



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

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

28 Elizabeth II

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



**VOL. XXVII No. 27A**

**2:30 P.M. Monday, March 26, 1979**

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, March 26, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Gaaham (Birtle-Russell):** Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my left where we have five members of the Fort Garry Horse hosting a group of Army Cadets, 25 Cadets, from Fort Smith in the North West Territories.

We also have 45 members of the River East Royals Bantam Hockey Team and an exchange team from Alma, Quebec, The Alma Aiglons, under the chaperones, Mr. Ed. Link of Winnipeg, Mrs. Claudette Blanchard and Coach Germain Martel.

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

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of privilege.

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege on the House. It was brought to my attention that, while being heckled by the Minister of Education and while we were trading insults, unfortunately my speaker was open and I referred to him in a term that is, to say the least, not parliamentarily acceptable. For this I apologize to him and to the Members of this House, Mr. Speaker.

I also have another point of privilege of this House. I asked a question that is important, while we were looking at the Estimates of the department, a question about the funding from Ottawa, and two Ministers have been playing ball with this question, and I have received some information and I would like to share it with the Members of this House to stop this misleading. I can say that the block funding sum that is going to be received, Mr. Speaker, by the government this year, 1978-79, is \$246.7 million and what is anticipated for .79-80 is \$282.2 million, or an increase of \$14.5 14.5 percent that we will receive from the Feds this year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I want to point out to the honourable member that the subject matter he has raised is, in my opinion, not a point of privilege. For the benefit of all members of the House, points of privilege ought rarely to occur in this Chamber, and when they are raised, they should be substantiated by a positive Motion so that the House can deal with the points of privilege. Therefore, I have to say that what the honourable member has raised is in effect, not a point of privilege, but nothing more than an explanation of what has occurred. — (Interjection)— Order please. May I point out to the honourable member that a ruling of the Chair is not a debatable issue. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health and Social Development. In view of the Minister of Health and Social Development's acknowledged ignorance of the deterioration in patient care at St. Boniface Hospital, those revelations which occurred over the weekend, can the Minister of Health and Social Development assure us that there are not similar deteriorations in patient care taking place in other hospitals across the province?

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

**HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's sensationalism, I think I had better correct that misimpression. The misimpression is the impression that's being seeded and sown by him in that question. There is no deterioration

of patient care at St. Boniface Hospital. There is no change in services. There is no reduction in services. The hospital is going through a perfectly normal procedure which the Honourable Member for St. Boniface knows hospitals go through every year in planning for their budgets. They are working within loose parameters of budget guidelines that they were asked for from the government and received late in 1978, calendar '78. They are working from in-house documents and in-house papers. They haven't even taken any of that range of options or alternatives to their Board yet, and for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to suggest that there were revelations of deterioration in patient care service, is simply untrue and incorrect. Nothing has changed.

**MR. PAWLEY:** To the Minister of Health and Social Development a supplementary. Has the Minister of Health and Social Development, in arriving at the conclusions which he's announced today that there's been no cut in patient care at St. Boniface Hospital, met and discussed this matter with Dr. Adams?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, my department officials and the Health Services Commission are in the process of meeting with the personnel and the administrative leadership of St. Boniface Hospital. I talked to the administrative heads of the hospital this morning. I'm advised by the hospital through a public statement that they've made to the press that their board and their administration will be discussing matters with the Health Services Commission this week. That's the normal form of communications in consultation of this kind. My answer to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is yes, in terms of my office. No, I haven't talked directly with Dr. Adams. I will if necessary, but I think he'll concede that the proper form of communication at this juncture is through the Chairman of their Board, and the Chairman of the Health Services Commission.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Further supplementary to the Minister. Can the minister advise whether or not written evaluations have been done insofar as the standard of patient care in hospitals throughout the province as a result of his government's cutbacks, in the same way that evaluations have been prepared in respect to the community health clinics in Winnipeg?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Standards Division of the Health Services Commission maintains continual watch and contact on care patient services, delivery of patient services and quality of patient care in hospitals. That is measured all the time. That is assessed all the time. That is continued unchanged. That is brought to bear in any budget consultations, obviously. We have not struck a budget for St. Boniface Hospital yet. We announced a general average increase in hospital budgets of 6 percent and we were very careful at the time of the announcement to say that that was a general average increase; some hospitals would get more than that, some would get less, depending on their requirements. Those budgets have not been struck yet.

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. Is the Minister of Health then saying that the amount that is asked in the printed Estimates under hospitalization, is the amount that he wants from the Committee from this House, but then that he will decide who gets 6 percent increase and if an adjustment will be made or will be all within that sum? Is that what the Minister is saying?

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** That's what I'm saying and it's certainly what I hope to do, Mr. Speaker. I assure my honourable friend that that is the amount I'm going to be asking for and on the basis of our experience in the past year and our consultations to date, we believe that that is a legitimate and a reasonable amount. I will say to him though, that I will have no hesitation if patient care is jeopardized and if budgets can't be met, I will have no hesitation in coming back to him and his colleagues and asking for supplementary supply.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, would it be his intention then that we would proceed with another department and wait in view of the fact that the Minister doesn't know the amount that he wants us to vote? Or, does he feel for one minute, seriously, that he'll be able, in the city here, to give an increase to a hospital like St. Boniface and take it on the 6 percent increase of the Health Sciences Centre or Misericordia or Victoria? Does he sincerely, does he seriously think that?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, no I'm not suggesting that we defer the examination of my Estimates. As a matter of fact, it was in response to the requests of the opposition that we agreed to go ahead with the examination of my Estimates fairly early in the schedule. What I believe we need, and as I said, I sincerely state to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that what I believe we need is what we are asking for. He knows that there are approximately 100 hospitals in this province. He knows that some have fewer responsibilities, fewer demands placed on them than others; there is room for flexibility in budgeting and the 6 percent figure will be an average. What St. Boniface's final figure will be, I can't tell him yet but those discussions between St. Boniface and the Health Services Commission are getting under way this week.

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, does the Minister remember that we repeatedly said last year that it was impossible, with the increase accorded, to keep the same level of care and the same thing is going to happen this year. The Minister said that this was common practice. Does the Minister realize that it isn't common practice, that the Manitoba Health Services Commission hardly met for more than a year and now that we're ready to go to the Estimates it is only pressure that will make the Minister see the light?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I think before we go too much further, I would not like to see a debate occurring on the Minister's Estimates during the Question Period. The members may very well be jeopardizing the time of other members of the Chamber who wish to ask other questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, if I may prevail on the time of honourable members opposite for one minute to respond to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, because I recognize that he is asking the questions out a sincere examination of the problem and we won't get to the Health Services Commission part of my Estimates for a few days yet. What I am saying is that the procedure for a hospital to develop in-house papers and documents relative to their budget planning process is perfectly normal. It may not be normal for those papers to be made available to the media and to the public, and I'm not commenting on that, but that process up to that point is perfectly normal. The new Health Services Commission board was in place and at work in the middle of December, and had been meeting with hospitals relative to their budgets since that time, so that there is really no departure from the procedures of the past, at least under this government, Mr. Speaker.

We said last year that we were going to attempt to hit a certain budget figure, subsequent to that we adjusted the bases of the hospital, and also took into account the changes to the fiscal year from the calendar year, which provided them with some necessary additional funds. This year we're looking at a general average figure that we think we can live within, with some hospitals being above it and some being below it.

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** On the same point of order, the practice certainly is not something that should be done at this time of the game, at this stage of the game, just a few days before the new fiscal year starts, and especially with the Minister who probably will be busy with his Estimates until some time in April, so how can he discuss this at this late date? That's my question.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. The Minister of Health and Social Development, just a few moments ago, indicated that the Estimates of his department were proceeded with as a result of urgings from this side of the House. Would the Minister not now concur, in view of the fact that there has been additional revelations over this past week-end, information which he was not party to earlier, that there is now justification for his Estimates being deferred until he has completed his evaluation so that we can return to the House and have a more fruitful discussion as to what has happened to the patient care in the hospitals and personal care homes in this province.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I think that my house leader, the Honourable the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, has gone out of his way to co-operate with the opposition in terms of the scheduling of the Estimates. I would not think of intruding into that exercise in co-operation.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** A question to the House Leader. Would the House Leader consider it intruding into his affairs if the Minister of Health and Social Development requested a deferral of his Estimates for better review?

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

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to proceed with the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Welfare, as has been scheduled. I can't think of any good reason why that schedule should be changed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Vital. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface have a point of order?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Yes, the Minister stated that it was this side of the House that asked for the Estimates of the Department of Health to be reviewed now and that is not the case. We're ready to go along and we made this offer, not because we want to delay, in fairness to the minister, who apparently doesn't know where he is going.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable, the Attorney-General. It arises from a report in the newspaper that the government or the Liquor Control Commission is to abandon the differential between normal and low alcohol beer. The question to the minister is: Has the government abandoned the previous government's policy of pricing liquor approximately according to its alcohol content, so as to introduce a measure of moderation in drinking?

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

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne):** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. WALDING:** Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the minister then explain to the House why the increase and why the two types of beer are being priced the same?

**MR. MERCIER:** The Liquor Commission take the point of view that the price of, the cost of low-ball beer is the same if not more than regular beer, and has been subsidized for a number of years in its introduction, and just as in the area of soft drinks the price remains the same for the low calorie soft drinks in comparison to the regular soft drinks. That has been the policy which has been applied in this particular case.

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

**MR. WALDING:** Another question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister then indicating to us that alcoholic beverages will be priced then strictly according to the cost and not to their alcoholic content?

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Vital with a fourth question.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Honourable, the Attorney-General, intends to answer the question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** May I point out to the honourable members that every member of the Chamber has a perfect right to ask a question. It is not within a member's right to demand an answer to any question. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I want to . . .

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

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Honourable, the Attorney-General. Could the minister confirm that the increase in beer prices will result in an increase in revenue to the breweries of approximately \$3.5 million this year?

**MR. MERCIER:** No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot. All I can indicate is that the price was negotiated with the Liquor Control Commission; there was a public notice of an application to the Public Utilities Board. The Public Utilities Board has approved the increase in price to the breweries, which remains among the very lowest price paid for beer in all of Canada.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Vital with a fifth question.

**MR. WALDING:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Given that the Public Utilities Board was told on February 27th that such an increase would amount to an increase in revenue to the breweries of \$3.7 million, can the honourable minister confirm that this government places a higher priority on the revenues to the breweries than it does to the revenues of the hospitals?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that obviously that was a very facetious, sarcastic question, I simply want to reiterate once again, Mr. Speaker. The prices were negotiated between the Liquor Control Commission and the Breweries and that application was made at a public hearing before the Utilities Board, it was investigated by the Utilities Board and the price was confirmed by the Utilities Board, and if the member had this concern, Mr. Speaker, I ask him where was he when the Public Utilities Board had their public hearings?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. LEONARD L. EVANS:** I'd like to ask the Honourable, the Attorney-General a question then. I gather from his answer that he concurs with the decision and policy intent of the Manitoba Liquor Commission. Is the Minister then in agreement with the policy that no longer shall the price of beer be set in accordance with alcoholic content. In other words, is the government now abandoning a move which would promote temperance in drinking in Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I point out to the Honourable Member for Brandon East that repetitious questions use up valuable time of the House. Does the Honourable Member for Brandon East have another question?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I am asking a question that the members of this House want an answer to and the taxpayers of Manitoba want an answer to. Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is, is the government of Manitoba changing the policy that was the policy for many years, and that is that alcoholic beverages will be priced in accordance with alcoholic content, and particularly, will low-ball beer, low alcoholic beer, now be given no price preferential in order to encourage temperance drinking in this province?

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I draw to your attention that that was the question that was asked by the Member for St. Vital in the first instance. It is nothing more than a repetition of that question. My honourable friend sits there and dreams. He doesn't hear the questions that are asked on the other side of the House.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** If I could speak to the point of order raised by the House Leader, I believe that Mr. Speaker will recall that the question that was posed by the Member for St. Vital dealt with the particular subject of beer; the question that is raised by the Member for Brandon East deals with the general pricing policy pertaining to all alcoholic beverages in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East with another question.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Attorney-General if this policy move by the Manitoba Liquor Commission is a forerunner to a policy move with respect to wines in this

province?

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

**MR. MERCIER:** No, Mr. Speaker, the price of beer as well as wines remains among the lowest in Canada.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney-General to ascertain whether or not there is any change in the policy that existed when he took over as Minister wherein there was a variation of treatment given to the mark-up on various alcoholic beverages based on the alcoholic content. Has he changed the policy?

**MR. MERCIER:** There has been no change in mark-ups and that has been maintained, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, then I must ask the Honourable Minister that if there is the same mark-up and the price goes up tremendously — the cost goes up tremendously, is this government then not restricting its own tax benefits by reducing the mark-up so that the price to the consumer will not be elevated to the same proportion as the cost to the government? In other words, is there no restraint in effect in regard to the price of alcohol to the consumer by the Liquor Commission?

**MR. MERCIER:** Yes there is, Mr. Speaker. In the particular case of beer, the Commission's markup is reduced from the low 40s to, I believe, 38 percent, in order to keep the price down to \$5.00.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister now saying that there was a change in the markup policy of the government from the previous, may I not ask why it could not be a logical sequitor to reduce the markup on low-ball beer in order to maintain the former preferential treatment given to lower alcoholic beverages. Since there was a change, why not carry that the further step to make sure that there is a preferential treatment?

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Can the Minister report on the status of the Headingley Jail inmate, who was released under the Temporary Absence Program last week and failed to return?

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, Mr. Speaker, but if the honourable member has any word on him, I'd like to have it.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I see that the government considers it a laughing matter but I would like to ask the Minister whether, in view of the fact that the prisoner was considered dangerous, why was he temporarily released?

**MR. SHERMAN:** I don't know, Mr. Speaker, but I'll certainly check into it.

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

**MR. DOERN:** I'd also like to ask the Minister whether he intends to bring about any tightening up of the temporary absence procedures which appear to be making a mockery of the whole judicial system.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I think I have assured honourable members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that the first steps toward tightening up the whole correction system have already been taken, and there will be further steps taken, and the Temporary Absence Program is one of those that's under examination and realignment at the present time.

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

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Mines and Resources, and ask him whether he has been approached by the Lake Manitoba Fishermen's Association to extend the fishing season by two weeks, until April 15th.

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

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the hard winter conditions and the ice conditions, and the poor fishing season that the fishermen have had on Lake Manitoba, would the Minister like to indicate whether he will extend the fishing season for two weeks?

**MR. RANSOM:** I am reviewing that situation, Mr. Speaker, but it doesn't appear, on the basis of the information that is available to me, that an extension would be warranted.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the low catch that the fishermen have experienced this past winter, could the Minister indicate what his information is that would tend to make him not extend the fishing season any longer?

**MR. RANSOM:** For one thing, Mr. Speaker, the low catch. That, in itself, indicates that perhaps there is some difficulty.

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

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Acting Premier. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, who that would be.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Acting Premier could indicate whether it is the policy of this government that when community groups, whether they be the Chamber of Commerce or the Lake Manitoba fishermen, whether the Minister of Deputy Ministers will say who may be in a delegation that meets with that particular Minister of Deputy Minister?

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

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the reasons that my honourable friend is asking this question. It would seem to me it is one of those that I would have to take as notice in order to ensure that I am apprised of the circumstances which led up the question in the first place.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will address then a further question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Government Air Division. I wonder if it is still the policy of this government that MLAs will travel free on government aircraft on a seat-available basis and if, in fact, there is an empty seat available whether an MLA or a federal civil servant would receive priority in occupying that empty seat.

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

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, there has been no change made in that policy. The same policy is applicable as has been the case the last number of years. I point out that there are perhaps a few less Government Air Services planes flying around in the north but the same policy applies.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, in light of the Minister's answer in terms of policy, I wonder if he would answer the second part of the question, if in fact on a government aircraft there is an empty seat available whether a federal civil servant or a provincial MLA would receive preference for that seat.

Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether, on the flight from The Pas to Winnipeg last Thursday at 4 o'clock, whether the federal civil servant occupying the seat paid fare or whether he travelled free of charge.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for The Pas is fully familiar with the policy and



the operative word is "if there is an empty seat available." My information is that the Honourable Member for The Pas did not make any prior arrangement with respect to the seat in question and therefore when the seat was occupied, became occupied, federal civil servant or otherwise, obviously the seat was no longer available.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Minister did not answer either of the last two questions I asked. I wonder if he could indicate whether the federal civil servant who took over the empty seat paid a fare on the flight from The Pas to Winnipeg or whether he travelled free of charge.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to take that question as notice.

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

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Resources, and I would ask the Minister why his department has removed the restrictions which used to be in place prohibiting the cutting of trees within 500 feet of rivers and highways to protect the environment and the natural beauty of our rivers and highways. I would ask the Minister why he has allowed this restriction to be removed and in particular why it has been removed on the east side of Lake Winnipeg.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the policy has not been changed, to my knowledge, but I have noticed that, in view of the exceptionally high Hydro rates that have occurred over the past few years, that there does seem to be a much greater demand for wood.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of forestry operations, particularly organized forestry operations that are operated by large forestry companies in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and I am asking the Minister specifically why this restriction on their activities has been removed, and why he is not concerned about the protection of our environment.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the honourable member's statement that I am not concerned about the environment. I said that the policy had not been changed. Certainly it has not been changed by me, and if there is a policy that has been violated somehow then I will take the honourable member's question as notice and inquire into the incident.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, could the Minister, in checking this matter, ask who it was who instructed the conservation officers on the east side of Lake Winnipeg to ignore this restriction and allow the forestry companies to cut within 500 feet of rivers and highways?

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Last week the Minister undertook to investigate and report back to the House in regard to workers at the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting operation in Flin Flon having to wait since last November for the results of lead in blood tests that had been sent to the Workplace, Safety and Health Division. My question to the Minister today, is he prepared to report back with that information?

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

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (THOMPSON):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that they waited from November up to date, but recently a report has come out from a group of 100 that was run through, samples from HBM and S. One person out of the 100 had a level over .08 and there is reason to believe that it was in fact a poor testing and we're retesting that particular individual and I'm sure the Member for Churchill will be as pleased as I was when I found out that the average of the 100 that was sampled, was .012. In relationship, it's not the exact question he asked, but there was another question in relationship to it. Was there ever, in fact, people in HBM and S that were sampled for lead who had over .08? Yes, in fact, there was, Mr. Speaker. There was one person in 1975 who was removed from the particular area and within two months his reading was .042. There was a person in May of 1976 who was removed from the particular job. Apparently it was agreed that he was not to be smoking in the area that he was in, but he did anyway and he had

a high blood count and within two months his was down to .03. And, the third person was in 1976. His was extraordinarily high. The department couldn't figure out what it was until they found that he was making lead fish hooks at home in an enclosed area and this, in fact — he ceased to do it and his blood count reduced substantially.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister if he could undertake to confirm that those workers have had to wait for results in their tests since November. He hasn't answered that question yet.

I'd ask the Minister if he can indicate briefly what procedure is followed when testing done by the Workplace, Safety and Health Division shows that an individual worker's lead in blood level exceeds the threshold limit value or the maximum permissible exposure limit?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, it's part of the program that we now have in effect which is substantially different than ever took place before. What now happens and didn't happen before is that the doctor and the company are informed, who in turn inform the employee. This apparently was something that wasn't always taking place over the last period of years. But, the employee is now informed and there is an arrangement made where he meets with the doctor for a physical, a complete, thorough physical. This was not done before in the past few years and it's part of our lead program. An additional sample is taken to confirm what is taking place. This was never done before and if in fact it's confirmed and the person is over .08, then the man is removed from the workplace, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate which specific companies have been informed that they will be voluntary participants in the Minister's so-called lead control program?

**MR. MacMASTER:** There are five major companies in the City, Mr. Speaker, that we've been meeting with.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Attorney-General, the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Liquor Commission. I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise the House whether it is correct that the distilleries of Canada are either about to raise their prices of distilled products, liquor products, or are in the process of raising those prices for the Manitoba Liquor Commission?

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, that was announced about a month ago.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister is confirming what I believed was a previous announcement. Is the Honourable Minister at all aware or is he at all concerned that the prices that are being raised by these distilleries are being raised at the same time by all distilleries that the Manitoba Liquor Commission is dealing with?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, my information is that they are being raised all across Canada at approximately this particular time, probably as a convenience to the commissions to avoid issuing numerous price list changes, Mr. Speaker. But that's the only information I have, is that it is being done across Canada at this particular time by all Canadian distillers, and, also, Mr. Speaker, by foreign suppliers.

**MR. EVANS:** Since this is the case, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney-General would consider bringing this matter to the attention of the Federal Minister of Justice for investigation for possible

illegal activities under the Anti-Combines Legislation in Manitoba. To put the question another way, Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister be prepared to have this matter investigated as an illegal operation under the Anti-Combines Legislation of Canada?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I have no indication or information that would substantiate the allegation of the member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a fourth question.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Minister not concerned that if a price competition policy were in effect, such price rises would not take place at the same time, nor to the same degree?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, the one point that I think is overlooked by the member is that not all of the prices increases are the same, that they vary with respect to each stock item that is on the price list and therefore there would appear to be ample areas of competition between the various brands.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just one question to the Minister of Labour pursuant to the previous question. Is the Minister prepared to indicate by name the five companies that have been voluntarily made a part of the Minister's so-called lead control program?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I can get those names for the Member for Churchill, the ones that are involved in the new, upgraded lead program that's in place now in Manitoba — the one I recently mentioned before, all the differences that are taking place today than were taking place in the last few years — that's the lead program I'm talking about. I don't know which one he's talking about, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the Minister I'm talking about the lead program that the unions are objecting to. I'd ask the Minister if there is any intent of his department to include more companies in the lead using industry into this voluntary program?

**MR. MacMASTER:** I don't know of any program that's in place in Manitoba that unions are objecting to. I know that the cheap political move by the Member for Churchill would like us to believe that some people are objecting to it, but that isn't the case, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a matter of privilege.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I'm challenging the Minister's statement about a cheap political move. I'm challenging that as being out of order.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, my terminology means just the following: I have been told many times by the members opposite that it's their role to embarrass and criticize us, it's not their role to destruct or destroy things that are meaningful for the people of this province. And this particular program is in place, it's meaningful for the working men and women of this province, so I think the depth to which, the Member for Churchill, his depth, is somewhat cheap.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister to withdraw the words he used, and I would request, Mr. Speaker, that you look into that and see whether or not he should be required so to do.

**MR. SPEAKER:** May I point out to all honourable members, if they refer to Beauchesne 5th Edition, Pages 104, 105, 106, 107, there are a listing of words that are considered to be unparliamentary, and one of the words that is listed as being unparliamentary is the term "small and cheap," and

"cheap political way." I would wonder if the Minister of Labour would care to withdraw the remarks and use some other language.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Taking your advice, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word cheap. I say it's less than heightening. It's a little bit lower than I would have expected by any member opposite.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. If it's a little bit lower or it's less than heightening, then the Minister must be looking at it at eye level. I would ask the Minister if he can confirm or deny, and I'll put him on the spot, yes, or no, that he has recently received a letter from the International Molders and Allied Workers Union that specifically states they are not in agreement with the so-called lead control program, and specifically ask him for a Royal Commission into the crisis in the lead-using industries in the province of Manitoba, and can he specifically confirm or deny that he has received a letter from the Canadian Association of Industrial and Mechanical Workers, asking him to do the same thing and voicing criticism of that incomplete and limited so-called lead control program. Is he prepared to do that, knowing full well that he is honour bound to tell the truth.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, the opinion of both organizations have changed somewhat off and on. I've had meetings with one particular organization, the Mechanical Allied Workers Union, in fact a good dozen of them the other day, who in no way tell me to throw out the program and that's what I'm concerned about.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister confirm that he received a letter from International Molders and Allied Workers as late as last week, telling him that they were not pleased with that program because it could not meet the needs . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I point out to the honourable member, his question is repetitive. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Perhaps I can rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister confirm that he has been advised by unions, numerous unions and in specific, the International Molders and Allied Workers, as late as last week, by whatever means that they do not agree with this so-called lead control program, and that they want a Royal Commission into the use of lead in the province of Manitoba so that the workers may be fully protected.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, my concern is the working men and women of the province of Manitoba today and what has been over the course of the years. A Royal Commission could take possibly six months to a year, and I'm not prepared to defer the effects that some of the people are going under in the province of Manitoba for a year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour for questioning having expired, and before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the Speaker's gallery, where we have 25 air cadets from the Russell Air Cadets under the direction of Mr. Paul Galachuk and Mr. Rick Thom.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

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

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Health and Community Services and the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Monday, March 26, 1979

**CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY  
SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AND URBAN AFFAIRS**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson):** Committee come to order. I'd like to refer the members of the committee to Page 71, Item 6.(b) Other Expenditures, \$368,900—pass.

Resolution 97: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,802,700 for Municipal Planning Services—pass.

7.(a) — the Member for St. George.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could the minister indicate following the public hearings that were conducted by the Chairman of the Provincial Land Use Committee, could the minister indicate the results following the public meetings that were conducted with municipal officials throughout the province with respect to the booklet that was distributed on Provincial Land Use Policies, the response that he has received?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, as you're well aware, there was substantial representation and involvement of municipalities throughout the regional medians on the provincial land use policies. In addition, a number of other organizations interested in land use policies made written submission to the members of the committee. The Provincial Planning Department is now in the process of almost completing the review of all of the material and the comments that are made, and I'm advised that that complete review should be ready for consideration by the Land Use Committee by the end of the month of April, next month.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, MR. Chairman. Could the minister indicate the nature of the presentations and whether there is any substantial difference with respect to any of the land use policies that have been presented by the Provincial Land Use Committee, and what different approaches do they take with respect to the policies that have been presented?

**MR. MERCIER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, you know there are many, many, many people who attended the Regional Meetings, of course, of varied expression of opinion. I would say that, in general, the municipal organizations and other organizations who have sent in submissions are, in general, supportive of the land use policies. However, the staff are doing an analysis of all of the submissions related to each policy and will be considering those by the end of the month. I would like to do that as quickly as possible so that we can indicate the final sort of position, and when I say final, I don't mean final forever, because those kinds of policies have to be reviewed on a continual basis in the light of changes.

**MR. URUSKI:** What I'm really getting at Mr. Chairman, is whether the Minister can indicate whether there's been any trend to the submissions that have been made in any particular direction with respect to the policies. There are 13 general policy statements that were presented to the public. Is there any one, or two or three of them that have been focused upon within the presentations that have been made. That's what I'm really getting at.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I would just say again, generally, I think they've been generally supportive, I think they would also be generally of the view that was expressed by the critic earlier that they're fine as long as common sense is applied.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate whether in view of those presentations being made, is there any changes, basic changes contemplated to be made once the review — on the basis of knowledge of the presentation made, is there intent to change any of the policies from the presentations at this present time?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, we don't yet have the review by staff of the analysis of the presentations that were made, but I think in general there would not be too much, I don't expect there would be too much change in principle.

**MR. URUSKI:** What format does the Minister intend on taking once the province reviews all the submissions made, what format does the Minister and his department intend on taking to relay back to the municipalities and interested parties the provincial position with respect to the submissions made. What role, or what feedback and what mechanism do you use to provide feedback to the groups who have made presentations to you, on your policies. On your final decisions.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, the process would be that the provincial Land Use Committee would meet to review the analysis of the staff and make a recommendation at Cabinet and the final policies would then be approved by Order-in-Council and forwarded to all municipalities and to all organizations who have indicated any interest, and then would be subject to a follow-up review. I don't know whether that would be on an annual basis, but it would always have to be subject to review afterwards.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Yes, as I understand the procedure with respect to developing plans of development or development agreements, there is a general statement that is presented to the people involved, after which representations are received. Then there is, of course, the specific plan of development that is subsequently introduced. Is there an opportunity for people to present views on these specific plans of development, or only during the general statement consideration?

**MR. MERCIER:** Are you talking about approval of a development plan or subdivision?

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, I'm talking about the planning districts now. They issue a general statement. That's one of their first moves.

**MR. MERCIER:** The planning statement and development plan are subject to public hearings.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(a)—pass; 7.(b)—pass. Resolution 98: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$139,100 for Municipal and Urban Affairs Provincial Planning —pass.

Resolution No. 99: 9.(a) — the Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** . . . that's listed here but not numbered?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I was given to understand that Item 8, there is no Resolution required and we dealt with the same thing in the previous committee under the Minister's Salary.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Would this not be an appropriate time to just ask a few questions and get some specific answers as opposed to general comments?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MERCIER:** If the member was not present, maybe I could reread what I said in my general introduction but just the specific paragraph or two relating to this area.

Mr. Chairman, there's an overall reduction of \$48,200 made up of a combination of general salary increase, salary adjustments and reduction of one staff man year. There's a net decrease in operating expenses of \$46,500 resulting from centralization of some services in Winnipeg and closure of offices for this branch at Dauphin and Thompson. This reduction flowed from the integration of the northern planning function with the Department of Municipal Affairs in 1978. The total amount for this branch is recoverable under the Canada Northlands Agreement and therefore is not voted twice. This is the reason for the nil total on the right hand column.

**MR. McBRYDE:** I'd like to ask the Minister what has been the change in the need for the service? Has there been a reduction in the requirement for community subdivision planning?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, we merely in this area service the Department of Northern Affairs.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister not aware whether there's a reduction in the need for this service from Northern Affairs, for the Northern Affairs communities?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, yes, there has been a reduction in services required of this area but I would suggest that perhaps those questions could be directed to the Minister of Northern Affairs.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, the actual function is being carried on by this Minister and he has the staff within his department and if in fact there's a reduction in staff I assume that he made

that decision to reduce the staff because there is less need for the service, and I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether there is less need for the service at this time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, the reduction for service in this area was negotiated with the Department of Northern Affairs, and we merely, they are our client and we are merely providing the service that has been requested.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, if Northern Affairs then said they no longer needed this service at all, then this department and this Minister would just drop the staff and drop the program altogether?

**MR. MERCIER:** Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, could the question be repeated.

**MR. McBRYDE:** My question to the Minister, was, if in fact Northern Affairs said that there was no longer a need for this service, this whole section would just be dropped from his Estimates, the people and the section would be dropped.

**MR. MERCIER:** I suppose that's true, Mr. Chairman. But there was for example, one area that the service ran out last year, in the area of mapping, \$155,000 reduction because the mapping, according to our information, was completed.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, in this particular section, I'm sure that the Minister or the Minister's staff would be aware of the reasons for reduction. At one time this particular section was running as fast as it could because of the need to provide subdivisions for the remote housing program, and I wonder if there's been a reduction in the remote housing program. Has MHRC stopped building remote houses? Has the Manitoba Metis Federation stopped building remote houses? I wonder what has been the reduction in that program that might lead to a reduction in this program?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, my advice from the department is that the subdivision activity was far ahead of the actual construction of homes, so that there is not a problem with respect to the number of lots available in general.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Could the Minister state specifically if it's been MHRC's reduction in the provision of houses that has caused this, or whether all the housing needs in the remote communities have now been met?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I think that's a question that would have to be put to the Minister of MHRC.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, since the Minister is not that familiar with this section, I'll move on to some other questions that relate to this staff item in his department. One of the problems in subdivision design, development and planning has been the restrictions placed by Hydro in terms of possible hydro development, and I wonder if this is still a serious problem or whether there has been some understanding reached with Hydro that they would do their surveys in order to change the severance or the lines, whatever title they're given, and whether Hydro has taken over that responsibility or whether it still falls with the province of Manitoba to pay for and do surveys, to change the hydro lines so that communities can go ahead with their subdivision planning.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, my advice is that the Hydro and the Province have been working together to resolve this difficulty, but it has not affected any of the subdivision activity.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister has been involved in negotiation with Hydro on this particular matter.

**MR. MERCIER:** No, I have not, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, just a final comment I would like to make on this item is that, as the Minister has pointed out, the so-called saving or efficiency in this particular section comes

from centralization. This department is saving money by closing an office in Dauphin, by closing an office in Thompson, and there has been a staff reduction of one person, according to the Minister, so I assume that they are still providing a considerable service to the community but that the Minister has made a decision — this government has made a deliberate decision — to centralize, which is contrary to previous policy decisions of the previous government to decentralize government operations out of Winnipeg into the rural and northern areas of Manitoba. I think that that should be clear, that the so-called saving here is a real loss to communities in Manitoba, and of course if this particular action of this one department — and it appears to be reflected in a number of departments — recentralizing in Winnipeg, increasing Winnipeg staff and reducing northern staff, and perhaps rural staff, although I am not as positive of that, but in this case rural staff, then that's how the saving is coming about, through centralization as opposed to decentralization as a government policy.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, although I indicated that the Northern Planning Offices have been closed, they have been integrated into the regular Municipal Planning Offices in Thompson and Dauphin, and that there are two people with Northern Planning in the office in Dauphin, four in Thompson.

Well, in any event, Mr. Chairman, with the integration of Municipal Planning and Northern Planning, the Northern Planning function and Municipal Planning function are carried out in offices in Thompson and Dauphin and Winnipeg.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his answer and it does show that they are not centralizing to Winnipeg, which is a good indication at least this department is not moving in that direction thus far.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder, then, in the Other Expenditures section, how much of the reduction is related to travel, because this particular section, because the community planning process is new to many of the communities, requires a considerable amount of travel, discussion, agreement and negotiation with the communities involved and I would hope that the Minister hasn't seen fit to reduce the contact with the community, the educational process that goes on with Community Planning in the communities, that they have in no way moved away from full consultation with the communities in order to reduce the budget but, at the same time, not have a very meaningful service for the remote communities. I wonder if the Minister could indicate if there has been a change in the travel part of this Other Expenditures and in his opinion, whether he agrees that the emphasis is still there, with this section of his department, that the communities have to be involved in this planning process and that the communities have to understand and be educated and then have a say in terms of how the planning is done and how the planning turns out, whether he is still in support of that full consultation in the planning with the remote communities.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, the amount included for travelling is the same amount as the existing level of service last year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(a) — the Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure the Minister heard the other part of my question. Maybe he didn't hear it.

I would just like some reassurance from the Minister that it is still the philosophy of this particular section that the communities must be fully involved in their planning, and that they must have a full say in their planning, and that, along with that, must go an educational process in terms of assisting the communities to look at this new process because most of the communities haven't been through this process before, and whether there is still that kind of dedication to community participation and involvement in the planning that there was in the past.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, there is no change in the objectives of consultation with the communities in regard to planning.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(a) Salaries—pass — the Member for St. George.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the Emergency Measures Organization that is listed here, I believe the Task Force on Government Reorganization recommended that this Branch be . . . Yes, you have made some announcements with respect to this Branch. Could the Minister indicate the specifics of the change? I believe he mentioned in his opening remarks — I don't think I was here — what the nature of the change is, and are there any staff changes and the like?



**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I indicated in introducing the Estimates that Cabinet has approved the transfer in principle of this department to Government Services, and that an Order-in-Council will follow shortly, I think this week, making the change effective, I believe, April 1st.

There was a report done on the Emergency Measures Organization throughout the summer months, on the whole Emergency Measures Organization. The report was considered by a Subcommittee of Ministers of Cabinet, who recommended that responsibility for the Emergency Measures Organization still continue to be with one line department and not a subcommittee of Cabinet, and a decision had been made that Government Services area would be a more appropriate department than Municipal and Urban Affairs.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, in view of the liaison that the Emergency Measures Organization has with Municipal officials throughout Manitoba and the direct contact, primarily in terms of natural disasters of flood, hurricanes and fires, could the Minister comment, when he indicates that this is a natural department it should be with, that it not remain with Municipal Affairs as the direct liaison department with local government?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MERCIER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, it wasn't with Municipal Affairs prior to the amalgamation of Urban Affairs and Municipal Affairs last fall. I was, as the member knows, located in the Urban Affairs Department. Really the function of Emergency Measures Organization should be one of coordinating all the necessary government departments in dealing with and treating an emergency. In government services there would be available to the department, I think, probably more substantial resources within that particular department for use in emergency and the function of coordinating other departments would be one in which Municipal Affairs and Mines and Resources would continue to be involved in as a part of that package. But there are any number of departments that are also involved — Highways, Telephones, Hydro — in any emergency situation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. George.

**MR. URUSKI:** Is there any change, diminution or change in service that will be offered or will be available in terms of coordination to the province by this change and in terms of the budget that is being presented here?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MERCIER:** No, in fact we would see it as an improvement for Emergency Measures because they would have more resources available directly in the Department of Government Services.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. George.

**MR. URUSKI:** There is no staff change in terms of the transfer or any staff change within this branch?

**MR. MERCIER:** No, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 9.(a)—pass; 9.(b)—pass.

Resolution 99: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$279,600 for Municipal and Urban Affairs Emergency Measures Organization—pass.

I would like to refer the members to Resolution 92: Minister's Salary, 1.(a)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** The tenure of the comments of the Minister throughout the course of his Estimates were that the Government of Manitoba has decided to do a number of things, but specifically to withdraw from very direct involvement with the affairs of the City of Winnipeg to its block grant concept and which appears to me as being a policy that is going to lead us into the position of not playing a vital role or a major role in the question of the growth of Greater Winnipeg or Winnipeg as a major city in Canada. And that to me and to our group is a step backwards, Mr. Chairman.

We believe that because Winnipeg represents more than half of the population of this province that it should have more provincial government involvement and intervention from time to time

in order that it develop along a path that is consistent with overall needs of the province and is consistent with the development of the cities across Canada. That can only happen if there is a major provincial role played in the development of a major urban centre. It has to do with the transportation networks. It has to do with the airport system and its connections with other cities in Canada and indeed North America. And, therefore, whatever happens should not be left to the decision-making process of some other body, that is, only to the decision-making process of another body, namely the City of Winnipeg. It has a major economic implication because however we structure the city will influence decisions of private entrepreneurs and that of course will influence the economics of Manitoba, but certainly of Winnipeg.

For that reason alone, there should be a major government involvement with respect to urban transit — I think that's a good example of where government can play a major role. I fear that the government will not want to use its elbow room in trying to persuade the City of Winnipeg in the direction of better public transportation systems and tie that in with the government owned bus manufacturing plant as has been the case in the past. And I think that has a very important economic consideration that should be taken into account by the Government of Manitoba.

We haven't heard from the government to date as to what they're planning to do with respect to taxation levels, property tax rebate in particular, and so we're not in a position to completely judge what is in effect going to happen this year until we hear the budget address. But, it seems obvious to me that one of the other important elements that we see before us here today is the fact that while the government is indicating a move to more efficiency in order to reduce taxation levels, so they claim, we find that what is really happening is that they are cutting back on services, on grants to local governments, not keeping up with inflation factors and thus forcing local governments, municipalities, school boards and hospital districts into a fair degree of financial difficulty. The school districts and the municipalities, of course, will have no choice but to do one of two things or perhaps some of both and that is to reduce services and increase taxation or one or the other. But whatever they do, or whatever they decide to do, it is not going to be a reduction in taxes as we were lead to believe that would take place, but rather a shifting of the tax load from the province to the municipalities. It may help to make the provincial books balance a little better but it certainly is not going to help the local governments in Manitoba. We believe that this is an unfair imposition on the school boards and the municipalities, Mr. Chairman, that the government must recognize that there are inflationary pressures and that there's only a limit to which one can squeeze any more efficiency from the system and networks that we have in municipal governments and school administrations and so on. So, bearing in mind that there may be some marginal success in that regard, we recognize that it cannot have major impact and that there will be a combination of lower levels of services and higher taxation at the lower level. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. George.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. These estimates, Mr. Chairman, that have been presented to the committee have really shown the government's hand in its role in Urban Affairs in the Province of Manitoba. This government has, and probably I would be too kind if I used any other word, other than emasculated the Department of Urban Affairs in terms of its leadership and direction that it can give and this Minister can give to the major urban areas of this province and we have one major urban area with only two or three smaller areas. This minister and this government is in its deliberate attempt, to allow through its direction of hands-off — possibly it won't be noticed in the first or second year — but it will really affect local governments by the policy that this government has brought in — the policy of neglect, the policy of user-pay. This government is allowing local government to flounder and that is possibly being too kind to this Minister of Urban Affairs.

This minister has indicated that he has no responsibility in any of the areas practically that we have discussed. He is a minister that, in farm language would be called a go-for minister; he will go for this department, go for that department to carry the requests of local government. He has virtually taken all hands off in terms of his relationships with local government. He is shifting responsibility for needed policy and direction, and program direction to other areas where he hasn't been able to tell us exactly who is co-ordinating the development of policy and direction that his government will take in the area of urban and municipal affairs.

He has admitted to us that there is collusion between the Provincial Government and the City Council, that all the dealings that will and have been taking place, have been one might say, under the table. All this hush-hush, everybody is in agreement, the City Council is in agreement with everything that the Province proposes. In terms of the block funding it appears that the compact at City Hall says, "Well, that's fine, you give us \$30 million and we will do as we please." So we

find while they accept the provincial block funding grant, on the other hand, their political affiliation with the government in power dictates that they want to and shall raise transit fees, increase user fees in various services at the municipal level.

They are certainly following the direction and the philosophy of the Provincial Government, in terms of user fees, and we've certainly witnessed that in the last year and a half by this Provincial Government in terms of university college fees, legal aid fees, nursing home fees, pharmacare deductibles. The philosophy of the Council in the City of Winnipeg has been along those very same lines so there's no doubt that they will be very happy with the amount of money that the province gives them. Who will be short-changed of course, will be the municipal taxpayer. We now know what the municipal tax bill and mill rate will be for the various areas of the City of Winnipeg, and along with the lack or freeze on finances to both the municipal level of government and the school divisions, this minister certainly is leading a department that I believe will allow local government to flounder as I've said. The department is not providing any leadership to the local governments of Manitoba, and it certainly will take its toll in the next number of years.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr Speaker, I want to sum up my position. It was noted at the meeting of urban municipalities in Brandon last October, and I quote from the Mayor of Pinawa, Howard Gilmore, he said that, "By cutting 10 or 12 municipalities out of the program the Provincial Government was passing its restraint program on to the municipal governments." I interpret that as meaning that they were bearing the brunt of costs and that the province was, in effect, passing the buck. My particular concern is a couple of specifics, and from there a general case, namely, that the transit, the urban transit, in terms of the City of Winnipeg, I think it is now going to find itself in an ever-increasing circle or cycle of costs and over the long run, probably in a decline in the number of passengers.

One of our governments main concerns was to keep transit fares down, and we did that, I think, in a combination of ways, but in particular through grants and corresponding commitments on the part of the City of Winnipeg to maintain low fare levels or in some cases I recall, discussions where it was a condition that there would be no increase, of course, in the fares. Now the minister is pulling out of a direct involvement in urban transportation, and I think the result in the long run will probably be declining passengers and increased use of cars and trucks, etc., which will ultimately mean, I suppose, more money spent on streets and roads and bridges, which will not be a saving in the long run.

The other thing that I want to mention was the fact that there is no assurance now, in terms of the Assiniboine Park and Zoo, there is absolutely no assurance that there will not be user fees charged at that popular provincial park, and I don't know whether the minister can give us any assurances in that regard or whether he has any concern or whether he expressed any concern to the City Council in terms of what might happen if there was an implementation of a user fee.

The City, I believe, was better off, under the previous administration, where a series of grants were given and that regardless of inflation or in spite of changing policy or improvements, the province still cost-shared those particular requirements. Now we get a case of where, according to some councillors, the province is saddling the city with the losers, that the losers are the things like the Convention Centre, the Transit System, the park etc., these are the areas where there'll be mounting costs and as a result, increased municipal taxation.

So, on one hand, the minister has given them one advantage, and I would concede that advantage and that is that he's given them a basic block funding and within that they can set their own priorities. What I object to is that I believe that certain programs included in the block funding should not have been included and should continue to be cost-shared because of their special importance, or their special place.

The other thing which I don't think he's satisfactorily answered is that the city, and he used to come and appear as part of that delegation, ask for new tax powers and new tax sources, and at least up until the present that has not been approved. Those have either been vetoed or set aside or delayed.

The final point that I would make is that I think that the government is continuing to demonstrate its lack of interest in the urban areas. I think that's a traditional attitude on the part of the Conservative Party, I think it was, to a certain extent — well it certainly was exhibited historically and I think Duff Roblin on occasion tried to break it, but I think we're going back in time to a concern on the part of the south-western part of the province, and a classic lack of concern for the urban citizen, 60 percent in the capital city alone. You know, the hands-off policy, the passive attitude of the Minister, the winding down of the Urban Affairs Department and so on — I said it before and I say it again, if it was true to say that Roblin abandoned Metro, it is also true to say that Lyon is abandoning Winnipeg.

**MR. MERCIER:** My concluding debate, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I understand there is no closing debates in Estimates. 1.(a)—pass — the Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, I have a question with respect to an issue which was brought to my attention by one of the municipalities within my constituency. Apparently, some of the provincial governments in Canada have been negotiating with the federal government for a cost-shared program which is available to them under a general policy of the federal government to assist municipalities in capital works projects at the municipal level. The people at the local level were asking me if this provincial government would be entering into negotiations or was nearing some type of agreement with the federal government on that program, or programs. Could the Minister perhaps enlighten us on that?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I think if the member is referring to the proposed community services agreement with the federal government, we went into that at some length and it will appear in Hansard, because it has been dealt with during the committee Estimates.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of what exactly the Minister has said, so perhaps for my clarification, I would ask some further questions and he can indicate if he has answered those questions. If so then I will refer to Hansard, but if he has not explicitly answered those questions, I would ask him to answer them at this point, and more explicitly, I would ask, if the department is negotiating, or if the Minister and his department are negotiating with the federal government and specifically what type of agreement are they attempting to arrive at with the federal government, and in the event that this agreement is concluded, what type of assistance would be available to the municipalities? Would it be on a cost-sharing basis, would the municipalities have to put up some of the funds, if so how much? What cost-sharing formula would be available to the provincial government from the federal government, is it a 50/50 cost-sharing, 60/40, 75/25, or what exactly is the nature of the agreement that is being negotiated with the federal government and when can we expect this agreement to be concluded? When is the Minister hoping to have this agreement in place, and will it be available to all municipalities in Manitoba? Would it be available to villages, rural municipalities, LGDs, urban centres, or just to specific parts of the province of Manitoba?

**MR. MERCIER:** That matter was dealt with during the Estimates.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Am I to understand, Mr. Chairman, that all of those questions have been answered?

**MR. MERCIER:** I think basically, Mr. Chairman, they have. Some have not been because some can't be answered at this stage until an agreement has been negotiated, but if the member would care to look at Hansard and if he then has any more specific questions, I'd be more than pleased to provide him with the answers.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, the one question I did pose and I believe would be very easy to answer, and the Minister would not be extending the time of this committee unduly if he answered that question, that is, when does he expect or hope to have this agreement concluded?

**MR. MERCIER:** We had hoped that it would have been last year, Mr. Chairman. We are awaiting some reaction from the federal government at the moment.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, is this agreement something which is available to all provinces in Canada, or does it have to be negotiated as a specific agreement between each province?

**MR. MERCIER:** It's available to all provinces, but no province has yet entered into an agreement with the federal government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(a)—pass; Resolution No. 92, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$680,100 for Municipal and Urban Affairs, General Administration—pass. That concludes the Estimates of Municipal and Urban Affairs.\$

**SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** I would draw the honourable members' attention to Page 48 in the main Estimates. We are on Health and Community Services, Resolution No. 64, Item 3. Social Services and Community Health, (g) Health Education (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, when we were concluding at the last meeting, the Honourable Minister said that he would take his copy of Building the Pieces Together with him over the week-end to try to have a look at it. I'm wondering whether he has any comments to make now in regard to this item.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** The only comments I have to make, Mr. Chairman, are that I acted, I believe responsibly and responsively to the serious concerns expressed by a number of parents. I do not apologize for having responded to those concerns. I stand by that action. We, in the Department of Health and Community Services, in the Department of Education and in the government of Manitoba will look into the program, determine whether or not it is worth promoting in the future. At the moment, we have ordered that promotion of the program be suspended.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister just used a verb, a grammatical construction of which I wonder at. He said, "we will look at it." I had understood the minister to say that they had been looking at it. Indeed, a decision to instruct the Alcoholism Foundation was made some time ago and I understood the minister to say that they are having it looked at. I tried to find out who was doing it and I thought it should be searched under this Item called Health Education. I don't believe the minister has really named the people who are charged with the responsibility of examining this, and although I think I've been careful to say that the minister had a right to indicate an opinion, there are several items that bother me.

Firstly, I still don't know if it's being studied. I know the minister said it is, but I don't know by whom. I know the Minister of Education has so far disassociated himself from the decision, and now I understand his department is studying it along with the Department of Health.

I have not yet received clarification from the honourable minister as to his authority to instruct the Alcoholism Foundation which, in his terms, is a free-standing, independent body, what authority he has to instruct them to do as he said he did, and I'm wondering whether he's not going to give us an answer, or which I believe is his right, whether he'll just say I stand by my decision, I had a legal right to do so and I did it and sit down. I don't know, I don't think this minister is the kind who would just take that position. I think he would try to respond to the questions, and I'm looking forward to giving him that opportunity right now.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I've tried to respond to the questions. The Honourable Member for St. Johns has asked me on whose authority was this done. I've answered on my authority. I'm not trying to duck the responsibility ' I'm not trying to duck the action, I'm not trying to duck the question. I did it, I stand by it, I will look at it, I will report back to the Member for St. Johns when we've had a chance as a government to look at it. We're not going to do it tonight, we're not going to do it tomorrow, we're busy. The program is in place for those who have it, the program is in place for those who ask for it, the program is not going to be sold and promoted to those up to this point who don't have it. By July, we'll know whether we'll scrap the program altogether, or whether it is desirable to continue it in the next school year 1979-80. That decision has not been made, it'll be made by me, by the Minister of Education backed up by the 33 members of the government caucus who have a responsibility to the electorate that was given to them by the electorate to try to conduct the affairs of this province in a reasonable way. That's the only answer I can give him. I'm not trying to duck anything, if he's trying to get me to say I'm sorry I did it, he's not going to get me to say that because I'm not sorry I did it.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't think for a moment to ask the Honourable Minister to say he's sorry he did it unless he was sorry and he's not sorry and I don't intend that he should feel sorry. I am sorry, and others no doubt who have examined the program are sorry, but that's why the minister has his responsibility and did what he did.

I have yet to understand from him, firstly, by what legal authority he could instruct the free-standing independent body to stop the promotion, firstly.

Secondly, he has again used the expression we will study it, and I am now correct in assuming

that it has not been looked at yet, and therefore, I ask him who precisely will be charged with this responsibility. Will it be lay people, will it be politicians, or will it be educators, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, or any other people who are trained in a professional way to deal with educational matters, especially in health?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that there is a review of the program in process, it's not at this juncture an all-consuming twenty-four hour a day, seven day a week review, but we are between the Minister of Education and myself and other members of the caucus, we are having a look, carrying on discussions, exchanging ideas at sporadic and infrequent intervals during what the Member for St. Johns knows is for us as it is for him, generally, a pretty busy week, and we will at a time when the Legislative Session is concluded and there is more time to focus on that question, having disposed of some other more important priorities, look at it much more intensely before making a final decision.

At the present time I would say that the general impression I get from those in our party who had a look at it, is that it is not a particularly desirable or advantageous way for children who should be learning to read, write, spell and do arithmetic to be spending their time. Now that may not be valid. I want to assure my honourable friend from St. Johns that no conclusions have been leapt to or formed in my mind, other than that because of the unhappiness of some parents who felt that it was upsetting their children, felt that it was in a way creating difficulties for their children in terms of relating to their own parents and their own brothers and sisters that we should not promote it until we'd had a chance to have a look at it. All that means is that for the balance of this academic year, we're not promoting it. It may be back in full bloom next fall, but I can't give him that anseer yet.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like then the Minister to agree to two statements that I'm about to make. Number one, he has not told us his legal authority to order the Alcoholism Foundation to stop promoting it. Number two, the only people he has referred to who have given him an opinion are politicians within the Progressive Conservative caucus. I asked him whether he was having this matter looked at by people who are trained to evaluate programs such as teachers, psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers and he has not answered that but he has said that members from the party, come to think of it he didn't even say the caucus but members of the party. Is he actually asking us to believe that that is the extent to which he's gone after ordering the program to be suspended?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, to take the questions in reverse order, I'm not asking the honourable member to believe that that is the extent to which we will necessarily go. That is the extent, yes, to which we have thus far gone.

The first question, when he asked me for my legal authority, I presume — but I want to be careful about it — that my legal authority rests in my being the Minister of Health, Community Services and Corrections, and therefore responsible for the administration of the Statute under which the Alcoholism Foundation operates. But over and against that, I want to assure my honourable friend that if the Board of the Alcoholism Foundation had not been prepared to concur in the instruction, that I would have had second thoughts about the instruction. I didn't have that kind of difficulty. I want to assure my honourable friend I don't believe, notwithstanding what he and his colleagues may wish to believe, I don't believe I've operated in a vigilante manner on this or any other issue. I don't think with respect to my honourable predecessor, the Member for St. Boniface, that very many Ministers of Health of this province have consulted as fully and as widely with community interest groups as I've attempted to do in the office.

And were there serious misgivings on the part of the Board of the Alcoholism Foundation and its administration, I would have had probably second and third thoughts about taking the action that I took, but there were no such misgivings. It was agreed that it was probably a good idea to have a look at it because of the objections that had been raised to it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I will try to postpone some questions for the Item dealing with Alcoholism Foundation in order to explore more fully the independence and free-standing nature of the Board. I'm looking at the Act now and I've not yet found that the Minister has the right to direct their program, and I do see he has the authority that all by-laws shall be submitted to him for approval, but obviously this program that we have been discussing is one which was largely funded by the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada as to its study but that it is in the hands of the Alcoholism Foundation. I'm just wondering whether the Minister is almost

saying when he said, "Had they disagreed, he would have another look at the program," I thought he was going to say he would have another look at the membership of the Board, and that, I believe, is the kind of an authority a Minister has, and that is the involvement in appointing the Board.

**MR. SHERMAN:** We have, as you know — we changed a great many members of the Board.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, then, Mr. Speaker, it may be that but that we can leave for later. We're really dealing with an educational tool which the Minister takes full responsibility for stopping as a program of the Alcoholics Foundation which he admittedly has not read, which apparently has not yet been looked at by the people involved in the advice givers to whom he's going to listen, and he says is going to be held until July.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think — I just want to repeat — I think it's irresponsible of him. I said the other day that if the allegations by parents were true then he did too little by stopping the promotion because if it's a dangerous thing for the childrens' mental stability, emotional stability, then why is he permitting it to be used at all, and I would fault the Minister of Education more than the Minister of Health.

Nevertheless, the Minister of Education, in questions I directed to him, passed the entire burden of responsibility onto the Minister of Health, who assumed it, so I'd have to say that the Minister of Health is at fault in permitting it to go on if it is as dangerous as parents have advised him it is, and the basis on which he stopped the promotion of the program.

On the other hand I suggest that he did too little because, Mr. Chairman, I am aware that there has been a complaint made by a School Division to the effect that they no longer know where they stand in regard to this program. They are asking the Minister of Education to approve a different kind of a program if he doesn't approve of this. The trouble is that although he made a public statement that seemed to indicate that he did not approve of this program, he did not as much as say so to the School Trustees, the School Boards, and apparently one of them in particular complained that now they don't know where they stand. They're looking for direction from this government and Mr. Chairman, all they're getting in this respect and in many others is a negative attitude of saying restraint, non-promotion, we're not going ahead with it, and you can do as you like and, Mr. Chairman, that is really begging the question for responsibility of a program which was being promoted by a Board which is funded by the government and is really . not facing up to the responsibility of making a positive decision, and that I deplore and to that extent I agree he may not be sorry, but I'm sorry.

I'm sorry that a Minister with so great a portfolio as he has, and I believe he has the heaviest portfolio of all, and I think he's not been relieved as he should have been of certain parts of it, has to be faced with a problem such as this which is completely out of his personal knowledge or training. Maybe I shouldn't say that because his training involves that of being a publicist and that, in effect, has to do with education, but I think that it is wrong for a Minister to have to say, and he does have to say it, "I am too busy to get involved in it." I understand that, but Mr. Chairman, if this Minister hasn't learned to delegate authority and to delegate responsibility for investigation, then it's going to be a pretty sorry state of affairs because he cannot possibly handle that.

I remember — the Minister of Highways was here — I remember asking him about some matter or other that he hadn't done and he said, "I've been too busy all summer building roads," giving the impression that he was out with that pick axe and I would think that it's back to being a pick axe now because that would be more in keeping with a Conservative approach to go back to the old tools of a pick axe and a shovel, which is probably what he's handling, and which is indicated by the Minister of Health having said already, "Well, we think that reading, writing and arithmetic are something we should go back to in the educational system", and when he said, "we", I think he spoke after having quoted the members of his Party.

So all of this, Mr. Chairman, is not to my surprise. I'm not at all surprised to get that response. What bothers me is it takes us quite a while to get Ministers to admit that many of their programs are really not doing things, really shirking dealing with them — and we've had that in the Question Period, I think, time and again now and today was an example — and I think it took a while for the Minister to make clear to us that it has not been studied up till now in spite of the fact that he first heard of it in October or November, that it has not been studied since he put a stop to it, but that it is going to be studied — and I still don't know by whom — and I think the answer is that no decision has been made yet by whom, or if it is that that decision is one that they're not too proud of — and I have to suggest that possibility — that the study is not being made by people whose expertise is one that we would accept and respect, so I have to say that there's neglect involved in this.

Here is an educational tool that is being used in some School Divisions, others don't know. In one School Division in particular, I believe, there was a funding withdrawn that had been . . . well, the Minister shakes his head, and yet I read somewhere that there had been a worker . . .

**MR. SHERMAN:** It was a two year contract.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Oh, a two year contract, I suppose, that was allowed to terminate, was not terminated by the Minister. I'm assuming that by what he said from his seat, but he'll clarify that as to whether or not — I'm sure he'll clarify it for the record so that we know the answer as to that contract — but I deplore it because I think that it is part of the philosophy of the government and of this Minister to go back to traditional ways, to avoid experimentation, to avoid considering a difference in approach or in programmer policy, as is evidenced by statements he made about Health Clinics where he said he thinks the traditional way is the best way, and if he said that originally we would have saved quite a bit of time.

I think now we've reached the stage where we can sort of understand that a program such as, Building the Pieces Together, is too much of a challenge to the educational system for it to be able to absorb because, in effect, if one reads this — and I hope that Minister is going to read it some day — he will discover that they have prepared it in such a way that a teacher can equip himself or herself to be able to cope with it, develop it, broaden its application, and make it a very useful general tool without disturbing the children unduly. And, as I said before, when I picked some pages at random and read them to the Minister, that these, to me, were very exciting educational tools.

I see the Member for St. Matthews is here, and he was a teacher, and I'm wondering whether he was knowledgeable on this program and, as a teacher, whether he would have accepted a challenge such as apparently, other teachers have done.

I suppose we will yet deal with it. We will certainly deal with this under Education, and I would like to think that the Minister will have more to tell us about this program, either when we get to the Alcoholics Foundation or when we get to his own Salary, but I would like him to know that, in my estimation, he is overlooking a very good educational program by listening to people who really didn't have the knowledge or expertise to advise him.

I want to stress again, as I did last week, that when I said that I had picked certain pages at random, indeed I did so and I read them to him, and I am quite prepared to pick further pages at random or have the Minister pick pages at random and discuss it, because it would be helpful to him if he really knew what this program was about.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with this matter from a somewhat different perspective for a few moments.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that one of the most fundamental and important aspects of Manitoba life is the fullest measure of co-operation and support from our local government, whether that local government be at the School Board level or it be at the Municipal level. School Boards and Municipalities are fundamental to the statutes of this province. They have certain very important functions assigned to them, and I believe that if we, at the senior level, tend to overlook or to bully or to slight local government then what we will have, Mr. Chairman, is the dying and the withering of the health, the health of local government in Manitoba.

Now, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the approach that the Minister undertook in this matter was of such a nature to demonstrate a — and I dislike saying this because I feel the Minister is a sensitive Minister in some respects; I have great disagreement with him in respect to what is happening in health care but I believe that his approach here was somewhat out of character, more in character with the First Minister's approach to matters, more in line with the First Minister's approach — an insensitivity to those that are entrusted at the local government level to manage the affairs of education in this province.

Why do I say that? Mr. Chairman, we have a lobby group of parents in the Evergreen School Division. That lobby group first meets with the Minister of Education. There is a meeting in Winnipeg Beach. The Winnipeg Beach Meeting, involving some of the parents that were concerned about this particular program, inquired from the Minister of Education whether he has read the book "Building the Pieces Together." His answer is "Yes". Then, subsequent to that answer, he acknowledges to the meeting that he does not favour the program.

Then, after that meeting, there are letters that are written to the Minister of Health and Social Development, and letters to the Minister of Education.



After there has already been a great deal of pressure melted upon the local School Board and the Superintendent of the Evergreen School Division, the Minister of Education, and the Minister before us, the Minister of Health and Social Development, deemed fit to respond to the parents in question.

There is no copy of the Minister's letter to the School Division, which had been bombarded by protest from a small group of parents in the School Division. They are not advised as to the Minister's position. There is no consultation by the Minister with the truly elected representatives at the local level, indicating to the local elected representatives that, well, we are divorcing ourselves from the position that you are taking at the local level; we don't really share your position. No, the Minister does not see fit to have what I would think to be a meeting of the two levels of government to discuss this particular situation, when both the locally elected people find themselves under pressure and the Minister finds himself under pressure. Instead we have a letter which is forwarded from the Minister to a representative of the protesting parents, with a copy of that letter, Mr. Chairman, to the First Minister of this province to let him know, to let him know what the Minister is saying to the protesting parents but not to let the people, who are very much in the front lines in this issue, know, the locally elected representatives in the Evergreen School Division.

I find that rather strange and rather peculiar from a government, Mr. Chairman, that proclaimed loud and clearly its allegiance to local grassroots effort at the Municipal and the School Board level. I find it rather peculiar, rather strange, that we already ascertained the development of that insensitivity and that arrogance being demonstrated from a Minister I would not have anticipated such insensitivity from.

Then, Mr. Chairman, what happens? What happens is that the Minister not only failed to consult with the locally elected people but the letter is written in such a way, and the letter indicates that it is forwarded to the protesting parent, without any attempt to ensure that that letter will not be used by the lobbying group in question. The Minister now describes his position to be that he simply wants to evaluate the program and that he is not opposed to the program as such but only wishes to cease the promotion of that program until such time as an evaluation has been completed. An evaluation by whom? We don't know, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has not seen fit, to this point, I believe — unless I am mistaken; possibly I am mistaken, I don't believe the Minister has advised us as to who has been entrusted with the very great responsibility of evaluating this program. Maybe it's the Minister of Highways; probably it's the Member for Gladstone; maybe it's the Minister of Education, who has already indicated his predetermined opposition to the program. I don't know. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the letter which was written to the protesting parent said that the government would cease forthwith from promoting the program.

The letter was written in such a way, Mr. Chairman, to give reasonable hope to the protesting parent that the government was right in their corner, on this issue, that the government shared fully the opposition of the local pressure group, so that the local pressure group would be able to march to local government in Evergreen and say, "Look look, here is the letter from the Minister of Health and Social Development. The Minister of Health and Social Development tells us the program is no good, that the provincial government is ceasing forthwith from the promotion of that program." The petition says that, that's used by the local group. So what we do have, Mr. Chairman, is local government, local government with the rug pulled out from underneath it, pulled out from underneath it, that's what happens.

Mr. Chairman, what happens now is that we have indication that school divisions don't know where they stand on this program, they thought it was a good program, they were proceeding to utilize this program, but they don't know if there's a group within their boundaries that should mount opposition. Do they have the support of the Minister of Education, and the Minister of Health and Social Development? Or will the Minister of Health and Social Development and the Minister of Education do a full-scale desertion of their particular support? Did the Minister of Health and Social Development say to Evergreen School Division we are only ceasing the program until we evaluate it? No, he didn't even tell them anything, Mr. Chairman. Didn't tell them anything at all. They didn't exist as far as the Minister of Health and Social Development is concerned. And unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, we see more and more and more evidence mounting on the part of the government across the way that they hardly even recognize the existence of local government in this province, whether it be at the School Board level, whether it be at the Hospital Board level, whether it be at the municipal level. That's what I object to, Mr. Chairman.

I'm not going to enter into a debate now, I've looked at this, I can't say that I've studied it in any detail. I can understand fully the minister's desire to evaluate the program, I think he should evaluate the material, but let him say that, let him say that, let him not be used as a tool by a small group to undermine local government in this province.

The Superintendents of Education met with the Minister of Education and I've seen minutes as a result of that meeting. The Minister of Education was advised by the Superintendents of Education

in this province that they feel they have been undermined insofar as this program is concerned. Undermined not because there's an evaluation of the program, but because the School Board and a superintendent saw fit to courageously stand up for what they believed to be right. They refused to be pushed and they said, look, we feel this is a good program, we've been democratically elected. The next thing they know, Mr. Chairman, they're confronted with a position without any notice, without any advice from them, from the Ministers of Education and Health and Social Development indicating their alliance not with local government, but with a group of parents, who may very well have very good sound reasons, who appear to oppose the program.

This is the basis of my objection to the minister's position, and I would hope that we could obtain from the minister an assurance that this insensitivity, this lack of caring, this nonresponsiveness to local government, will cease at least on the part of this minister. I know it's going to occur on the part of other ministers across the way, it's certainly going to appear on the part of the First Minister, but I would hope that we could at least obtain an assurance from this minister, that insensitivity, nonresponsiveness will not take place from his desk in this building.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, with due regard to the rule about repetition, I would like to make a few comments on this particular program under this item, and leaving perhaps some of the other considerations further down in the Estimates.

First of all, I wish to support the minister in his contention that it is his prerogative to exercise and he exercises. The disagreement that is coming from this side of the House is the manner in which he exercises that prerogative. But it perhaps might serve the House well if a couple of points were made.

The program that we're talking about is, in my judgment, an excellent attempt to deal with some of the problems facing society and this is the Department of Health and Social Development and we're dealing with an educational component of it. The minister, in one of his earlier remarks gave his personal view of what education in the school system is about, that it's back to the basics and nothing else is to be taken up in school. If the minister reads in Hansard what he said in response to the Member for St. Johns, I think he will see how I arrive at that conclusion. I can best describe the program in simple terms by an experience in my own family in which my youngest daughter got on a bus and she had never seen a negro person before. This was a chain of events. And she walked up to this fellow and she said to him, why are you black? And this fellow had the sense to say, come on and sit down and he asked my daughter, what colour are you? She said, I'm white and he says, no you're pink. They got into a discussion on this sort of thing, and as a result of it, hopefully my child won't limit her life by growing up with some of the prejudices that permeate our society.

But there are some things in this program which do perhaps cross some lines and there is a caution included in the book itself, cautioning teachers on some of the problems which may be encountered. But to scrap this particular program just because of a gut reaction, I think primarily and it's my honest opinion, it's because of a box that the Minister of Education got himself into at a public meeting in Gimli in which he ascribed the idea that it was a socialist program and therefore it fell into that hold bag that everything that we did was bad and they have to go back and recreate the world in their image and likeness.

With reference to this particular program, why it sits in this particular area, I would just like to put on the record. A number of years ago, there was a position in the Education Department which was involved in Drug and Education, and the decision was made by the former minister in cooperation with the Minister of Education to second that particular position over to Health and Social Development for the development. The individual that occupied the position went on to other things, and I believe he's still in the system.

But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, the people who are involved in this particular program, I don't know if they're Socialists, or Conservatives or anything else because I agree with Tommy Douglas in the sense that it's easier to make a Socialist out of an engineer than it is an engineer out of a Socialist. The people who were deployed in this particular program were people who were competent, and some of them perhaps may subscribe to our particular political philosophy. There are equally a number of others who didn't. In this regard, I know the minister is just too busy for socializing too much, but he said in response to the Member for St. Johns that the Board at the Alcoholism Foundation has been changed and we'll deal with the repercussions of the imposition of Conservative philosophy under that particular item.

But on this program here, Mr. Chairman, I think it's very important that it gets through to the public that what we're having is another manifestation of the regressive preservative philosophy that everything that was done under the former administration is bad, so therefore it has to be

scrapped. The Member for St. Johns went through and he did, because I was watching him, some of my papers were in, marking his place on this particular program, because he was just opening it at random. In fact, one of the random places I opened it — in fact it falls open at that place again — it says, Note to teacher. The risk for experiencing activities from Building the Pieces Together are substantial." There's a cautionary note in this just where it falls open. And in fact, the teachers who are involved in this go through an rather extensive teacher training type of involvement and the whole program, the product itself, the philosophy of the program, the books which were being used, the education or training of teachers to use it, is avant-garde in North America. In fact, some of the people were asked to go to Alberta of all places to discuss this program.

And if the minister will derive any solace from the fact that criticism preceded that government by some of the people who react to it. And I would suggest that the approach to people's concerns, some of which legitimate, Mr. Chairman, because as you're going to try something new, there are bound to be people who are apprehensive about it. final, just small example, of how this particular program deals with the approach to dealing with the problems of people sharing a space, this world that we live in. Some people can do it intuitively, they don't need Building the Pieces Together, they do it intuitively. I know an excellent teacher, who teaches in pre-school. There was a sandbox, and this child was sitting there and playing in the sand and another child from a different ethnic group came up and sat and wanted to play. And this child said, you can't play here. So this teacher went over and said well, the child could play there and you kind of have to learn to share. So the teacher stood back to see what would happen, and this one youngster sat there and stared at the other individual and in a couple of minutes, he put out his hand and he touched the face of this differently-ethnic child and the look on that child's face was very rewarding to this teacher because this child discovered it was skin. Subsequent to that, the child learned that the individual came from a home that thought perhaps people who were different ethnically weren't people. But nevertheless, in that particular instance, hopefully that child will learn that we're all people.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I don't want to impinge upon the rules of repetition because as is stated on the front of this particular thing, this was done under the auspices of the Alcoholism Foundation and I should mention though, arising out of my colleague, the Member for St. Johns' remarks earlier, there is an absolute control in the sense that the budget of the Alcoholism Foundation is under the authority of the minister and while there may not be a clause in the Act which says the minister has the right to dictate policy, nevertheless, he has quite an influence as far as the allocation of the final dollars are concerned.

But, Mr. Chairman, in this regard it is worthy of note — I'm much milder today than I was the other day when I was accusing the Minister of peddling humbuggery which I still believe, but nevertheless it's worthy to note that earlier today during the Question Period, that the Attorney-General who is responsible for the Liquor Control Commission, very arrogantly sat there and refused to answer the legitimate questions of the Member for St. Vital. The Liquor Control Commission decides. In another case, the other body, some other body or agency decides, but nevertheless, when something comes to their view which is against their policy, they immediately react.

So, Mr. Chairman, it's very interesting that it's finally getting through to the public, I believe, that what we're having here is the imposition of Conservative policy across the board, and that they're going to, you know, stop the world, take out of it eight years, go back and hopefully bring it up to date. And it is regrettable because when we talk about Health and Social Development, this attitude of the government toward this particular project is but a manifestation of their whole approach to Health and Social Development. It impinges this particular line of their Estimates, it impinges upon the Community Health Clinics type of an operation, the whole thing in the name of "restraint" that they are slipping in under the rug, their policy.

I would like to put on the record also at this time, Mr. Chairman, the reasons that the former Minister exercised some of his ministerial prerogatives. It was apparent that there had been built up a terrific momentum within the bureaucracy of the Department of Health and Social Development a particular thrust towards the single unit delivery system which arose out of Castonguay's study in Quebec with very little attention being paid to some of the problems which were building up in the Province of Quebec, so there was a lot of pressure by the system to have this whole operation included under Community Operations.

May I digress, Mr. Chairman. When I'm talking about the bureaucracy, I wish to go on the record that when this government changes hands once again, as it will with the help of members opposite, I want every civil servant to know that my policy, as far as I'm concerned, anywhere that I'm asked to serve within a government even if it is the back bench, is that I want to make it a good place to work. There will be no holus bolus firings. There will be no stomping through the ranks to find Socialist personnel, because within that system they had highly competent, capable people who

tried to consistently advise the Ministers, argue with them sometimes long into the night on how we should approach some of these problems.

But back to where I was, Mr. Chairman. The reason that the government accepted the recommendation of the former Minister that things go in a particular way was that we were trying to implant some new seeds into the System, and it's comparable to taking at this time of the year your tomato seeds and you put them in the ground now so that they'll be ready to put out in the spring, and that's what's with this whole thing, this particular piece, and when we get down further in the line we'll see relative to the Alcoholism Foundation that had things gone on in the normal course of events, if there had been some attempt to bridge the change in governments then about this time, within the next year, I quite conceivably would have supported an integration of the two systems because the thing would have gone through a nurturing process that it would be able to stand on its own two feet within the larger system. Nevertheless, having put on the record why the former Minister proceeded in a particular way, I support this Minister's prerogative to make decisions, as the former Minister had the prerogative to make decisions, that when the Minister says that the only basis for the instructions to scrap this program was because of a reaction to it, I think that the Minister erred.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I must admit that I knew nothing about this report, this study report, until it was brought to our attention by the Member for St. Johns, and I for one would think that whenever it's a question of conscience that any man, the minister, if he hasn't got the legal right, certainly he has the moral right to do something about it. I say, if it's a question of conscience — and who are we to argue — and what might be a question of conscience for me might not be for any other members in the House, and the reverse is also true. But one thing I can't understand, so I'm not condemning the Minister this time because he felt that he had to take action, but one thing that I'll never understand — it seems to me that if I had been in this position and if somebody would come in and say, "Watch out. This might be harmful", that I would suspend it immediately — the program, not just the advertising. I don't think that you can treat different children, different students in different ways. I think if it was dangerous for the children of these parents that criticized, that it could have been and the Minister said, "I don't know. I'm going to investigate. And if it's not dangerous and if it's felt that it's a good program it'll go ahead no matter if the people" — if I understood him well — "no matter if these people are complaining, but if it's wrong, well, we'll stop it", but in the meantime what happens to those students who might be exposed to something that can only be harmful? That's the thing that I can't reconcile with my honourable friend. I think that something should be done.

Now, I'd like to see if the Minister is consistent. You know, we hear so many things that big government, big governments that you let the people — there are other people, not just politicians that are smart. There's a lot smarter people outside. And the Minister is certainly one that pushes this principle and talks about that quite often. He wants to go to free enterprise and other people. Now, if I understand this well, and at first I thought that this document or this book — I can't say a book — I thought that this was issued to the students, and now I'm told that it goes to the teachers. Well, if it goes to the teachers it seems that we shouldn't panic. I think the Minister said, "I'll make the decision." In all humility, and we should be humble at times, but we don't become expert in everything because we're elected to this House, and it seems to me that people that are trained to become educators and who spend many, many years in whose profession it is, I think we've got to give them a little bit of credit and think that they will present it in a way that shouldn't be harmful to the students. I think by the action of the Minister he's saying that he hasn't got confidence in the teachers of this province because, in effect, you know, if I had a book like this and if I was a teacher and I felt that it would be harmful, either I would take the good part and would change it or I wouldn't use it at all. I think that, you know, it is not the children we're afraid of, it's the teachers. We feel that they will not know how to handle this.

It also is a lack of confidence in the School Divisions, the electorate or another level of government who are just certainly as intelligent as the people of this House and it is their responsibility. The Minister, who has such a big portfolio and who is behind in everything, including the working out with the hospitals to get a proper budget, is deciding that he will decide and I doubt if it is his responsibility.

Now, there's another point. I think it's a lack of confidence in the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, and that I can't understand. If the Minister has enough confidence in them to give them — I think the Estimates will come up a little later — I think it's over \$4 million, but we haven't enough confidence in them to do this in the right way. I don't understand. And the first thing that struck me was that the Minister is certainly not consistent because on the Item just before that

— what was it? I know it's the one just before that — Home Acts, I made a certain suggestion to the Minister and he said, "Well, you know, we don't understand that. I believe in the freedom of people", and he says, "I never would try to stop people in advertising junk food". Do you remember that, Mr. Chairman? The Minister agreed with me that there was a lot of junk food and that there were a lot of these things that was a detriment to the health of the youngsters, especially, but he felt that he would draw the line at preventing people from advertising, that it was a free country and that they should advertise and five minutes, or three minutes after, the Minister is saying, "I stopped the advertising on this", so I don't understand.

Then I wonder, you know, as I defended the Minister in his moral right even if it wasn't his legal right, if he is sincere, but I wondered at the sincerity of the Minister. It seems that any administrator, if somebody comes and complains because it got known, and especially in that department, that you have people complaining all the time, criticizing his actions, especially of this government with this restraint. It seems to me — and I just looked at the document the other day and it doesn't seem to be like a novel or anything like that, it's different chapters that are quite independent — it seems to me that if somebody would complain and said, "Well, you know, this is detrimental, this is not good for our students," I would ask — and it seems to me that any administrator would say, "Well, give me some specific examples", and I would insist that they would write me, that they should write a letter and give me the number of the page and quoting what they object to, and it wouldn't take more than fifteen minutes for the Minister, when he's discussing with the Minister of Education, to look at that page and to see if that is, in effect, so detrimental and that isn't done. So it seems to me that these parents brought this to the attention of the Minister quite a few months ago and the Minister will say, "Well, there's no rush", so sometimes you doubt the sincerity. You have something that might be helpful, and something that should be decided, not wait forever to see if it is good, and the Minister said, "Well, you know, it's not the most important thing in the world", and I agree with him. But there's no reason it should take this long, although I must say, this is not my first priority. Maybe it is to other members of this Committee, and I didn't know anything until it was brought up by the Member for Selkirk, but I fail to see that the Minister is very consistent in dealing with this after the statements that were made in this House.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just before we leave this matter of Building the Pieces Together, I'm going to say a few words further to what the Member for Winnipeg Centre was saying. One of the individuals that was working on the development of this particular program happens to be a constituent of mine, and I've had a couple of conversations with him and he has explained to me the basis behind the development of the program and the philosophy involved with it. As the Member for Winnipeg Centre has stated to the House, it was developed through the Alcohol Foundation and came about as a result of a study and research that was done into the problems of drug abuse and of alcohol abuse, and of attempting to discourage young people from starting to drink and overdrinking, and also in an attempt to prevent them from getting into drugs for the first time.

The theory behind the development of the program, Mr. Chairman, is a recognition that people take to drugs or drink because they are somehow pre-programmed to do so, that they have frustration with life or a need to escape mentally from society, and that this develops out of a sense of lack of self-worth by the individual, that they will seek some means of escape or relief from the pressure of society or the frustrations of their job or the school. The theory then goes on to say that you can go into the schools and tell a teenager not to drink, or not to take this pill or that powder or whatever it is, but it's too late by that time, that their sense of self-worth is developed by that age and it's a waste of time, it's a waste of money to attempt to indoctrinate or warn those teenagers of the dangers that they are facing. It is a complete waste of time to tell them that they will rot their liver by drinking and rot their brains by taking pills or some drugs or another. The way to cope with the problem is to remove the need for those people to seek these chemical comforts, that the time to get to them is in their formative years.

It has been explained to me that the program has been developed to enable children, through their early grades, to develop this sense of self-worth in themselves, to learn to cope with other people and with situations that face them in society, the problems that they will face in school, at home, and this sort of thing, so as to develop their own sense of self-worth so that there will not be, in later years, this need to look around for some chemical comfort or alcohol to serve as a prop or as an escape mechanism for them.

Now, seen in those terms, Mr. Chairman, the principle for developing this program makes pretty good sense, as long as you accept that it is a feeling of lack of self-worth that encourages teenagers

and adults to turn to these chemical comforts. It makes sense to try to alleviate this condition at an earlier age by developing such a program as "Building the Pieces Together" is. I cannot claim that it's a perfect program. There might well be things involved with it that could be improved, but I'd like to ask the Minister if the principle behind the development of this program has been explained to him and what is his reaction to it. Does he accept the theory behind the program? If he does not, of course, then perhaps he should try to scrap the whole plan, but if he does then he not see the value of it and the need to get to children at young formative years, rather than to try to influence adults or teenagers, whose sense of self-worth is developed to a very high level. I wonder if he would comment on his.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I certainly see the value and the necessity of getting at children in the early youthful years with respect to alcohol and drug education. I don't quarrel with that principle in any way. I know, and my honourable friend from St. Vital knows, that there are conflicting philosophies. There are almost as many philosophies as there are teaching institutions, as to the best tools and methods to be honed and utilized for delivering that kind of exposure and education, and I certainly don't pretend to be an expert in terms of the priority rating and the reference for one of those approaches over another.

This is one of the things that the Alcoholism Foundation, under its new Chairman and new Board members and new administrative unit, is charged with working on, on behalf of the government and the people of Manitoba.

I think that there's perhaps a point here that, although it seems obvious, is worth mentioning for the record and that is that we, as a government, of course, inherited the programs and the policies and the approaches that were developed and put in place quite legitimately by the Alcoholism Foundation under the previous government, just as we develop programs and policies and initiatives in other areas. I find it passing strange that there should be so much apparent difficulty on the part of my honourable friends opposite to understand why — you know, I can understand their challenging our philosophy as opposed to theirs, but my goodness we all live in this process of one government succeeding another, and pray God it will always be that way. What strikes me as passing strange is that they seem to have difficulty accepting the fact that we would, for example, change the direction of the Manitoba Development Corporation or change the direction of this government in respect to certain taxation policies that we believe in and that they legitimately don't believe in, or change the policy with respect to cattle marketing, or change the policy with respect to any one of a number of things, but they don't seem to be able to understand why we would change the policies of the Alcoholism Foundation.

We inherited a program that we have had considerable objection to. In fact, with all respect for my honourable friend, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, I inherited an Alcoholism Foundation and a spectrum of Alcoholism Foundation operations that I and we, my colleagues, had had a lot of complaints about. I'm not arguing whether those who were on our side are right or those who were on the other side of the question are right, the fact is it's a reality, just as it will be for him and probably was in the past for him, that we were the repository — or not the repository but let's say the beneficiary — of a considerable amount of discontent expressed with respect to the Alcoholism Foundation. Therefore, we have made some changes in the Alcoholism Foundation. We have changed the administrative set-up; we have changed the Board; we have changed the Chairman; we have stopped promoting "Building the Pieces Together."

You know, the Member for St. Boniface questions my consistency with respect to this particular item and some others that we have discussed but I think that he should also challenge the consistency of his own colleagues. On one hand we have got the Member for St. Johns saying that if this is the way I felt, I should have stepped in and stopped the program . . . —(Interjection)— Well, somebody said it. I have no authority to do that. I can't overrule individual School Divisions, elected School Trustees who have made a decision, but in any event, leaving it on the level of abstract argument to make my point, they say I should have stepped in and stopped the program. And yet the Honourable Member for —(Interjection)— Well, that is what has been suggested. The Member for Selkirk, the Leader of the Opposition, is shaking his head, but some of your colleagues have suggested that and yet the Honourable Leader of the Opposition says to me that I'm trampling the rights of local government by even having suspended promotion of the program. So I mean when we come down to consistency, let's have consistency on both sides of the House.

I took what action I felt was legitimate and responsible in the circumstances, without going too far, because I recognize that I do not have the authority to step in, and if I had the authority I don't think I would until the end of the school year. The School Divisions who have that in place have it in place. It's not the teachers who made the decision. —(Interjection)—

The Member for St. Boniface asks me about a misguided confidence or challenges me on a misguided or a lack of confidence in our teachers. It's not the teachers who have the responsibility

for this, other than teaching it. It's the elected —(Interjection)— Well, the elected scho I trustees, who are just like all of us in this Chamber, elected public officials, have the responsibility for making the decision on whether they wanted that program in their school divisions or not. I can't overrule them, any more than they can overrule me. They have made that decision. But what we can do is say, "Look, because a number of parents have expressed considerable concern", and surely they are just as important as the number of cooks who have gone to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition to complain about certain of their conditions which they feel are unattractive, just as a number of people in the area of agriculture have colained about certain marketing procedures and there has been response, just as there was a response on the part of the previous government to people who had particular anxieties about things, we have responded — I have responded to the anxieties of parents who are set by the program by saying, "Well, we better hold the horses and take a look at it. So we will not promote it anymore, until we have had a look at it. That will be done before the next school year is in place."

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Why didn't you say that?

**MR. SHERMAN:** I did say that to them. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't speak for the manner in which my letter might have been used by that group of parents, any more that the Honourable Member for Selkirk can. I wrote a letter to the parents to tell them that because of our concern we were instructing that promotion be stopped. What they did with that letter is their business. If the Honourable Member for Selkirk feels that it was used as a pressure instrument and as a lever to exert pressure on the school division, I regret that, but that was of their volition.

As a matter of fact, I didn't xpress an opinion one way or the other as to whether they should use .y letter or not. All we did was instruct that promotion of the progr m be stopped.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour being 4:30, and in accor ance with Rule 19(2), I am interrupting the proceedings for Private M mbers' Hour and will return at 8:00 p.m.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. We are now under Private Members' Hour. The first item of business on Mondays in rivate Members' Hour is Resolutions.

### RESOLUTION NO. 2 — ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT INF RMATION

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Resolution of the Honourable M mber for Transcona. The Honourable Member for Inkster has five minu es left in his presentation.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I was dealing, w'en we left off, with the manner in which the Resolution now stands an, I did want to indicate to the House that there was at least a partly erroneous submission that I made which I want to correct, when I indicated that if the Resolution had been left as it was there would not be a necessity for a second Resolution to create the committee. And looking at the Resolut-on, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't create a committee; it asks that somethi.g be referred to a committee. So, even if passed, the normal situat-on would be that there would be a motion, probably by the House L-ader, to create a committee, and naming the members on the committ.e. And that procedure will have to be taken, in any event. So we would.'t have saved anything, but it does merely indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the passing of this Resolution without the words what have been added to it would still have required a motion in the House, and that motion would, in the ordinary circumstances, be made by a member of the Treasury Benches, so the inclusion of those words are hardly necessary.

I would indicate, Mr. Speaker, that have looked at the journals, and I want to read to the House Leader a Resolution moved by the honourable member at that time — I think it was for Emerson — the proposed Resolution of Mr. Tanchuk, "Whereas this House has no Standing Committee of Education; Whereas education by general agreement is given top priority," etc., "Therefore Be It Resolved that a Standing Committee of this House be appointed for the purpose of Education, which committee shall be empowered," etc. Nothing about the government considering the advisability, because it is the establishment of a legislative committee.

But if this motion were passed, then the Standing Committees were set up at the beginning of the year, at that time the normal process was for the First Minister to move that a committee of seven be established to establish these Standing Committees. I say that, Mr. Speaker, not because the point is really of great consequence, but it has resulted in an unnecessary addition, in my opinion,

to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the other point, I still have difficulty with some members — notably the Member for Fort Rouge, who is not here — who not only doesn't see a difference of opinion on this subject, but he says that the people who are not of the opinion of him are trying to bring about secrecy, and for two years I have been trying to convince him that because I happen to think that open government arises in a different way does not mean that he happens to be in favour of openness and I happen to be in favour of secrecy.

I want to commend to the Members of the House and to the Member for Fort Rouge, who is not here, a book that I have just finished reading, called "The Politics of the Judiciary." And this book, Mr. Speaker, was written by a law professor by the name of J. A. G. Griffith, who is at the London School of Economics, and takes exactly the same position — not exactly, but in principle, the same position that I have been taking — and I don't believe that one can accuse him of being in favour of secrecy in government.

But listen to what he says, Mr. Speaker and he deals with the judiciary in all its facets, and he comes to the conclusion that the judiciary is the bastion of the status quo, and as between the individual and the government, the judiciary will vote for the government and that they protect the government. And this is what he says, Mr. Speaker, on Page 199. "Personal or human rights are not vested rights but claimed. Even when they are presently enjoyed to some extent, they have to be continuously insisted on and continuously fought for," — and that's another way of saying, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty — "any carelessness in the protection of freedom leads directly to their erosion. Moreover, the enlargement of my freedom, my liberties, means the diminution of power to however small an extent enjoyed by some person or more likely some official or institution. When therefore, the judiciary is asked to defend such personal rights, it is being asked not to protect but to assert, not to strengthen institutions, but to weaken them. And this is something which judges are reluctant to do, for it is alien to their principal function, which is not the enlargement of liberty, but the preservation of legally invested rights."

Mr. Speaker, I have been to the courts for 15 years on civil liberty cases, and if you ask me whether the courts are the place in which to trust one's civil liberties, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, as a result of years of experience, that it's the last place. The civil liberties of human beings will be protected by the elected representatives of the people, that in a contest between civil liberties and the state, the court's great historical tendency has been to rule in favour of the state, and for a period of 50 years, Mr. Speaker, the Legislature had to undo decisions against trade unions made by the courts, which offended against personal liberties, and continually did so.

Mr. Speaker, the writer goes on to say that "freedom of information should not be left with the courts because the courts, in deciding freedom of information cases, will decide in favour of the state and not in favour of the citizen."

**QUESTION put on the Resolution as amended, MOTION declared lost.**

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is . Resolution No. 2, moved by the Honourable Member for Transcona, as amended . . .

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that the amendment is before the House, and not the Resolution as amended.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** It is the amendment that is before the House at this stage, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I believe the amendment was voted on the previous day, on March 15th.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I spoke, I believe on . . . no, it's possible that's right because I spoke on the amendment last time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The information that I have is that the amendment carried on March 15th. We are now voting on the motion as amended. The Honourable Opposition House Leader, is that correct?

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether, if all of the members agree, Mr. Speaker, because there was confusion in my mind, and I think confusion in other people's minds, if you will put the



question again, and ask, is the motion as amended to be put.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that because there was confusion and all the members are here and they've been called into the House, that the motion as amended, now be put again, if there is no objection.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I believe that's what I was just attempting to do, was put the question.

**QUESTION put on the Resolution as amended, MOTION carried.**

### RESOLUTION NO. 6 — LORD'S PRAYER IN HOUSE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The next order of business is Resolution No. 6, the Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

**MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, Resolution No. 6,

Whereas basically Canada is a Christian country founded upon the Christian ideals, and;

Whereas the prayer known as The Lord's Prayer is pre-eminently the prayer of the whole Christian community and is accepted by most religions, and;

Whereas 90 percent of the population of Manitoba, at least nominally falls under this purview, and;

Whereas this prayer begins by putting God in the centre of our lives, reminds us of the majesty of God, the purpose of God, and the Will of God, and continues with the most comprehensive petitions ever encompassed in any prayer, and;

Whereas British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec already incorporate the reading of the Lord's Prayer by the Speaker of the Legislature each day at a meeting of the House before the daily routine of business;

Therefore be it resolved that Rule 18 of the Rules, Orders and Forms of proceedings in the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba be amended by inserting the words, "including the Lord's Prayer" following the word "prayers" in the first line thereof.

**MR. SPEAKER:** You have heard the motion of the Honourable Member for Point Douglas. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have presented this resolution before the House, not because I happen to be a member of the clergy, but because I strongly believe in the merit of it. The resolution simply calls for the changing of Rule 18, Orders and Forms of Proceedings, by including The Lord's Prayer. I would have introduced this resolution even if I were not a member of the clergy.

The opening sentence of the preamble in the resolution states that basically Canada is a Christian country, founded upon Christian ideals. Of course, I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that in this great country of ours, there are many people of many other faiths besides the Christian faith, and I fully respect their beliefs and also their rights to their faiths and beliefs. But the resolution I am presenting should not arouse any antagonism from any quarter regardless of their beliefs.

No one, of course, will dispute the fact that in Canada, the great majority at least profess to adhere to the Christian faith and Christian ideals. Mr. Speaker, according to the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, which indicates that here, in Manitoba, we have, not like I said in the resolution, 90 percent, but it says 93.7 percent, of our citizens here in Manitoba, they've declared themselves as a Christian, one way or the other. But Mr. Speaker, an examination of Christian ideals insofar as they provide moral and ethical guidance for the conduct of our lives, do not defer from the basic ethical and moral standards of all religions.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, the Ten Commandments. The general prospects contained in the Sermon on the Mount are also found in the other religions. The exhortation of Love One Another, to refrain from killing or stealing, to be good, decent people, these basic ethical guidelines are contained in Judaism, Confucianism, Hinduism, Buddhism, in Islam, and any other religion I know anything about. Insofar, Mr. Speaker, as the Lord's Prayer is concerned, it is, of course the principal prayer of the Christian religion, Catholic, Protestant, and all Christian sects. I believe it is also quite acceptable by some Jewish communities. So I am not suggesting anything, Mr. Speaker, that goes strongly against the grain of another member of this Assembly.

I considered this very carefully, for I found no wish to present anything in this House, Mr. Speaker, of a religious nature that would not be acceptable to all members. First of all we have to realize

one thing, as I said before, that if we, as representatives of this Chamber, if we represent 93.7 percent of the population of Manitoba, which means automatically that also we are representing 93.7 percent of our own constituency.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, almost in every church, on every Sunday, we are praying for our representatives — let's not say, we, I say, our constituents — they are praying for us, they are praying for our Premier, so I can see no harm that we, as their representatives, that we can pray for them.

Mr. Speaker, some honourable members may be wondering what is my motive to propose in presenting this Resolution in this Assembly where we deal with earthly problems, daily problems. What do I hope to accomplish? Will reciting The Lord's Prayer at the beginning of our session make us wiser or better men or women? Will it in some way help us in coping with what our problems are?

I am sure that it will, Mr. Speaker, and I think we all realize we're living in very trying times, in very confusing times, and, in that moment, Mr. Speaker, today, I believe, is a very important day in the history of mankind, when two nations are signing a peace agreement. This is very important, but they are children of God, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— My Honourable Member for Inkster interrupted. They are not, either, Christians? —(Interjection)— How do you like that? Moslem and Jews. And they were so happy that they are finally getting together.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many serious problems confronting us and so little agreement on solutions. So many people are currently striving to find some sense that solves the peace of mind in the chaotic world.

Mr. Speaker, our Lord and Saviour, to whom I believe, and I am His Disciple, He said, "Without me, you can do nothing. If you are trying, go ahead on your own, but you will be sorry." And we are sorry for what we did. Because, Mr. Speaker, any Resolution we passed here, we didn't satisfy everybody. I don't care what legislation we have, or we will take, for example, will help some and disturb the others. But, Mr. Speaker, the meaning and the spirit of The Lord's Prayer wants to help everyone.

We are talking about peace. We are fighting for peace, but the Good Lord said on the resurrection Sunday, when he came and saw His Disciples after His resurrection, when he was greeting them he said, "Peace I am giving to you. Not the peace the world is giving to you, I am giving to you. Take it. Have it." But we didn't.

Mr. Speaker, we have so many young people searching for some meaning to their lives in a society where so many thousands are denied the opportunity to use their talents and training in earning a living. There is so much strife and bitterness in our society between competing groups. There is so much violence and killing in our world and so little evidence of human kindness and consideration. There is too much striving for material things, and so little towards spiritual development.

Mr. Speaker, recently I found the article about The Lord's Prayer in the Christian Science Monitor I believe every one of us receives. This is from March 13, 1973. And the author of this article started this way, I am quoting, "Christ Jesus' prayers were the most authoritative and effective the world has ever known. He prayed constantly and confidently. He turned to His Father, God, for comfort, inspiration, and help, and proved undeniably that He, as the Bible says, 'God is our refuge and strength and ever present help in trouble'."

Mr. Speaker, we don't have to go very far, but in our everyday life we need inspiration. We need a good life. Sometimes we don't want to accept this line which He would throw to us. That's why we have such a problem.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the same author of the Christian Science is saying, "The theme of The Lord's Prayer develops systematically from the base of one God, the Father, divine principle, to elevate human hearts from sin and discord of the understanding the true being is holy, spiritual, pure, good, lacking nothing.

Through this acknowledgement of the beauty of harmony in God's universe as the actual established facts of Being, the effective and false images of the material sense are eliminated from hearts."

Mr. Speaker, I may go on and on, and prove it, the very very important meaning of The Lord's Prayer. It wouldn't take long, Mr. Speaker. We have actually eight petitions in —(Interjection)— Thank you, Mr. Speaker — in this Lord's Prayer. We're talking first about Our Father, we're talking about heaven, and we're talking about gratitude. We're talking about the will to grant forgiveness, love and guidance. Altogether we are talking about 58 or 70 words.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of us sometimes get the feeling that the problems of the world are beyond men's capability to cope with, so there is nothing wrong with showing a little humility by asking for divine guidance in a few brief minutes of meditation every day, especially, Mr. Speaker, when, as I mentioned in the Resolution, that other provinces are already practising using The Lord's

Prayer.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is running out, I don't have much time. If, Mr. Speaker, talking about British Columbia, who have over 2 million population, Ontario over 8 million, Quebec over 6 million, Mr. Speaker, altogether I am talking about over 70 million Canadians — in the Legislature they are opening the session by turning to Our Father. And I am not saying Conservative Father, Liberal Father, NDPer Father — Our Father. —(Interjection)— Wait a minute.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very important thing in our life when we are starting our proceeding with The Lord's Prayer. Like in the Resolution it says that the meaning is that we would like to bring God into the centre of our lives, to remind us of the majesty of God, the purpose of God and the will of God. God we would like to have always with us.

Mr. Speaker, one of the professors . . . How many minutes do I have yet? I will try. Three minutes, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the book I was referring to was "The Plain Man Looking at The Lord's Prayer", which was published by the Dr. Barclay. He is a distinguished scholar and an exceptionally gifted preacher and broadcaster. He writes for a British weekly paper, and proved so popular that a full page every week is now given to the paper.

Mr. Speaker, he said — that Professor Barclay — he showed that the prayer Jesus gave to His Disciples is at one, a summary of the Christian teaching and pattern for all our prayers.

Mr. Speaker, that doesn't mean that the Apostles didn't know how to pray. They prayed. They were praying every day but all of a sudden they came to the point, they said, "Well, we are not quite sure if our prayer will be received by the Almighty God." So they approached Our Saviour and asked him, "Lord, teach us how to pray." And in answer they received The Lord's Prayer.

Mr. Speaker, the other book, which was called, "Born to Save" was published by Austin Purdue, and he says, "This book has one key word about which everything else revolves. This word, which is all too important in the life and each individual and nations is "desire". The perfect guide to the study of its use and meaning is to be found in The Lord's Prayer."

Mr. Speaker, he is also continuing that, "As St. Thomas Aquinas tells us, this prayer is a series of perfect desires. My hope is that I can make this sufficiently clear. First, I want to distinguish between a desire and a wish; second, to show that a true desire is, of itself, a force of tremendous power; and third, to offer something of the program and aid in the art of discriminating against wrong desires and of building and choosing right desire."

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

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** One sentence? (Agreed) Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to appeal to all members from both sides for their support of this Resolution. Prayer never hurt or harmed anybody, but rather it will help show to your constituents that if they are praying for you that you are also able to pray for them. Thank you.

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

**MR. ARNOLD BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the things that I was most impressed with when I was first elected to this Legislature was the prayer that is read by the Speaker of this Legislature at the opening of the Legislature each day. In this prayer we acknowledge that all power and wisdom comes from God. In this prayer we ask for guidance to frame such laws as will be in accordance with God's will, laws that will tend to the welfare and prosperity of our province and all our people. It is an excellent, well-thought-out prayer and I certainly would like to see this prayer continued.

The Lord's Prayer, of course, is the greatest prayer of all and it is of much more of a personal nature. I sincerely hope that all members on both sides of this House pray The Lord's Prayer at least once a day during the week, every week of the year.

Now, basically members on this side of the House are not opposed to the use of the Lord's Prayer in the Legislature, but I do think that this matter could be best dealt with by the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House. Therefore, I move, seconded by the Member for Roblin that the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Point Douglas be amended by the deleting the word "operation" in the last paragraph and substituting the following: "Therefore be it resolved that the matter of the inclusion of the Lord's Prayer in the daily routine proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba be referred to the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House for consideration." Seconded by the Member for Roblin.

**MR. SPEAKER:** You've heard the motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin that the motion be amended. Do you want me to read it out again? The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleague for bringing this into the House but I will be supporting the amendment.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I can take this occasion to share his concern, but I can begin by recalling an incident in which one of my children when they were younger asked me while she was praying whether she was speaking to God or was she just speaking to herself. I guess that's a question that each one of us has to resolve in our lifetime, and perhaps in this regard I could say that I am of Christian persuasion, but I too struggle with many things.

But, Mr. Speaker, what we're about is the whole question of people pondering what they are about in this Chamber and I thought it was an excellent opportunity to take a look around this Chamber, because we arrive at this point in history of the course of events and if you will just look around, you walk into this Chamber and the first thing that strikes you are two figures, with Moses over here with the Ten Commandments and Solon over here on my right, sitting poised there in case we say anything worth recording.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we look around the Chamber, there is more symbolism which should lead us to contemplate such philosophical points as is implied in the Lord's Prayer and if we look up at the dome and go around we start over here on this corner we have a cherub with a banner of Hammurapi and if we go across the street to the other corner we have — I can't say the other name but we all know him as Amenhotep III from Egypt. We come back over here to the Greek Dracones and we go back over to the other side we find the twelve Tables of Rome. If we come back over to the other side we get into the Hindu. Yes, here we are — Menava and Shastra from the Hindus and we get all this and we come together with the Magna Carta. We get it all coming together in the Magna Carta, / and that's just starting at the circle up at the top.

Because, is it not the case, Mr. Speaker, what the Member for Point Douglas is bringing before us is the seriousness of that which are about. And these symbolisms which are built into our system — I don't mean to imply that prayer is but a symbolism — but nevertheless it is an attempt to get us to ponder and we put these things in this building to make us ponder when we come in here that this is what we're about. And in that circle the history of man, as far as their laws are concerned, all come together in that great effort under John to come up with the Magna Carta.

Now, if we come down a bit we look at the other attempts of man. And, there up here with Gregorianus and we can go back and forth, Justinianus Leviticus, Caesar and Napoleon, the different attempts of people to build in the systems of law a means by which people can govern their own affairs with something greater in mind, the totality of things. And, if we look at the figures as we go around, in between the alcoves, Magnanimity, or first one, Faith, Hope and Charity — we're even having this come down to us in Ukrainian names, Nabdea — but all of the things that we build in, Mr. Speaker.

And look at this beautiful one up here — Understanding. We go around to the other side and we have Tolerance and then we have the other three figures of Fortitude, Prudence and Temperance and then standing over there with just a tender finger raised, Mercy. We have our two figures up in the corners, Mr. Speaker, and I'm advised that the translation from the Latin — my Latin's kind of rusty — He sought for the Glory of Valor. He sees the Glory of God. We come over to the other side — Dear is the love of the homeland, but dearer far is liberty. What a challenge to the Canadian mozaic. Your authenticity is important but liberty is more important.

Then, Mr. Speaker, one of the most beautiful things in this room, I think, is in the Apse — I forget how you spell it. I never get it right in the jigsaw puzzles either. But the central figure is Justice and traditionally, Mr. Speaker, we see Justice standing with his sword with valances and blindfolded. Here in Manitoba tuck put in place, years ago an entirely different concept of justice for legislators to contemplate. We have on the left of right standing there with open arms as if to give benediction but listening to the people. Then, the other figures that are in that Apse, we have a young man starting out and we have an old man and it's tied together that this is what it's all about, Mr. Speaker. And underneath it we tie it all together with Confucius, Lycurgus, Alfred, Justinian and Manu. All over the World they've tied all this thinking together and this, I think, is what it is all about.

I agree with my friend from Rhineland that the prayer we have is a good prayer. In fact, we modified it somewhat through the Rues Committee here a number of years ago to take out that one phrase where Kings rule and make equitable laws. But, nevertheless this prayer I think, serves us well. But this idea, Mr. Speaker, that we should when we begin our contelation of laws which

will affect people, it should be in the totality of human experience as epitomized and as epitomized by these symbols which are in our Chamber and I agree with my colleague from Point Douglas that we should perhaps pay more attention to the second. The one of Moses I think shakes his hands at us all.

But, Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks, I would like to put on the record of the legislative assembly, a rather crass attempt for me to describe my understanding of the totality of things. I wrote a poem. And the poem goes "I thirsted, but the waters of the desert parched my tongue and I cried: 'Where is this rock which when struck gushes forth waters sweet.' And the Shepherd said: 'Follow me,' and I found the waters sweet in the shadow of His tree." But, that is a personal experience. And when my colleague quotes again Augustine and the rest of them they should bring into this discussion the difficulties that people had reaching a the point in their lives where they come to grips with the problems of life. But, I would support the amendment offered by my colleague from the other side of the House and refer this matter to the Rules Committee and I would express confidence in the Prayer as it stands and that is taking absolutely nothing away from the Lord's Prayer because my personal conviction is it is a beautiful prayer and I need it every day because one of the things I disagree with Paul is that when he says that of sinners he is chief, I am.

**QUESTION put on the Amendment, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now, we're dealing with the main motion as amended. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would not want the debate to proceed on the basis that somebody made a motion that the Lord's Prayer be the basis on which the Legislative Assembly commences its activities, that there was a motion to refer the matter to the Rules Committee and it ended there. Because to do that, Mr. Speaker, would leave the impression that there was some feeling that this would be a good replacement for our existing proceedings and that the motion to refer was in some way an affirmative registration of that particular suggestion. It could be, Mr. Speaker, that most members don't take that position. And, as a matter of fact, I venture to think that they don't. But, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, if the motion is passed at this stage, all that comes out of the Legislative Assembly is that there was a suggestion that the Lord's Prayer replace the existing prayer and it was referred to the Rules Committee with nothing else being said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to indicate that I cannot agree with some of the reasons that are suggested in the whereas's with respect to the Lord's Prayer being the appropriate way for members of the Legislature to pay respect to their respective faiths. I sympathize with the gentleman who puts forward the motion and who wishes to have affirmation of faith at the beginning of legislative activities and indeed, Mr. Speaker, I believe that all members of the Legislature wish that to be the case. That, at the present time, we use a prayer which is virtually non-denominational, and it was so selected, Mr. Speaker, and even abbreviated to remove that reference in the prayer which referred to the divine right of Kings. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that when the divine right of Kings was removed from the prayer, and it was left virtually non-denominational, I have to say that it was still a compromise because as non-denominational as it appears to be, it could be considered by some to be an affirmation of a particular faith or it could be considered by some to be an affirmation of several faiths, none of which are identified. And, on that basis, Mr. Speaker, it commended itself to members of the Legislature and I would say that the closer and the more the affirmation of faith commends itself to the diverse people in our community, the better it becomes a prayer which reflects all of the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in saying this I would not want to reject any person in this Legislature making an affirmation of faith to whatever belief that he happens to have and I would not, Mr. Speaker, under any circumstances, want to prevent my honourable friend, the Member for Point Douglas or my honourable friend, the Member for Rhineland, or my friend, the Member for Winnipeg Centre from commencing legislative proceedings, and I think that this a good idea, Mr. Speaker, for anybody and I don't think that there's any dissention in this area. I think that we are unanimous that man is a small part of the universe, that we have to continually reflect on our "tininess," if that is an appropriate word, on the fact that we represent a very, very small force in the nature of things and that in commencing to deal with our activities, that it makes us more responsible to be humble and that humbleness, Mr. Speaker, is what causes different people in different ways to contemplate that force of nature, that divinity, that whatever, however that force is translated, to contemplate that because it helps us, Mr. Speaker, bring ourselves down to size. I don't think anybody disagrees with that.

But, Mr. Speaker, different people have different ways of doing it and regardless of the fact that my honourable friend says that 92 percent reflect a particular religion and even if that were

so and I'm not certain that it is so, but I don't want to avoid that statistic being used in argument, even if that were so, it would be not, may I say it, not in keeping with that particular religion which my honourable friend is referring to that it be imposed on anybody else, even if it's 7 percent and yet, Mr. Speaker, nobody would deny the Member for Point Douglas from making that affirmation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Order please. The hour being 5:30, the honourable member will have 15 minutes when this item next appears on the Order Paper.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that I could finish my remarks in five minutes and perhaps then — it almost came to a vote — if there was another speaker, then we could adjourn. If not, we could continue.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I'm at the mercy of the House. Whatever the House wishes at this time.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I believe, Mr. Speaker, there's a possibility that there may be speakers on this side of the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour is 5:30. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply will be meeting in this room to consider the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development at 8:00 and they will be meeting in room 254 to consider the Estimates of the Department of Tourism.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Highwaysnow adjourn and stand adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon but meets at 8:00 in Committee.