

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, April 30, 1973

SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs,

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, practically all those that made their remarks this afternoon are absent from the House but I imagine . . .

A MEMBER: But I am here.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . they'll read -- well maybe I should start with you then. Yes, my honourable friend from Osborne was worried about the water quality and there is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that because of the little snow and rainfall that we've had this winter and spring and that there is little water in the Rainy River Watershed that these -- Brereton Lake, I think that's the lake that he's concerned with, at least last year it was, and some of the other lakes in the Whiteshell. And we can expect excessive growth of the algae, weed growth, and some water stagnation unless the conditions greatly improve. The low levels in our lakes for the boating recreation will create dangerous navigating conditions and powerboat users are therefore warned to use extreme caution when navigating outside of known safe channels. The sparse snow and rainfall has created extremely dry conditions in our forest areas also, and this could present a real danger of forest fire, and I take this opportunity to caution those using the back country to use good common sense. The cottage owners in our parks should also be aware of the fire hazards around their cottage areas and take all due precautions.

Now the algae is not necessarily a result of low water levels. Many factors such as the warm water, the extent of sunlight, nutrients in the water can cause algae. The water resources branch in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources is aware of the existing condition. And I might say for the honourable member that there is little doubt that the algae can be controlled but only at a substantial cost. The cost would be prohibitive if this algacide treatment was to be extended over all our recreational lakes in the province. But the health inspectors are constantly checking and testing this water. Copper sulphate, he mentioned copper sulphate before the dinner hour. Well this certainly works well as an algacide but little is known about its residual effect in the aquatic flora and fauna, and until more is learned -- there is extensive use of that in different parts of Canada and the United States and until we learn more about that we are reluctant to recommend it for widespread use for fear of creating another mercury problem.

The honourable member also talked about West Hawk Lake. I would say to him that the main dock is relocated so that the boat storage and marina services will be well removed from the swimming area. We have been concerned about this intermixing of uses for some time and now we are taking corrective measures.

My honourable friend also had quite a bit to say about Hecla Island and I say to him that there has been no change in the plans for Hecla Island from what was originally proposed. It is to be a natural environment park focusing on the resources of the many islands within the park boundaries and the recreational potential for boating and sailing.

Our development program is aimed firstly at providing the basic services for visitor use as well as creating a proper setting for the park's core area. Thusly we have built some access roads, the sewage and water treatment services, the camping area and our maintenance facilities. This summer we will be working on beach and picnic space. We will also initiate work on the historic resources of the island, build trails and an amphitheatre for outdoor programs.

Then our next phase of work will concentrate on making the outer islands available for use by boat traffic.

The golf course use much of the open area on the north end of the island although new clearing was also necessary. It will be open next year and we forecast it to be one of the finest in western Canada.

The campground is located in an area that provides good wind shelter, tree cover that gives a degree of privacy yet within walking distance of the park core services.

The soil conditions are difficult but no more so than in many other locations in the other parks where we wished to locate campers convenient to the services that they will use most. Campers don't want to be in an open meadow and I will rely on the expert of my staff.

I would like to point out to my honourable friend that the local residents also advise us that the first big storm would wash away the new causeway but it's still there.

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . .

Our master planning program will take into account some of the user conflicts that exist in the park. We are considering confining motorboats and other similar recreation equipment to areas zoned especially for that purpose. In this zoning we will also have to work closely with the cottage owners, the campers, and wilderness users, so that all opinions are heard.

He talked about the navigation of Lake Winnipeg. Well the lake can indeed be dangerous to the uninitiated recreation boat. Two years ago the department completed a detailed survey of all harbors, channels, hazards, safe coves, etc., in preparation for future growing traffic. We are prepared to make this information available to the federal authorities who have the responsibility for charting same.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge -- I think I was saying just at 5:30 that we would like to develop a Heritage Manitoba Foundation that would parallel the new federal programs, that is the newly developed Heritage Canada and also Mr. Chretien's byways and special place programs. The Heritage Manitoba Foundation will be, when the necessary legislation is passed, a means whereby the public and private sector can work together to preserve historic areas, historic sites, buildings, and artifacts. It will operate much as the National Trust operates in the United Kingdom and borrow ideas of historic site preservation from countries in Europe and Asia. Families will be able to leave their homes and lands to the province and earn tax concessions and in turn the province will be able to share with private individuals and corporations in the preservation and restoration of important historic places and buildings. We will work, Mr. Chairman, in very close co-operation with the recently formed Heritage Canada at the national level and with our own provincial Heritage Foundation.

The Member of Crescentwood, I think I answered most of his questions, but I might say to him I should add that a proposal is under discussion by the Arts Council for a play writing contest with the winning play to be made available to both the MTC and the amateur theatre groups for production.

The Member of Souris-Killarney is back in his seat. I started to tell him that we have made a \$20,000 grant to the Royal Canadian Legion Sports Foundation, but I should also add that the Recreation Branch co-operates with the Sports Foundation in conducting their programs. We provide the Legion with some financial assistance for the coach clinics conducted at the International Peace Gardens. The camping facilities at Adam Lake in the Turtle Mountain area Mountain Park, were open on an interim basis in midsummer of last summer, last year. The site has 40 campsites which received excellent reception for the short period services were available, and good use was made of the swimming area that was built as part of these facilities. As far as numbers are concerned I can't give him this information; it was only done on an interim . . .

The Honourable Member from Point Douglas is also absent but he spoke of preserving of the area around Point Douglas, and I believe that I covered most of these points when answering the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge. He also spoke of multiculturalism, and this is something that is considered to be of the utmost importance by this department, Mr. Chairman; in order to promote national unity, preservation of the different cultures and to give confidence to our new Manitobans.

We also wish to create a tourist policy that will stimulate tourism and help the tourist industry. And this is the reason why we've assisted the different ethnic festivals, such as the Dauphin Festival, the Festival du Voyageur, and others. We've also been very pleased with the work of the Folk Art Council in promoting Folklorama, which is second to none here in Canada and which was visited by many of the . . . -- (Interjection) -- I wonder if the Member can slow down a bit, I can hardly hear myself talk.

A MEMBER: Tom, sit down for God's sake.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Our Advisory Board on Multiculturalism was also named a few month's ago, Mr. Chairman.

There was the Honourable Member from Assiniboia -- he claimed that the Whiteshell is congested, and I say to him -- and then he talks about what the former government has done -- but I say to him that one of the reasons is because of the lack of proper planning -- and I don't blame any past government -- he was talking about the Campbell administration,

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . and so on. This is something new; this is something that troubled all parts of North America, and all parts of the world; and it is impossible to satisfy everybody. I think that we had an example of this this afternoon where we had a fellow that wants to stay - to keep the park in the natural surroundings. He doesn't want - take my honourable friend from Osborne, he didn't even want a golf course; and then my friend from Assiniboia wanted it the other way around, everything for recreation. I think that our new act will try to remedy this to satisfy as many people as possible.

I think if my honourable friend and others before criticizing too much should look at our master - our plans that we have for our different parks. I can say that we had three meetings to discuss the Duck Mountain plans. The first meeting wasn't too well received, the people didn't really understand, but after the third meeting most of the people were in accord that we needed something like that. For instance, in the Duck Mountain area there's approximately 200 square miles of land and I think that 90, 95 percent would be kept in the natural surroundings the way it is now, but we definitely need, and we intend to have some developments that will help promote tourism, and will help people of the different parts of the province to come in and to enjoy those parks also.

We certainly will discuss any future planning with the people in the areas, but if anybody feels that a certain part of the province belongs to some people they are definitely wrong and this will not be considered. The province belongs to all people of Manitoba. The same areas that are at times quite parochial, they want to see their little cottage, they want nobody around there, and they want to enjoy this thing and they don't want anybody else to enjoy it; well, we will not have too much patience with these people. And these people in the area also want us - they tell us every day, you're trying to promote tourism only in the areas around the city, and I say to them, well this is a way of promoting tourism to bring tourists in their part of the province, and this is what we are trying to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The time allotted for the Minister has expired. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Chairman, I just have one or two brief remarks to make in regard to the Department of Tourism and Recreation. I notice from time to time members getting up in the Assembly and asking the Minister to raise taxes on golf clubs and curling clubs, or at least to give concessions of a type, and I would ask him to give serious consideration before making a decision on that because I feel that when you go to a golf course on a Sunday morning and you see a Cadillac coming in there worth \$10,000 and a man wearing a 60-dollar pair of golfing shoes and pushing a cart, bringing along a 300-dollar set of clubs with it, I would consider not only is he a Conservative, but he's a rich Conservative. He's one of those -- what do they -- fat cats. He's a fat cat Conservative and I would say, please don't in your department ever make recommendations to your people to start setting together any tax reform in that area, be they Conservative or rich NDPs, whatever they are. I think that this would be a move in the wrong direction. Anybody that can afford to play golf or to curl, I think that they should be able to pay their own way. I would sooner see money spent in that area towards people, senior citizens, and to areas of groups of younger people that are more in need of it.

I looked today, Mr. Chairman, with interest at the annual report of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation and I would ask for some clarification from the Minister on this. I checked through on Exhibit A and I see that once again to the construction of the centre of cultural Franco-Manitoban, however that's said, have \$713,000, and I noticed on Exhibit C to the same people, to the same cultural centre, some \$735,000; and then near the last page of it, on the overall statement, there was a million dollars passed to the, I think, somewhere in towards -- it was a centennial project effort, but it all took place for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, so I would like some explanation from the Minister on that because it seems to me that last year we passed some Bill 49, I believe it was, and this gave that same group \$100,000 to spend for working capital or to use for working capital, as well as giving them the authority to borrow some 100 or 200,000 dollars. So I'm concerned about that because it seems to me that going in to one group of people, one culture, one group of French people, there's a lot of money, it totals 2.4 or 5, \$2 1/2 million, and it seems that the population ratio within the province doesn't warrant that. The Anglo Saxon group has close to two-thirds or at least .6 or 60 percent, pardon me, of the population of the province. The Germans have 82,000 out of a million, the Ukrainians 72,000, and the French have 60,000, and I wonder

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . why we have a cultural centre for the French in the first instance.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. MOUG: . . . why do we spend this kind of money? Why can I pick \$2 1/2 million out of this annual report here from the Centennial Corporation? Why do we pass a bill through this Legislature last year authorizing \$100,000 working capital, and it just seems to me that it's a lot of money to simply re-elect one Minister. I can't . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I suggest that the honourable member withdraw those last remarks which are uncalled for in this House, unless he can prove it. Prove it or shut up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I recognize the opinion expressed may well be strong, but it is an opinion and the stating of a matter of opinion is not a question of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's a statement that he's made.

MR. MOUG: Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, I think that if you check back during the four years that I've been elected that probably 50 percent of the things I've said are not absolutely truly correct, but I have to put out, I have to put out exactly what I think. The only statement I've made in here that I can be absolutely sure of is when I said that I thought the Member for Flin Flon, that was a character that had been created by Al Capp, and I still think that is correct. -- (Interjection) -- I can see no way out of that -- (Interjection) -- But certainly, Sir, when you look at the amount of dollars, \$2 1/2 million in this one annual report on the Centennial Corporation, plus \$100,000 that we mentioned before -- now Trudeau's been making a mistake in Ottawa, we know it. It was proven him last October 30th. He searched through Ottawa and dumped dollars and dollars and dollars into Quebec. And there was no way could he get votes other than in Ottawa. And I say to the First Minister of this province that there's no way he can get re-elected by dumping dollars only into St. Boniface. -- (Interjection) -- And I don't object to anybody, I don't object to anybody that wants to spend dollars on any culture:-- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, if you would kindly ask that man to be quiet I would appreciate it. But I say to you, Sir, that there's no way that the government is doing the right thing. How can they expect to get the support of the balance of the province when they simply keep dumping money into a Cultural Centre in St. Boniface? -- (Interjection) -- Well the odd part about it is the Anglo Saxons have not got a cultural centre in Manitoba. The Jewish people, the Jewish people have not got a cultural centre in the Province of Manitoba. The German people have not got a cultural centre in the Province of Manitoba. The Ukrainians haven't; the Polish haven't; the Italians haven't, and our First Minister sits there and waves his head as much to say, the Member for Charleswood's wrong. Well I'm not wrong because this is the case. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me?

A MEMBER: . . . look at the whole background of it all.

MR. MOUG: Well I say no, I say no. You show me an Anglo Saxon cultural centre or a German or Ukrainian or Polish cultural centre. Where is it? -- (Interjection) -- Pardon.

MR. SCHREYER: And who had something to do with . . .

MR. MOUG: There's no way -- I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, . . . . asked the question . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order. Is the honourable member finished?

MR. MOUG: No, I'm not. Mr. Chairman, I say that the First Minister as he gets out of order across the floor saying that I am wrong when I say that the Anglo Saxons of this province have not got a cultural centre, they haven't. We share one. We shared with the Jewish, the Polish, the Ukrainians, the Germans; we shared with everybody -- and I see nothing wrong with that. I see nothing wrong with it, even the Icelanders, as my friend from Rock Lake says. But I am sure that my good friend the Honourable Member from Wellington would agree with; that even the Icelanders we have to share that with, and that's a problem because I have a wife that's Icelandic. But I'll tell you that's going to great lengths when we have to share our cultural centre with them. But at any rate, Mr. Chairman, we've been spending a lot of money into that one area and to the one group of people, and I certainly have no objections to my good friends in this Legislature -- the Member from Emerson here is a friend of mine, and he happens to be French and I'm sure that he's proud that he sits on this side of the House.

This is not something that started lately. Ever since the time that this government came into power and the Member for St. Boniface switched allegiance to keep this government buoyant, the pay-offs were going steady, steady, steady into that side of the city. It's not only from the government these payments are coming, the City of Winnipeg will gladly give at any

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . time — \$35,000 to St. Boniface for the Festival du Voyageur. The Minister said two minutes ago before he sat down, the last statement he made I'm sure, was a commitment he made to the Festival du Voyageur. This goes on and on and on. Charleswood as an individual municipality previous to becoming part of the City of Winnipeg when I was out there, we couldn't get 15 cents out of the city; we couldn't get 15 cents out of the government. -- (Interjection) -- Not 15 cents. Last year after it was part of the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Chairman, the City of Winnipeg did not put anything out there to a group in Charleswood that has the same type thing as the Festival du Voyageur in St. Boniface, they call it "Charleswood in Motion Days". They couldn't get 15 cents from the City of Winnipeg. When the Legion came in and played their Dominion Finals in Charleswood which is a once a year, once in Canada, type thing in the calendar year, couldn't get 15 cents out of this government, not 15 cents out of this government. And I can understand why. How can you possibly buy all those votes in St. Boniface and also help support Festival du Voyageur -- the Charleswood in Motion Days after you dumped it all into the Festival du Voyageur, and the Cultural Centre. I would like an explanation because I think I'm wrong on this. There's \$713,000 on . . . there's \$735,000 on the last page on the general statement of total expenditures, and Centennial Projects, \$1 million. So I would think that if a person dug back to things that we've had since I've been in this House that comes . . . you could pick up a good many. I had an Order for Return, that the Festival du Voyageur was \$35,000, \$40,000 -- the City of Winnipeg was helping in this. I would just like an explanation, Mr. Chairman, of that. It would more than satisfy the people in Charleswood.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . because I think I certainly also have opinions. My opinion is that he is the most narrow minded person in this House. He's proven that in the past, and he doesn't know what the hell he's talking about. No. 2, Mr. Chairman, he's talking about a couple of million dollars or a million dollars. Let me tell him first of all that this . . . for one thing is not for St. Boniface. It's a Franco-Manitoba cultural centre and it is not only for people who are French. There is in this country, if he likes it or not, it is the policy of this government -- we're not going to hide behind that -- and it's the policy of the government in Ottawa, and up to now I thought -- well, that's unfair -- I still think it is the policy of the Conservative Party, at least in Ottawa -- (Interjection) -- It's fine. Let me say that first of all that this setup of construction of a cultural centre started with the Weir and Roblin government. That's where the promise came from first of all. -- (Interjection) -- There's my man that knows it all.

Now, secondly, there is not the amount that he's talking about because the Federal Government made a grant of \$5 million to the Province of Manitoba for the Centennial of the province. One of the riders was that half a million dollars at the time would be used for a cultural centre for the people that wanted to speak French, not necessarily just the French people. And the French people, I can exactly like my honourable friend said, they shared with the Jewish people, with the Italian people, even with the people from Charleswood, even with this character from Charleswood if he wants to come, anybody can share it. It does not belong to the French people. And the amount that he's talking about is all wet. -- (Interjection) -- I'm explaining it, if you'll keep quiet I'm explaining it. You've been wanting this for a hell of a long time because you're so narrow minded, and you've had your claim to fame is to be the defender, try to attack me on that, and you talked about the Festival du Voyageur, because you're so damn narrow minded.

Mr. Chairman, he's talking about tourism, he didn't say a word about Dauphin. He didn't say a word about Dauphin and if he wants it I'll give him the report from Dauphin to see what it's meant for the people of the area. He's talking about St. Boniface as a city, there is no more City of St. Boniface, it's the City of Winnipeg, it's the Greater City of Winnipeg, and certainly the City are making grants because they're not all narrow minded like my friend who sends this hate literature once in awhile around Manitoba. This is what my friend is doing now. This was thought of by a Conservative government who accepted from Ottawa that they would pay half a million dollars and who said, who agreed in principle, that they would match that. That is your government, your former government. You don't like that but it's the truth. You're . . . you haven't got any brains at all, you're just a fanatic, that's all.

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . .

Now, Mr. Chairman, he doesn't like it when he gets the answer and the total that was given from the province was \$650,000, and the same amount from the Federal Government. As I say this was received — the approval in principle from the former government. It is true that we passed a bill and we give the possibility the bill will provide funds for operating costs; \$5,000 has been given so far, and it's not even operating costs, the building is not finished. So this is what it has cost the Province of Manitoba, 600 -- aw, shut up -- \$650,000, not a million and a half, this is what it cost. If he can't count, it's not my fault, and if he doesn't like it he can tell his former colleagues who are not as fanatic as he is or as narrow minded as he is. I wonder how proud he is . . .

Now he's talking about Festival of Manitoba as I say, the Festival of Manitoba is an ethnic festival, and we're proud of that. And there'll be others, there'll be others. There's one in Dauphin that's doing quite well. And we've helped the others. Now there has been -- before I became a Minister, Mr. Chairman, before I became a Minister, much before that, there was \$15,000 given to the Festival du Voyageur and this is what they received year after year, and I hope that they will keep receiving that.

My honourable friend forgets that there is the question of the linguistic policy of this government and the government where the Party, all the Parties and there's the cultural -- there are languages that are promoting culture, and we're very proud of that, and we've done a heck of a lot more than this former government has done or that my narrow minded friend from Charleswood has ever done.

A MEMBER: Trudeau failed.

MR. DESJARDINS: Trudeau failed, but it's funny -- in case you don't know I think you should call him Prime Minister Trudeau because he's still there, and you're not, and you're not. He's still there, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- he's still there. -- (Interjection) -- Without principle. I think he's got a hell of a lot more principle than my honourable friend from Charleswood who hasn't got any brains nor principle. -- (Interjections) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . and he keeps sending hate literature around this province and this is what he does; this is his claim to fame, his claim to fame, Mr. Chairman. We agree, and I will tell him the policy of this government if he wants. We have a linguistic policy and we believe in the biculturalism in Canada. We believe in the two languages, official languages in Canada, and we provide means for these people to promote our culture; we're not ashamed of that at all, and we're joined at least by the Federal Conservative Party, and also the former Conservative Government in this province, and certainly with the Federal Government and this Provincial Government. So before my honourable friend goes off half-cocked again and makes statements that he can't back, he should try to find out a little more about that. If he's talking about a million dollars it's because the money from the Centennial Corporation, the grant from Ottawa came to the province and the province had to make the dispersement. And this is where he's talking about that other \$650,000, that is a grant from Ottawa and directed exactly for that purpose. So I'm not going to spend any more time with this maniac out there, Mr. Chairman, but I'll defend our policy. -- (Interjection) -- There were four members -- he's talking about people leaving parties. Does he know now why I would never allow the Conservatives -- sit down, unless you've got a point of order -- I'm not . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood on a point of order.

MR. MOUG: It's up to you, Sir, to make a decision as to whether he can call me a maniac in this House, whether it's parliamentary language.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's only my opinion, Mr. Chairman, and the opinion of practically 57 other members. But I'm told that we can give opinions in this House. This is my opinion; he's a maniac, and a narrow minded one at that, Mr. Chairman. -- (Interjection) -- What? You invented the word. You invented the word.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think that there's any point wasting any more time with this person. He was talking about buying votes. I don't think that we have to buy votes, all we have to do is listen to these people. All I have to do is take his speech and send it to the people of St. Boniface, and I'll guarantee that there's no Conservative ever going to win St. Boniface. -- (Interjection) -- Would you like to bet? I'd like to make the bet, give the bet the fellow \$1,000 for a certain thing . . .

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. -- (Interjection) -- Order, please.

MR. DESJARDINS: We'll find out. We will find out. -- (Interjections) -- There were four members that left -- talking about switching Parties -- there were four members of the Liberal Party who didn't like the policy of the Schreyer -- Mr. Schreyer's policy during the last election and they joined the Conservative Party. Every single one of them because they didn't like the policy of that, and they were talking about the policy from Ottawa; they thought they'd capitalize on that. Every single one of them, of those former Liberals lost their deposit, Mr. Chairman.

Well, I don't think that this man warrants any more time in this House. I'd like to keep on -- (Interjections) -- calling the -- answering now the Honourable Member from Assiniboia. He was talking about a road to the east side of Lake Winnipeg, and I would agree with him that it has fine potential, but the road development programs are very costly, as my honourable friend should know, and at this time it is not, certainly not the first priority of the department or of the government.

Now he said that during the last ten years or so he's been hearing that we were looking at a second national park. I think it was only two years ago that a committee was formed representative of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, and Mines and Natural Resources, and they are looking at the situation of a second national park. And a second national park, certainly it'll be a good thing for Manitoba, it'll be a good thing for Manitoba if we don't rush into it, if we try to find the right spot for it, if we don't give all the resources away, because you know, we have to sign everything to the Federal Government, we're not allowed to rush into this. Facilities are there for the people that want it. The thing is that if we have a second national park we hope that it would be in an area where it'll provide jobs, especially for our native people, and we would hope to use the Federal Government to help develop roads in the area that will help mostly the north part of our province. So we won't be rushed into this.

My honourable friend also mentioned Ninette. He said it wasn't in my department, it was in the Department of Health. Well, he's wrong because it has nothing to do with any department. The Sanatorium Board is not part of the province, or the Provincial Government, or any agency of the Provincial Government, and they own the Ninette Sanatorium, the former Ninette Sanatorium. I might say to my honourable friend that I was quite enthused also, I felt that maybe there should be quite a facility that would go there and I with some of the senior people in my department, we visited Ninette; we looked at all the possibilities and then we commissioned the Department of Public Works to make a survey to find out what it would cost. But most of these buildings were built around 1920. They're not in very good condition, and as I stated previously in this House, it would cost us about \$1 million, we'd have to put \$1 million just to keep the buildings going -- this is not changing walls or partitions or anything like that. The water was not in as good condition that we thought in the lake up there, and then the operating costs, this famous operating cost that my friend from Charleswood probably went out to phone his friends. He's not in the House now, but anyway -- (Interjection) -- he's got one I think -- he's got a fellow that works, the other fellow that sends this hate literature all across Manitoba. So anyway this would cost about from 100 to 140,000 dollars a year just to keep this going and it's not worth it. We would like to keep this place going in Ninette if at all possible, but I suggest to my honourable friend, it's not viable; it's not something that could be considered; it would be too costly. It's unfortunate, but that is the score.

Now my honourable friend also mentioned the speech of his leader of yesterday-- and I don't know if he said that I criticized it. I did not criticize the speech of the leader. I gave him the information I didn't like the idea that he mentioned that there was \$25,000 spent for sports, for amateur sports, and so on, when there was close to \$2 million committed. It's not exactly the same thing and I pointed that out. I think that my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party realized that and he accepted that, and the Leader of the Liberal Party was also absent when we've talked about tourism.

Now my honourable friends seem to think that there's something wrong because the tourist industry is about the second or third largest industry in Canada, when we're dealing with Canada, and in Manitoba it's only the fifth. But I don't think that this means a darn thing. I wish it was as good as it is now, and if it was 20th it would be a lot better for Manitoba. But I can say that we certainly have improved; probably this province has improved

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . more than any of the provinces across the Dominion. As I mentioned the number of visitors increased to 7,7 percent over 1971 to close to going on well on our part to 3,5 million. The American visitors entering Manitoba also increased by 19,4 percent over last year compared to a decline of 3,6 percent for Canada. And a contribution to the provincial gross product was \$211,5 million, an increase of 10,2 percent over 1971. So I don't think that we have to accept the statement of the Leader of the Liberal Party that the industry is not improving an awful lot here in Manitoba.

I think that we've had an example today, Mr. Chairman, how important planning is in this department. I can say that I was guilty also of trying to do too many things too fast. We'd plug a hole only to see another hole opening. Now we've reorganized the department; we attach a lot of importance in planning. We want progress but not progress just for the sake of progress, and we don't want to steam roll this progress through and then that the people of Manitoba will suffer in years to come. There is an awful lot of planning that we need. We want a very healthy tourist industry but not at all cost, not at cost of taking everything away, and the resources of our provinces taking that away from the people of Manitoba. There will be more and more leisure time. The people are retiring as a whole at an earlier age. There are more holidays in each year for most of the people, and also I think there'll be shorter working hours. So, this is something that we need, those resources here in Manitoba. There is a shortage of them, we know that. I'm not going to stand up here and say that we're satisfied, that this department is satisfied that everything is perfect — far from it. We have a lot of catching up to do. There are an awful lot of demands for those recreational facilities. We have to develop our parks if we want to bring tourists, not only from the United States, not only from the rest of Canada, but also from within our province. For the last two years we've advertised; we've had a program of in-province advertising, and we think that it's paying off. It's letting our people here in Manitoba take advantage of the resources of Manitoba, and it's keeping dollars that would be spent elsewhere, and this is just that the dollar is worth just as much, the dollar that our people spend here than if — instead of spending it in the States or somewhere else. So, Mr. Chairman, although we think that we're on the right direction, I think that we have a lot of catching up to do.

As I said today, I would like to thank all the members, except the Honourable Member from Charleswood -- and I use the term very loosely -- for their remarks. I think that they were constructive; I think that they were sincere, and I can assure you that their constructive criticism will be considered in developing any new programs in this department. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister of Tourism and Recreation he ended in such a low key that I don't really feel compelled to make the opening remarks which I had felt a little while ago that I might, should have made, which was that I prepared to come on like a bridge over troubled waters and remind the Honourable Minister, as he indeed has reminded us, that the Progressive Conservative Party certainly needs no reminder of our responsibilities with respect to the cultural makeup of this province, nor our dedication to the course that we have set upon ourselves within this nation in recognizing that same course. In fact, if the members of the New Democratic Party want to be reminded of the fact, then I'm prepared to remind them of that fact that to date, that the people of Quebec, for instance, have not yet seen fit to place their faith in any single member of their party to carry out their expressed wishes, whereas they have done in history gone by elected many prominent members of the Conservative Party to serve that party, and that culture in the highest office, namely in the office of the representatives in the Ottawa government.

However, Mr. Chairman, I really was diverted momentarily from making remarks that I wanted to make. I did, despite the fact that I have been known to joust with the Honourable Minister from time to time, did wish to rise on this occasion to congratulate the Minister for being one of the Ministers to date that has probably taken more time to answer questions in detail — I think most poignantly on the Minister whose Estimates that were just passed, and it is a sad reflection that when the Official Opposition has to make that move out of sheer desperation where no answers are forthcoming and only rhetoric, and only nonsense, and only garbage, is forthcoming that the Official Opposition moved that — took that unusual move to suggest that we forego consideration of his Estimates because there was no point in asking



## SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . questions. I concede to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation that he is giving us answers to the questions, the legitimate questions being asked on this side of the House, and for that I thank him.

Well Mr. Chairman, I do have a specific purpose for rising on this occasion to make a special appeal to him, to make a special appeal to him and, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that he of all Ministers will appreciate the fact that I choose to make that appeal in my own native and cultural language. And it is simply this:

(German spoken here. Will appear with translation in a later Hansard.)

MR. FROESE: On a point of order. I think he used one word that was unparliamentary. (Laughter)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would caution the honourable member if he's using unparliamentary language to not do so.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I thought I detected a frown on your brow too so I withdraw that comment. But, Mr. Chairman, briefly, and I've had my little moment, what I was saying and with a degree of sincerity is that the coming year for the Mennonite community of Manitoba, we are preparing our 100th year celebration of our arrival to this fair province, and I make an appeal to the Honourable Minister, and his department, and I for purposes of translation that obviously he'll recognize the difficulty that I'm in because if I suggest for a moment that he should concern himself with that, then I'm conceding that he may still be in office next year. And I really don't want to do that. But nonetheless, nonetheless, knowing the capable staff that he has that would look after these kind of functions, I appeal through him, through his staff, that they will take due cognizance of the fact that the Mennonite community has indeed made their own indelible impression upon the cultural mosaic of our province and that they are, they are in full flight, if I may use that expression, in many plans of their to commemorate that occasion when they first came to the Province of Manitoba in the year 1874. And by the way, Mr. Chairman, this really is not the night that I want to pick on Icelanders but it happens to be that we got here before the Icelanders, much to — as much as that may provoke another debate.

But in the truest possible sense of recognizing the very real contribution the various cultural, various cultures, and the various cultural backgrounds that we Manitobans have brought to the formation of this province, to our, what I'd like to believe to be a genuine demonstration of our capability of living together and of creating possibly the best of all possible societies in this province; that if indeed in a small measure to indicate officially the province's appreciation of this particular cultural group of people's background and contribution to this province, that the Department of Tourism and Recreation are prepared, as I'm sure they are, and will indeed assist in every way possible to make this a memorable occasion for celebration for a relatively significant group of Manitobans.

I'd appreciate if the Minister had any comments to make with this respect, or if he's aware of any of the current plans, or ongoing plans, that are being made in this regard, and I await his reply. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, -- (Interjection) -- No I won't correct the honourable member's speech. In fact, I would like to speak the other German that we use and which is a written language. The one that he uses is a more or less a dialect that is not written language and I would — I think the people that are to transcribe will find it very difficult to do so. So if I may address a few words in the German I would be happy to do so. -- (Interjection) --

(German spoken here. Will appear with translation in a later Hansard.)

Now Mr. Chairman, I have briefly related similar remarks to what Mr. — well I shouldn't say Mr. Enns, I should say the Member for Lakeside said, that we appreciate as Mennonites, as a group of people here, that we've been able to move and immigrate to this country and make our home here. -- (Interjection) -- On a point of order?

MR. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would like to also have a chance and say a few words in my own language.

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's not a point of order. Order. -- (Interjection) --

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, on that same point of order, I think we're just running a big show here. We haven't got translation in here. The rest of us are sitting here, we can all understand English and everybody knows what we're saying. What are we trying to do? Put on a show?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Member from Ste. Rose on the same point of order.

MR. A. R. (Peter) ADAM (Ste. Rose): If the Honourable Member for Pembina will be patient, I'll speak in Spanish. (Laughter)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Well, I think the hour is close approaching that we will be adjourning for tonight anyway, so I might as well use up these few minutes. We would, we would as a people in the Province of Manitoba, as Mennonites, certainly appreciate anything that the Minister can do and this government can do to facilitate us in celebrating the 100th Anniversary in 1974. And certainly I hope that the occasion will present itself where you people, as members of the government, and all members of the Legislative Assembly here in Manitoba, we will have an election in-between, we don't know who the government is going to be or who the members are going to be, whether I'm still going to be a part of it or not, that the people of this province will determine. But certainly the celebrations will be on anyway and I do hope when these take place that all members will be availing themselves of the opportunity to join in in the festivities.

. . . . . Continued on next page.

## SUPPLY - TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 9:00 o'clock, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour. Private Members' resolutions. Resolution No. 4. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, . . . Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, could I have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: It'll drop to the bottom of the Order Paper. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order so there is no misunderstanding. Unfortunately the matter will have to proceed and I believe that the Leader of the Opposition will just lose his chance, unless the Member for Morris is trying now to reach him; we can wait a minute or so.

MR. PAULLEY: Hold back for a second and wake him up.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I'm amenable to waiting for a few minutes. Possibly we could revive United Nations hour for another five minutes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. - Is he coming or not? Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member for Morris -- (Interjection) -- was going to get the Leader of the Opposition or he's not here tonight?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, according to our rules since the Leader of the Opposition is not here, if no one picks up the debate there is a vote call on the particular resolution, but the Member for Emerson has a right to close this debate since it is his resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: He can speak on the amendment -- (Interjection) --

MR. JORGENSEN: Well he can speak on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: That's correct.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was wanting to speak on this question.

MR. SPEAKER: Well the floor is open on the question of Resolution No. 4, and the resolution has been amended by the Honourable Member for St. Vital. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I particularly wanted to speak on this amendment for two reasons; one, because it's one that, as some members will know in any event, interests me a great deal in terms of the subject matter; and secondly, because of the speeches that were made with respect to it both by the Member for Lakeside and merely what I read and the reaction of the Member for Emerson to the amendment that has been proposed. In particular, Mr. Speaker, when one looks at this amendment for the first time, it appears to be a suggestion that there be a form of arbitration, although it doesn't say that and I'll explain that in a moment, it appears to suggest that there be a form of dealing with labour disputes as they affect essential industries in a manner other than the freedom of collective bargaining as between the parties. And as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Member for La Verendrye has a resolution on the Order Paper, which I think I mentioned to him may or may not offer that as a subject - contain the same subject matter as is contained in the Member for Emerson's resolution.

However, Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the resolution that has been proposed by the Member for Emerson, it becomes apparent that the Member for Emerson is saying nothing else but that he would like there to be less labour disputes in matters as affecting the essential industries of Manitoba. And I suppose that that is a wish which would be shared by everybody in this Assembly. And I don't even think, Mr. Speaker, that in that particular desire one would even limit it to what are commonly referred to and yet never adequately defined as essential services.

## RESOLUTION No. 4

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . Because Mr. Speaker, the area of essential services has never really been defined and I would expect that as things proceeded, any labour dispute could be looked upon as affecting an essential service to the people of Manitoba, although that would be carrying it perhaps to a logical absurdity. The fact is that the steps in between would certainly be subject to great argument. For instance, is a strike in the construction industry a strike affecting an essential service? Is a strike in the elevator industry a strike affecting an essential service? Is a strike in the transit industry affecting one which is essential, which is an essential service? Is one in the lumber industry or one in the forestry industry? And I think that, really, the definition depends on who is the affected, and if certain people are being affected and are having their employment opportunities interfered with, or their profit interfered with, or a supply interfered with, then of course they would regard it as an essential service and quite properly so. Therefore the category of defining essential service has always been a problem. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, that really isn't the heart of what I would like to say today.

The Member for Emerson proposed a resolution which, I repeat, says nothing more than we would like there to be less labour disputes in essential industries. And there is absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker, contained in his resolution, which suggests as to how you will have less labour disputes in essential industries as against how you will have more disputes in essential industries. And therefore he is really expressing a desire, and the surprise that I had is that when someone came along and made an amendment which indicated a direction whereby you get less industrial disputes with respect to essential industry, that the Member for Emerson looked upon the amendment as a cop-out. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the amendment which does suggest a means of resolving labour disputes in essential industry is a cop-out, then what is the resolution which proposes nothing with regard to disputes and essential industry?

The Member for Emerson so drafted his resolution as to studiously avoid the suggestion that there be compulsory arbitration with regard to disputes in essential industries. And the reason, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that he did that, is that he wanted to both propose that he is trying to deal with this question and yet he wanted to stay away from the suggestion that there be compulsory arbitration. And yet, Mr. Speaker - and this is the talk that I am referring to - the Member for Lakeside got up on this resolution and says, "Now we're going to see whether you people have got the courage of our convictions. Now we're going to see whether you're going to talk about satisfying where your bucks come from." I think that's the paraphrase of his language - I hope I'm not being unfair to him. "Now we're going to see whether you people are prepared to deal with this question or not to deal with this question."

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have put, or the Member for St. Vital has put an amendment on the Order Paper. The amendment says how you will have less dispute in industrial relations. And he is saying to the Member for Lakeside that historically the study of industrial relations will show that where you have free collective bargaining you have better productivity, you have less industrial disputes, and where we have more restrictive positions as between employers and employees you will have more industrial disputes. What he has said, Mr. Speaker, in effect is that freedom of contract as between individuals, as between employers on the one side and employees on the other side, that freedom of action, the freedom of an employee to say that he will work under certain conditions of employment or he will not work under certain conditions of employment, and his freedom to say to his fellow worker that "I want you to join with me in refusing to work for conditions of employment which the two of us do not agree with," and the other side of the coin, Mr. Speaker, freedom of the employer to say that "no third party will tell me that I must stay in business at wage rates that I cannot afford," that those two freedoms are preserved by the mover of the amendment to the resolution.

Now I want the honourable member to put his money where his mouth is. He stands for freedom, he stands for liberty, he stands for the right of an individual to say that he will not be governed by the state, he stands for the right of an individual to say that he will operate a business in accordance with the way that he sees fit and that he will not be pushed around by the state. He is for freedom. Now I ask him to put his money where his mouth is and vote for the amendment, because the amendment says nothing more, Mr. Speaker, than that freedom . . .

MR. ENNS: I hate to interrupt the member, would he submit to a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes, certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

## RESOLUTION No. 4

MR. ENNS: I do this reluctantly because I don't like to disrupt the Minister in stride. But will he, will he address himself to the resolution and separate the question of collective bargaining per se as to the question of vital services, disruption of possible vital services? To me that is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I already dealt with the question of vital services and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that freedom in our society cannot be separate; that every individual in society should have the same freedom to deal with these questions as does my honourable friend; that if the medical profession -- and I want to indicate to the honourable member that I did not speak with two voices on this question. When the Province of Quebec said to the doctors in the Province of Quebec that "you will either render medical services or go to jail," I was on the side of the doctors in the Province of Quebec and spoke out publicly in their favour. That is an essential service, and the doctors of Quebec, Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- yes, certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Did the Minister also do the same when dealing with the insurance agents in the Public Auto Insurance debate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, the insurance agents in the Province of Manitoba have never been forced to work for Autopac, nor have the people in the Province of Manitoba been forced to maintain a system of automobile insurance which they did not agree with. And both sides, Mr. Speaker, had the right to their freedom. And Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba still have a right to say through their elected representatives what kind of automobile insurance plan they will have. Is the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell really saying that if 57 members of the Legislature unanimously decided that they would want to have a particular form of automobile insurance underwritten by the people of the Province of Manitoba, that that is an infringement on a person who is now delivering that service, that he must be required at all cost in perpetuity ad infinitum, even if the total population were against him, that he must have the right to continue with that service, because that is the rationale that my honourable friend is referring to. And we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a proposition which both the Member for Emerson and the Member for Lakeside have tried to, in their words, cop out on. Because when they start talking about essential services, they have to start talking about the liberty of the employer and the liberty of the employee.

Now I want to know whether the Honourable the Member for Lakeside takes the position that the Civil Service is a public service, that it is an essential service, although I'm sure that you will find argument to the contrary, that some people would say -- as a matter of fact, I hear it from the Member, Leader of the Opposition all the time, that the Civil Service is completely unessential and they shouldn't be working at all. But let us assume that the Civil Service is an essential industry. Does the Honourable Member for Lakeside take the position that we in this Chamber have got nothing to say about it, that the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba have nothing to say about it? That if the wage rates of Civil Service as determined by some third party, maybe a judge, maybe somebody else, says that the Civil Service wages shall be doubled and there will therefore be an increase of three or four percent in the sales tax, does the Member for Lakeside say that the people of Manitoba have got nothing to say about this? Because that's what it comes down to. And the most striking example of that, Mr. Chairman, was the ad which appeared by the elevator contractors, and in this respect, Mr. Speaker, I was on their side. The elevator contractors published an ad in the paper in Ontario. I wasn't on their side of the dispute so let there be no misunderstanding.

A MEMBER: . . . clarify that.

MR. GREEN: But I was -- I'll tell you what I was on their side about. I'll tell you what I was -- (Interjection) -- I'll tell you what I was on their side about. They said that we have a right not to submit this dispute to compulsory arbitration. We have a right to resist what a third party says we should pay. We have a right to go out of business, or not continue in business under rates that a third party will set, and we want to solve this dispute with our employees and the employees asked for compulsory arbitration, and significantly, the government of Ontario because it happened to be the employee who was asking for compulsory arbitration, were

## RESOLUTION No. 4

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . prepared to legislate compulsory arbitration against an employer, and Mr. Speaker, I was against that; I was against the legislation of compulsory arbitration. I wasn't for the employer in dispute, I merely indicated to the Honourable Member for Emerson that that is not the way of solving labour disputes -- and I'll prove it to you, Mr. Speaker. You take the firemen in the City of Winnipeg, and here's a perfect example. The firemen in the City of Winnipeg were subject to compulsory arbitration. They submitted a dispute to arbitration and J. Gurzon Harvey, the late J. Gurzon Harvey, who was at that time one of the heads of committees of the City of Winnipeg, said that if that Compulsory Arbitration Board orders payment of more than six percent, we will fire 57 firemen. Is that what my honourable friend says is the way of settling labour disputes?

If so, I wonder what my honourable friend would have said if instead of Mr. Harvey having said this that the president of the union got up and said that if that Compulsory Arbitration Board does not order 12 percent we will all go on strike illegally. Would that be, Mr. Speaker, acceptable to the Honourable Member for Emerson? Well, of course, neither is acceptable where there is such a thing as compulsory arbitration. But the resolution says, Mr. Speaker, what has proven to be a fact, that in all the years of studying industrial relations, it has always been indicated, Mr. Speaker, that free collective bargaining produces a greater degree of stability, and restrictive collective bargaining produces a lesser degree of stability.

And if my honourable friend wants to check that out he can look at the statistics and find that in Australia, where they had compulsory arbitration, so-called, for many many years, they had more man hours lost due to labour disputes than they had in England where they did not have compulsory arbitration, or than they have had in Sweden where there was no such thing as compulsory arbitration of a dispute, outside of a one that occurred within the term of the collective agreement, which of course is not what my honourable friend refers to because we have that legislation in Manitoba now and have had it for many years.

So what my honourable friend is saying is that there are certain areas which we should legislate, cannot go on strike. And, Mr. Speaker, if that would work, if that works, then cast aside all philanthropic or philosophical reason. There wouldn't be a legislature in this country or a legislature in the world that did not have such legislation, because if you could merely pass legislation which says that people will continue to work, and firms will continue to operate, and that will solve the problem of industrial relations, well it's so simple, Mr. Speaker, that nobody would resist doing it. But what has occurred, Mr. Speaker, is that the reverse has happened; the more restrictive the legislation the more difficult the disputes and the more man hours have been lost.

Now the Honourable -- I want to deal with some examples, Mr. Speaker. In British Columbia they passed such a law; they said that the Cabinet has a right to declare if a dispute is essential, and they have a right to say that no strike will take place and a strike is illegal. Something like 40,000 construction workers, I believe, went on strike in the Province of British Columbia and the Cabinet of British Columbia invoked the law, said that this is illegal, those people will go back to work. But people did not go back to work, they stayed out of work. What did Mr. Bennett, the Premier of British Columbia do? Did he lay a prosecution against the 40,000 people? He said no; call the people in and I will discuss it with them, and his rationale to the newspapers was, that when 40,000 people are breaking the law it is necessary to call them in and talk to them about it. That was the situation with regard to that type of legislation.

If my honourable friend wants a better example, Mr. Speaker, I'll give him one. In the City of New York the transit workers went on strike against the law, against this law, which said that a person shall work if required to by the state -- which you know is the law in the Soviet Union that he who shall not work, shall not eat; strikes are illegal, there is no compulsory arbitration; the state says what are fair and reasonable conditions of employment and factories stay open and people work. That is the situation. And they do not have the level of productivity or the efficiency of productivity that we have in a free society, but they have that type of law. But nevertheless the Legislature of New York passed such a law with regard to transit employees. The transit employees went on strike. The court made an order that they shall go to work. That didn't get the trains running, nobody went to work. So the court made a prosecution against -- I believe it was seven people, and put them in jail, and the seven people went to jail and the subways did not run. The seven people being in jail, Mr. Speaker, somehow did not have the alchemy of making the transit system run. There was still nobody went to

## RESOLUTION No. 4

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . work. Finally Governor Rockefeller intervened, and what did he do? He negotiated a collective agreement with the transit workers, and a negotiated collective agreement got the men back working, got the subways running again.

But some citizen of New York said that this was a terrible thing, was against the law, and there was a provision in the New York statute which said that any gains, any time a union goes on strike, on an illegal strike, they shall not have the right to get the money that that strike got for them, which the governor had negotiated with them, and furthermore they were not entitled to an increase for two years following that illegal strike. It's the kind of a law that the Honourable Member for Emerson wants. But, Mr. Speaker, that didn't get any trains running, because the transit workers did not go to work. And what Governor Rockefeller had to do was convene the Legislature and pass a law making that negotiated collective agreement legal.

Now do we want to go, Mr. Speaker, or does a civilized society wish to go through that type of farce? Well, the Honourable Member for Lakeside is laughing. I tell the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the same thing happened in the Province of Quebec not more than approximately 18 months ago; that the Province of Quebec had a law with regard to the civil service which said that they could go on strike. When they did go on strike the Province of Quebec thought that they could solve the problem by passing a law saying that they couldn't go on strike. They passed such a law and they ordered the union people to send the employees back to work, and for days they did not go back to work and they lost more man hours in those few days of what we call illegal strikes that I would venture to say that Manitoba lost in its entire year -- in an illegal strike. And now, Mr. Speaker, in order to enforce the kind of a law that my honourable friend is talking about, we have three people Louis Laberge and Marcel P  pin and a Mr. Charbonneau, nice people like my honourable friend, worked hard all their lives, never committed a criminal act, were decent law abiding citizens, but because of the nature of the law that was passed, those people are now in jail, and have been sentenced to jail for a year, for what crime? What was their crime? They would not tell an employee to go to work; that was their crime. And when a society has to put people in jail for that kind of action then the society should examine itself and see what type of insane law it has passed in order for it to be able to get into that type of position.

Now, what does the amendment say? The amendment asked the Member for Emerson, the Member for Lakeside not to cop out. Do you believe in a free society? Do you believe in freedom of employers? Do you believe in freedom of employees? Do you believe that the two sides -- (Interjection) -- do you believe, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister's time is up.

MR. GREEN: Well, if I can finish my . . . Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. GREEN: If the honourable members believe citizens in society, both of the employer and the employees, have a right to make that decision based on their freedom of choice rather than what somebody else says, then they should have no difficulty supporting this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside. Is the House prepared to adopt the amendment? The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Just briefly, I haven't spoken on the amendment. You know, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources really should not be allowed to make that pragmatic and practical argument that sounds so all - convincing and make it in a vacuum. He studiously avoided, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the gist of the resolution before us because, No. 1, we're speaking about a specific type of service rendered by people where there is not a relationship of employer-employee to begin with, where there is at large - where the population at large forgives or gives up certain rights that they have, obeys to a second or third party, a municipality or a government, agrees to a form of taxation in the promise that a second or third party not the firemen, not the policemen, not the other essential services gives to that party direct, but in fact a government, or an agency of government, says that when I build a house in this part of the community, I agree to abide by all kinds of rules and regulations that I haven't even got time to read tonight, but I'll build it in this way; I'll build it in that way; I'll have fire escapes where that agency wants it for me to have. In return that agency of government says that they will provide me with fire protection and they contract that out to some third party, namely in this case, a firefighting group.

## RESOLUTION No. 4

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

And I'm not the person in the first instance involved. Much as the debate really has demonstrated the mentality of members opposite would like us to believe, they have that state to people complex, they believe, they believe that the state is here subjecting and dictating and governing and regulating everybody else in society, but not all people, not all socialists have that point of view -- and I'm not one of those that has that point of view. When I accept to certain responsibilities and make certain payments to my municipality for certain services, I don't even know who those people are going to be that are going to provide those services. But I agree to -- I subject myself to the dictates of society to provide the necessary funds and to fulfill other conditions to make that possible.

And the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources likes to translate that down to a straightforward employee-employer type of labour relations' argument. And I say that that is not that quite simple. I say it's not quite that simple. And if he wants to of course that's another debate that I can enter into. But, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that the Honourable Minister and the honourable response from the members opposite has been one to essentially side-step the gist of the debate. It has substantially put forward a concept that in their mind fills thence that they, or the obligations, the responsibilities that they feel that they owe to a specific constituent, that they have the generous support of, and therefore I suppose we could expect nothing else in response from them.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I've not really had an opportunity to hear the member for -- well, to hear any of the debate that preceded today's portion, so I really had only to listen to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources and the Member for Lakewood. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

Now I have the resolution before me. Honourable members -- some of them may not have it because it's in the reduced form in the Order Paper, but I have it before me. I'm having difficulty in understanding just where there was a difference of point of view. Apparently the Member for St. Vital accepted all of the words in the resolution proposed by the Member for Emerson. He said -- and the resolution portion is that this Assembly consider the advisability of supporting measures to protect our essential services against interruptions due to labour disputes. I really don't know; I confess I don't know what the Member for Emerson or his supporters did indeed propose, would be measures to protect our essential services. I don't really know whether they supported compulsory arbitration, and maybe they did. But the resolution, the amendment by the Member for St. Vital, also supporting all of this that went before, added the resolution which seems to support the principle of free negotiation and an agreement arrived at as a result of free discussions between employers and employees. It also says that dictated terms and conditions militate against productivity and stability. It seems to me this is so obviously true, and of course the Minister of Mines elaborated on the truth of that statement. So that it may be that members opposite have the problem of voting for a statement of truth which doesn't in any way argue with the resolution itself. Well, of course that may be their problem.

But the reason I've risen to speak is not that I want to speak in any language other than English, but I do want to try to understand what the Member for Lakeside had to say. He made it appear as if a person choosing to live in a certain municipality, moves into the municipality for the purposes of living there without acquiring any rights whatsoever. He pointed out the responsibilities he assumes, that he has to build his house in accordance with the municipal by-laws, I suppose building by-laws, safety by-laws, zoning, all the rest of it, and in return, according to the Member for Lakeside, he contracts for protection. He is entitled, once he complies with the rules or the by-laws, he's entitled to protection, protection from whom? Then he proposes some peculiar third party sitting somewhere which is an employer of the firemen and contracts out with the firemen for them to look after the protection. And this visualizes to me that this person who enters into a municipality doesn't acquire any rights to choose the people who represent him to act as the employer of those who have to provide the service.

Now, I don't know whether whatever municipality he lives in is one in which he doesn't play a role. I don't know whether or not he votes at municipal elections. But whether or not he votes at municipal elections he certainly has the right to indicate by his vote who shall



## RESOLUTION No. 4

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . represent him, and go further and have through his representative, or to his representative, the right to address himself as to how he expects that person to conduct the affairs for the collective group. Now I don't understand that this party of ours, the New Democratic Party, insists on bringing statism in as something separate, apart and different from that of representing the people that elect them, and, once elected, represents all the people. And how that differs from the situation described by the Member for Lakeside of contracting out to a firemen's group is just arrant nonsense. The employer in the case he describes is the municipality. The municipality is a council elected by the people who live within the municipality, and who therefore delegate to the council the responsibility of providing the protective services he describes. And they then negotiate, as they should, on behalf of the people, who are the employers, and the firemen or policemen, who are the employees.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it still comes back to the question before us. What alternatives, what alternative methods is it required that this House consider? And all that is required is that we do consider the advisability of supporting measures to protect ourselves. Well by all means. I assume that that has been done all along and will continue to be done. But it is well to state a principle as being one which is described in that of the Member -- the amendment of the Member for St. Vital. And unless it is not true, then surely we have to support it. And it is patently true, it is patently true that freely arrived at agreements militate in favour of productivity or stability, and dictator terms militate against them. Is that or is that not so? Do we need all sorts of history? Do we really have to go to Russia to find that it is not so? Can it be that members opposite do agree with the principle as with the policy as described by the Minister of Mines, as in Russia where the employer, the government, makes the decisions. The employee has no right even not to work, because the employee is dependent entirely on the state to provide the work and the means whereby he lives. Is that really an alternative where you do bring in somebody with a whip? Is it the whip that we should be discussing to force a person to work? Or do we go back to a statement called out by the Member for Lakeside saying; the right to work, not only does a person have to have the right not to work - and he didn't say that, the Minister said it - but he then said he should have the right to work.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that there's anything in the discussion or the resolution which would deny a person the right to work. Basic, however, is the fact that a person has the right to withhold his services too, so that in a free society he either has a right to work or to deny the use of his work when he is not prepared to do so. And only by that kind of negotiation can we get anywhere. So that the reason that the Member for Lakeside rose to speak was, I think, only because he felt something had to be said in some way take away from the logic and the cogency of what was said by the Minister of Mines. Well he didn't succeed simply because he wasn't understandable. He was not understandable because he didn't seem to clearly accept the fact that a person moving into that mythical municipality he describes, is a person who also has a right to decide who shall deal on his behalf with the employee. That is a right that he has; by proper representational government he does do that, and his spokesman, his representatives, then make the decision. That to my mind is a lot better than going to some extraneous party altogether and saying, "We want you to impose on us the kind of an agreement that we haven't been able to arrive at through negotiation and discussion. Because we couldn't agree with the opposite party, we want you to force us and to force them to comply with some terms which were not satisfactory to us." Surely, Mr. Speaker, that should be the very last thing we should have to do, and yet the Act as we have it now does contemplate the possibility that in the end the people's representatives in this Legislature might yet have to make a decision in that eventuality. But the discussion that we have before us, the advisability of supporting measures to protect our services, is one that has been going on during this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my comments will be very brief, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I've listened with intense interest to the comments of the Member for St. John and also the Member for Inkster, and I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that I am not nearly as well informed on the affairs of Russia as other members of this Chamber. And if they give me their assurance that they are fully aware of what is going on in the State in Russia, I have to accept their decisions and their judgments in that matter, and I think that I will have to stand up and more or less agree with the two members that have spoken in this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the House prepared to -- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

## RESOLUTION No. 4

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, before I cast my vote I certainly would like to make a few remarks. While I look at the original resolution that we are amending and we're now discussing the amendment on of the original resolution, it speaks of measures, supporting measures to protect our essential services. These measures have not been defined in any way and this is what the amendment is dwelling on, - on the very fact of the amendments that will have to be taken in consideration. And the Minister of Mines when speaking, he talked about B. C. and of their legislation out there. I don't recall the wording of the legislation as such. I know it was Bill 34, if I'm correct. But the conclusions that he came to and that the examples that he quoted bringing Russia into the picture and democracies, in democracies it looked as though we were put to shame, the government was put to shame because they couldn't implement decisions and laws that they had made, whereas under a dictatorship, under totalitarian government, they were able to do this. But how? By putting the gun at the people's head and you do it or else, and certainly we are not prepared to do this in a democracy. So certain groups of society can go against the wishes of government and its laws and yet get away with it in democratic countries.

But as far as the amendment is concerned, I think it just states a matter of fact. That is the way I read it because the first part of the amendment reads this way: "Be it further Resolved that in the consideration of such measures this Assembly give practical implementation to the historical evidence that terms and conditions of employment freely arrived at between employers and employees militate in favour of industrial productivity and stability." This is the first part of that amendment and which relates to the measures dealt with in the resolved part of the original resolution. And this is just stating it in my opinion as a matter of fact.

The second one then goes on and, and I'm not sure whether the semi-colon and the word "and" should be used there. This is what confused me originally when looking at the resolution, and this is where I found difficulty in setting things in its proper place. But the balance of the amendment reads: "and dictated terms and conditions of employment as between employers and employees militate against industrial productivity and stability." This is just another statement of fact.

So you just have two statements here actually which more or less, while not defining the measures in the resolved part of the original resolution but at least state them as a fact.

Now just what measures the mover of the original motion had in mind, I don't think these were properly brought out before this Assembly as such, and I certainly think that before we vote on the whole - the amendment and the original resolution - that he get up and define to the members of the Assembly, and as the mover of the original motion just what he had in mind in putting forward the original motion as is.

At the time that members spoke on it, and I think I spoke on it briefly too -- I really didn't give it the consideration that I should have before I made my remarks, I remember that. But again then, as far as I can remember, most of the members speaking, addressed themselves to the matter of essential services and this, this too is a loose term which can, the meaning of which can change as time goes on. And as additional services may be brought on into society, certainly some of the services that we now feel are really essential, wouldn't have been essential 20 years ago, and certainly in another 20 years time there no doubt will be other services which we feel as a society that could be and would be essential at that time. So this term is certain an irrelevant one and should, if and when legislation is brought in will have to be defined in order to make it meaningful.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour on the . . .

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, yes in speaking on the motion as amended . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member has already spoken once on the motion; he has also spoken on the amendment.

MR. GREEN: He has the right to close debate on a motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The main motion is now an amended motion.

MR. GREEN: That is correct, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that the honourable member has a right to close the debate on the main motion as amended.

MR. GIRARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. Whether it's amended or not, we're still dealing with the main motion and therefore I feel I have a right to make closing remarks.

## RESOLUTION No. 4

MR. SPEAKER: If it's the pleasure of the House, I'll let the honourable member go at the moment. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it has to be done at pleasure. I believe that a member introducing a resolution has a right to close debate. And the honourable member brought in a resolution, and if there is some doubt Mr. Speaker, in your mind, I would suggest that rather than saying that it's being done at pleasure perhaps you should have a look at it and see whether it's correct.

MR. SPEAKER: Well if I may through the House, the honourable member has had two occasions to speak, and that's the only reason why I query whether he has another opportunity to speak again on the motion. In normal essence, in normal terms, a member can make a motion and close debate, which gives him two opportunities. This time he's had an opportunity on the main motion and once again on the amended motion. Now to close the debate on the amended motion is not really his prerogative any more because it's not totally his motion any more.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that an amendment is a motion to amend a previous motion, and everybody has a right to make a speech on that motion to amend. That a member then when it comes down to the motion, that the resolution that he has put even if it has been amended in between, has the right to close the debate on that motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Well possibly the best course would be to take the matter under advisement and give the opportunity to a member at a later time. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would reconsider that because there is a possibility that we will not see this motion again during the remainder of this session and I think the Honourable Member for Emerson would like to make his contribution now he has ten minutes left in which to close the debate, and I have to agree with the House Leader that anybody introducing a resolution in this House whether it is amended or not has a right to close debate on that motion. And it is fact that he has introduced a resolution, he has spoken on the amendment, now we are dealing with the motion as amended the main motion and the honourable member has a right to close the debate on that main motion as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: Well the Chair has one difficulty that it wishes to set no precedent and if the House desires to at this moment to have this debate continue, I shall proceed with the desires of the House. But it is not a precedent. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate on this resolution I would like to clarify a few matters. At the time when the amendment was introduced, I hadn't had a chance to really peruse the amendment and it is one that was a little difficult to understand fully at one reading, and I don't wish to fault anyone but myself in my own shortcomings. However at the time when I spoke on the amendment I cheated a bit, and I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that my remarks were addressed to the main motion and really not to the amendment.

However having studied the amendment to some detail, I had thought all along that what I had presented was inherently including what was in the amendment, what is in the main motion now, because I thought that it was an acceptable fact that freedom to negotiate is more productive than legislation compelling. And I don't think that we have any argument on either side of the House with that regard. I was a little fascinated when I heard the Honourable House Leader setting up straw men and sort of making me look at the resolution again and think well, by golly, is this really what I was suggesting. But in re-reading it of course, it is not at all what I was suggesting. I was simply suggesting, and the main motion suggests now that we look at essential services especially, not necessarily only, that we look at essential services and through the co-operation of management and labour that we not coerce but we induce, if possible, through leadership given by government, that we induce some study, some search in order to find a way, keeping in mind the history as the resolution now says, a way of settling labour disputes that will allow us to through our sophisticated society of today settle disputes without labour strikes, and I don't see anything wrong with it.

After again having looked at the amendment very carefully, Mr. Speaker, I interpreted the amendment at being a vote in favour of the resolution, and really not one that added a great deal to the resolution as the Honourable House Leader has suggested. But it seemed to me that what the government's attitude seemed to be in this regard was that we will amend it rather than passing it as it is; at least we've made a mark on it and it might be less identifiable. If that is the case then I must forgive them because if this is their attitude that's real fine, but I'm indeed happy to see this kind of resolution go through.

## RESOLUTION NO. 4

(MR. GIRARD cont'd)

One more suggestion I want to leave with the members from the other side, Mr. Speaker, is that although a great deal has been said about the measures or the services not being identified, I would just like to clarify that in my introductory remarks I specified very clearly that the reason why I did not specify these in the resolution was to give the honourable members on the other side, who have the reins of power now, a right to select, a right to decide to arbitrate which services should be considered essential, and use them as guidelines, or use them as methods by which this kind of study can be undertaken. And therefore I find it maybe a little surprising that the debate has been so long to find out that we're in agreement.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to carry on or to call it 10 o'clock? The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Tuesday).