

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 23, 1974

CAPITAL SUPPLY - BILL 8

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance. (Applause)

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, at 5:30 I looked across the way and a little behind me and I thought everybody looked so tired and hungry and I thought it might be a hardship to suggest that we vote at 5:30 and then possibly somebody would want to have a recorded vote so that might take time and then nobody could - couldn't go home and couldn't have our dinners, even those of us who have homes to go to in Winnipeg and those who don't, so I thought that it would be just as well to postpone the vote for a little while. But now when I come back and I'm greeted by the exuberance that I heard when you called on me to speak it's almost as if honourable members opposite want to hear more from me.

A MEMBER: Thirty minutes, thirty minutes.

MR. CHERNIACK: The suggestion is 30 minutes. I would think that I could really go 59 minutes because--oh no, that would be a hardship I see.

A MEMBER: By leave.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well I don't know by leave. I'm not sure whether this isn't a major resolution of government which entitles the Minister proposing it to speak for an indefinite period of time. But really I'm not sure that that's necessary because I would hope that we could pass this on second reading and hopefully then proceed with Committee and proceed through with it.

Honourable members will know that the Estimates have been before us for some time; the requirements are spelled out pretty well and I believe that as the hour was nearing 5:30 this afternoon I was saying that, in contradiction to what was said by the Leader of the Opposition, that these are accountable resolutions within Capital Supply, that when we have this very large item for Manitoba Hydro the moneys to be borrowed are to be raised for the purposes of Manitoba Hydro. And the Leader of the Opposition seemed to have the impression that the Provincial Auditor has no review responsibility or authority regarding Capital Supply. It is my opinion that he has the same powers, responsibilities, the same authorities in dealing with expenditures under Capital Supply as indeed he has in dealing under the Estimates of the Department. And I did want to get that on the record.

Having done that, Mr. Speaker, there's no sense repeating what I said this afternoon because to some extent I was responsible for statements made by the Leader of the Opposition which didn't have any sense this afternoon either, so that I think we could bring it to a conclusion and may I invite the support of members opposite to Capital Supply in the light of what was said by - I think put very well by the Member for Lakeside who in speaking to this bill stated a position that although he did not agree with certain items - and I remember him saying some of the Hydro programs were those that he did not agree with, he did not think some of their plans were right yet he wanted to see the work of Hydro and of other governmental operations continue and I believe said that he would support it. The Liberals I think are on record in opposition so that's their problem. I invite honourable members to vote in favour of the Supply Bill.

QUESTION put MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider and report of the following bill for third reading: No. 8 - an Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the Same.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE - BILL NO. 8

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Bill No. 8. (Bill No. 8 was read and passed) Bill be reported.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee passed Bill No. 8 and recommends bill be reported to the House.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 8 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if we could now move to Bill No. 27 and the other adjourned debates on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 27 - The Lotteries Act. The Honourable Member for Lakeside. Bill No. 27. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

BILL NO. 27

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have probably, as some honourable members opposite have noticed, prepared myself for my remarks with respect to Bill 27, the lotteries bill. In fact, Mr. Speaker, like one other occasion I can remember when assisted by the Honourable Member from Riel I have a prepared speech to make tonight with respect to the lotteries bill. Mr. Speaker, it's a rather lengthy speech, it has some nine, ten, twelve pages. But, Mr. Speaker, as the Member representing the constituency of Lakeside it behooves me to remind you, Sir, and also the other members of this House of the member who once occupied the chair that's my privilege now to occupy, namely Mr. D. L. Campbell, the former Premier of this province who was also a member for some 47 years for the constituency of Lakeside, who used to make, he used to make an issue - Mr. Campbell never made an issue unless he, you know, he really felt strongly about things. But he did bring to the attention of the honourable members of this House that certain rules and traditions should be adhered to, and one of his favourite rules that he used to remind members of this House was that if a member did not have something worthwhile to say that he could say freely as the Honourable House Leader has indicated to me, like from the top of his head he thinks that he pours it out of his mouth, then really he shouldn't be saying it in any event; and even if that means that he doesn't have the opportunity to have printed copies rushed out to the news media so they can report his speech properly and so forth and make their job easier. But nonetheless I, Sir, despite the fact that I have a very excellent speech you know of some 25 pages on the lottery bill before me, would like to commend myself to the rules of the House, namely Rule No. 29 which says, "A member addressing the House shall not read from a written previously prepared speech." In fact when you put in that "previously prepared" I think in the modern idiom it should say previously prepared by who and by what, you know, executive assistants, and etc., etc., etc. Really those of us who have enough nerve to aspire to public office should be able to stand in this Chamber and with all the ughs and the stuttering and the occasional lapses of earthy barnyard language should not really make too many apologies. Certainly not to those people who sit, you know, up there. And I certainly don't pretend to do that.

But, Sir, I will be commended by this rule which says, and I quote further, the Rule has two exceptions. "A member addressing the House shall not read from a written previously prepared speech, except in the case of (a) a Minister of the Crown in making a statement of policy." Well, Sir, I am not a Minister of the Crown and obviously I'm not making a statement of policy as I rise to speak on this bill. (b) The second exception Sir, to this rule is "that the Leader of the Opposition or a Leader of a recognized opposition party making a statement of policy." Well, Sir, I am neither one of those - at the moment, Mr. Speaker. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, let me at least pay homage to the efforts of those who have prepared good notes for myself with respect to Bill 27. And really the question comes down to the Minister who introduced this bill, Bill 27, and who introduced it in a manner and way which lead us to believe that this was permissive legislation. That the Minister was not acting under any pressure of duress. There were no deadlines to be met. There was an attempt made by the Minister that the suggestion that we should forego our eminently successful Golden Sweepstakes, our lotteries in Manitoba, to join in questionable enterprise called WesCan, and the suggestion that the Minister left when he introduced the bill was that we were not necessarily going to do it, all he wanted by way of introducing this bill was the kind of broad permissive legislation that would permit him, if he thought it advantageous, to in fact join that WesCan group. I think,

## BILL 27

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . Mr. Speaker, I am paraphrasing the Minister correctly, I'm putting forward generally correctly the position that he indicated to the House.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the simple question, How come all of a sudden this has become a bit of a kind of a pressure bill? How come all of a sudden we have to have this passed by June 1st? Who is pushing this bill? And I honestly don't know the answer. And, Mr. Speaker, I have to, you know, right at the outset, you know, suggest to you and to reasonable members opposite, you know, there are not too many occasions when we are allowed the privilege to really kind of, and I decry that, to really you know as individuals dropping our partisan banners, dropping our Progressive Conservative, Liberal or New Democratic Party banners and to approach a matter, you know, in a straightforward intellectual basis, common sense basis and make our judgments on it. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I could be corrected but I think my memory serves me right that that is the manner and way in which the whole question of lotteries in Manitoba was initially introduced. If I remember rightly, it was a vote that crossed this floor, party colours, there were members of the then government as well as members of the opposition that voted for and against it. Mr. Speaker, in the tradition of Manitoba politics there are but few issues that deserve that kind or that--I shouldn't say deserve but that receive that kind of recognition of longstanding as the question of the way we deal with liquor in this province. By and large, you know, amendments to the Liquor Act have received the kind of position that, you know, it's a matter of conscience for the individual member.

Mr. Speaker, whether or not we go into WesCan or we maintain Golden Sweepstakes is not going to bring down this government or suffer this government any undue embarrassment. I think, Mr. Speaker, there are eloquent spokesmen on that side of the House that are not prepared to, you know, at any given moment to suggest that the bill before us, Bill 27, is in any way a kind of a fundamental policy of the New Democratic Party. In no way is it a fundamental policy of the Progressive Conservative Party. And as for the Liberals, well they don't count.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest really, I suggest really that we should allow ourselves that all too seldom opportunity, really that all too seldom opportunity, where I can look at the Member from Crescentwood, you know, as I looked at him and played with him on the ice in a hockey game not so long ago; that I should be able to look at the Member from St. Matthews or from St. Vital or from Ste. Rose, and I should be able to somehow reach them, not on a basis of a Conservative speaking to a New Democrat but simply on the basis of the merits of the bill put before us.

And really, Mr. Speaker, the whole essence of my few comments on this speech will be to make an appeal. I make the appeal to the one man with whom I've had some of my most difficult moments with but on the other hand I have, you know, as I would like to say some feeling for, namely the House Leader. I would ask him, I would ask him to use his influence to take the whip off this vote. I would ask him why make this bill a matter of government policy. I recognize, and I have been a member of the Treasury Bench before, that I am not making just a simple request because this government chose to introduce this kind of a bill by a Treasury Bench member and that has certain implications, and I appreciate them, so I recognize that my request is not so simple.

The Honourable Member from Crescentwood I think maybe doesn't fully comprehend that. I think he spoke genuinely the other day on the bill. He somewhat concurred with my deskmate the Member from Souris-Killarney who made an eloquent plea to let this bill die, to table the bill. Let's take another look at this whole matter. I mean why take the chance of destroying something that has provided obviously a tremendous amount of benefit for many charitable organizations, cultural sports organizations in this province. I think that was essentially the gist of the Member from Crescentwood when he spoke on the bill, which indicates to me that there is some feeling on the other side that there is not--that this thing hasn't been whipped into line in the NDP caucus, that everybody had to snap to attention because this happens to be a bill put forward by a member of the Treasury Bench, a member of Cabinet. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would make this bold suggestion, you know, recognizing that the Honourable Minister himself really is not the author of this piece of legislation, that it probably was something that he inherited when to his surprise, relief or whatever he all of a sudden graduated to the position that he now holds, that is Minister of Tourism, Recreation from that other office that he held before, but he found the nemesis of Bill 27 before him and that kind of locked him into a position which says that he should bring forward this bill.

## BILL 27

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest even at this late stage of the game, I know we've had many speeches on this bill, that they should consider withdrawing the bill, and letting it be represented again, as it should be, Mr. Speaker, by a private member, by a private member. I make the suggestion only, and I withdraw that suggestion only if the First Minister, the Minister of Finance, the Honourable House Leader - unless they stand up and say to me that this is a fundamental partisan policy of the New Democratic Party, it is essential to the social well-being of this province, it is something that we have told our electors we would always do, you know, it's something that we have campaigned on the hustings on--but, you know, I abuse their intelligence, Mr. Speaker. I know they never said those things. I know they never suggested those things. And so really this is not the kind of bill that should be put to this House by a member of the Treasury Bench. It should be the kind of bill that should come forward from - well you name them. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, the Honourable Member from Point Douglas, whom we haven't heard too much of lately, or any other member, Sir. Indeed, Sir, it could have been a bill brought forward by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, from Fort Rouge, from St. Boniface. Mr. Speaker, it could have been a member from this side. What I am trying to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is it's the kind of bill that should encourage, you know, the kind of broad exchange of views as to who's going to benefit as a result of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that there are sufficient reasons put forward by people much more knowledgeable about the question of lotteries than I am, that indeed prepared this speech for me, that can indicate to you that the Province of Manitoba is in danger of losing upwards to a million dollars worth of revenue that has supported worthwhile cultural and sports activities. Mr. Speaker, we have put ourselves, we have put ourselves into a position by the kind of joint action by one Maitland Steinkopf when he presented the bill as a Centennial Lottery and one that was picked up by this government and put into law and has now been operating for four years, again one of these kind of joint ventures by opposition and government which has proved eminently successful. We are the Cadillacs in the business of running lotteries as far as Western Canada is concerned. We have the sales contacts, we have the organization, we have the techniques and we have shown that we can run an eminently successful lottery in this province. I've talked with people that are engaged in it, I've talked with people that are happy, the charitable organizations, the agencies that are selling tickets. They're fearful of one thing, that we are prepared to you know limit ourselves to some kind of a proportionate share based on the population of Western Canada. Well, Mr. Speaker, that just makes us losers, that just makes us losers. The Province of British Columbia, the Province of Alberta, have more in those terms than we have, but we have the expertise, we have the organization and we have the knowledge. Furthermore, those very agencies that have been involved in the selling of lottery tickets, they are not one bit afraid of competition, in fact they can supply statistics that show that competition indeed helps the sale of lottery tickets. I am told that the sale, for instance, of Irish Sweepstakes has risen appreciably since the event of the Manitoba Golden Sweepstakes.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be unduly harsh on the Minister that presented this bill but he has made and he has put himself in several contradictory positions. On the one hand when he introduced the bill he seems to suggest that if we enter into a reciprocity agreement with the other provinces that we will, you know, just take our fair share and nothing else; denying the fact that we have the four year lead edge on them, we have the know-how, we have the recognition of being really in this field in Western Canada super salesmen as far as lottery tickets are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to prolong the debate on this matter any longer than need be. I make an honest appeal. I make a very honest appeal to all members opposite. Really, you know, this is the kind of a vote, this is the kind of a bill that I am not asking any of you honourable members opposite to bend your principles, I'm asking you to open up your minds, your thoughts and your views on this question, allow this bill to be treated in the same way as its parent bill was treated in this same Chamber on a free vote basis--(Interjection)--on a free vote basis. Don't tie your principles, never let it be said on the epitaph of one member, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, as he reposes in some peaceful country cemetery in that grand constituency that he stood for lotteries in this way or that way. I mean it really is not that kind of an issue. And the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose honestly can't tell me that is that kind of an issue. The Honourable Member from Crescentwood can't tell me that it's that

## BILL 27

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . kind of an issue. Mr. Speaker, I make an urgent appeal through you to the members opposite, we need to - you know we at least need to explore every avenue possible to try and get a better exchange of ideas going back and forth. You know we've been abusing each other to the extent that you know it really is a constant assault on one's sanity and I have been so much part of that, and I apologize to the part that I've been part of it, but we should at least maybe look for those avenues, you know, where we can act, you know not in that thrust and cut and partisan type of a way, you know nothing that - no particular issue here is going to decide the fortunes of the Progressive Conservative Party, the Liberal Party or the New Democratic Party.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we but listen to the very people, those organizations that have done well and appreciate the move that was taken by this government when we instituted the lottery, the Golden Sweepstakes; when we consider the number of organizations, the sporting organizations, the cultural organizations that have benefitted from this. For what? You know the Minister has not even been able to assure us that for instance, you know, can you--the Minister was quoted in the Winnipeg newspapers recently that the agencies would retain their 45 percent commission structure. Will he now in fact guarantee the Legislature, and put on the record, that this will be the case?--(Interjection)--As well as the 45 percent commission earmarked just for ticket selling agencies who actually sell the tickets, or is a portion of the commission earmarked for a newly created administrative body that will in fact take part of the 45 percent commission?

Mr. Speaker, this operation has generated upwards to a million dollars worth of money, so that even this government must appreciate that they are not directly responsible for extracting of the taxpayers. The taxpayers do this voluntarily. They buy the tickets in the hope of a windfall benefit. Now, Mr. Speaker, you know, I suppose in the honourable words of the House Leader who once indicated to us how far the big wheel turns. I can recall a speech by the Leader of the Opposition when he was condemning the inactivity of the present government for having done only these and these things, and the response by the House Leader was well if you've done these and these things, that's pretty good because ten years ago or five years ago that would have been considered radical.

Mr. Speaker, four years ago the question of lotteries was kind of a major moral issue in the Province of Manitoba, whether we should or whether we should not. And perhaps, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to make fun of that, perhaps for some it is a moral issue. All the more reason, Mr. Speaker, that I suggest, and I seriously suggest to the First Minister that he consider calling the whips off on this particular vote. And, Sir, I have attempted to indicate to him, I make the suggestion not because I want to, you know, maybe put any particular minister in an embarrassing position. Indeed maybe the bill should be reintroduced by a private member. I think in the cool afterthought, I think they are asking themselves, why did we not do that? That this really is the kind of a bill that quite properly should have been brought in by a private member. You know and we could have the kind of open debate that should ensue on this bill. Mr. Speaker, I see no benefit accruing, absolutely none, and the Minister has not been able to tell us that. You know, he has no benefit accruing to the people of Manitoba, the Province of Manitoba, as a result of our giving up the Golden Sweepstakes and entering into WesCan. As a matter of fact, I can see nothing but us taking, you know, as a result of our population base, as a result of our numbers, taking a secondary, a third or fourth position in this matter.

The honourable members opposite have from time to time taunted us with well, can you really support a position which is fundamentally illegal and not in accordance with the laws of this land? Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the question of morality that they want to raise, they want to raise, if they want to raise it in this manner, really should be directed against such agencies who have over the years abused the law, to name the Irish Sweepstakes as one. And, Mr. Speaker, to raise the question again, has there been any legal action taken against us for selling our tickets beyond our borders, parts of Saskatchewan, Alberta, or British Columbia?

And finally, Mr. Speaker, really, is not the question, and is not that acceptable to most honourable members opposite, that when a practice begins to become acceptable in a very broad and general way, then is then not the law really an ass, and should it then not be changed, and should then we not be putting our efforts forward to changing that law? And, Mr. Speaker, we haven't pressed that hard but have we - you know, I can recall, Mr. Speaker, this

## BILL 27

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . government going down to the Supreme Court and fighting all that came against them because of what? - chickens and eggs. Who lays the egg, as to where it should be marketed. This government is prepared to do that in cases of whether some people consider a certain movie obscene or not. It was my misfortune that I have a liberal judge as a brother that decided it was not obscene; it cost me many votes. But, Mr. Speaker, I really ask, should not, should not this government now be asking themselves whether or not - you know, I can name you, I can name you the number of illegal lottery tickets that are being sold in the Province of Manitoba just in this last little while, in this last little while. Mr. Speaker, I want to name you those because it indicates, you know, the kind of suggestion that was being made opposite that we are by speaking this way, essentially purporting to support an illegal position.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the sales of illegal tickets such as the Irish Sweepstakes in the Province of Manitoba is placidly accepted, why is the government so concerned with the sale of our tickets in other Canadian provinces? You know, that's getting back to my prepared speech and that always never works does it, Mr. Speaker, when you go by the rule book, you know, on the one hand, and then go back to your prepared speech. But what I was referring to my notes for was to suggest that here are the presently illegal lotteries - tickets that are being sold in Manitoba: Saskatchewan Sport, Red Deer Stanley Cup, Edmonton Exhibition, Calgary Stampede, Quebec Loto, Kin Loto, Barbados Sweeps . . . Lottery, Ontario-Saskatchewan Lucky Dog Lottery, West Indies Lottery. At least ten major lotteries being run all illegally, all illegally in this province. But, Mr. Speaker, we're told, we're told by this government that, and by this Attorney-General, that for some reason or other we are suggesting an immoral position by supporting our own NDP-made Manitoba Golden Sweepstakes. Now really, let me appeal to you honourable gentlemen opposite that we should take the whips off on this vote, let the chips fall where they will, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that if you check on the past Hansards that you would probably find as many members on this side may be voting against it as the last time. I wouldn't care to predict that. I only suggest to you and to the Honourable Minister that brought in this bill, that it is not, it is not a bill that really offers any promise of gains to the people of Manitoba. Indeed what it does, it says that we will share our success with the other four western provinces. Well now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps as a Canadian I should accept that position. But you know, Mr. Speaker, my patriot, the gentlemen that the Honourable First Minister knows full well both in Alberta and in Saskatchewan, didn't feel quite that way when it came to discussing oil. And, Mr. Speaker, that may be far-fetched but the fact of the matter is that our people, we have an organization that has developed a good organization, good sales contacts, they have done an admirable job in promoting Golden Sweepstakes, and we just seem to be bargaining that away and nobody as yet has told us what we're getting in return. Nobody as yet has told us what we're getting in return in fact the most, you know, what we have been told is that in all likelihood we will lose out. Mr. Speaker, I fail to see the reasoning behind the government and its Minister that would support that position.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to address myself exclusively to the contents of the bill but some of the issues raised by the Honourable Deputy Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party deserve some comment. It's only when we have the fortunate experience of having his leader out of the House that we have the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party speaking with such candor and such frankness.

MR. CHERNIACK: You should hear what goes on when you're out.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, in listening to the speech by the Conservative Deputy Leader one cannot help but be amused because of the hypocrisy of the statements. Mr. Speaker, we know, honourable members on government side know, we know the history, and we know the position of the Conservative Party, as enunciated often in this House by the Deputy Leader over the years, that the issues, or the very things that he speaks of tonight that the local organizations should have money to accomplish, were never supported in depth and in substance by him or his party. And so, Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude, and I'm sure all members of government and the Liberal Party certainly conclude, that this is both posturing, this is pandering, because there is no tangible evidence that the Conservative Party with the possible exception of its Leader, that the Conservative Party has ever stood for supporting

## BILL 27

(MR. ASPER cont'd) . . . . the kind of social progress that the Lottery is aimed at supporting. So the hypocrisy of the Conservative House Leader is well known to anyone in the House. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Honourable Members ignore, ignore the impassioned appeal by the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party because it has no substance, it has no history and it has no foundation.

We take a similar position on certain facts but at least, Mr. Speaker, we will vote to get this bill into Committee, because we have learned some of the rules of the House, we have learned some of the techniques that the government asks for.

A MEMBER: That's something new.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, if the Conservative Party wishes to curtail debate and allow the government to use its majority to pass the bill, that is typical Conservative head in the mud approach. But, Mr. Speaker, we have now learned the gimmick, and the gimmick is this, that this is a stupid bill. We know that. It's a gross mistake. We know that. And only if we get it into committee where we can bring public pressure on government, only if the organizations, the charitable organizations of Manitoba, are given an option to come in, and come in and show this government how through its cowardice, through its lack of guts, through its ability to be conned, through its accessibility to blackmail, have sold out hundreds of charitable organizations of this province, Only when those organizations come before committee, and, Mr. Speaker, I think the First Minister is having a fit; would you call in the Sergeant-at-Arms and administer oxygen to him?--(Interjection)--Well then why don't you leave the House?

Mr. Speaker, we will demonstrate, and we will document it, we'll show the amateurs for what they are, having been pushed, conned, because that's what happened here, that's what happened here, and the Minister of Cultural Affairs knows it, and if he has any sense of shame, knows that he got sold down the river, and that he is about to cost the people of this province millions, and if he doesn't know it, then God help us in other departments of government. Mr. Speaker, when those - and we will pass the Bill to Committee, we will vote second reading, and I appeal to honourable members to understand why, only then will we have genuine submission and public hearing. Because to vote against it, means the government will vote it with its majority to go into second, then into third reading, and so why fight, why fight, why fight the government majority to prevent it, or try to prevent it as my honourable friend from Lakeside would suggest, to ask backbench government people to vote. It isn't going to happen. It hasn't happened; we've never seen it. They don't have--(Interjection)--Yes I respect, I respect the Member from Crescentwood, the honourable member who had the courage to stand up and say he'll vote against it, and if my honourable friend from Lakeside is correct, that that is a widespread view amongst government--(Interjection)--Yes, if you can demonstrate, if we are persuaded that there are members of government who have the temerity, and who don't understand what the lash is about in the NDP, by all means we will switch our position. Our position tonight is that we will pass it to committee.

A MEMBER: That's the trouble with you Liberals, you keep switching and we don't know where you stand.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I hear the honourable member from his seat criticizing because of his inflexibility, his lack of understanding of, or his concrete positions--(Interjection)--That's right, that's right, Mr. Speaker, what he says from his seat is quite true, we are quite flexible. If we are given evidence that persuades us to change our mind, we will change our mind, but tonight we will vote to put the bill into committee and ask for widespread expression of public opinion in the hope of persuading this government to dump this insanity.

Mr. Speaker, we have one commitment, the Liberal Party in this issue, and it really isn't worth the amount of time we're giving it, but it is very important to dozens of Manitoba organizations who have pioneered this thing, and who have produced millions of dollars of revenue, both for Crown and for public and social and cultural purposes, and we're not going to sell them out so quickly and that's what will happen, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Golden Sweepstakes Lottery, and this is not an issue of should there be lotteries, a lottery is well known, it's a tax on fools, and I don't have any regard for the government, I've raised it in this House, I think it's a shame that government money be used and spent to exort people to gamble, and yet I believe in the right to gamble, but I don't believe public funds should be used to exort people to gamble as this government has done, and as I

## BILL 27

(MR. ASPER cont'd) . . . . complained in this House two years ago when we began, or 18 months ago. But, Mr. Speaker, having done it, the Golden Sweepstakes must be protected, and that's our objective here. If the First Minister will stand, or the House Leader will stand, and tell us that we're into a free vote, then perhaps we can reconsider our position, because I believe, I believe that the government, I believe the government backbenchers may very well share the concerns that the Liberal Party feels keenly. But, Mr. Speaker, only the Honourable Member from Crescentwood has so far had the courage to stand and make a very very cogent argument in this House, saying that he saw through, and the reason I have such profound respect for the way he put it, was because he has the experience, he has a lifetime of experience in similar kind of trade-offs, and has been very eminently successful at it in a career before he dreamt of coming into public life, so when he stands in his place and says, we're being conned, Mr. Speaker, he persuades me, and I ask him to persuade his colleagues on the government side. I ask him to speak to his backbenchers, persuade the House Leader to have a free vote, as the Honourable Deputy Leader of the Conservatives suggests, and I'm satisfied that this bill will then be defeated. But on the assumption the government will call it a government bill, as they are, we hope to get it into committee, we condemn the misleading information that the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs has put before the House by impression, but his statements to the public. Because, Mr. Speaker, we were led to believe by his statements that we were dealing with a permissive thing, that we were setting up machinery in answer to questions in this House, we were setting up machinery - if deals could be reached, if protective positions could be struck then maybe we would do this.

Mr. Speaker, that's no longer a decent charade because it's now clear from statements made in the past few days that there is a deal and as the Letters of Intent get filed, and we know what's going on in Alberta and Saskatchewan and B.C., we now know that this is permissive only to sneak it through the House binding in moral terms by commitments this government has already made to other governments. What is the commitment? To centralize, to wipe out what we have built in terms of a revenue base, a selling base for the Manitoba lotteries. Mr. Speaker, if you'd have said that two years ago there would have been less opposition from this side of the House but at this stage where organizations, the Scouts, the Legion, the Catholic organizations, the multi-cultural groups who have built budgets based on revenue from this source, we are not prepared to trade it off for some interprovincial trade off which has always been a one-way street for this province. I didn't see the Honourable Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party said, Alberta and Saskatchewan trading off the oil; and I don't remember Saskatchewan saying to the Government of Manitoba, hey maybe you want the steel factories. I don't remember that. I've said in this House many times that until the naive, the rose-coloured glasses of centralism come off this government and they understand the competition that they're in as a government, competition with other jurisdictions for tax revenue, for capital, for jobs, for the things that make a community hum, we will have this kind of silly sellout every time this government goes to an interprovincial conference to represent we the people. And if you need any kind of an exhibit A, Mr. Speaker - I don't want to make that the thrust of my point tonight, I hope we'll find the opportunity to discuss the First Minister's representation of his province at the recent Energy Conference; and when every Manitoban is paying ten cents a gallon for gasoline more we'll have ample cause to question the quality of representation we're getting in interprovincial and inter-regional dealings by this government. But WesCan Lottery is classic, it's the fact, it's the fact.

Well, Mr. Speaker, our concern, (a) we were misled, we were misled into believing that WesCan was the usual housekeeping legislation, permissive, and now I believe unless somebody stands in this House and assures me I am wrong, that a deal's made. The deal's cooked; the sellout is done and we don't have Golden Sweepstakes Lottery with the exclusivity we had. And, Mr. Speaker, if somebody stands in his place and tells me we'll be wiped out by competition, I'd say, let's go that way, let's be wiped out by competition, let's not sell out. Mr. Speaker, we won't lose the competition and that's what we're fighting for, the right to compete. Not to centralize and blame, because this province has been shafted every time we made that kind of deal. Who doesn't believe for one second that a year and a half from now Alberta's going to say to this province, Well you know you've got a million people, we've got a million six, so the breakup's going to be a little different from now on. And think we can resist that kind of being leaned on? Nonsense! I don't trust the skill of this government to make good

## BILL 27

(MR. ASPER cont'd) . . . . deals in interprovincial dealings because I've seen this government in every interprovincial negotiation I've seen them go into come out with a very short stick.

Mr. Speaker, St. Paul's College, what is it? - \$600,000. St. Vital or rather St. Boniface Bulldogs - I'm sorry St. Vital Bulldogs. St. Boniface Mohawks - \$400,000. St. Paul's College - three-quarters of a million dollars. Seven Sisters Wildlife Association - a third of a million dollars. Five million dollars in all through this source to worthwhile cultural, social, charitable organizations in this province. That is what's jeopardy, that's what may be sold out by the lack of skill in the negotiation of this deal.

Mr. Speaker, I say the Minister was conned, I say he was misled into feeling that he had no options but to make this deal to throw Manitoba into the pot. Regionalism. In the name of western economic unity or some other nonsense. Mr. Speaker, oh, Mr. Speaker, in the hands of somebody who understands it those concepts are valid, Manitoba can prosper but in the hands of fellows who believe in centralization, who have traded off Manitoba's position every time in the name of centralization, who are likely to allow the Union at Dorval in the name of centralization to keep the overhaul base out of Winnipeg, in the name of centralization. That's been the piece, that's been the piece for five years under this government.

Mr. Speaker, I hear something from the First Minister that sounds like, "veiled treason", veiled treason I think he's speaking from his seat. I hope he won't rise in his place and say the same kind of thing because it would shock my tender sensitivities. Mr. Speaker, the Minister's answered by saying that the law, the Criminal Code of Canada threatened that which we had built up for several years. Mr. Speaker, I find that incredible and I'm sure the Attorney-General finds it incredible. He can't stand in his place and tell us that that's the case, because if it is the case how come through our cunning we have escaped prosecution for two years. If the Criminal Code threatens the Golden Sweepstakes in its expansion across this country, how come we haven't been prosecuted to date? I hope somebody will answer, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)--When I'm finished, when I'm finished. Just a minute now.

Mr. Speaker, why hasn't the Government of Manitoba prosecuted anyone else, why hasn't that Attorney-General prosecuted anyone else who's selling lotteries in this province? Mr. Speaker, we know why. We have "a gentleman's agreement" and we have had one for a decade and we will continue to have one, because public morality is not outraged, public decency is not offended and Manitoba Golden Sweepstakes without the trade-off would prosper and we would not be prosecuted, unless somebody wanted a showcase piece of prosecution to teach somebody a perfunctory kind of a lesson.

Mr. Speaker, if I'm wrong and there is threats of prosecution suddenly after a decade of once a year or twice a year pulling some poor taxi driver before the courts and saying, uh huh, we found you with a book of Irish Sweepstake tickets. Fine \$35; bang. Mr. Speaker, if that's the threat, the tokenism of prosecution, let's gamble because what we all know, and what everyone in this Chamber knows is that the Criminal Code is obsolete on the point; it has not the respect of this Chamber, it has not the respect of this government, it has not the respect of the public, it is not even expected to be implemented on this point. So who got to the Minister? Who convinced the Minister that he was going to go to jail or that Boy Scouts who were selling raffles were going to go to jail. That's the only defence for this trade-off, that's the only reason we've had advanced to us that we are forced to give up our leadership in the field and the millions of dollars that go to their treasury and that go into the cultural--(Interjection)--Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Labour indicates that there has been external pressure. You bet there has. And you know what happens when somebody leans on you, Mr. Speaker. You lean right back, you lean right back and you don't sell out. --(Interjection)-- When I'm finished.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I won't be able to conclude before Private Members so I will yield to a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I thank the honourable member. Is he consciously and seriously advocating as Leader of the Liberal Party that the Criminal Code be ignored and broken by Manitoba citizens? That's the way I interpret what he just said. Am I correct?

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I am consciously saying two things. (1) If the law is obsolete cause it to be amended. (2) What have you done to make representations to the amendment of

## BILL 27

(MR. ASPER cont'd) . . . . the Criminal Code to legitimize what we're doing? If what you are suggesting as being illegal tomorrow should not be done then you and the Attorney-General must stand in the House and account for why you have been doing something illegal for two years. Mr. Speaker, I yield to a question by the Honourable Cultural Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, my question to the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party would be hopefully on the principle of the bill and he did make reference to my being conned into presenting a bill to the House that I didn't believe in. That's the way I took it. My question is: Has the honourable member read Section 10 (1) of the bill before us and Section 19. Section 10 (1) deals with permissive legislation.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I've read the bill, I've read 10 (1) which simply is permissive, which allows the government to enter into agreements with other - sorry the commission, the Lotteries Commission to enter into agreements with others. Mr. Speaker, it is precisely that section that I was led to believe was the permissive section of the Act, and now, Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying is that I don't believe it. I believe there is evidence that will indicate clearly that Manitoba Golden Sweepstakes, the origin of \$10 million approximately of revenue to us and to our charitable organizations will be wiped out in a trade-off under that section. I will not negotiate it.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour. The first item is Bill No. 39. The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie is absent. Bill No. 23. The Honourable Member for Radisson. (Stand)

Oh, did I miss a couple, I'm sorry. Bill No. 35. The Honourable Member for Morris. (Stand)

Bill No. 40. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 31. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. HARVEY PATTERSON (Crescentwood): Stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 45

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 45. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief on this bill but I want to just say that I'm really surprised. I'm glad the Member for Ste. Rose in his seat because I'm really surprised that he would bring a bill in such as this one. I think the Member for Roblin brought a similar bill in, I don't know if it's worded just the same or not, a couple of years ago, but the lesson I want to bring home to the government, and I'd like to emphasize this - never bring a bill in that involves two municipalities unless you have a resolution from both municipalities endorsing that bill. Never bring a bill in unless you got a resolution from both municipalities, because I tell you it will come home to haunt you. It will come to haunt the Minister of Highways, I'm sure this bill will. And if I'd been the Minister of Highways I'd of never ever let anybody bring in a bill in like this. I see members bringing bills in before and I'll tell you what happened in one case in 1959 it was.

The Member for Portage la Prairie at that time brought a bill in incorporating part of the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie. They did make an agreement for 70 acres and the mayor through his attorney at that time put in 570 acres and it wasn't 'til the second reading of the bill was completed and into committee the rural municipality found out at that time there's 570 acres in that bill. Well you can imagine, you can imagine their thoughts at that time, and they come in, they expressed their point of view to the committee at that time, Municipal Affairs. And I moved a motion the bill be not reported and the bill was thrown out.

The lesson to learn, Mr. Speaker, the lesson to learn is you never do something that people don't want in the first place, and in this case the Town of Dauphin don't want this bill and until such time as these two municipalities make an agreement and pass resolutions endorsing that agreement it's wise and proper and just not to bring this bill in. So a lesson to

## BILL 45

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . the Member for Ste. Rose, that he's made a mistake, he's made a mistake. Let the bill die in second reading before anybody gets hurt. Because I'm sure somebody on the government's side going to get hurt. It won't be us over here on this side of the House. It won't be the members on the opposition. We can't get hurt on this bill, but there's two people can get hurt. One is the Minister of Highways, the other is the Member for Ste. Rose. And I tell you they'll get hurt, and they can't get hurt if they let this bill die. They can't get hurt. I just give a little fatherly advice, fatherly advice, that's all I'm giving.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, they got a glorious opportunity. Just let this bill die now, let it die, because if it gets into committee I'm sure the Mayor of Dauphin will be coming in, storming in here telling us the facts of life to the Municipal Affairs Committee and in the long run you'll have to let the bill die anyway because you're not going to please anybody. So I say to everyone in this House, the government's got a glorious opportunity through the Member for Ste. Rose, just forget about this whole thing right now and tell the rural municipality of Dauphin that if they want such an agreement changed that they work out their agreement with the town, work it out, that's the place to work it out up there in Dauphin, not to work it out in this Legislative Building, because nobody's going to be happy.

So that's all I want to say, Mr. Speaker, on that bill. If the bill comes to second reading we'll be voting against this bill. We have no choice because there's only one resolution endorsing it. Until the Town of Dauphin brings a similar resolution endorsing this bill we have no choice but to vote against it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this bill has quite a lengthy history. I can recall on several occasions when we have dealt with this bill, the substance of this legislation in the past, I can recall hearing from the Municipality of Dauphin and the Town of Dauphin back in 1970 when there was sharp cleavage between the two municipalities at that time insofar as the substance of the bill is concerned, I know that on repeated occasions members of this House pleaded and urged the two municipalities to get together and to attempt to resolve their differences. And finally back in 1971 legislation was passed in this House which appears not to have been acceptable to the Rural Municipality of Dauphin. I don't think it is fair for the Member for Souris-Killarney to attack the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose for having introduced this legislation, for surely, Mr. Speaker, if two municipalities are in disagreement and cannot concur, insofar as the substance of some material matter is concerned involving those two municipalities, then their only recourse is to bring their dispute to the House, but only as a last resort and not as a first resort. Certainly in the instance, in the . . . matter before this House now, this material is not here as a matter of first resort but as a matter of continuing disagreement between the two municipalities, which to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, at least dates back to 1969.

The issue seems to be as to whether or not the municipality of Dauphin should be bound by legislation which was passed many many years ago, in which the Town of Dauphin was exempt from certain taxation in respect to certain assets of the Town of Dauphin within the Municipality of Dauphin. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we relate to the Municipal Act, and the provisions of the Municipal Act, as they pertain to all municipalities within the province, certainly the Town of Dauphin ought not to be exempt from these assets. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if we honour the agreement which was agreed to by the parties many many years ago, and I believe it was 35 years ago, then the Municipality of Dauphin ought - continue to be committed to that legislation.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the two municipalities could, as the Member for Souris-Killarney suggests, meet, discuss, and come to a common agreement. Certainly they as neighbours living side by side, sharing together regional facilities, the concerns of people in the Town of Dauphin are certainly also the concerns of the people in the Municipality of Dauphin, and certainly the statesmanlike thing would be for the good people in Dauphin and in the Municipality of Dauphin to come together in common agreement. I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that this has not been possible and that is why the legislation is before this House.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I would not want to prevent the municipal people from Dauphin Town and from the Municipality to come before a committee of the Legislature to present their respective positions.

## BILL 45

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd)

The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney says that his group will oppose this bill from being passed by way of second reading. I would urge the Member for Souris-Killarney not to do that, because by so doing it will prevent the people in the rural Municipality of Dauphin from presenting their brief, their submission, their case, to the Committee, and I think at least in fairness and equity we would want to permit the Municipality of Dauphin to present their case, their proposals, their reasons, for their thinking to the Committee. Certainly there's a responsibility I think in this House to at least give both the town and the municipality a hearing again in Committee, and possibly as a result of that hearing in Committee we'll be able to bring about some accommodation between the two parties, but surely that is the spirit to which we should want to proceed with this legislation before us, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a couple of comments on this bill because I believe this same issue has been before this House before, and if I'm not mistaken our municipal committee held hearings in Dauphin - I believe it was in 1970 or 1971 - and we heard the petition from the rural Municipality of Dauphin and the Town of Dauphin pertaining to the same problem. I do not know if the councillors representing the rural Municipality of Dauphin are the same that were there before, but I'm sure they must be different councillors today than they were at that time, they may not, but I do believe - that at least I don't recall that we have killed a bill on second reading, not to have these people have their day in court. My feeling would be - I do know that we had a bill concerning the City of Brandon that has come before which was a contentious bill to this House, and we allowed it to go into Law Amendments Committee, so we can hear both sides, and at that time we can either have much more knowledge and appreciate the problems, but from my own point of view we have heard the two sides, and I feel that there may be new councillors now and I still feel that they should have their day in court, and I think that we would be prepared to let it go to Law Amendments Committee to hear both sides.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? (Agreed) We are now on Private Members' Resolutions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS - RESOLUTION NO. 21

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 21. The Honourable Minister of Mines has 19 minutes to go.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties with Private Members' Resolutions which probably the Member for Morris did not foresee when he proposed that we have this new system, with which I agree and I think it has been an improvement, with regard to Private Members' Hour, but one of the difficulties with regard to participating in a debate of that kind is that you may be very inspired or provoked on the day in which the debate took place and when you rose to your feet, and two weeks hence, or three weeks hence, with 19 minutes left, as the Member for Lakeside says, you have lost or may have lost a great deal of enthusiasm for the debate because the debate ended last time, which is about two weeks ago, with speeches by the Member for Roblin and the Leader of the Liberal Party expressing some amazement at the fact that the Member for Thompson had the nerve to get up and suggest that he was going to not support a proposal to have a special minimum wage in Northern Manitoba. I can recall the Leader of the Liberal Party using similar language, Mr. Speaker, as he used tonight, like sold out the people of northern Manitoba; I dare you to vote; I dare you to go back to Thompson; I dare you to stand in front of the people of the north and tell them that you voted against a resolution which would have a specific minimum wage for northern Manitoba. In the minute that was available to me the last time, I indicated that three of the members, and I was mistaken, there were really only two, the Member for The Pas and the Member for Flin Flon had done exactly that. They had stood up in this House and they had voted against a resolution for a specific minimum wage in northern Manitoba. They had gone back to northern Manitoba and stood before the electorate, and not only, Mr. Speaker, were they returned to office, but lo and behold they brought three other members for northern Manitoba back with them to the House.

And really the lesson of that particular debate is that I think that the Leader of the Liberal Party in particular has to reassess his position as to what elects a person, because

## RESOLUTION 21

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . according to the Leader of the Liberal Party's speech because that resolution was specifically framed in such a way as on paper, it would appear to offer an immediate benefit to northern Manitoba, that no northern member with any degree of concern for his electoral position could vote against it, because if he did so, he would be obviously voting against something that was for the benefit of his citizens. And I think that the Leader of the Liberal Party's position with respect to that kind of thing has been rather consistent, that even tonight, Mr. Speaker - and I'll deal with the question of lotteries at a more appropriate time - but even tonight, his position seemed to be that we have to take the position that Manitoba is entitled to do everything that it can to secure its own position, regardless of what happens everywhere else, and that ultimately is to the long-range benefit of the Province of Manitoba, refusing to see whether there is a long-term benefit in doing something else.

Now with respect to the minimum wage, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that nobody on this side have ever said that the minimum wage is what people should get paid; that the minimum wage is designed as a floor to protect those who have no bargaining position whatsoever; that really in terms of obtaining good terms and conditions of employment, it is much better that there be no state control, that there be a bargaining position of strength on one side and a bargaining position of strength on the other, and that this would be the best way of insuring a good wage, and that to legislate a minimum is to involve one's self in a degree of state control, which one does only as a last resort because one knows that there are going to be certain people that cannot bargain for themselves. And of course the people in northern Manitoba are - and I'm not suggesting that there isn't a concern for a minimum wage - but generally the wages in northern Manitoba are above the minimum wage. Their problem is not the lowest minimum wage . . . the negotiated position and positions vis-a-vis others.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree that there are people who are working for the minimum wage in northern Manitoba, but one has to measure whether one starts to have specific minimum wages across this province and tries to measure the economic soundness of an area in terms of that becoming the basis upon minimum wage being set, or having a blanket minimum wage, which both the previous administration and this administration has followed. But that, Mr. Speaker, is something which I think the people of northern Manitoba have apparently decided upon, or at least they have supported this government, despite the fact that the Leader of the Liberal Party would think that it's suicide to go before the people of northern Manitoba and tell them that you did not support the higher minimum wage.

Now I think that that is an attitude towards politics which I have discerned in the honourable member from time to time, and I can tell him, Mr. Speaker, that I have not acted that way. I have been lucky thus far. I think that the best example I can show is that when I was on Metro Council none of my constituents paid a zone fare. I was on Division 3 and there was no zone fares in my constituency. On the other hand, there were zone fares in the constituencies of four people, and there were ten councillors, and for years you could not eliminate the zone fare because the six members, who represented zones who didn't pay the zone fare, thought that it would be suicide to go back to their people and say that in the interests of a transportation system in Greater Winnipeg we are going to eliminate the zone fare, which means you pay more, and the people who are now paying the zone fare pay less. And it took, I tell the honourable member it took at least four years before the zone fare was eliminated, and it was eliminated because I broke the balance and went back to my constituents and accepted the responsibility for it. And, Mr. Speaker, that is something which, fortunately for me, has not been a terrible political liability.

Now the main point of the Leader of the Liberal Party's speech was that these people had to face the northerners, and they had to sort of pay for their political sins; implying, Mr. Speaker, that to do the reverse would be good politics.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to examine the advice, the political advice, that the honourable member has given. The honourable member is my member, he is my member of the Legislature, and to carry through this kind of reasoning and you know, one of the things that was distributed to my house, and I'm going to let the honourable member correct me if I'm wrong, is that there should be a ban on non-resident parking in Wolseley. Now here is the Leader of a party which seeks to become the government of this House, who is campaigning personally on a ban to non-resident parking in Wolseley, feeling that in order to win the support of the Wolseley citizens one has to be that confining in terms of what one is offering them

## RESOLUTION 21

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . specifically, a ban on non-resident parking. Which means, Mr. Speaker, that you as - well the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I think he has a brother who is in the area, would not be able to park because he is a non-resident of Wolseley. My daughter who is twelve and has a sense of humour went to the Liberal headquarters and put a little ticket on the Leader of the Liberal Party's car saying that he is a non-resident and therefore his parking should not be permitted. In that respect, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is the same as I, I do not reside in my constituency, he does not reside in his, and I make no point of that at all. But I think that his appeal was based on that kind of position, and I tell him that despite the advice that he is giving to the northern members, that apparently he should look back at his own position and see whether, let us say, it would be good politics to go to Wolseley constituency and say that everybody in Wolseley constituency should have a separate minimum wage, on the basis that his constituents are going to get something. Now I know the member would say that that is ridiculous, that that's not a policy. Therefore it is not a policy to say that merely because somebody has proposed that there be a separate minimum wage in northern Manitoba, that a northerner is completely ridiculous if he votes against it, because there may be implications, and I'm not really at this point arguing, Mr. Speaker, that the member is right or the member is wrong. I am saying that it is not as simple as to say, how can you vote against something as the Member for Roblin said, when your constituents are going to get a special benefit, because it may not in the last analysis be a special benefit.

. . . . continued on next page

## RESOLUTION 21

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

MR. ASPER: I thank the Honourable Minister. Would he direct some comment to the fact that he appears to be saying that there is no rationale for having minimum wages differ throughout regions of the province. Would he direct some comment to the fact that under his government there is a differential in the heavy construction industry in rural Manitoba as opposed to urban and the Civil Service as well?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: As a matter of fact, that is the case, there is a differential, that differential has been historical. I'm not saying that it is good or bad. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm saying that there may be reasons for it, there may not be reasons for it, but that if there are reasons for it, they are articulated; if there are reasons against it, they are articulated. One does not say that merely because someone has said that he represents the north and someone has proposed a separate minimum wage for north, that it is against the interest of the north to vote for that particular resolution. I happen to think that it is in the interests of the people of Manitoba that there be, as long as we can hold tightly to it, one minimum wage, because I say, more than one minimum wage is a serious problem. But, you know, it's really the honourable member's electoral technique that I wanted to talk about for a minute with relation to his advice to the northern members.

Mr. Speaker, here is something that should interest the Tories. In June of 1963 the Liberal Leader complained about the Conservative campaign. He said, Mr. Asper said that the same - well he said that the Conservatives were trying to scare the electorate into voting one way and not dividing the votes as between two parties, and I think the Conservatives were pushing for the elimination of the Liberal Party. I guess that's the name of the game. The Honourable - this is 73. Oh I'm sorry, 73. Well here's what the Leader of the Liberal Party is quoted as saying: "Mr. Asper said the same high pressure campaign was tried by the Conservatives in the Wolseley by-election last year when they warned voters not to split their vote. Will the people of Wolseley listen? And they decided not to split the vote, they voted overwhelmingly Liberal." Now he says the Conservatives in Wolseley by-election last year warned voters not to split the vote. Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has worse enemies than myself, you know - I've got five children and they're all interested in every campaign and this struck one of my sons a little unusual. He remembered that somebody in the last campaign had said, don't split the vote, and the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party is anticipating me, Mr. Speaker. Here is the 73 election campaign literature --(Interjection)-- No, no, the by-election. Well you said that in the by-election the Conservatives warned voters not to split the vote. Mr. Speaker, in 1973 the Leader of the Liberal Party said that the Conservatives in the previous election in 72, had warned the voters not to split the vote. Here is the Liberal literature. Asper - don't split the vote. Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems, indeed I'm sure the Liberal Party Leader remembers, remembers that somebody a year ago had said, don't split the vote, and the only problem is that he didn't remember who was the one who made that particular statement. However, I just give that, and I know that the honourable member takes it in good spirits, that this is an attitude towards electoral politics which he was lecturing my colleagues

. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Five minutes.

MR. GREEN: . . . that he was lecturing my colleagues about, some of them which didn't need a lecture. You know, the Honourable the Member for The Pas got one of the highest percentage votes in the province by virtue of the fact that he was in a two-party fight and certainly increased his percentage. The Member for Flin Flon also increased his percentage, and of course the Leader of the Liberal Party knows that his percentage, despite his lecturing and despite the fact that one appeals to his constituents on the basis of a very very narrow appeal. That is, no non-resident parking in the constituency of Wolseley. I would warn my colleagues, who were shaking in their boots as a result of the Liberal Leader's speech at the last hearing, when I said that I was provoked, and I'm no longer provoked, that you'd better think twice before you take the position that you should watch what the Liberal Leader is saying relative to your electoral support in Northern Manitoba.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the issue is far more complicated than the member for Assiniboia would have it in his resolution. I think that the Member for Assiniboia understands it. I'm not suggesting that he does not understand the position. I think that a minimum wage is

## RESOLUTION 21

(MR. GREEN Cont'd) . . . . the sort of last resort of the public in dealing with terms and conditions of employment which should be freely negotiated between the employer on the one side and the employees on the other side, and I would gather that the Leader of the Liberal Party, who does not believe in state control, would also take the position that as much as one could, stay out of the area of setting terms and conditions of employment by legislation, rather than by negotiation as between the parties, hoping and trying to assess whether or not the negotiating positions of each of the parties is relatively of such a nature as to enable him to negotiate a fair minimum wage, or fair terms and conditions of employment, that as much as one can, one stays out, and that the minimum wage then becomes a wage which one says raises the floor from which negotiations then can commence. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in Northern Manitoba that in many cases the average wage for instance would be higher than in many other parts of the province, that there would probably be - one would have to if one wanted to apply strictly the north formula, one would have to measure the number of people who work at the northern minimum wage in percentage to the number of people who work for it elsewhere. --(Interjection)-- Well the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party says that it should be tied to the cost of living and I think that the Minister of Labour over the years, between the time that we came in when it was \$1.25 to now when it is \$1.90, and he keeps making increases, has in effect kept pace with the cost of living. That's really not the question. The real question is whether one can try to zone the province into areas where one says there will be a particular minimum wage in one area and another particular minimum wage in another. However, I'm not suggesting that there is a fast answer to this question. I'm merely trying to answer the Leader of the Liberal Party in saying that there isn't the fast and obvious inclination of northern members to seize that kind of opportunity because it pretends to be an immediate benefit to people in Northern Manitoba. I am going to deal much further with that position, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the lottery that the honourable member mentioned tonight, because in many respects, in many respects I believe that there may be the same philosophical difference relative to that lottery as there is with regard to Northern Manitoba.

The honourable member says that it is a drive to centralism I would prefer to think, Mr. Speaker, that it is a feeling on the part of some that while one is involved with his fellow citizens that the more one broadens the range of people with whom he has affinity, the better the world becomes, and the more one narrows the range of people with whom one has affinity the more difficult it is, because through a greater affinity amongst a greater and greater number of people, I believe that society is able to accomplish much more for the benefit of those people. --(Interjection)-- Well the honourable member says that he takes that as trite almost, maybe well he says it's centralism. I don't think it's centralism, Mr. Speaker. I've never been a nationalist of the economic variety or the other variety. I believe that some of the national boundaries that we have probably we would be better without. I say that - and I'll finish in one moment, Mr. Speaker. I am saying that I recognize the boundaries that we have as a reality. I am certainly going to live in a way in which I have to face that reality and deal with them, but if I have the choice of undoing or strengthening those boundaries, then I would be in the camp, Mr. Speaker, that goes towards eliminating the things that divide us rather than building the barriers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, the House Leader when he arose to participate in this debate claimed that after a two and three week lapse in the debate one had some difficulty in generating some enthusiasm for debate. I can only comment that he did very well in generating his own enthusiasm, something like a perpetual motion machine; once it got started, it just kept building up momentum. He did very well. I'm sure, Sir, if you had been a little more generous in the time you allotted him, he could have continued on for some considerable length of time. As it was you were very generous in allowing him to drift somewhat from the purport of the resolution before us. He dealt with non-resident parking, which I had some difficulty in relating that particular subject to the bill. He dealt with election campaigns, which perhaps if you stretched the imagination could bear some relationship to the content of the bill.

But I want to say to the Minister that I'm inclined to agree insofar as voting appeals are concerned, and I have said for some time now that if there is one thing that is wrong with politics in this country, if there is one thing that is wrong with politicians, and I don't exclude myself in that generalization, is the tendency on the part of politicians by the very nature of the

## RESOLUTION 21

(MR. JORGENSON Cont'd) . . . . art of politics, it tends to become self-perpetuating. I've campaigned against that. I have suggested that rather than developing ourselves into a class of professional politicians where our only interest is the next election and getting ourselves re-elected, that we could serve the country a great deal better if instead of attempting to draw up a laundry list of things that we're going to do for everybody during an election campaign, if we're to get elected, that we would face the facts and tell the people of this country that they can't have it both ways; that if they indeed are to expect more in the way of largesse from the government, if they're to expect more government expenditures, then consequent upon greater government expenditures is higher taxes. And the whole process is self-defeating because the higher you raise the taxes, the greater the inflation, the higher the costs and the greater the need for more payments from the treasury, and it's a continuous thing. We're reaching the stage now where the rate of inflation is accelerating to such an extent that it's almost predictable now what will happen, and I've on a previous occasion predicted what will happen. I say, Sir, that during the course of election campaigns and during political conventions, what politicians should be doing is providing a great deal more leadership instead of attempting to bribe people with their own money, as this resolution purports to do.

Sir, I don't think there is a reputable economist in this country that has ever attempted successfully to defend the minimum wage, let alone an increase in the minimum wage in the north, but defend the minimum wage on economic grounds, because it can't be done. The minimum wage, Sir, is nothing more than a device whereby the middle-class worker benefits himself at the expense of the worker on the lower end of the scale. And the tragedy, our experiment in the application of the minimum wage law, is that it has had a tendency to put more people on welfare than to assist people in establishing some economic base for their own livelihood. There is a limit to which an economy if it is to be free in this country, if it is intended that we're to compete in the markets of the world, as indeed we're expected to do; indeed without competing in the markets of the world, this country will wither and die. There is no way we can survive without trading. And the only thing that's saved us so far is that the rate of inflation in other countries is as great as the rate of inflation in our own. And then if there was a country, and indeed there was in Japan for a number of years, and in Germany for a number of years, until the socialists moved in there too, that had a lower cost of production and were able to compete, and the only way that we could protect our - and this is the cry that always comes out when goods from other countries flow into this country and begin to compete with ours, then the cry goes out, that you've got to protect the workers, and it's the companies that always beg for this kind of protection. Not for themselves mind you, oh no, oh no, they can, you know, they say we can survive, we're doing well, but boy think of those poor workers that we're going to have to lay off if you allow another country to compete in our markets, and so the pressure is put on for some kind of protection. The more protection that's put on the less our ability to trade in the markets of the world. And say, it's a vicious circle which feeds upon itself, increases wages, increases costs, and increase the cost of living to the people who are, particularly the people that are on fixed wages. And then once it's reached the stage where it's almost intolerable for those who are on fixed wages, such as pensioners, to survive, then the government will come and say, well we've got to do something for those poor people. So they'll give them \$500.00 to fix their homes; they'll increase their pensions a little bit more; they'll let them ride free on the buses; and they'll do all sorts of things, and these are nothing more than vote buying gimmicks, nothing more than you see right here.

My honourable friends opposite have the whole bookful of them, and they have been throwing them at the people of this province over the years. My honourable friend the House Leader talks about vote buying. They've been pretty successful at doing that in the last couple of elections.

Now Sir, if we're going to face reality, and sooner or later we're going to have to do that, we've got to come to realize that we can't have it both ways; that leadership consists of something more than just going around telling people all the things that they should be getting, that they should be asking for, and if they're ever caught not asking for enough, to urge them to ask for more. Leadership, Sir, consists of laying before the people of this country the very serious situation that we find ourselves in now as a result of that kind of vote buying, as a result of attempting to bribe people with their own money. And I'm not, when I

## RESOLUTION 21

(MR. JORGENSON Cont'd) . . . . look at my honourable friends opposite, it's very natural because I'm facing them across the way, I'm not just suggesting that they are the only ones that have been doing it. I think all political parties are guilty of it. I think the time has come when all political parties have got to take stock of themselves and recognize that they are leading this country to ruination because it cannot continue without ruining the very basis upon which this country was founded and our ability to survive. --(Interjection)-- Well you see the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who is a very infrequent visitor to this House and every one in a while we welcome his presence here, has just made an interjection, and he said, we stopped building roads. And, you know, it was earlier this afternoon that I was pointing out the essential difference between our philosophy and their philosophy across the way. There are certain things that people cannot do for themselves. One of them is building roads. The floodway was another one. Building schools and hospitals, providing the kind of superstructure or infrastructure that enabled people to do things for themselves. That's the role of government from my point of view.

And the Minister of Industry and Commerce who now seems geared up to want to participate in the debate begins to make rude noises from his seat again. I'm going to give him a chance to participate in this debate because I would like to hear his contributions. I would like to have him address himself to the subject matter raised as a result of this resolution, raised by the House Leader. I've commented upon it, and I'd like to hear further comment from the other side of the House.

Sir, the fact is that these are serious problems. I maintain that we cannot rely upon the crutch of the minimum wage to provide a better life for the average worker. There's a better way of doing it. To continue to rely upon that crutch is going to destroy the very people that it's intended to help, and indeed when one looks at the welfare rolls today you're going to discover that to a large extent they are created by the minimum wage, because those people who are in marginal industries find themselves unable to stay in business if their costs continue to be forced up while they have no way of increasing the prices of the things that they are either manufacturing or the services that they're providing. I have run across so many people who say, the troubles that I have in attempting to keep a labour force under present conditions does not make it possible for me to survive. I'm better off to fold up my business and go and work for some big company. And that's happening every day, and it will continue to happen until we recognize that we can't impose conditions on the business community that make it impossible for them to survive, in the name of attempting to help somebody that is not being helped by measures that will not work.

I hope that the government recognizes that and they -- the Minister of Labour I see now is all primed and ready to respond, is all primed and ready to respond, and I hope that the Minister of Labour will address himself to that problem without ranting, without raving, without crying, and without threatening to resign. I hope that just once that the Minister of Labour can address himself to a very serious question that is raised from this side of the House and give some responsible answers. It would be my fond hope, Sir, that before the Minister does hand in his resignation, which I trust will be soon because I see the Member for Crescentwood sitting back there with an eager look on his face, and the Workmen's Compensation Board will benefit as a result of his resignation from this Chamber. I hope when he does rise, Sir, that he will deal very seriously with a matter that I have raised because I haven't, I haven't found a solution to it. I haven't been able to be convinced by anyone, as I said, I haven't heard of a reputable economist who has defended the minimum wage on economic grounds. Now the Minister of Labour can defend it all you like on social grounds, on humanitarian grounds, but I ask him to defend it on economic grounds, and I don't think he can do it.

But I am going to give him that opportunity because I see that he is poised and eager but insofar as the resolution is concerned and I frankly admit that I have strayed somewhat from it myself, I doubt very much if the intent of this resolution will achieve what its sponsor hopes it to achieve. If there are disparities between the northern part of the province and this part of the province, then that's nothing new. We've had disparities between the eastern part of this province and the western part of the province. We tend to try to overcome those disparities, and maybe, maybe some day, although we've lived with them for a hundred years, sometimes the tide turns a little bit, and just recently on the energy situation we find ourselves holding a few aces which we never held before. That might, even after a hundred years, give

## RESOLUTION 21

(MR. JORGENSEN Cont'd) . . . . this part of the country an advantage that we never had before, and an opportunity to pull up equal with those who have had the advantage for so many years.

The same could happen in the north. The resources that are up there, the wealth that is up there, the opportunities that are up there will be exploited by those people who have the courage and the initiative to go up there and work. And if the government feels that there must be something done to equalize the difficulty then one of the things that can be done for example in transportation, they can remove the tax, gasoline tax on those people who live north of the 53rd parallel. There are measures, there are things that can be done. The Minister of Finance may shake his head in dismay at that suggestion, but it is one suggestion that I am tossing out as a possibility. And now I know the Minister of Labour is so eager to participate in this debate, I will not delay him any longer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I hope I can ask a question of the Honourable Member for Morris and still give my colleague an opportunity to speak. Does he then accept or reject the statement by the Member for Roblin on Page 1834, and I quote: "I again stand up before the members of this Chamber and say that the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party of this province are in complete support of this resolution."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: The Member for Roblin of course speaks for himself. This happens to be Private Members' Hour, and I've always regarded the Private Members' Hour as an opportunity for the member to voice his own views on the subject matters that is brought before us during this period. Without taking away from the views of my friend from Roblin who is -- I certainly don't want to create the impression that we agree in everything, because we don't, anymore than I agree always with my honourable friends opposite. But I've always felt that the Private Members' House is an opportunity to give every shade of opinion on the subject that is brought before this Assembly, and I don't bother reading the speeches of previous members to determine what they've said so I can follow in line. I had a point of view that I wanted to express, and I did it on this occasion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well put too.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am to happy to hear from the Honourable Member for Morris that he has extolled his personal opinions insofar as minimum wages in Manitoba and elsewhere are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, he made reference to an interchange that took place yesterday evening as to whether or not I should tender my resignation, and as to whether or not it should be accepted. I want to say to my honourable friend this evening, I want to say to my honourable friend this evening, yes, I am not going to rant; I am not going to rave; I appreciate the plaudits from the honourable members opposite. I do want them to hear me out, Mr. Speaker, that I seriously took the stance I did last night insofar as possible withdrawal or resignation as a Cabinet Minister, as a member of this Assembly, but I want to say tonight, Mr. Speaker, I have become determined than ever to continue the fight until there is eradicated from society individuals who have the basic philosophies and ideologies of the Member for Morris.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, when we were under Orders of the Day I had the temerity to stand up in this House and to indicate that this was St. George's Day, that I was proud to have descended from my parents who were born in England, and that little tight isle, or part of a little tight isle, had fought for democracy, had fought for the rights of individuals. They had fought for a participation --(Interjection)-- even against dragons. Right, Mr. Speaker. And I would suggest that we saw a dragon here this evening, a dragon as exemplified by the Honourable the Member for Morris. This type of dragon was the reason that St. George had to slay individuals such as he, and that, Mr. Speaker, is now my purpose as Minister of Labour, and even if I weren't Minister of Labour, I will not rest content until the philosophy, as the Member for Morris has attempted to inject in our debate, is eradicated for all time, because there is nothing so regressive then the utterances of the Honourable Member for Morris.

Now I realize, Mr. Speaker, that you have indicated to me that there is something that you want to discuss or have I until 10:00 o'clock . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the Honourable to discuss the resolution before us.

## RESOLUTION 21

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I have, I have, Mr. Speaker. I have the resolution before me, and that resolution deals, that resolution deals with the rights by legislation, or otherwise, of people who make a contribution into society as to whether or not they shall receive a reasonable recompense for their efforts. The Honourable Member for Morris in his oration, Mr. Speaker, suggested that they should not, that we should go back to the feudal days, that we should go back to the ancestral home possibly of the Honourable Member for Morris, that no one should have the rights to receive a fair return for their efforts. The Honourable Member for Morris, he didn't say it - I suggest to my honourable friend the Member for Swan River that he should read Hansard and inwardly digest the archaic approach of the Honourable Member for Morris in today's society. He would go back to the days when there were no rights of the worker to receive - and I would imagine too, Mr. Speaker, by the utterance of the Honourable Member for Lakeside of a like nature, that there is no differences of opinion between them. You know there were days prior to Magna Carta that the light and even the Honourable Member for Swan River could be considered as a proper disciple as to the utterances of the Member for Morris, joined by the Member for Lakeside, that we should turn the clock back to the prior days of the Magna Carta when the little man for the first time stood up and said that we are human beings. And those three gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris, the Member for Lakeside, and indeed the Member for Swan River, are tarred with exactly the same brush that they don't give a damn, they don't give a continental about the common wheel. And I will continue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister will be able to continue another day. The hour of 10:00 o'clock having arrived the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Wednesday)