those Liberals who have sat in this House in the intervening years, may I join with previous speakers in extending sincere sympathy to the family of this distinguished former member of the Legislature, Joseph Wawrykow.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the second Motion of Condolence is in respect of a distinguished member of a distinguished family of Manitoba, namely Nicholas A. Hryhorczuk, a name that is well-known in the political annals of this province.

Mr. Hryhorczuk was born December 19, 1888, and he died last November 23, in his 90th year. He was first elected to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in the general election of June 29, 1920, as an independent farmer representing the electoral division of Ethelbert.

He was re-elected in 1922 as a member of the United Farmers of Manitoba, in 1927 as a Progressive, in 1932 as a Liberal-Progressive. He was defeated in the general election of July 27, 1936, but was again re-elected in the general election of April 22, 1941 as a Liberal-Progressive member of the Coalition. He was again defeated in the general election of October 5, 1945.

So he served, but for a period of four or five years, continually from 1920 until 1945. He certainly was one of the distinguished senior veterans of this Assembly.

He was born, as I mentioned, in 1888 in the old country, in Kolomaya, in Western Ukraine. His family emigrated to Canada in 1897 and settled in the Drifting River district, north of Gilbert Plains.

He married Mrs. Hryhorczuk in that area as a young man, and she was a very young girl at the time of the marriage in 1905, and in 1911 he moved to Ethelbert where he established a business and remained there until 1978, when he became a resident of St. Paul's Nursing Home in Dauphin.

I may say as a personal aside, Mr. Speaker, that it was at St. Paul's Nursing Home in Dauphin in October of last year that I had an opportunity for a good visit with Mr. Hryhorczuk. We talked about his time in the Legislature. We talked about his late son, Mike, who was known to many of us in this Legislature, a former distinguished member from Ethelbert constituency, who was a one-time Attorney-General of the province and a member of the opposition in early days when some of us in this House served, after 1958.

His mind was excellent. His hearing had failed a bit, but he had lively recollections of the personalities and of the people and questions about all of them. And he told me on that occasion, Mr. Speaker, how extremely proud he was that his grandson, Boris Hryhorczuk, was carrying on in public service in the Province of Manitoba, as the Deputy Minister of Government Services.

So he was alive and well to all of the situations going on in the province, and it was a delight to be with him. And it was only a matter of a few weeks later that he was taken from us.

He was a very active participant in the Ukrainian culture in his own area and throughout the province. One of the founders of the Ethelbert Town Hall, a very active member of the Drama Society, he was instrumental in a number of community activities which still bear his mark, and the subsequent mark of members of his family, down through the years.

He served in this House under the premierships of the late Premier John Bracken and the late Premier Stuart Garson.

It's of significance to note, Mr. Speaker, that he and Douglas Campbell were the two living members of the 1922 Legislature which saw Premier Bracken become the Premier of this province. Mr. Campbell is now the sole distinctive survivor of that hardy group of early legislators from 1922, who were members of that first Progressive Government, in 1922. And Mr. Campbell, to this day, can give you a very accurate and a very compelling story of how he and Nick Hryhorczuk, and the other members of the Progressive Party, literally interviewed the men who were being sought to be Leader of the Progressive Party in 1922, because they had been elected without a leader.

And the man that they were to select was then to become the Premier of Manitoba, and how Mr. Bracken had turned them down and went back to the University of Manitoba in his car, and then was subsequently called back to the meeting and later was convinced to take on the leadership of that party, and then became the Premier of Manitoba for a span of some 20 years.

Friday, 7 March, 1980

Nick Hryhorczuk was at that meeting. Nick Hryhorczuk was one of the supporters of John Bracken. Nick Hryhorczuk was thereby part of the very compelling political history of our province at that time.

Mr. Hryhorczuk, as I've mentioned, participated in many many community activities. He was a person who carried a zest for life in himself, and you couldn't help but be electrified when you were around him because there seemed to be that spirit of "go" with him at all times.

He devoted his life to proving, by his own actions, that the Ukrainian people in Canada could promote and remain true to their ethnic heritage, and at the same time be exemplary Canadians. And, Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more exemplary Canadian than Nick Hryhorczuk. That he in turn instilled in his family that same kind of community and public service, is something for which all Manitobans owe him a deep debt of gratitude.

His son, Mike, to whom we paid respects on his death in 1978, carried on that marvelous tradition. And of course, as I've mentioned before, the fact that his grandson is carrying on in public service was a matter of great joy to Mr. Hryhorczuk as recently as a few weeks before his death.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that this House convey to the family of the late Nicholas A. Hryhorczuk, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement, and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this Resolution to the family.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, it was July, 1978, that this House expressed the condolences of all Manitoba and Canada, to the family of the late Mike Hryhorczuk, as the First Minister has just related to the House; and today we are expressing the condolences to his father, a very unique situation where a father and son had the distinction and the honour of serving for those decades in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I found it very interesting in checking the records of the 1921 session of the Legislature regarding some of the things that this learned and great man did as a Member for Ethelbert, and I found that he served on the Standing Orders Committee, Printing, Agriculture and Immigration and Municipal Affairs during his first term.

And, upon further review of the Legislature and his record, I noted an eloquent speech that he made, I think it was on the 4th of March, 1921, pleading for the dropping of the word "foreigner" in connection with the settlers who were representing other than British nationality in this Legislature.

And in that same speech, Mr. Speaker, he was very very critical of the Winnipeg Free Press, and pointed out that the people of his group, or his constituency, are not the ones that had brought up the bi-lingual issue during the 1920 election campaign. Nor, Mr. Hryhorczuk said, had it ever been discussed at any of his campaign meetings. So, it's very interesting through time how issue was still around in those days and has been with us over those years.

He went on further, in that particular speech, to accuse the Winnipeg Free Press of attempting to break up this newly-formed farmers' party, which he was so dedicated to, and of which he was a member. The records show as well that he was very critical of what he described in his speech as "that famous officer of the provincial government" who was in charge of Manitoba's schools in those days, for not entertaining petitions from Ruthenians - he described his group as Ruthenians - as to how they wanted to operate their public schools and educate their children in the Ethelbert area. And one of the remarks that struck me, he said: "Give Ruthenians some opportunity and they will manifest that they are capable of performing wonderful things," said this very learned and Honourable Member for Ethelbert, as he closed his remarks on the 4th of March, 1921.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to have the honour and the privilege of seconding this motion. He was a very close friend of mine for all the years that I've represented Ethelbert, and no words of mine can express the high esteem, the respect, loyalty, devotion and the down-to-earth friendship of this truly outstanding Manitoba pioneer. Over the years of his extremely useful and very important role in life, he gained the undivided loyalty of an enormous wealth of friends, neighbours, and people from all walks of life.

Friday, 7 March, 1980

And, as the record shows throughout his life, he gave really of his skills and talents as he continually went about striving for the better quality of life for all mankind, but especially those of his constituents who arrived in Canada - and particularly in Manitoba - as they were immigrants from the Ukraine and Eastern Europe in those days.

So, Mr. Speaker, I repeat the quote from the honourable member of that day in 1921: "Give Ruthenians some opportunity, and they will manifest that they are capable of wonderful things." This great Manitoban gave many Ruthenians, and Manitoba citizens, from all walks of life that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to second the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to associate the opposition with this motion. In reading some of the background of the late Nick Hryhorczuk, one certainly is impressed by the fact that we are today honouring a very strong individual, one that was of independent mind, yet very dedicated and very committed to those principles which he stood for, and served for a quarter of a century in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. And I'm sure very few of us will be able to share that privilege to serve a quarter of a century the people, the province and Manitoba in the Manitoba Legislature all the way from 1920 to 1945. During that period of time, Nick Hryhorczuk, of course, represented his own area with industry and with principle, and at the same time was always very very conscious of the contribution by the Ukrainian people to the development of the Province of Manitoba, very very conscious of need to extend an understanding of the Ukrainian culture language throughout, so that it could in, fact, play a very important role within the Manitoba heritage.

And probably one of his finest contributions in that regard is that his son, Mike Hryhorczuk, became the first Ukrainian Cabinet Minister in the Province of Manitoba. And then, as the First Minister mentioned, of Ukrainian origin; and then, as the First Minister mentioned, the fact that Boris Hryhorczuk later became his Deputy Minister within the present government.

So, we, today honour an individual, strong, committed, lengthy public service, one that represented something very very solid, very meaningful, to the provincial community.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all Liberals, I wish to join in honouring the memory of Nicholas Hryhorczuk, who served in this House for a nearly a quarter-of-a-century. He died only a few months ago, Mr. Speaker, and it's hard for some of us to believe that he sat as a Member of this Legislature before many of us were born.

Mr. Hryhorczuk was active in many areas of his community, and particularly in encouraging the preservation of the Ukrainian customs and heritage. Following this distinguished man's example, Mr. Speaker, members of his family have continued to make significant contributions to the province. Reference has already been made to Mr. Nicholas Hryhorczuk's son, Michael Hryhorczuk, who became a Member of the Legislature for the same constituency of Ethelbert in 1949, and who became the first Manitoba Cabinet Minister of Ukrainian origin, having been appointed as Attorney-General.

Nicholas Hryhorczuk's daughter, Mrs. Nadia Ewanchyshyn, has served for many years as an alderman of the town of Dauphin, and I've had the privilege of serving on volunteer organizations with Mrs. Ewanchyshyn.

As we have heard, Boris Hryhorczuk is Deputy Minister of Government Service, following an exemplary career with the City of Winnipeg. And many times in the City of Winnipeg, I heard him speak with great pride of his father and grandfather, and of their contributions to our province.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all Liberals, I join with previous speakers in the motion of sympathy to the family.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, many of us in this Chamber knew, and I think it's no exaggeration to say loved, Abe Harrison. Abe Harrison was first elected to this Assembly in a by-election on June 22, 1943, representing the then electoral division of Killarney as a Liberal-Conservative coalition candidate. He was re-elected in the general election of 1945

Friday, 7 March, 1980

as a Progressive-Conservative, on November 10, 1949 as a Progressive-Conservative Coalition, on June 8, 1953 - again as a Progressive Conservative, June 16, 1958, May 14, 1959 and December 14, 1962. He retired from the Legislature, and did not seek re-election in the election of June of 1966. So, in all, he sat in this House for some 23 years. During that time, in the Roblin administration, he served as Speaker of this Chamber, in your role, Sir, from October 23, 1958 to February 27, 1963, and later on was Minister without Portfolio from February 27, 1963 until May 15 of 1966.

When you think of Abe Harrison, you think immediately of Holmfield. And Holmfield is that excellent little village that lies just a few miles to the east of Killarney. And when you think of Holmfield, you think of Harrison Milling Company - and if you've been into Holmfield, the largest building in the community is the Harrison Elevator and Milling Company. And if you're fortunate to go over there and go into the office, you can find still, today, so far as I am aware, home-ground flour, you can find good home bran, you can find the kind of unadulterated cooking material that Manitobans, pioneer Manitobans, were famous for producing at the Harrison Mills.

Abe was a member of a pioneer family that had settled in that district, Mr. Speaker, some considerable number of years ago. He received his education there, he carried on that family milling and grain business with his brother and his sister until their retirement. And then subsequently his two sons, Bill and Errick, carried on the business, even though they had taken training in the law and practiced law in the Town of Killarney. One of his sons still lives in Holmfield, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker. He and his wife Amy, who many of us are privileged to know, graced this House and the social part of our relationships in this House for many many years.

Abe was the kind of a man who was very very self-effacing. As I say, Sir, I had the privilege of serving in this House while he sat in your chair. He was not a Speaker, as other members will recall, who tried to enforce his will upon the House. He listened carefully. As he would say sometimes from the Chair, "I may not always be right, but I'll try to listen and do the best that I can." And in many ways, that typified Abe's life. I don't know of anyone who disliked Abe Harrison. I have yet to find anyone who was an enemy of Abe Harrison, because he was not that kind of a person. He could find and make friendships among all groups in society and with his kind of good humour, quiet humour, and with his interest in his responsibilities as a member, he was a delight to be with and a delight to serve with in this House.

He served in the Cabinet, as I mentioned, of which I was a member, for some three years before his retirement. And again, he was not one of those who would take the lead in many of the major discussions that would be going on, but his quiet voice and his quiet wisdom was certainly not lost upon his colleagues in the Cabinet of that day. Abe had a deep understanding of human nature. He had a deep understanding of his fellow man. And he had seen all of the foibles that his long life had given him the opportunity to see of his fellow man and was prepared, I think, with God's guidance, to accept man as he found him and to make a friend of every man and every woman as he found them, and to be assured that, in doing so, he was fulfilling that higher moral and ethical rule that all of us would aspire to follow under God's guidance.

Well, Mr. Speaker, he is known and fondly remembered by many of us in this Chamber. It was my pleasure, not only to know him and to work with him in this Chamber and in the Cabinet room, it was my pleasure to have visited him on a number of occasions in his constituency and to be in his constituency and, as recently as 1976, to be at his home in Holmfield and to visit with him briefly.

Mr. Speaker, we will all fondly remember Abe for the characteristics that I have described and for many others that others in this Chamber can recall, activities and acts of kindness that he carried out on their behalf.

And so it is with a very great deal of pleasure and honour, I should say, Sir, that I move, seconded by the Honourable, the Member for Rock Lake, that this House convey to the family of the late Abram William Harrison, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement, and its appreciation of his devotion to duty and a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

Friday, 7 March, 1980

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise at this occasion, to have the opportunity to say that I have had the pleasure of representing the constituency that the late Abram William Harrison had the honour of representing for 23 consecutive years, namely Rock Lake and Killarney, as was mentioned by the First Minister.

Abe Harrison was a man of great courage, was a man of his own convictions, and, as was indicated by the First Minister, a very quiet-spoken person, and I have had the honour and pleasure of knowing Abe Harrison for at least 25 years. And I can recall in the days when he was in this Legislature, I used to discuss with him matters in our community of problems of individuals, and I always found him very compassionate. He was the kind of man who believed in the free enterprise system, but at the same time, understood and had compassion for his fellow man.

I should like, just for a moment, to dwell on Abe's private life. His family originally came from Ontario, as I am given to understand, and they settled in Wakopa, which is a small community in southern Manitoba, where they built a grain elevator. And, as the First Minister has described to you this morning, just over a year ago, they celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of that elevator and flour mill being in the Harrison family. And it was my pleasure to be able to one of those guests to visit the Harrisons in assisting them in celebrating that great occasion.

I should like to say here, Mr. Speaker, that the Harrison Flour Mills at Holmfield is the only independent flour mill operating in western Canada today.

Getting back to Abe Harrison's political life, and having had the pleasure, as I said, of serving the area that he represented for 23 years, I used to travel around the community, talk to people about Abe Harrison, and as the people knew him, there is one tribute I think that is most fitting. And I can't think of a finer tribute to make to any one individual who has given 23 years of his life to duty, to his community and to his country.

And Abe, Mr. Speaker, was known by the people who have come to know him so well, as "Honest Abe".

And as I got to know Abe Harrison, I come to realize how true this was. I also want to say to his family that, while Abe Harrison was a very quiet spoken person, he used to make comments about various things. And I always took note and listened, because Abe Harrison was one who gave me a good deal of advice and guidance, which I have been better for in my serving of the people of the community in the constituency of Rock Lake, and also the Province of Manitoba.

And I, Mr. Speaker, wish to thank the First Minister for allowing me the opportunity to second the Condolence Motion to his wife and his family.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, members on this side join with all members of the Legislature in this Condolence Motion that is before us now.

It's a fine tradition, that has become accepted in this Legislature, to recall to members of the House - and through them to recall to Manitobans - the services that have been given by colleagues of the past.

I suppose that when we deal with the Condolence Motion of a person who has been departed from this House for so long that none of us knew them, that we have the opportunity to reflect on the tradition that has been left to us, of the service of those who have gone before it. And it is less of a sense of bereavement for those people we did not know than it is, of course, for those that we knew and with whom we worked. On the other hand, it is a feeling of satisfaction that we can recognize that people who have served in the Legislature for many years - as is the case of Abe Harrison and those other two motions we've already dealt with - that after having served in this House, they have continued to serve the community of Manitoba in their own particular community, for many years, and had the good fortune of living long after having left this House, and continuing to make their contributions to society.

In the case of Abe Harrison, I find that there are only four of us in this House today, who did serve with him as members of the Legislature at the same time.

In my case, my first four years of this Legislature coincided with Abe Harrison's last four years. And I remember him well, not as Speaker because at that time he was a member of the Cabinet and sat in the second row in the corner seat. And I remember him as a kindly, fine, gentle person whose every action showed courtesy and consideration, and it is a memory that I have which makes me feel very warm in recollection, of having worked with a colleague

Friday, 7 March, 1980

of a different political belief but one who, like all others, had a sense of need to serve and to wish to contribute.

That is why I think it is fine that we recognize the service of our former colleagues, and, as I say, join on behalf of members on this side, with all other members, in support of this motion.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, 22 years ago, when I first entered this House as somewhat of a crusader that was going to change many things, the man sitting in the Chair that you now occupy was Mr. Abe Harrison.

As you probably know, I wasn't always an example of decorum, and I've had my innings with different Speakers, but I can say that I never won any with Mr. Harrison.

I also, as the Member for St. Johns mentioned, remember him, not for his fiery speeches, but for being a decent man, a human man, a down-to-earth, unassuming man, but always had dignity. The First Minister is so right in saying that nobody, but nobody ever had Abe as an enemy. I don't think there are too many Speakers that can say that, or for that matter, too many members of this House, but this is one thing - you could not get mad at Mr. Harrison.

It's a pleasure and an honour for me, also, to join the previous speaker, to pay tribute to this man who served his country and this province well, and join in the Motion of Condolence to his family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to join the Condolence Motion in honour of Abe Harrison. I sat with Abe from 1962 to 1966, and the quiet diplomacy which he displayed certainly impressed me as a new member, and his fairness in debate. I remember the support I got from Abe Harrison on a resolution that I had presented at that time to do with unemployment insurance for farm labourers, and I remember the rather rocky start it started. But his support and his words got that particular resolution back on the proper track, and later approved.

And I'll always remember Abe for his rather quiet, deadpan humour and a little chuckle that followed, and I would like to join the rest on the motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of all Liberals, and in particular those who have sat in this House over the years, both with Mr. Harrison and since his retirement, may I join with other speakers in extending sincere sympathy to the members of the family in the loss of this distinguished former member of the Legislature, Abram Harrison.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Further to the statement that was provided to the House yesterday by the Minister responsible for energy, the Minister of Finance in which he outlined a disposition of lease rights pertaining to oil, the giving away of a considerable part of the heritage of Manitoba, and in view of the recent statements by the Premier of the Province of Newfoundland, Brian Peckford, to the effect that Newfoundland intends to obtain an equity interest in the development of natural resources within the Province of Newfoundland, my question to the First Minister is whether he will be consulting with his colleague, the Conservative Premier of the Province of Newfoundland, in order to ascertain whether or not there is not the real feasibility of a different route for Manitoba to pursue, a route that's not too dissimilar from that which is being pursued by his colleague, the Premier of the Province of Newfoundland?

Friday, 7 March, 1980

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I am always happy, of course to have my honourable friend's doctrinaire advice as to what should be the policy with respect to mineral developments in Manitoba. I'm sure that when the Minister of Mines comes to his Estimates, he will detail to the Leader of the Opposition, and to the members of his party, what has been happening in geophysical exploration in Manitoba as a result of Manitoba, once again, becoming competitive in terms of not being a force-fed partner in mineral and/or geophysical exploration in this province. But I can merely say to him that from time to time, of course, we consult with all of the Premiers of Canada with respect to the various policies that they put forward.

I consult with my neighbour and colleague, the Premier of Saskatchewan, who has not slavishly in any way followed the policy that is being advocated by the Leader of the Opposition, and I can reassure him that we have - unlike himself, Mr. Speaker, we have no doctrinaire hangups at all. Our policy, however, will be directed by what is in the best public interest of the people of Manitoba. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the announcement yesterday by the Minister of Mines was an example of how the new policy is succeeding in Manitoba, because the amounts that have been earned by the Treasury far outstrip the amounts that were earned when my honourable friends were in office.

And far from giving away, as my honourable friend would use the term, giving away mineral leases in Manitoba, the terms of the lease are from one to five years, Mr. Speaker, and they are put up for public tender, and the public purse of Manitoba is benefiting in a way that they never did when my honourable friends had their closed-circuit version of state oil companies operating in Manitoba - state oil companies that never came into existence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to revert to my earlier question, and simply ask the First Minister whether he has consulted or whether he intends to consult with Premier Brian Peckford, Province of Newfoundland, pertaining to equity involvement of the public in the development of the natural resources. Has he consulted, does he intend to consult, this so-called doctrinaire position that has been outlined by his colleague, the Premier of the Province of Newfoundland? It doesn't require a lengthy answer, just an indication of yes or no.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, all Conservatives that I am aware of are non-doctrinaire, they are empirical pragmatists. My honourable friend ought to look up both words, and he would find out that impericism and pragmatism can best serve the public interest rather than 19th Century ideology, which my honourable friend follows so slavishly.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I know that according to the Rules I have no right to demand an answer. But again, I am wondering if the First Minister has simply overlooked answering the question which I have made in a spew of verbiage, because again I was interested - I am sure members of the House are interested - factually whether the First Minister will be discussing with Brian Peckford the thrust in the Province of Newfoundland pertaining to equity involvement.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to address a question to the Minister of Tourism. In view of the indications by his predecessor Minister of Tourism last year that members of the Tourist and Convention Bureau would be attending a convention in Breezy Point, Minnesota, of the Manitoba Bar Association to attempt to persuade them to hold future conventions of the Manitoba Bar Association in Manitoba, could the Minister of Tourism indicate to us what efforts have succeeded in persuading them in regard to this year's convention?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any efforts on the part of the Tourist and Convention Association at the present time. I am

Friday, 7 March, 1980

aware of the efforts that were made last year, but I am not in a position to report on that right now. I would take the question as notice and let the member know.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, then, whether the Minister could indicate if there is any special effort that is being made by his department directed to Manitoba organizations in an attempt to have them hold their conventions within Manitoba so that Manitoba dollars are spent in Manitoba, and so that there is no loss of balance of payment by Manitobans holding their Manitoba conventions outside of the province and outside of Canada?

MR. JOHNSTON: There certainly is, Mr. Speaker. If the honourable member had taken the time to attend the Canadian Outerwear Fashion Show, which was held by and sponsored by the outerwear fashion manufacturers of the province of Manitoba, he would have found that it was done by Canada, Manitoba, and attracted 450 buyers from United States into this city, in this province, just this week. All efforts are being made to have Manitobans have their conventions here and Canadians, Americans and anybody else.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a final supplementary.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister has taken the opportunity to talk about some success, and I recognize that, which has nothing to do with a convention of a Manitoba organization being held in Manitoba, may I ask the Minister whether he is aware of the fact that the Manitoba Bar Association is proposing to hold its convention this year in Fargo, North Dakota, on June 5th to 8th, 1980; and if he is aware of that, what is he doing about the attempt to change it; and if he is not aware of it, what is he prepared to do to attempt to persuade them to stay in Manitoba?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the first statement is wrong. The Manitoba Government had a lot to do with helping the fashion industry have it here, and so did the Canadian Government.

I can only assure you that I am not aware until now - I may have been neglectful in not knowing it - but I am not aware that the Manitoba Bar Association is having their convention in North Dakota again. I can only say that we would do everything to try to persuade them otherwise. But I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we don't have an iron curtain around Manitoba, and we are good neighbours with the people of North Dakota.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, apropos the first questions that were responded to by the First Minister, can the Minister of Mines tell us what the present value of the public interest in the mining find at Flin Flon is - the one in which the public of Manitoba, in partnership with Granges Exploration of Sweden, found a viable mining development in northern Manitoba. Has the Minister recently evaluated the public wealth which has been created by that development?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been some estimates made on the value in terms of the number of tons of minable ore that are there. There also has been some speculation based on rates of return from the point of view of copper prices or base metal prices. But, Mr. Speaker, none of these come into any real world of reality until such time as the development of the mine takes place, and I can advise the House and the Member for Inkster, that continues to be pursued, and I expect that hopefully, some time during the course of the year, we are able to announce to the House that there is some progress that is going to be made on that site.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Mines confirm the previous advice that if the public wished to dispose of that interest at the present time, they could get for it,

Mr. Speaker, more money than was spent by all the exploration that was carried on by the public of Manitoba during the years that we decided that we had some . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I believe the question could be considered to be hypothetical. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: . . . him to confirm a present fact, that the present value of that development, if the Crown wished to sell it to a private interest, would result in the public treasury receiving more money than they have spent in all of the development projects that they undertook when the people of Manitoba were going it alone and with private interests in partnership.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the member's entrée into this area of speculation was by way of the announcement that was made yesterday regarding the expiration for permits to undertake development or exploration work by the private sector. But, Mr. Speaker, the member has now taken it into the area of mining. I think it would be appropriate to advise the House and remind the member that the former government undertook a fairly extensive oil exploration program, gas development program, spent hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars and didn't even get a teacupful, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, he's conveniently ignoring the fact that they got zip return on their oil exploration work, but he wants to now cover that up by speculating there may be a return in mining. Mr. Speaker, it's quite possible that there will be.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that the answers he's giving have a tendency to provoke debate, and I suggest that this is not the particular time to be inviting debate. We are here to elicit information during the Question Period.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I note that the honourable member is refusing to answer as to how much the public treasury and public wealth is being benefited by the state, by the public involvement. If, Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's remarks that we did not discover a teacup, is it a lie, as reported by Manitoba Mineral Resources Limited in its annual report, tabled by the Minister yesterday, that the company had oil income totalling \$15,668 from its interest in five wells jointly with Barrie Petroleum Limited, and four wells with Copperhead Oil Company, and income and total production of 3,124 barrels of oil resulted in income of \$3,493 in addition to that? Is that a lie as reported in this statement? Well, Mr. Speaker, is my honourable friend saying that this is not a teacup?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in relative terms the answer still stands. But the member is ignoring a very extensive program that was undertaken, financed entirely by the provincial government during their tenure, financed entirely by the taxpayer, that resulted in absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker, and was the subject of discussion and controversy in this House for many many months. And he ignores all of that. Mr. Speaker, to get back to his question with regards to mining. There is information contained in the report, I believe, in that regards with the mining location in the Flin Flon area. He can gain information from that. Until it comes into further development, the real figures will not be known, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance just what the position of the government is with respect to the increase of interest rates in the United States, and how that may affect Canadian interest rates, and whether or not measures are being planned or undertaken vis-a-vis the Government of Canada, or in co-operation with the Government of Canada, to assure Canadians that they will not be subject to the same interest rate surge that is now occurring in the United States.?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

Friday, 7 March, 1980

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, that course is clearly a federal matter, and that decision will be made by the Bank of Canada and the federal government. At the present time, there is a 2 percent or so spread between the Canadian rate and the American rate and the Canadian economy seems to be surviving, and I trust that the Bank of Canada will follow the policy it has been following in resisting increases that will tend to track the American rate. However, they are, I know, watching it very very closely. There are many considerations that have to be taken into account, and at this point in time, at least, we are running that degree below the American rate and we seem to be surviving and perhaps they will continue to do so.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether or not his office is at least attempting to convince the government of Canada, and through the government of Canada, the Bank of Canada, that interest rates should be held down to the extent that it's possible within practical limits?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, we've been advising the Bank of Canada and the governor of the Bank of Canada of our feelings in that regard, which I, in reply to a question the other day, stated that we hope that with it being an inexact science or an inexact art, and if they had to err, for goodness sakes to err on the low side of the interest rate schedule, and they seem to be doing that. Our feelings to them are well-known. We have lobbied them consistently for the last two years in that regard.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister now indicating that the former Finance Minister, who's been defeated in the last election, was wrong in his policy of following the American increases with Canadian increases?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, again the former government - during the tenure of the former government was the period when the Bank of Canada did decide to not maintain a Canadian rate higher than the American rate, and in fact started the practice, began the practice, of bringing the Canadian rate and sustaining it below the American rate, to the point where it is now at the 2 percent level below, and consistently ran anywhere up to 1 percent or so above the American rate prior to the Clark government in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Since the government is considering dismantling the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission and allowing smaller stores, grocery stores, etc. in Manitoba to handle the sale of liquor, has the Attorney-General given consideration to the fact that, should small stores be allowed to sell liquor, that there could be more holdups, and that there may be less control in terms of the sale of liquor to juveniles?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the premise of the Member for Elmwood's question is totally inaccurate. There is no intention whatsoever to dismantle the Liquor Control Commission. The review committee have been requested to consider the advisability or inadvisability of making recommendations with respect to revisions of the Act, and procedures under the Act, and regulations under the Act, and to take into consideration employee concerns, industry concerns, concerns of the public, trends in other jurisdictions, and to make recommendations with respect to that matter. There will be a full series of public hearings, Mr. Speaker, at which members of the public will have an opportunity to express their views, either at public hearings or by way of submission to the review committee, Mr. Speaker, and we'll have to await the results of that review which will involve extensive consultation with the public.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Will those extensive consultations with the public also include extensive consultations with the law enforcement agencies? Because it was the head of the RCMP's Criminal Investigation Branch who today was quoted as saying that he was concerned about the possibility of more hold-ups in smaller stores and less control by storekeepers,

should this occur in dealing with juveniles and minors. So I ask the A.G. whether the RCMP and the Winnipeg Police, etc., will have an opportunity to have an input into the deliberations?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there's no question that the concerns of law enforcement authorities in the province will be given serious consideration.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the Attorney-General if he could ensure, for the benefit of the opposition, that members of the front bench attend Question Period. Because only a few moments ago there were six Ministers missing, now the Premier has walked out and there are four Ministers. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I point out to the honourable member as I have recently, it is not proper to make remarks about the attendance or the absence. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: On a point of privilege, I do not believe that the members of the opposition can properly perform their function if they are faced with a decimated front bench. And when we have six Ministers missing, and now five Ministers missing, we are not allowed, and are unable to ask questions of the government, and this is depriving us of our rights as members of the opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the attendance of the treasury bench has been excellent and there are occasions when Ministers have other meetings, have business of the government to attend to that is unavoidable. This morning, of course we've had an unusual circumstance in that we've had Motions of Condolence go on until sometime after 11:00 o'clock. There may very well have been meetings that were scheduled for 11:00 o'clock which were made, not realizing that Motions for Condolence would go that long and that Question Period would be extended to this time. Mr. Speaker, if there are question that members opposite have, there are Acting Ministers who can either answer the question or take the question as notice and provide the information at the next sitting of the Legislature.

But overall, I think Mr. Speaker, the attendance of Cabinet Ministers during Question Periods, has been very good.

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

MR. DOERN: On a point of order, two points. First of all, the Condolence Motions were indicated several days ago so Ministers were aware of the procedure, and secondly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable member want to address himself to the point of order?

MR. DOERN: I'm attempting to. The Attorney-General made the point that the Condolence Motions affected the Question Period. I say to that that notice was given at least 48 hours ago. The reason I raise this matter is that as soon as Question Period began, three or four Ministers left the Chamber and I think that the business of the House, in terms of Question Period, should take precedence over departmental matters.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, very briefly and very calmly, I believe that my appointment book, like other Ministers' appointments books get filled up long before 48 hours ahead of time. I happen to know that there are some Ministers that have kept people who have driven in from the country waiting, and they have gone to see them in their offices.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Friday, 7 March, 1980

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to address to the Minister charged with responsibility for the Manitoba Hydro. It's regarding the \$750,000 set aside for a study of the Burntwood River Hydro proposal. When will a consulting firm be appointed to study this plan? I understand that this appointment has been delayed from month to month.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Hydro utility has indicated that it is going to undertake these studies. That has been announced publicly. When they may select the consultants for it is best known to the Utility Board itself, and I suspect that there will be opportunity for the member to address the question to the Hydro utility when it appears before the Public Utilities Committee.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, at what stage in their deliberations will the government require the consulting firm to consult the public, including the native population, and can we assure that any consultation will take place before one of the five sites is selected?

MR. CRAIK: No doubt, Mr. Speaker. Apart from the consulting work that the utility may embark upon or engage in, there will be involvement through the Clean Environment Commission as well, and there will be plenty of opportunity for public input.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, on another matter, I have a question for the First Minister, which I'll address to the Deputy Premier, if that's the correct title. In view of the statement made by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs at a meeting with the Morris McDonald School Board in January to the effect that houses in town and country should be levied for education taxes as they are in the city of Winnipeg, of course, and in view of the silence on the part of the Chairman of the Assessment Review Commission on what is coming out of his Commission, can we assume that this government policy will be part of the report by the Assessment Review Commission?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I know that that cannot be assumed, but since the member has addressed the question in general, I'll take it as notice for either the First Minister or the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. My question is directed to the Minister of Health. Can he confirm that the government has turned down a request for capital funds for this fiscal year for Mount Carmel Clinic?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PARASIUK: Can the Minister indicate if funds are being provided in the capital program, future capital program for health facilities in Manitoba for Mount Carmel Clinic, or are funds only being allocated in the future for hospitals as opposed to community clinics like Mount Carmel Clinic?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there certainly is no discrimination. If the honourable member is inquiring as to whether there is, as between Mount Carmel Clinic and conventional community hospitals, where the capital program for the Manitoba Health Services Commission is concerned, we were not able to accommodate Mount Carmel's request at this point in time in terms of prioritization, but certainly their request and their legitimate ambitions remain under consideration by the government for future programs.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, in view of the fact that the government has obviously over-budgeted for personal care homes and hospitals in the Lundar-Ashern-Eriksdale area to the point that the local hospital board Chairman has said that the government wants to push

unnecessary beds in that area, would the government reconsider its position with respect to funding of some of those facilities which the local people say are somewhat over-budgeted, and use some of the funds saved to provide for the capital facilities for Mount Carmel Clinic, which has been serving the community well for a great number of years? Would you do that for this fiscal year?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the short answer is no. The long answer is that I dispute, in fact I reject the suggestion by the honourable member that we have obviously over-budgeted in terms of personal care beds in the Interlake. That question has been in some considerable discussion and in some considerable dispute. It was not the Chairman of the Board who said that the approval offered by the government was unnecessary. Certainly a spokesman for one sector of that district system has suggested that; there are others who suggest quite the opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Deputy Premier. In view of the pronouncement by the Premier this morning that we now have a government which is a government of empirical pragmatists, and in view of the fact that last night there were a number of meetings throughout the city of Winnipeg at which teachers stated to concerned parents that there were problems with respect to crowded classrooms, with respect to loss of special programs, with respect to sharing of programs between schools and the busing that that will cause, and the loss of individualization as a result of the lack of funding by the provincial government to the city, can the Minister advise the House as to whether something will be done before the board meeting of next Tuesday by the provincial government in order to assist the city of Winnipeg school division to alleviate these serious problems?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there are serious adjustments being experienced by the school divisions, but I have to indicate to the member the same reply that has been given by the Minister of Education in this House on a number of occasions, that the first line of examination and discussion is at the level at which it's now taking place, and that is at the school board level. That is what school boards are created for, and that is what they have done their job at for many, many years. This isn't the first time we've had adjustments of a serious nature that have had to be undergone in the school systems. While Division No. 1 is the largest division by far in the province, the problems that they are facing, Mr. Speaker, are of the same nature that has been faced by all of the school divisions right across the province for many, many years. There is no doubt that the demographic shifts that are going on and the reduction in school population are causing problems.

Mr. Speaker, I read just recently where the city of Calgary had faced the problem of closing seven schools in their downtown area. Mr. Speaker, there isn't a city in Canada that is not experiencing the kinds of problems that are being addressed now by School Division No. 1, and in fact, by, I would think all of the urban school divisions, by having an expanding suburb and a contracting inner belt. That has to be done, Mr. Speaker, and that includes the transportation problems referred to by the Member for Rossmere. My own school division went through the same battle over the last five years of the busing from one area to another to try and help solve its problems. They are all going to have to wrestle with the same problem.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary question. It is my understanding that the Winnipeg No. 1 School Division is not in a position where they are discussing preliminary budgets. They are talking about the actual budget this coming Tuesday evening, and in that budget there is a cut of 1.9, or an addition of 1.9 students per teacher, at a time of declining enrolments because of lack of funding by the provincial government. And in fact, the Teachers Association is claiming that the provincial input into education is going down in percentage terms, and that the percentage of provincial income going into education is going down at this time. Therefore I am asking the Minister whether at least the government could send someone down to that meeting and listen to these people, listen to their problems. I understand that nobody showed up last night at all of those meetings throughout the City of Winnipeg from the government.

Friday, 7 March, 1980

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has already addressed this question in the House. I would like to add, though, what appears to have been overlooked, that in addition to the direct grant increase that was announced by the Minister of Education of course, there is also an increase in the total amounts of moneys being distributed by way of the school tax, the property tax rebates, Mr. Speaker, that have also already been indicated in the Estimates. I think, perhaps, that by the time the two of them are added together, the public school system, with the access they have through their regular taxation flexibility in their own mechanisms, are in a position where they can wrestle with their difficulties, probably as well as any other level of government can.

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

MR. JAMES D. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Acting First Minister, who is the Acting Minister of Education today? Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question, then, to the Acting Minister of Education, and point out to him that I've asked a question of the Minister himself on two occasions as to information specifically as to the value of the Foundation Program to Winnipeg School Division No. 1. I wonder if the Acting Minister could give me that figure?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister without Portfolio.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Well, Mr. Speaker, if indeed the member has addressed this question to the Minister of Education, I'm sure he has taken this under consideration. But, from the explanation which the Member for St. Vital has given me today, it would indicate that it is a matter that could very well be considered and discussed when the Estimates of the Department of Education are considered in committee, and I would suggest to the member that those Estimates will be before the Committee of Supply in relatively short order, so that he will have that opportunity then.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Acting Minister of Education whether that information as to the dollar value of the Foundation Program to Winnipeg No. 1, has in fact been communicated to the Winnipeg School Division No. 1, given that it will be finalizing its budget, I understand, next Tuesday, and could not or will not be in a position to wait until the Education Estimates come before the House.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I'm not able to comment specifically as to whether or not the information relative to the Foundation Grant to Winnipeg School Division No. 1, has been discussed directly with that school division. I will take the question as notice.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel like the Jack-in-the-box this morning. Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Health, and I'd like to ask him whether he is prepared to clarify his statement that the chairman of the board of the Lakeshore District Health Board used his two votes to defeat a proposal of his Cabinet to the board, when that statement that the Minister made, both in the number of votes and in the matter at issue at the board, were both inaccurate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, what I said was that at a meeting as recently as November or December - and I cannot specify the precise date, but it was in November or December - when the board met on the issue once again with respect to the government's recommended position on the development of health facilities on the west side of the Interlake, that the result of the vote of a 12-member board was a six-six split, and that, as was his democratic right, and I specified that I recognized it as his democratic right, the chairman of the board had the opportunity to cast a second vote.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister check that the chairman of the board did not, in fact, cast two votes; he did cast the deciding vote with respect to breaking the tie of the board in question, but that the chairman of the board has not two votes. He has one vote as any other member, and he cast that vote in breaking the tie of the board?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking me whether I can check that. Certainly I can check that. My statement is based on information that was conveyed to me with respect to persons in attendance at the meeting and concerned with the issue. I made it in good faith. Certainly I can check it, but it's my understanding that was the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a final supplementary.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister provide to this House an assessment or an accounting that should be available at the Manitoba Health Services Commission of the additional costs that will be incurred should the present Cabinet proposal be accepted by the District Board, the additional costs being of the service that will not be provided by the hospital that is in the area - the additional bussing costs or ambulance costs, and the additional costs in running the facility? Could he provide those costs to this House, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SHERMAN: Of course I can do that, Mr. Speaker, and there is no doubt that I will do that, that it will be debated at some length in my Estimates. At that point in time, that information will be made available. I want to specify for the benefit of the Honourable Member for St. George, and some of his colleagues, who seem to have taken a vocal, if only semi-informed part in this discussion, that the government has ordered nobody to do anything. We are not in a position to order anybody. We wouldn't if we could. What we have done is approved a conceptual course of action. If the member municipalities don't want to follow that course of action, they're under no obligation to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Question Period having expired, we will proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

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

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Labour and Manpower, and the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of the Attorney-General.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Morris McGregor (Virden).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call the Committee to order and I might remind all members at that last night's meeting the Chair felt a little bit concerned with the discipline and I would just like to address it to each member: When you do have the Chairman's eye and you want to have a further supplement, show him, because I am trying to reach not knowing, and if you are finished, then I want to look for someone else. To give the Chair a little more of a break on it, I hope not to have to do any more, but it might well be some time in the future we would have to ask each member to stand, because that would clearly, because if you look down here, the hands are everywhere. Clearly signal if you have got the Chairman, and you want to follow it up.

The Member for Wolseley.

MR. R. G. (Bob) WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to raise what I consider is a matter of personal privilege.

Yesterday, the Member for Wellington accused me of abusing the privileges of the House and I was hoping, as I say, to share one or two of my personal experiences with members of the Committee so that future generations, and those coming up behind me, do not sort of lose their rights and privileges. It was never my intention to discuss my case, it was only the present policies which need, in my opinion, an overhaul. And I suggested that the member certainly offended me in many comments that he made, and I think I probably precipitated that by sort of insulting a couple of members of his legal club by demanding that they be questioned for perjury and be investigated.

So I really think that the record will show --(Interjection)-- Well, the member raised experiences about his clients in front of this Committee. He talked about cases that he had. And, you know, the member is the last one to talk about privilege, because when he was a member of the City Legal Department, he turned over a privilege file which involved me to Robert Matas of the Tribune, and as a resident of Wolseley, he is the hatchet man for Professor Mills, the new NDP candidate. And I suggest that the Member for Wellington should refrain from insulting me in further dealings in these particular Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 16, 2.(b)(1). The Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Getting back to business, Mr. Chairman, during the past year we have had cause to be concerned, I think, about the disclosure of the names of accused. Several prominent people in the Manitoba community have been involved in cases which have resulted in a great deal of public embarrassment. It certainly has made them the focal point of a great deal of attention, and I think what that has done is precipitate a re-evaluation of the propriety of disclosing names prior to an accused person being convicted in the courts.

Just generally, I would ask, through you, Mr. Chairman, that the Attorney-General provide us with his opinion relative to publication of names in order that the Committee have an opportunity to discuss this matter in some detail.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, let me say firstly that there is, as the member is well aware, no law at the present time which prohibits publication of the names of persons accused of crimes. What was started last year under the Federal Attorney-General was a major review of the Criminal Code of Canada through the Federal Law Reform Commission, and in close consultation with the Provincial Attorney-General's Departments. The election, of course, intervened and I don't know that the new Attorney-General of Canada will be pursuing that - I would hope that he would.

What the member raises is a very difficult question, but I think I would be inclined, if he wishes to know my personal view of the matter at this time, that I would not be in favour of bringing into law a law which would prevent disclosure of the names of persons until their cases are disposed of.

MR. CORRIN: Just a matter of clarification, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister. I am not sure which side he took. Could you just say whether you feel that there should be disclosure of names prior to a conviction or that you feel that should be withheld until after the conviction?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, at the present time I would be in favour of the present system.

MR. CORRIN: In that regard, Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is incumbent on us to discuss the reasons for that. It seems to me that there are pros and cons on both sides of the argument and it is a question, I suppose, of whether you wish to fall on the side of social rights, collective public rights, or individual liberties.

On the one hand, Mr. Chairman, I would indicate that I feel that it is manifesting justice to people before the courts to have their names published prior to conviction without their permission. On this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to be clear that I feel that the law should be reformed insofar as names should not be published prior to conviction without a person's consent. Certainly people like Peter Trew - I use him as an example - would obviously wish that their criminal proceedings be held publicly. They wouldn't - people charged as Mr. Trew was obviously would want the public to be aware of the fact that charges were pending and want the advantage, the benefit of having their charges laid open to public scrutiny. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I would postulate and submit that it is often of tremendous impact to an individual to have his or her name published in the press respecting the laying of charges.

As we all, know not all people who are charged -and we had an example yesterday, I think a rather dramatic example, in the McGay College case involving Mr. Dragan, who works for the government and who sat on the Juvenile Justice Committee - not all persons who are charged are guilty. Just a short while ago, the Minister saw fit to appoint this individual, Mr. Dragan, to a very important justice committee in order that he give assistance to the Minister and the government in the formation of recommendations respecting matters of justice policy. Now I suppose, in retrospect, it's obvious that a person who otherwise is of good character, otherwise well thought of in the community, has been subjected to personal embarrassment, humiliation.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to interrupt the flow of ideas as between the respected members, but I would indicate that it's difficult to speak when there's such an uproar.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would submit that there are obvious examples of people whose lives have been irreparably damaged as a result of the publication of their names prior to the determination of their prosecutions.

I also am cognizant, Mr. Chairman, of the age-old argument that the public must have a right to know, because otherwise members of the public would be in jeopardy. A person who is accused of a serious crime could be on the streets, and we should all know that person is possibly an imminent threat to our well-being. Well, Mr. Chairman, I've always been of the view that's the responsibility, the protection of the public is the responsibility of the judiciary. That's what interim judicial release or bail procedures are all about. The judiciary undertakes to appropriately set preconditions for a person's release in order to assure the security of the general community. So, I don't think in these times, that's a relevant argument.

A secondary argument, I suppose equally important to many people in society, is the right of members of society to have all business of the state conducted above-board and in full public view. Well, as I stated earlier, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that individual liberties could be a matter of individual conscience. If the law was appropriately reformed to make provision for individuals to waive their right to privilege and secrecy, rather than simply having this public overview imposed on them. So it seems to me that we could enshrine in law the opportunity, give the opportunity for an individual to determine his or her own fate, to determine whether or not he or she wishes to make known to the public the fact that he or she is the subject of a prosecution in the courts.

But, Mr. Chairman, having spoken to those concerns and those issues, I don't understand, in these days of mass media - and I stress that we are living in highly technological times when the impact of publication is very different than it was when these matters were first considered and enshrined in our law. When we spoke of these matters as a society 100 years ago, mass media technology was unknown. Sure, a person could come down to the courthouse and check the public record and determine whether or not John Smith or Jane Doe

was the subject of a criminal prosecution. But obviously, it was unlikely that was going to happen, and generally, only people of a very serious mind who had good reason to do so would make such a strenuous inquiry.

But today, Mr. Chairman, we live in a very very different world. We live in a world where, because of television and the mass circulation of mass print media, the news of such a charge can be sent around the entire country in a matter of hours.

The Bill Guest case probably was the most notable example this year, Mr. Chairman. I think it really underscored the impact of the present state of law. Mr. Guest was not even charged by the Crown. It was an act of negligence, an act of omission on the part of a police officer who zealously undertook to transmit some file documents to the administrator of the court office. So Mr. Guest, as a result of the negligence of one person, found himself on the front pages of all the newspapers in this province. He found himself the subject of news reports on television and radio. He's a well-known person. Obviously, his livelihood is dependent on his reputation in the community insofar as he is a public personality.

And, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Guest was, I'm sure, unnecessarily and greatly embarrassed for nothing. Shortly thereafter, it was determined that the Crown, I believe, did not wish to proceed. A stay was granted. There was no substance or foundation to the laying of the charges. Yet unnecessarily he had to face that.

And I think we can all appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that it's a very serious matter. There are people in our community, good people in our community, who do indeed value their reputations, and don't wish those reputations to be the subject of public discourse and controversy. And you know, Mr. Chairman, the other argument is, if a man is not guilty and he's acquitted, or if he receives a stay of proceedings and the Crown discontinues the case, that's sufficient. That in itself will establish, to all right-thinking people that the person was indeed innocent.

Well, Mr. Chairman, after ten years in the profession of law, I can say that that is purely nonsense. I have represented clients who have been the subject of publicity, and I can tell you that it doesn't work that way. I have represented men who have lost their jobs as a result of employers who felt that it was too embarrassing to continue their association in their firm. I think notably of one client I had about four or five years ago who was charged with indecent exposure. He was a salesman for a large Winnipeg firm. He was very well known around the province. He had three children. It was a very very serious matter. It was very embarrassing. His name managed to find its way into the newspapers.

I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that his employer didn't even wait for the trial. He didn't even wait. He sacked him. That was the end of it. He told him that he couldn't expect any of his clientele to deal with this person, and even though he was sure that he was innocent and that it was all a big mistake, mistaken identity and so on, that he couldn't jeopardize the future of the firm and the reputation of the firm and lose the clientele to the competition.

And that's realistic, Mr. Chairman, I can understand that. Sales, for instance, are competitive. It's impossible for somebody to be expected, to be able, to tolerate that sort of situation. We all know that it takes months before a case is even dealt with in the courts. At the very best now, a contested trial, even if a person is in jail, takes five months. Here in the Winnipeg Tribune, Wednesday, March 5th, a few days ago, here's a man going before one of the County Court Judges in Winnipeg, spent five months in custody. I shouldn't mention his name, but his name was already published.

This man, a young man of 26 years of age, was sentenced to a day in jail for possession of stolen property. He had originally been charged with robbery, a very serious indictable offence. It was armed robbery, as a matter of fact, involving two marked, armed gunmen who are alleged to have perpetrated an afternoon robbery on October 12, 1979, involving \$15,000 in cash. I wish to note that the record should show, and it does, that both charges were dropped.

Yesterday night we discussed overcharging and plea bargaining. Well, here we have a case where the Crown took a guilty plea to possession of stolen property, which is a minor charge compared to armed robbery, and they dropped the very serious charges of armed robbery.

As a matter of fact, the Crown Attorney, Mr. Kaplan, it says, told the judge that evidence from the preliminary hearing against the accused failed to directly link him with the holdup. So he spent five months in jail because he couldn't afford to put up the cash bail that had been required. And after all that, was never found guilty of the serious charges originally laid, entered a guilty plea to a lesser charge - and I'm sure the reality was to get out of jail, because his lawyer probably told him that if he entered the guilty plea to a minor charge that after five months in jail he'd be on the street in 24 hours. And that's not uncommon, Mr. Chairman.

Friday, 7 March 1980

But the point is that here was a man whose name was probably published in the paper as being an armed robber, a very serious thing; a man who, using a shotgun, held up a business. And now he's on the street, and he entered one plea to possession of some stolen property. It could be anything. It could be a radio. A transistor radio worth \$10.00. But he sat in jail for five months pending that.

So, getting back to the original point, Mr. Chairman, I don't see in these times of mass media penetration, that it's equitable or fair to members of society that they should have imposed on them this burden. It seems to me that prior to the conviction of an accused, an individual should have the right to have, if he wishes, if he or she wishes to have a privilege respecting the publication of his or her name, it does nothing to the state of our justice system, it does nothing by way of contributing to respect for the law, to have mass media publication prior to trials.

The last point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, it just occurs to me, the Attorney-General might say, well, you know, it's the right of people to know what goes on at trials and the public should be able to be informed of the progress of trials. Well, I'm not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that that isn't the public's right. And I'm not suggesting that the media should not be allowed to be present at trials and publish details of trials. I'm just suggesting that it's unnecessary for them to publish the name of the accused. You can tell all about a charge, and all about the conduct of the prosecution and so on and so forth and where it took place, and the details, and who is alleged to have been shot, or who was alleged to have been banged over the head, and so on and so forth, but it's in my opinion, wholly unnecessary, prior to a conviction, to publish the individual's name.

I think I would go further and say that there should be no publication until the time for appeal has been expired. Because even there, Mr. Chairman, there have been serious situations arising where people's names weren't published when they were charged, but were published when they were convicted, and then a few weeks later they launched an appeal, and at the end of the appeal, they received their acquittal. So even there, there is a bit of havoc that's been played with respect to people's lives.

As I have said, I would ask the Attorney-General to provide some response. I think I have attempted to be as candid as I can and disclose the position I personally take. I don't represent it to be the position that's taken by all members on this side of the table, but they can speak their own minds, I think they should. I think it's an important subject and one that's long overdue for public discussion and review, particularly if the Federal Law Reform Commission is now engaged in a general review of this law. I think it is important that the government of Manitoba make known its position to the Federal Law Reform Commission in order that they have some idea, some feel, for the position taken by representative people in the various provinces.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Attorney-General whether he can state for the record why he feels that there should be publication of names on the laying of charges.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley on the same subject.

MR. WILSON: Yes, on the same subject, I have a different slant. I believe we should give the names. I realize it is a sort of frightening and very unhappy experience, but life isn't easy at the best of times. I think possibly the different slant I have is maybe the re-education, if I can use the word, or possibly the enlightenment of the Crown and members of the Minister's staff. For instance, if you had staff meetings and they were to be assured that all of them had a "University of Life" degree, that they hadn't had a sheltered existence, that they would visit prisons, and know what happens to people that they do accuse, so that if we are going to go along with and deny the people out there, the public, through the impact of publication, the right to know, then if I was to slightly agree with the Member for Wellington I would say that it would have to be, in my opinion, a categorization of the charges. In other words, I could see maybe where in some case of say a financial dealing that was not a crime of violence, maybe a commercial fraud or maybe an income tax evasion, or maybe something such as leaving the scene of an accident or impaired driving, maybe that type of thing should be categorized so that that could be kept out, that that is the half-way point I might consider --(Interjection)--.

Well, maybe I haven't got them all correct, but it would seem to me that the ban at the preliminary hearing, which is in place now, it really only seems to favour the extremely wealthy or the people that know the score. First offenders and people that have never been in trouble and people that are poor don't seem to enjoy the privilege of having their names not printed.

Friday, 7 March 1980

I would like to say that I have a pearl of wisdom here by the late J. Edgar Hoover, at least it is attributed to him, it is called "Rules of Investigative Work" and it says, "The Crown should strive diligently to secure the evidence to free the innocent as well as convict the guilty." He has got about ten points, I won't read them all, but I have copies available for anybody that might want to use that type of pearl of wisdom to maybe have the Minister continually have his staff, which is changing constantly, have this type of overview, because maybe the chap is a young lawyer just graduated, and it is common knowledge that the people sometimes work for the Crown for several years to gain their experience and then go on. It is sort of like on-the-job training or a Masters Degree or whatever you want to call it.

But I can't help but think, talking about releasing names under this Section, it brings to mind the Jordan case down in Toronto where this particular member of the legal profession, a Malcolm Robb, a lawyer, seemed to be a 20th Century pupil of this Lord Braum there, this fellow who was a real hatchet man in the 19th Century, who said that by all means and at all hazards and costs to other people and persons, and in performing this duty he must not regard the alarm, the torments, the destruction, which he may bring upon others. In other words, in that particular case they alluded to this woman's personal life, true or false, no matter how tenuous, in order to get his client freed.

Now apparently that is an accepted matter, that in the case of an accused, a lawyer is sort of a gun-for-hire and he doesn't question, he does the best of his ability to get his client off. However, I think it is incumbent upon the Crown to make sure that their lawyers are well educated in the ways of life so that they don't go about possibly - the concerns expressed by the Member for Wellington that they do jump the gun in very thin situations and have names printed of prominent people, people who are salesmen, people who are heads of families, the breadwinners. I think at some point in time that there may have to be considered, and I say I know it is being considered in some states south of the border, that in some cases where it has been suggested by a judge that the case was frivolous or vexatious at best, that maybe the Crown at some point in time is going to have to compensate these people for loss of income for having been fired from their jobs and having the bank remove their line of credit and the mortgage companies and so on and so forth.

One has to some day have a book written, and maybe Morton Shulman can write it, or somebody, in which the life of an accused can be well documented so that the general public, who has no dealings with law enforcement, maybe only once or twice in their entire life - I am talking about the large majority - that I think at some point in time the life of the accused person, and I couldn't agree with the Member for Wellington more, that people don't wait for the trial, and that gentleman who lost his job as a salesman probably no doubt has to uproot his family and move to another city. I just wanted the Minister to get a different slant of what I consider may be a re-education, a "University of Life" degree for his staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns on the same subject.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, it is on the same Item, and it is peripheral to the subject that has been raised, but I want to speak anyway on that and then development.

I think it is an extensive debate that will have to continue on the question of publication. I don't know whether there is going to be a solution today, this morning or this year, but I think it is an important subject that should be explored and this may well be the proper arena where there is give and take. I want to hear more about it.

But the peripheral thing is the responsibility of the Attorney-General's Department to make sure that there is no poorly prepared case, which would expose a person in advance to adverse publicity and then falter. I have not attended this Committee meeting until now and I am not aware whether there has been any discussion about this Hong Kong case. But what I would guess from the newspapers is that there was inadequate foundation to carry on the trial, and I am not at this stage prepared to lay blame on anyone. But, Mr. Chairman, I am sure blame has to be laid somewhere, and I think that to be accountable as the Attorney-General's Department, and he must be, there will have to be a report made as to what happened in that trial, how much money was spent, and in relation to that, what is the justification for that and how come it ended up with a stay of proceedings?. I think it was stay of proceedings. So that will have to be explored. We will have to learn about that and learn whether or not there are occasions when there are frivolous charges laid or charges laid frivolously. The case cited by the Member for Wellington, of some officer who usurped his authority, apparently, and laid a charge to great embarrassment - no doubt as much embarrassment to the Attorney-General's Department as to the person involved - would indicate a laxness or looseness that would have to be checked and controlled.

Whilst listening to the honourable members, I jotted down a list of statistics that I would like to hear, and which I would guess would be within the department. I don't even know, maybe it's been published, but I'd like to list the questions I would like to have answered to sort of measure the performance of the department, and that's why I assumed that the department may well have this information readily available or could provide it before this item passes. So I am going to read them, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to know how many charges are laid in a period of time, in a month, in a year, probably in a year. How many of those charges are stayed, which means the Crown itself decided, after laying the charge, not to proceed? How many of these charges are reduced by guilty pleas, which means apparently, a bargaining? How many of these charges have been reduced by decision of the court or the jury? How many of these charges have ended up with a conviction as charged? How many of them have been dismissed?

That will give us some sense of statistical accountability which we could then discuss, possibly in relation to other jurisdictions or to Canada itself, and I assume Statists Canada does have some of that kind of information. I would like to know how many decisions have been appealed by the prosecution, and how many have been appealed by the defence. And I would like to know the successes - and they're not always a clear-cut success one way or another. And in saying that, I'm not looking again to lay blame, but really to assess the overall picture.

For example, somebody - and I am not sure that, I don't really remember who it was - did some kind of a survey to judge all the different magistrates, which is not an invalid thing to do, but somebody looked at the appeals from various magistrates by Crown and by defense to try and assess whether the Appeal Court agreed or disagreed with the leniency or the harshness of sentences by magistrates by name. It's not an improper thing to do, and it may be interesting - not that the Court of Appeal is any smarter or necessarily more correct than some of the magistrates. As a matter of fact some day I'd like to make a speech about some of the judgments in criminal cases of the Court of Appeal, and the fact that they sit as a three-man court out of six people. And I think sometimes, just like in the magistrate's court, the person who judges, the magistrate, some lawyers try to predict the outcome based on who is sitting as magistrate, who the presiding judge is. Some lawyers would also probably try to predict the outcome depending on which three of the Court of Appeal judges are sitting. And that may be considered to be unkind, unfriendly and maybe improper, but nevertheless I say it with some amount of conviction.

So, I would like to know whether the Minister can, before this item passes, give us the kind of information that I have asked for, and I believe that its relevance is justified on the discussion that already proceeded in relation to the names of people.

Now, I don't know really basically the involvement of the three people charged with that Hong Kong affair. I do know that the Crown failed, after laying a charge, and the names of the three people are public. They have been found not to be guilty and they have suffered, no doubt they've suffered harm of some kind or other, and therefore I've come back to that case as an example of the points raised by the two members that spoke before I did, and the fact that I think there ought to be some sort of review of the statistics which would indicate the extent to which the prosecution has been hasty or ill-conceived.

I do not want, Mr. Chairman - and I am sure that there must be information available in the department of the success rate of individual members of the Attorney-General's department - I don't want that at all. And when I said blame should be laid in that case for example, I don't want to hear that so-and-so in that department, that young lawyer, that member of the staff, made a mistake. I want to hear where the mistake lay, in what department, in what sense it did, and I am wondering the extent to which the RCMP may well be at fault in some of these cases. And I say that without too much respect for the attitude of RCMP. Their competence, I think, has been shown fairly well, but I'm not sure that they don't provide a subjective approach to what they're doing. And, of course, my doubts are strengthened somewhat by what we are hearing from the two commission hearings that are going out in the east on activities of the RCMP. You know, I'm concerned.

Can it be, and I just conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying I recently had an interview with RCMP officers relating to some matter that they're investigating that's well over a year old, and which to my mind was inconsequential, something that I, as a lawyer, had some contact with, and I wondered the extent to which their sense of proportion or importance was involved in investigating something which I could not quite comprehend in being really important. To what extent is the Attorney-General consulted whilst investigations of this type take place? To what extent is the Attorney-General informed that an investigation which crosses

Friday, 7 March 1980

international boundaries and oceans, and the cost involved, justify the travelling that must have taken place in order to make a charge? I don't think that people should feel secure just because it's too expensive to prosecute, but there has to be some sense of proportion as to cost, as to relevance, as to damage from publicity and otherwise. I'm hoping we can get that kind of information from the Attorney-General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre on the same item.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: I would like to support very strongly the position of the Member for Wellington. We, as legislators, can only discuss things when the occasion arises under the rules to discuss them and this is a question, this publication of people's names before they are convicted. In my view as a lay member of the public, not as a professional lawyer, I don't think justice is served. It strikes, in my view, at the very concept of equity in law. Even in our own Court of Queen's Bench Act it says that equity shall exist as 1875, and if law and equity, then equity.

I think that we should continually strive for the broad, philosophical concept of equity. And I do not think that the public wheel is served one whit by persisting in this attitude that the public has the right to know what? - because everyone of the agents in the media put in headlines, the charge, and in the back page, it's just the nature, the very instruments that the acquittals, or dismissals, or whatever, don't get the same amount of attention as the charges do.

This is a subject which has bothered me since, in my view once more, a councillor in the city of Winnipeg because of his actions in trying to bring some rhyme and reason to pedestrian traffic, was literally harrassed out of this community, subsequently acquitted of the charges that were laid against him, but nevertheless, the damage had been done. Yet people forget that today in the city of Winnipeg we have crosswalks as a result of this man. I never knew him personally, or his sexual propensities, or anything else.

But Mr. Chairman, the very concept that our legal system is based on, the concept of habeas corpus, that a person is free, and the only time that we can interfere through our instruments of state, is if we have cause to protect ourselves and say, this man is classified as somebody who is dangerous to society, that the person shall be free. It's not the proper forum really, to debate this in depth, but nevertheless, I appreciate very much the Member for Wellington raising this point because it is a very important point. And for people to insist and perist, to continue it, I think is wrong.

The only reason at all for having it, it acts as some inhibitor, I do admit to that, that it perhaps inhibits some people from performing anti-social functions. But that's the only reason. As far as the concept of equity in law, as far as the concept of national justice, I think it's an archaic practice and we should encourage the government to review this whole situation with a mind of bringing this practice current, and I for one, would support the contention that until a person is classified as somebody who has performed something which is a criminal act, that should not be public information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The time being 12:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30. The Chair will recognize the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

Friday, 7 March 1980

SUPPLY - LABOUR AND MANPOWER

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would draw the honourable members' attention to Page 68 of the Main Estimates, Department of Labour and Manpower. The item under discussion is Resolution No. 89. 1.(c) Women's Bureau, Item (1) Salaries--pass.
The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, as I outlined the procedure I suggested we follow and I got your concurrence and the members from the opposite, just a brief few words about the division, certainly not in detail. We can go into that as we go through it, the number of people in, the number of people vacant, that type of thing.

The Women's Bureau works with individuals, women's organizations, other voluntary agencies, employers, unions, government departments, schools, colleges, universities and others. It works to promote greater understanding of women's problems and concerns, and encourages action on them. The Bureau deals with issues relating to education, employment of women, and works for the recognition of women's contributions to Manitoba. It offers service to working women in Winnipeg and southwestern Manitoba.

Numbers of people, Mr. Chairman: Last year there were 6.26 SMY's; this year we are proposing 7 SMY's. At present there is one vacancy which will be posted in the very near future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, I think it is appropriate, as we had mentioned earlier during the Ministerial Statements in the House this morning, that we do just reflect for a moment on not only the purpose of this particular department, which is a department that the Minister has indicated is put in place to promote and to support women in their quest for better conditions both in the workplace and in activities that are supplementary to their work. And I think that tomorrow being the International Women's Day - a day when women throughout the world take time, along with their brothers, to stand shoulder-to-shoulder to show solidarity, to indicate that they are not satisfied with those conditions that face them now, that they recognize the contributions and the progress that they have made in the past, but that they wish to bring the society further along in what seems to be, does not need to be, but appears to be, an eternal search for more equality, more opportunity for all.

There are a number of issues that are currently germane to the discussion of the Women's Bureau's issues that we understand and we know that women outside of this Legislature and inside this Legislature are interested in promoting that will hopefully, if put into place, if reconciled properly, will enable women to take their rightful place in society. And that rightful place, Mr. Chairman, is shoulder-to-shoulder and side-by-side with men.

You know, it is somewhat of a tragedy that there are only two women that currently sit in this House, and that is not to take anything away from those two fine and capable members, because they are serving not only their sisters, but they are serving all of society as well as their constituents, and they are doing a capable job. And if we watch them, although we criticize from time to time, as is natural when put into a situation and environment such as this, but when we do watch them, we do know, and we have a vivid demonstration and example that women play as forceful a part, and as strong a part and as productive a part as any man in this Chamber, and that there is indeed no difference, outside of the physical differences, between women and men, and that we should for that reason alone, that we should stand shoulder-to-shoulder, and that we should share.

It only makes eminent sense to someone like myself that it is wrong when women are making in their daily work a percentage of what men are making for work of equal value, for work of a similar nature, equal pay for equal work, however you want to term the phraseology, and there are subtle differences that we must apply ourselves to in discussing those specific subjects. But it is wrong, the whole issue is wrong that they should be making less than men when performing essentially the same function.

Friday, 7 March 1980

But it goes beyond that, Mr. Chairperson, it goes beyond that. The tragedy of the situation, the travesty of natural justice in this instance is not that they are making less right now, but as years go on and on and on they are making less and less and less percentagewise. In other words, we are not closing the gap, we are widening the gap. There is something very basically wrong with a society that allows that process to continue unabated, and that is why we stand here today and discuss the efforts of this department. And that is why we will stand here in years to come, to discuss the efforts of this department, and in some detail, to find out exactly what it is that that government is doing in their attempts to stop this trend, and their attempts to not only stop it but reverse it, because it must be reversed until we do stand side by side, shoulder by shoulder economically.

When we go to work, when the woman marches in beside the man into their place of employment, whether it be into a factory or whether it be into a mine or whether it be into an office building or hospital or any one of the hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of industrial situations or employment situations in the province, that they march in knowing at the end of the day and at the end of the week they march out having been paid the same remuneration for their efforts. Because their efforts are as important to them as individuals, their efforts are - I am talking about - the Minister of Natural Resources asked me what is this "march" business. I am not talking about Monday morning when we all sort of drag in, I am talking about Friday morning when we march in knowing that the weekend will be shortly upon us. But that "aside" having been completed, Mr. Chairperson, I don't want to be distracted from this very important issue.

The fact is that they are putting in the same amount of effort, but that they are not receiving the same rewards, and that is a travesty, that is tragedy, Mr. Chairperson.

But it goes even beyond that, because when we watch those people walk in or march in or however it may be, when we watch them do that, what do we see? We invariably see more men than women going in; except for a certain number of isolated employment areas, we will see more men than women, and that is not right, that is not right. It is historical, it certainly is historical, but it is not correct, and that is something else that we have to overcome. We have to overcome that segregation of our society that differentiates us by sex; it also differentiates us, Mr. Chairperson, by our historical background, where we were born, whether we were born in northern Manitoba or in the urban centres or the rural centres, there is that sort of segregation. There is also the segregation as to what color our skin may be. There is all sorts of segregations - as to what our religions might be - and they are all unnecessary and they are all wrong, every one of them right down the line is wrong.

And that includes the segregation that occurs when women try to enter the workforce. That is why we commend the Minister's efforts when he tries to get more women into the trades' area. We commend him. Also, Mr. Chairperson, something we are going to do more and more of as the time goes on, we reserve the right to criticize that because it may not be enough or it may even be the wrong efforts. But the thought behind it, the concept is a good concept, a proper concept, and an overdue concept, and one that we must support. We will try to offer suggestions by way of criticism and also by way of constructive policy statements to enable the Minister to more fully meet his obligation to have some impact on how society treats its different groupings, its different members.

But that being the case, Mr. Chairperson, there is a need for some sort of policy orientation, there is a need for programs, there is a need for development of women as an integral part of our workplace, of our labour force. Conditions are better, I might add first, then they were before, but they are not good enough. Women have not been able to take their rightful place in the work world, and that is wrong, that is a tragedy, that is a travesty of justice, Mr. Chairperson. And that we must direct our attention to when discussing the efforts of this department.

We must talk about affirmative action, we must bring the concept forward, we must discuss it in this, a public arena, so that we can generate discussion that will take place outside of this building, so that we will encourage people by our awareness and by our investigations and examinations, to come forward with their ideas, because that is where the efforts have to be made in the final phase of any sort of a program. They have to be made outside of this Legislature. We may devise and develop techniques and strategies and mechanisms within, but they have to be applied to the general economic environment as a whole.

So we will talk about affirmative action. We must talk about also the fact that women when they do get into the workforce sometimes face work hazards, and that they must be made aware of the hazards, as all workers must be made aware of the hazards, that directly and specifically apply to them, and that we must develop mechanisms and strategies again, programs and policies, to enable them to protect their health and to protect their safety, as we do for all working people. What we are doing is, we are again applying the same criteria, we are trying to break down the walls of segregation. We are trying to break down the arbitrarily and the unnatural laws that have been built into our economic society that mean that women will not have the same access to economic opportunity and to employment opportunity as will you or I, Mr. Chairperson.

I also want to talk a bit about the World Plan of Action. We talked about the International Women's Day and some of the actions that have arisen out of the International Women's Year, but there is also a World Plan of Action that all the countries of the world sat down and developed towards trying to answer some of the problems that women face, some of the problems that we have just discussed. We are half-way through that now, we are half-way through that whole problem, and I think perhaps now is an appropriate time to sit or to stand as it may be and to discuss that particular program for a while.

Mr. Chairperson, having said that, and there will be other discussions that will arise as the general discussion continues, but having said that, I can just take this opportunity, I hope, to pledge to the Minister and to the government that we will support the efforts of his government to break down the walls to enable women to enter the economic workforce on equal terms, as long as we believe those efforts to be the proper efforts and as long as we believe those efforts to be efforts that are being taken to be positive progressive and also comprehensive. We will reserve the right to criticize the Minister's effort, where we believe those efforts not to be so, not to meet those criteria.

But if I can as a quick aside just inform those that may be listening to this conversation, this debate, discussion, or maybe reading about it in the Hansard, that when we do criticize we are in many instances not criticizing the concept. I don't want that mistake to be made; we are criticizing specific details and efforts. For that let me just take one moment to again, for the record, pledge our support for those progressive efforts that are being made throughout Canada, throughout the world, in regard to trying to bring women more to the forefront of the economic community and also more to the forefront of society as a whole, to integrate them on an equal basis, something which has not been done in the past.

Having said that, I would ask the Minister if he can indicate exactly what the positions are, the seven positions that he mentioned previously, what the titles of those positions would be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: There is a director's position; there is two secretarial positions; two program development people; and two counselors, Mr. Chairman.

In reply to a couple of the comments that the Member for Churchill has outlined, I think it was a slip of the tongue when he made reference to the fact that we must strive towards the day when equal number of women are marching into plants as opposed to equal number of men. I don't think he really meant that as the way it came out, because it is of no consideration to this government to attempt to force that particular position in the numbers' game. I think probably what he meant was that equal opportunities be available for women - in the particular case we are talking about now - within those plants, and not necessarily if there are 100 men that there have to be 100 women, because I don't think that achieves anything, that type of number game.

We must remember, Mr. Chairman, that we are talking about women who a great number of, super citizens in our country, have chosen a way of life, and that is to stay home, and I for one completely and 100 percent endorse that if they so choose that. This government is not going down the road of a numbers' game, where we are trying to establish that X number equals X number in a particular situation. This government supports the desires and the aspirations of those women who wish to stay home and raise their families.

As we are going through the particular Bureau's work, I would like to point out to yourself, Mr. Chairman, and to other members, that there may be other things that

Friday, 7 March 1980

are asked, and it is not that we want to walk away from this particular Bureau, but there are other departments that are doing work as it relates to opportunities for women. So if the members will bear with me when they raise what might questions that come up, I may be referring them to other responsibilities that I in particular have that relate to opportunities for women in helping them advance their way of life.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am most interested in hearing the discussion, and I certainly feel that there is an increased awareness and commitment on the part of all governments on the role that women must play. I am one of those women that chose to stay home and keep house and raise my family for the years that my children were small, and when my children were of an age when I could leave them during the day I went into active politics. Mr. Chairman, I don't think women nowadays, any women, are trying to say that women should not have the choice to make, that it should be their choice.

Some facts have been assembled by the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and I presume that as they apply to all of Canada they apply pretty the same ratio to Manitoba. I would just like to introduce some of these into the records.

Fifty-one percent of working age Canadians are women, I think is acknowledged by everybody; 47.8 of all women are working or looking for work compared to 37.1 percent in 1968, showing the change in trends of what women are choosing to do; 38.9 percent of the labour force are women, which is an increase of more than 6 percent in the last ten years; and 46.3 of all married women are working or looking for work compared to 26.8 percent in 1966. These are all percentages and they sound very statistical but I think if people will listen to them, that they are of great interest, especially in view of the trends that they indicate.

Women in the labour force, 87.1 percent of women in the labour force have some high school education or better, compared to only 79.6 of men in the labour force. That is an interesting statistic, and yet for every dollar, as of 1975, for every dollar a man earns, a woman earns only 60 cents. And women have to work more than eight days to earn what a man in the labour force will earn in five days. 27.4 percent of women working for pay are unionized, compared to 41.6 percent of men working for pay. And in Canadian knitting mills, 68.7 percent of workers are women, 15.4 percent of those women are unionized.

In the electrical industry, according to Women in the Labour Force Facts and Figures published recently by the Women's Bureau of Labour Canada, a woman earned \$4.44 an hour compared with \$4.61 for a man in 1972; and in 1977, her wage had dropped to \$4.01, and his had increased to \$5.50. Now, this is deplorable. The trend is to accept women increasingly in the labour force, and as members of the labour force, and yet the trend continues to increase that gap in income.

The suspicion is felt that employers are becoming increasingly efficient in finding ways to get around equal pay for work of similar value by ghetto-ising - an ugly word - the female employees into the lowest-paying categories. And I'm afraid that this is something that we have observed in various industries in this province and elsewhere. I'm afraid that the Labour Department just does not have enough inspectors. I'm glad to see they're increasing the number - I believe that's what was said - so that the rights of women in the labour force will be protected as rights of all members of the labour force.

It's not expected that over the years women have become less efficient. I think employers have become more efficient at slotting women into those jobs which pay less, and the men are working in higher categories. And I that's something I think we have to watch very carefully.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The figures that the Minister gave us that show an increase of .74 staff person years in this department indicate that several areas have been changed from the figures that we had received in previous years that are not reflected in a global view at the number of changes in personnel.

Last year there was one research officer, or it was indicated that there would be one research officer working for the department, and I don't see that position in the lists that

Friday, 7 March 1980

the Minister gave us, whereas we now have two counsellors - last year we had two counsellors - I'd like the Minister to break that down. Last year it was one counsellors and two part-time positions; I'd like to know if it is the same this year.

And we now have two program development officers, whereas last year we had one program development officer; and we now have one more half-staff person year under clerical staff than we had in previous years. I would ask the Minister then to indicate if this would be indicative of a change in thrust, that there is less emphasis on research in the department now, and more emphasis on program development as it would appear from his figures, and generally, what the reasons for making those changes would be.

MR. MacMASTER: The opening comment of the Member for Churchill was somewhat inaccurate, and it's understandable. It's not a .74 increase, it's a .26 increase. For his edification, when you're talking about staff man years, you're talking about weeks. So, last year we had 6.26, which is really 6 1/2, and we have added that half. The position that's being advertised was the research position. It's being advertised because we're looking for a counselling position; we feel there is more need for that. And for the information of the members opposite, the reason that we have changed our mind - not unilaterally - we have had a great deal of debate on it in the last two or three months, just how that position should best be filled, with what qualifications a person should have, keeping in mind the type of service that they want to provide.

We have a very adequate research department within the Department of Labour and Manpower. We see no reason, and in fact there is no reason, why that department cannot avail itself, the Women's Bureau, of the massive amount of research and the brains that are within that research department to serve their needs. They have used it, it served their needs well, very well, and we think that one particular position - and the member is correct, it was labelled as a research person - we have now decided that it should be a counselling person, and that's how the job will be posted and that's the reasoning for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, perhaps then the Minister can take this opportunity to indicate what research is currently being done by the research department on behalf of the Women's Bureau, and also what is happening with the research that has been done in previous years. In other words, the research must find its way out into the general economic society, or into the society at large in order to be effective - people must have access to that research. And I know that there were a number of reports and documents that had been prepared by the research department, and yet we do not see them surfacing outside of the department itself, and I'm speaking in specific now of one that was done on the study of occupational health and safety problems that were experienced specifically by women in reference to their employment.

So I would ask the Minister to indicate what is happening to those reports, and also, what research specifically the department, the general research department under the Department of Labour, is currently conducting for the Women's Bureau?

MR. MacMASTER: The particular report that the member is talking about, which was researched last summer, is in draft form and will be completed in the near future. I don't have a list of specifics that the research department can or will be doing for the Women's Bureau, but when questions are raised by organizations or by individuals of specific concern, the research department is available to answer those specifics or to work with them on any extensive sort of work that they may request.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister indicated, just recently that the project on the occupational safety and health was being compiled. It's my understanding or recollection from the previous Estimates last year, that we had received the same sort of assurance from the Minister in regard to that report, so I would ask the Minister if he can give us a more specific date as to when he would expect that report to be made available to working women, and to other interested persons and organizations, so that they may begin to use the information that has been compiled in that report in the most productive and effective manner.

MR. MacMASTER: I can't name a day and I have got myself in trouble in this House before for naming specific days. I said to the member, not that it was being

Friday, 7 March 1980

compiled, I said it was in draft form, which means that very shortly that report will be put together and will be distributed to the appropriate parties.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you. In the past, summer students have been used - it's my understanding at least that summer students have been used - by the Women's Bureau to do research of a specific nature, to also help out in some of the ongoing projects. I would ask the Minister then to indicate if summer students were used during the previous summer, and if so, in what capacity by the Women's Bureau?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, there was one student last year, Mr. Chairman, and it was to do with a survey in non-traditional occupations.

MR. COWAN: Very briefly, then, could the Minister indicate how that would compare with the number of summer students that were used in the previous year and the year previous to that, so that we have some idea of the level of activity in comparison to previous years.

MR. MacMASTER: I'll get that answer for the member, Mr. Chairman. I don't have that.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Can the Minister indicate, give us some preliminary figures, they don't have to be specific, some general figures, on the level of activity as to the number of counselling sessions, group counselling sessions, seminars, number of studies undertaken, reviewing the effectiveness of the Women's Bureau, matters of that nature - can the Minister indicate generally what it is the Bureau has been doing over the past year.

MR. MacMASTER: There has been an estimated, approximately 375 counselling sessions; this is individual sessions, Mr. Chairman. There were three group counselling sessions on the choices and changes, there were three public seminars in Winnipeg, there was a public seminar in Brandon, there was a study that we have mentioned that we're working on now and we'll have in draft form that was carried on, and there were a number of news releases that were issued during the course of the year.

There were four shopping mall displays, there were five career days displays, there was one special display put on, and there was an advertising campaign carried on.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I will make the assumption that the advertising campaign was the bus poster that had been mentioned in the previous Estimates, or at least that was a substantial part of it. I have to take this opportunity, then, to commend the department, the Women's Bureau, on that sort of activity which extends the reach of the bureau out into the public awareness, which means that there will be people who will become aware that there is a Women's Bureau and that it is put in place to help women enter the work force, to help women adjust to the work force, if that is a necessary requirement of their entering the work force, and also generally, to not only help individual women, but to, in the broader sense, try to create a more favourable climate for all women.

And I would ask the Minister, therefore, having made the prejudgment, or the assumption that that was an effective campaign, if there is any sort of tendency on his part to continue that sort of advertising, outreach component of the Women's Bureau which has been sorely lacking in some other departments, that sort of outreach program to bring people into government, to have government serve them better.

Is the Minister prepared to indicate that will be continued, and hopefully even expanded upon?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, we intend to continue that type of work, Mr. Chairman, and when we get into the other portion of our expenditures, we will outline some of the things that we're going to be doing in that particular area.

MR. COWAN: Back to the subject of reports and research by the department in previous years, can the Minister indicate what is currently happening with Mary Eady's previous report on equal pay for work of equal value. And the reason, of course, I bring

this forward, is primarily because of the appropriateness of the time to discuss it in regard to the recent federal decision, which does put an obligation on the province to review its mechanisms. If I just might elaborate upon that very briefly, the federal legislation, which is different somewhat to the provincial legislation, as all legislation, has to be tested in the courts from time to time, or is tested, I don't know whether it has to be, but it is tested in the courts from time to time. The most recent example, in a landmark case in that regard happening in one of the Maritime provinces in regard to nurses at, I believe, a psychiatric institute - although I may stand corrected on that, but I believe that was a specific instance - and that is, the decision complemented the legislation in that the report upheld the complaints of the nurses, that they were entitled to equal pay for work of equal value, and that they had not been receiving it, and there were adjustments made.

That is very important. It's one thing to provide lip service to the concept, it's one thing to discuss the concept generally, but it's another thing to get down to the nitty-gritty and translate it into dollars and cents. It's not only important to the individual nurses in this particular instance, but it's particular to society. It's important to society on the whole, Mr. Chairperson. And the department did do a fairly comprehensive document. I referred to it as Mary Eady's document, I may have been wrong in that, the document done by the Womens' Bureau, I think under the directorship of Mary Eadie a number of years back, in regard to the concept of equal pay for equal value.

I would like the Minister to take this opportunity to, in some detail, outline the specifics of his government's plan of action to bring this very important concept to the province of Manitoba, to extend our legislation, if necessary. That's something that he can discuss, to make certain that the courts are upholding that legislation. Also, the Minister said previously, and I don't want to attribute a direct quote to him, but I believe he said in the Question Period, and I can look it up, in answer to a question from the Member for Fort Rouge, that the problem wasn't so much in the legislation, but the problem was in getting people to come forward with complaints and then enforcement of the legislation.

So what exactly is the Minister doing in that regard to entice people to come forward with those complaints, many of which are not coming forward for some very justifiable reasons, (1) they don't know that there is a mechanism available; (2) they don't know the legislation, it has not been widely advertised.

Some are, as the Minister knows, having been a shop steward, as I have been, that sometimes some people are hesitant to bring a complaint forward, they are afraid that it will reflect upon their own employment. They are afraid of the ramifications; they do not really understand the protections and the safeguards that are allocated to them under the law. So we have to deal with those problems in a very specific way.

The question therefore, Mr. Chairperson, is a two-part question. The one question is, what action does the Minister have in mind to extend the concept of equal pay for work of equal value in the province of Manitoba; and (2) what specific action is the Womens' Bureau or his department taking in regard to enabling individuals from the workforce to come forward with the complaints, an area which he has suggested, I believe, and I don't want to put words in his mouth, but if I understood him correctly, he suggested is an area of concern to his government and his department.

MR. MacMASTER: One thing that is being done that hasn't been done before, Mr. Chairman is, we talked about pamphlets the other day and the value of them. The Member for Churchill had some thoughts about why there was a communications' person within our department, some that weren't obviously correct, but one of the things that I did emphasize, that we were putting out literature now that certainly was readable and understandable, and putting out more of it, and attempting to get out it to the people that were interested in it. One of the pamphlets that we have now put out is the labour laws of Manitoba and how they affect people and what people can expect from them, in fairly simple language.

One of those pamphlets outlines the clauses in the Act that calls for equal pay, and those pamphlets have been distributed to womens' organizations throughout Manitoba and continue to be distributed, and our people in the Womens' Bureau talk to those womens' organizations outlining to them just exactly and precisely what the member is asking, to make women aware of the particular legislation that is in effect.

Friday, 7 March 1980

MR. COWAN: That was not entirely satisfactory, but at least a partial answer to the one question that I had outlined. The other question of course, was, what is his department doing in regard to bringing the provincial legislation more in line with the federal legislation? There is a difference between the two, and therein lies part of the problem also, so if the Minister can elaborate upon that aspect of this specific problem.

MR. MacMASTER: My answer to the Member for Fort Rouge, my answer to the Member for Churchill is the same thing, that we have legislation today that we are not close to realizing the results of it, not only the paid portion but the programming and thrust that our government has taken in efforts to create an equal opportunity availability for women in the workforce. And when we get into the Civil Service Commission we will be outlining some of the efforts we have made which we believe are very commendable, and so does a good number of people of the fairer sex, if I can use that particular term.

That's really all I have to say about that particular section. I have no thoughts in mind at this particular moment of bringing in any new legislation in this regard.

MR. COWAN: Can we take that as an indication then, that the Minister is satisfied with the legislation that is on the books presently?

MR. MacMASTER: The member wasn't listening very well. I said that there is legislation in effect today that isn't being fully utilized, and he said he was listening, but again I said that we have to make people more aware of it and start living up to the legislation. It's not bad legislation in any way, shape or form. But there is no real sense in any regard of bringing in additional legislation when what you have in place isn't working all that well. And we're in an effort now, trying to do the two things I have already mentioned. There is no sense keeping repeating myself.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, I would hope you will take note of my conciliatory manner, my forced smile, and my agreeable nature that I have exhibited throughout these Estimates, and hope to continue to exhibit, not wishing to get locked into the sort of posturing and blame-throwing that we were locked into last time in these Estimates which were in a great degree, a substantial reason for the extension of the Estimates longer than perhaps they should have gone. And I don't want to follow that course of action. So I will, in a very conciliatory manner, repeat my question to the Minister.

The question was, is he satisfied? He has told me that he does not believe the legislation we have to date is being effectively implemented. I don't want to put words in his mouth, but that's the assumption that I draw from that. So he is not satisfied with the enforcement mechanisms. I know that. He has told me that the legislation is not bad legislation. I want to provide the Minister with an opportunity that I didn't have the other day. In my opening remarks to him, I said, he is not a bad Minister. And I went on to say how we are not bad members because we are doing what we believe to be right. One of the press came to me later and said, "Why did you say the Minister of Labour was a good Minister? Do you have a grudging respect for him?" And I want to enable him to avoid that trap, because he said it is not bad legislation, having words put into his mouth that he said it was good legislation.

My specific question to the Minister, a question that he did not answer, was, is he satisfied with the legislation as it exists today? And I do not ask him that question to put him on the spot, nor do I ask him that question to create an argument or to create an acrimonious environment within these Chambers, I asked it because it is a very important question. It gives us some idea of the position of the government to date, and it also gives us some idea of where we can realistically, as members of the opposition and as members of the public, where we can realistically expect his government to go in this specific area.

So the question, I believe, and I can't force him to answer, I can only ask him to answer this specific question, is he satisfied with the legislation as it exists today in the province of Manitoba?

MR. MacMASTER: I'm prepared to repeat generally what I said, Mr. Chairman, that the legislation that's in place in Manitoba is not bad legislation. That's the first

Friday, 7 March 1980

point. I have already said, and here I am repeating again, I have said that we are putting out pamphlets out now to women's organizations to make them aware of the value of that particular legislation, which has never been done before in the province of Manitoba, and that's an effort to establish the usage of that particular legislation. Once it's established, how good that legislation is, there may be no great need to change that particular legislation. But you don't really know to what extent and how good it is until it's well utilized.

The Member for Churchill has made reference to the fact that it hasn't been too well utilized, and that's correct. So in an effort to make people aware of the legislation, we are doing, I think, very responsible things. I'm not prepared to consider additional legislation until the legislation that's in effect today, which is reasonable legislation, has been used to its fullest extent.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. I'll ask very briefly if the Minister, perhaps when we come back from the break - I'm not certain that will enable him enough time, but at least he can make a commitment to bring to us during the discussion of these Estimates, an example of all the pamphlets - and I'll ask him for all departments, because there may be pamphlets for other departments, and we'll be perusing them as we go through the Estimates; example of the pamphlets that are being brought out, and also in this specific instance, a distribution list of women's groups to which this pamphlet that he has referred to in specific is being sent.

MR. MacMASTER: I can supply that list, Mr. Chairman. I should point out that the Mary Eady report relating to the topics that the member has been raising was finalized in the year 1975-76, substantially before our government took office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: L'heure est midi et demi, maintenant je doit partir, et je vous revenir à deux heures et demi. It is now 12:30; I am now leaving the Chair and will return at 2:30.