



**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. 43A**

**2:30 P.M. Thursday, April 19, 1979**

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 19, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committee  
The Honourable Minister of Mines, Natural Resources and the Environment.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement with respect to the spring runoff situation.

With regard to the Red River basin, snowmelt has been very rapid in the Red River Valley since Tuesday, and virtually all of the snow should be melted by the end of the week. Tributaries are now beginning to rise, and very rapid rises may be expected for the next few days. Dead Horse Creek at Morden is cresting now. The crest on the Boyne River at Carman and on the La Salle River, the Seine River, the Morris River, and the Plum River is expected on the weekend. Gates on the Red River control structure will not be raised before Friday afternoon. The recent rainfall was confined to the basin north of Grand Forks, and was most significant in the rural municipality of Rhineland, where up to one and one-half inches of rain fell. An evaluation of the situation on the Red River taking into account flows occurring in the United States portion of the Basin is underway and a new forecast will be issued tomorrow.

With respect to the Souris River Basin, snowmelt over the southern portion of the Souris River Basin has been very rapid yesterday and today. Rapid rises in stages of tributaries may be expected tomorrow and on the main stem over the weekend, however, the forecast for the Souris River which was issued on April 17th is still valid.

With respect to the Assiniboine River Basin, temperatures over the Assiniboine River Basin have been cooler and snowmelt has been more gradual. Runoff is not expected to be fully underway until next week except in the area downstream of Portage la Prairie where conditions are similar to the Red River Basin. Omands Creek is cresting now and Sturgeon Creek is expected to crest on the weekend. Flood forecasts issued for the Assiniboine River on April 17th are still valid.

With respect to the Dauphin, Whitemud River and Interlake Areas, as in the case of the Assiniboine River Basin, temperatures in the Dauphin, Whitemud River and Interlake areas have been cooler and snowmelt has been more gradual, and runoff is not expected to be fully under way until next week. Approximately one-quarter of an inch of rain fell on the Interlake on Wednesday. Flood forecasts issued on April 17th have not changed.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister's information to the public of the province relative to some of the more recent developments with regard to flooding in our province. I want to assure the Minister that the Members of the Opposition will do everything we can to bring to his attention problems as they exist in what I hope will be a constructive effort to see to it that flood problems in the province will be handled in as expeditious a way as possible. The Minister is aware that I have on several occasions raised with him the possibility of greater than normal floods this year. I did so, I hope, Mr. Speaker, in a positive sense and I hope that the information that was available from the two evaluations which were conducted of flood fighting under the previous administration will have in it some useful information to him.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the Minister that he can expect co-operation from the honourable members of the opposition with respect to doing everything that is possible to both fight flood problems and to bring to the Minister's attention flood difficulties.

I do, Mr. Speaker, note that there has been no mention of the compensation programs that have been provided by the province in the past relative to flood damage. I would hope that the so-called restraint program will not be such as to in any way reduce what has been the normal

treatment that has been afforded to citizens of the province relative to flood problems which are beyond their control.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY(Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Attorney-General responsible for EMO. Would the Attorney-General advise the arrangements which have been made between EMO and the municipal organizations in the province pertaining to the present critical situation that we are facing pertaining to the water runoff?

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

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can indicate to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the Emergency Measures Organization has been transferred to the responsibilities of the Government Services and as such, I was able to visit the operational headquarters of Emergency Measures this morning in the Fort Osborne Complex government buildings. I can assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that under the direction of Mr. Miller they are becoming fully operational today. He indicates to me that he has been able to establish some time in advance already, of course, in the areas in which history has indicated to us have particular flood problems contact with the municipal authorities and to date we hope to be in as good a position of readiness as is possible.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister responsible for Government Services, can the Minister advise whether or not there is an adequate supply of sand bags in view of the various and increasing numbers of requests that have been made from various residents in municipalities pertaining thereto?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I would have to check with the Emergency Measures as to exact numbers on hand. I can confirm that a number of demands and requests have already been met. My understanding is that there is deemed to be a sufficient supply of bags in stock at this time.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Can the Minister confirm that insofar as the obtaining of sand bags that the only route by which such bags can be obtained is through requests from municipalities to EMO, and that in fact residents cannot obtain such bags in times of emergency on their own by direct approach to EMO.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm happy too for the further information of the general public that is so affected — indicate to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that that is correct, that the municipality is the source for the obtaining of this kind of flood protection material, whether it's sandbags and other, for instance, in the odd case it may be a pump. When a situation becomes too serious for the municipality to be able to handle, at that time and point Emergency Measures associated with other government departments would step in and perhaps be in a position to help directly.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Would the Minister be able to inform the House and the public in general as to what arrangements were made between EMO itself and the municipalities in light of the obvious expectation of difficulty which we would be confronted with this year due to the late runoff and the large amount of snow. Was there adequate arrangements made by way of communication, information, provision, joint meetings, EMO and the various municipalities, and also, Mr. Speaker, at the same time, I would like the Minister to indicate whether or not there is any problem developing anywhere in the municipalities that are being affected by flooding in obtaining adequate supplies of sand for the sandbags, which are being obtained from EMO.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is describing precisely

the work of EMO, and that's of an ongoing nature throughout the year. Contacts are made with municipal officials, they're advised of the programs and assistance available to them through the agencies of Emergency Measures Organization. They have, for instance, just in my visit to the office this morning, indicated to me they have come out with a very descriptive and informational bulletin that is made available by Emergency Measures to municipal offices, that individual citizens and homeowners can pick up, with useful tips that homeowners can avail themselves of, to protect themselves. This is the kind of work that EMO does throughout the year, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that in the long term it's having beneficial effects. The second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, there has been no particular problem brought to my attention of any municipality that is at this point experiencing any difficulty in obtaining the supplies that it is requesting.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister responsible for Provincial Land Use Committee of Cabinet. Pertaining to the initial reports of flooding which are occurring, particularly in many areas in which new subdivisions have gone ahead in various municipalities surrounding the city of Winnipeg, could the Minister advise whether or not he will be reviewing the present guidelines in order to assure that in a spring such as this of heavy water runoff that every effort will be made to avoid what could very well have been mistakes in respect to approvals to certain subdivisions that are located on lower levels of land.

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

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has, in part, defined precisely the purpose of the guidelines — it's to avoid situations that have demonstrated in the past, that have caused problems, not only for the people involved, but for the taxpayers of this province. There will be a further review of the guidelines very shortly in order to finalize and to put into concrete form the guidelines that will become operative.

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

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. In these times when the policies seem to indicate, to dictate, that more retarded and handicapped people should be taken care of in their own communities, is the government offering any assistance for those that might want to open homes — that is, assistance to advising them the best place to locate, and also in helping them get the proper licensing to operate these homes, and open these homes.

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

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, certainly there is assistance available in terms of getting the proper licensing and meeting the necessary criteria. Insofar as selection of neighbourhoods, and areas, and locations for such homes, there is no direct initiative undertaken by my department, but requests from agencies or parties interested in that kind of development, such as the CAMR, are dealt with at an advisory level by the office of Residential Care of my department, and certainly help is available to try to break down neighbourhood resistance.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, it would seem that such a group, the Covenant Home Incorporated, are having a difficulty. Have they approached the Minister, or if not, can somebody from the department approach them to make sure that we don't lose this group, and that they can find the way to get proper licensing and zoning restriction, to help with this home, or any others?

**MR. SHERMAN:** They haven't approached me directly, Mr. Speaker, but I have requested that my department, my office, discuss with them their problem. Their current problem is one that falls into a rather unique category; it really can't even be met on the basis of pure legislative prerogative or zoning changes, and I have instructed that my office discuss their problem with them.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, in view of the fact that we are finding a reduction of doctors in Manitoba, is the government, or some one in the name of the government recruiting, or is there any anticipation that there will be some recruiting done for doctors from outside the country?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, if necessary, that can certainly be done, but I am advised

by the College of Physicians and Surgeons that the outflow during August to April, although relatively high, reflects a normal pattern in terms of the time of year, and that the period April to August usually finds an evening up of that kind of procedure. If that doesn't occur, then we will have to measure the doctor-patient ratio in the province, and ensure that we're not falling below acceptable levels.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Highways. During the minister's debates on his Estimates, I expressed concern regarding roads, P.R. 260 and P.R. 261, that my understanding is that P.R. 260, south of Walderssee, is now closed and impassable and I would ask the minister if he could advise the House if he would consider upgrading P.R. 260, south of the paved section, south of Plumas this year, in order to prepare a base and road mix next year.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that the constant and somewhat ominous presence of the Member for Gladstone, who sits immediately behind me, has made me only too aware of the present condition of that road. I welcome now the included support from the Member for Ste. Rose, as well as the Reeve of Westbourne who has joined us and is sitting in the public gallery along with some immediate farmers connected and vitally interested in this particular road. And if I can enjoin my friends opposite, not to bear down so hard on me, every time moneys for highway construction is mentioned in this Chamber, and perhaps let me get on with the business of building some roads, then we certainly will try and do that, Sir.

**MR. ADAM:** I take by the minister's answer, Mr. Speaker, that he will do something this year. I thank the minister.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Health who I believe, just a few moments ago, indicated the probability that the situation of reduction of doctors in the province is not that serious, and on that indication — he's nodding his head as I've said this statement — on that basis, is he not premature in already saying that he may have to relax certain rigid principles in opting out and increasing moneys to doctors. Is he rushing ahead already? Which way is he going?

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** I trust 'm going the way of reason, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. According to recent statements by the minister, five more employees have been added to the growing list of lead poisoned individuals in the province. Can the minister confirm that these recent poisoning cases now bring this year's total to over 30 workers, who have received compensation or are receiving compensation for lead poisoning at the workplace?

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

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, this brings a total in the neighborhood of 30, I don't have that precise number. That's 30 unfortunate individuals that have been detected in the year 1979 under a concentrated exercise program by this government. It still does not compare with the numbers that were taken at random in 1975, which at that particular time, the number was 35, and in those days, Mr. Speaker, there was no concentrated effort made to really go out and find out what the problem was.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, I would only have to follow that answer, Mr. Speaker, with another question to the Minister, asking him how many cases of lead poisoning were approved for compensation, then, in 1976 and 1977, and if he cannot confirm that those two years were somewhere around

seven and eight cases, which showed that we did bring the problem under control. Our government brought the problem under control at that time.

And can the Minister indicate how many individual workers had lead-in-blood levels in this most recent blitz of testing, over 50 micrograms per 100 grams of whole blood; a level that has been medically and scientifically linked with adverse, and in some cases, irreversible body effects.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the member gets these statistics that he pours out, but the particular level that was established here in Manitoba was .08, and at that particular time that was the same level as was in place, I understand, in North America. There are those now who are advocating something less, and I rather doubt whether Manitoba will sit on the .08 forever; time will dictate when that particular level will be reduced, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, seeing as how I haven't gotten an answer to my first two questions, I'll try one more time: Is the Minister prepared to initiate lead-in-air tests and lead-in-blood tests at Kromar Printers, ESB Ray-O-Vac, Lawson Graphics, Domtar Construction Materials, and Hooker Chemicals in Brandon, all industries that are listed as worksites where lead is either a known, possible, or probable hazard under Order-in-Council No. 880?

**MR. MacMASTER:** It could be a longer list than that, I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that will be eventually considered by our particular department. I appreciate the suggestions of the member; I'll add them to the list, and as the program expands, I'm sure they'll include these particular industries.

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

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Highways, in a follow-up to the question I asked him earlier this week, with respect to P.R. 304, which, as I understand, is becoming even more impassable as time goes by. I'm wondering if the Minister can give any assurances to the people who live in that area, that his department will ensure that vehicles will be able to pass through the road, the bad spots on the road, in order that emergency traffic will be able to go through, and in the case of emergencies, where vehicle traffic will not be able to proceed on the road, that some other measures will be taken by his department, or the Emergency Measures Organization, to ensure the safety of people who live in that area.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the particular section of road that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland refers to, Provincial Road 304, is in difficult terrain, and it will be very expensive to upgrade to the kind of all-weather capacity that I'm sure he and residents having to use that road would like to see happen. I suppose the costs would come in at somewhat in the neighbourhood of over \$200,000 per mile. We are aware of the condition of the road, we are doing some improvement in that general area; I think that has regrettably somewhat added to the present difficulties. I understand some of the new work done last year is precisely the stretch of road that is providing perhaps most of the difficulty. I can only assure the honourable member that we will, within the limits of dollars available, try to put that road in the best possible shape for this coming summer's traffic. But I want to indicate to the honourable member that the solution to that problem, particularly given this kind of weather conditions, kind of snow conditions, the road would require considerably more attention than it is presently getting.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for answering one part of my question. The other part of the question, which I'll repeat, is will the Minister alert the Emergency Measures Organization, which I believe he is responsible for, and ensure that they will provide the necessary means by which the people in that area can continue to either travel back and forth over the road or have some alternate means of transportation in the event of emergency.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister ensure that the road not receive any more adverse treatment by the heavy pulp trucks that are travelling over the road while it is in the soft condition that it is presently suffering under? Will he ensure that no further heavy traffic will be allowed on the road that is not absolutely essential at this time?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I can confirm, taking his second part of the question first, that the road had been abused by heavy trucking of pulp and that I have dispatched additional inspectors from

the Motor Vehicle Branch to carry out and rigidly enforce highway regulations with respect to overloading.

With respect to the role of Emergency Measures Organization, I should indicate to the honourable member that Emergency Measures Organization is not a transit system for all of Manitoba. It will certainly be there and be prepared to offer a service of an emergency nature, if in fact that is the case. I know that this is not particularly satisfying to the member or to the residents that are living in the community of Bissett, particularly. I think what we can both hope and pray for is sunshine and lots of it in the next few days.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the First Minister. Can the First Minister confirm whether or not he has met this week with the Manitoba Metis Federation, or if not, why he has not met and when he will be agreeing to meet with the Manitoba Metis Federation?

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

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, I met with the past president of the Manitoba Metis Federation on Monday last. I had previously met with the president and the past president last week, and on one other occasion with the past president; the Minister of Northern Affairs met with the president and the past president last week. We had suggested a meeting between the president and the Minister and myself today. The word we had was that the president was not able to —(Interjection)— Does the Member for St. Johns, Mr. Speaker, have something he'd care to add to the answer?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. LYON:** In that case, aside from his rudeness, I'll carry on with the answer. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, if we're fully settled down, I'll try to answer my honourable friend's question. In that case, Mr. Speaker, the office of the president indicated to my office that he could not meet for a suggested meeting today, and a date has been suggested for Monday next, and we're waiting for confirmation of that date.

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

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. On Monday, April 9th on page 2222 of Hansard, I asked the Minister if he would consider tabling the letters of transmittal and recommendations that were made for the lead in blood tests for Weston School and he stated in his reply that he would try and dig out the documents the member was talking about. Has the minister been able to dig out those documents at this time?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** I haven't as yet, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. JENKINS:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Can the Honourable Minister of Labour inform the House the time frame when he will be conducting the new blood tests on the children of Weston, since there is only approximately ten weeks left in the present school year?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, our plans would be to have the children tested and the results back to them long before they finish the school season. I appreciate what the member is saying, that there is a time limitation on this particular project.

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

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Minister of Labour in reply to a question from my honourable colleague, the Member for Kildonan earlier this week, replied that he was going to make an announcement with regard to the minimum wage. Today is Thursday, tomorrow is Friday. Is the Minister going to make the announcement tomorrow?

**MR. MacMASTER:** I will be making that announcement as soon as it's possible, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Highways a question some two or more weeks ago with respect to a construction project at 59 Highway and Cook's Creek and he took that question as notice. I'm wondering whether he has forgotten about the question or whether he is still waiting for information.

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

**MR. ENNS:** As a matter of fact, I have, Mr. Speaker. But I'll provide the honourable member with the answer.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General and ask him whether a green light has been given to the architectural and engineering consultants existing to design a new provincial judges' building.

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

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

**MR. DOERN:** Could the Minister indicate whether there has been a resumption of the planned renovations to the Law Courts building, which will help alleviate the shortage of court space?

**MR. MERCIER:** That matter is under consideration, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister, in view of the seven month backlog of court cases and the rumoured rental of the IBM building for court space, whether the government is adopting a more expensive two-step approach, first of all where they will rent and renovate a building and then secondly design and build one which they will own.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, we are in fact proceeding in the most economical way possible.

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

**MR. PETER FOX:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the connotation for four-letter words sometimes is not acceptable, I hope that the Minister of Labour, in using "soon", won't delegate that word into that category.

My question is to the Minister of the Environment. In view of the release in the newspaper that Hooker Chemical, in respect to a legislative committee of the United States, has indicated that it was aware of creating an environmental problem but did not indicate it to the public because it was afraid of being sued, has the Minister of the Environment in Manitoba instituted any further investigative and inspection services in order to ensure that Hooker is not doing that here in Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for the Environment.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the situation to which the honourable member refers of course is in New York State and that is obviously beyond the jurisdiction which we have in Manitoba. —(Interjection)— Well he says it's the same company, Mr. Speaker. Well it doesn't necessarily follow from that that the conditions that exist in New York exist in Manitoba.

**MR. FOX:** In view of the fact that policies generally from headquarters filter down to branch companies, I would suggest that we should be wary. Can the Minister indicate whether Hooker is doing any dumping in the Brandon area and whether those sites have been inspected?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, any individual or corporation that are discharging contaminants into the environment by and large must have a permit to do so from the Clean Environment Commission. I think the honourable member is aware that applications are made and hearings are held and orders are issued. Those orders are public information and are available to anyone who wishes to look



at them. But if the honourable member would like me to make personal enquiries into that and respond to him, I would be happy to do so.

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

**MR. FOX:** I thank the Minister for contributing a lot of knowledge to me but I am also aware that inspections are the key. And if they are not properly carried out and enforced, then things may occur which we are not happy with. I would just ask the Minister to make certain that his inspection routine is being carried out regularly.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I do acknowledge the honourable member's concern and I would be happy to investigate the schedule of inspections that take place in those situations and respond to the honourable member.

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

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Government Services, who is not in his seat, and I wonder if he would like to return there to answer a question. In light of the Minister's enthusiasm for his new responsibilities, I wonder if he could indicate the stage of the redesign work of The Pas Correctional Institute. Is that progressing at this time?

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, that matter is receiving active consideration.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, we now have a new type of consideration to add to the list. I wonder if the Minister could give us some target date by which the tenders might be called for the construction of that facility?

**A MEMBER:** In due course.

**MR. ENNS:** Soon.

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

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs responsible for landlord-tenant relations. Since the City of Winnipeg bylaw presently makes landlords liable for tenants and long gone tenants' unpaid water bills, would the Minister of Consumer Affairs look into the legality of what I consider to be an unfair bylaw by the City of Winnipeg?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Supplementary to the Minister, would the Minister also investigate whether landlords are building in bad debt costs over which they have no control with regard to the unpaid water bills that the city is forcing them to pay, whether they are building in these bad debt costs onto the bills that other tenants have to pay in their rental bills.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes' this is a question directed to the Attorney-General who I know has an answer in search of a question, and I'm asking him the question because I think it is important for personal care homes that are setting their budgets right now. Will senior citizen homes and personal care homes be exempt from local taxation for the land that they have over 2 acres of land? This is with respect to the City of Winnipeg assessment and the local taxation bills that are being levied on personal care homes and senior citizen housing projects.

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, there will be some relief or clarification of the existing law in The

Statute Law Amendment Act which I expect will be introduced in the Legislature very shortly.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, last week the Honourable Member for Churchill asked me three questions and I would like to respond to one of them. In fact, I could respond to all three but they are fairly lengthy and detailed so I will respond to one and perhaps respond to another one tomorrow.

The honourable member asked me whether in the north there had been a 40 percent increase in welfare expenditures in the employable category . . .

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister has indicated that it's a rather lengthy answer, could the Minister not adopt a practice of giving the answer to the honourable member and if the honourable member wishes to have it recorded in Hansard, Mr. Speaker, then he could do so. That practice has been adopted in the past and it has proved to be very useful.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to all members of the Chamber that if they expect to ask questions that require lengthy answers, perhaps they should present them as written questions so they could be answered in the written manner.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the difficulty that you have is that sometimes a question is asked which the questioner thinks can be answered very succinctly and the answerer thinks takes a long time. In this case the Minister has indicated that it is a very lengthy answer and I think if you would look at the precedents in this case, and honourable members know it, he can provide the answer to the member, if the member wishes to have it recorded in Hansard, he can merely request that it be done and that will look after the difficulty that has arisen. The Minister has indicated in advance that it will be a fairly lengthy answer and he intends to do this again tomorrow. I am merely suggesting that it can appear in Hansard.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I would hope that maybe the Minister could, in giving his answer, give the main points and if there is a great deal of detail he can probably provide it to the member privately.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I intended to approach the subject with my usual clarity and brevity and therefore . . .

**A MEMBER:** Dispense.

**MR. SHERMAN:** . . . in fact I can meet the problem raised by the Honourable the Member for Inkster in that, if I were to give all three answers it might be rather lengthy. So I'll just give one at this point. I'll save the two winners for tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

Well, the honourable member asked me if there had been a 40 percent increase in welfare expenditures in the employable category in the north. Sir, there was in the period under review which is the third quarter of 1977-1978 contrasted with the third quarter of 1978-1979, an increase of 50.9 percent in provincialsocial assistance expenditures in the employable category in the north. But I want to point out that we are talking about expenditures not caseload. I think it is important to point out, Sir, that the information pertains only to those persons living in unorganized territory in the north and that the size of the increase of expenditures in the northern unorganized territories is greatly influenced by the changes in the unemployment insurance program and by increases in housing and utility costs.

The question having to do with municipal assistance in the north which concerns unemployed employables in communities such as Flin Flon, Thompson and The Pas, Sir, reflects a position which is quite favorable to the economic conditions and economic policies of this government. There is an increase of 6 percent in expenditures during the ten months from April 1978 to January 1979, over the same period the previous year. But there has been a 7 percent reduction in the number of cases: 170 cases formally, 157 cases on the latest count, and that's very much in keeping with the general provincial trend, which is approximately 519 fewer cases in the unemployed employable

category requiring either municipal or provincial assistance, from December 1977 to December 1978.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, can the Minister confirm that the decrease in the number of cases in the three communities he mentioned is not equivalent to the percentage decrease in population that has come about as a result of his government's policies in northern Manitoba? —(Interjection)—

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, certainly not, Mr. Speaker. Not only can I not confirm it, but I cannot agree with it.

**MR. COWAN:** In that case, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister undertake to find out and to present to the Legislature the decreases as a percentage of the population loss in northern Manitoba.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I'll take it under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour for Question Period having expired, the Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** 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.

**MOTIO presenteu and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for the Department of Education, and the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

### SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson):** Committee come to order. I'd like to refer members to Page 10, Resolution 11, Item 6.(c)(1) — the Member for Virden.

**MR. MCGREGOR:** I would just like, Mr. Chairman, to ask the Minister, it's regarding certain rail abandonment retention, if that would be the word — in other words, what hope is there retaining some of the lines that are up for abandonment, either now or in a year or two ahead, and I am involved very directly with that, as there's four branch lines in my constituency. Three are deadend branch lines, two, I guess I can say, to all intent and purposes are gone, one is gone, one is practically gone, and there's two left. Local farmers have some hope some powers somewhere will give them enough room to retain these lines for a year or two longer than the deadline is at now, trying to give grain companies time to get bigger elevators, because we all sense, as active farmers, there's going to be an awful congestion at some of these points. And certainly those elevators are not going to be ready to take the grain at the end of this year, as one or two of them are up, and maybe, at that, I'll just stop there and give the Minister a chance to . . .

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

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Chairman, the member refers to rail line abandonment and retention and what we're doing. I think that it does lie within the jurisdiction of the federal government, however we have indicated with our department, and with the department responsible for Transportation and Economic Development, that in fact communities that have formed retention committees, we're prepared to work with them to make representation to the hearings that are to be held throughout the province when there is a decision to be made, if there is a decision to be made, to removal of a certain line.

However, with the federal election now coming up very shortly, I think that in fact it is very much in a situation of unsuredness at the federal scene. I don't think to enter into it to any large extent is going to resolve anything at the committee level here. However, I just want to further substantiate our position as a department, that we are in fact continuing to work with retention committees to prepare cases to retain lines that have been identified by local communities, and supporting

them in those efforts.

Again, it is essential to have that type of infrastructure in Manitoba to service agricultural people, ensure that — as the member is well aware, particularly a lot of the agricultural communities have developed and been built on the strength of the grain industry and the railroads that have serviced those communities.

To remove them is, of course, going to take away what initially they were put there to do, and it is, in fact, going to cause very severe hardships in certain areas. And that's why I feel, by providing staff within the Department that we are prepared to work on providing of backup information, make representation, with those groups of people in supporting their efforts to retain the infrastructure, where it is truly identified by the communities involved.

**MR. MCGREGOR:** Then another area of a question, Mr. Chairman, is the one that comes to most of us rural members in low lying areas — I appreciate the Minister giving us warning about road restrictions and their local flash floods — with, you know, bins of grain, that they haven't been able to move it because the quota system is calling for maybe for one or two, and they're sitting with three or four, and the Wheat Board doesn't seem to respond to these kinds of requests to any great extent and I am just wondering what pressure can. . . I realize we can do very little for this year, but unless the ground was to tighten up and you could get over there with bigger trucks. But for future, because we often go through this and no one does seem to be coming up with the kind of answers as to . . . and I think farmers are a fair lot. If my area that's high, I'm sure we'd concede letting some of our boxcars go in another area that's in a low lying area, and how much influence can we expect the Minister to put on the particular Wheat Board and the transport authorities that allocate these cars. That maybe is a very unfair question, Mr. Chairman, but it's a question that we have to answer our constituents, now, today, and days shortly ahead.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the member brings up a very important matter right at this time, the fact that we are looking at certain flash floods in certain parts of Manitoba. We have in the past weeks had contact with some communities that have been concerned about the flooding situation and the problem that it is going to create within the community is particularly where we have grain that is in low lying areas that could be subject to flooding. We have been in all cases, when we have been contacted, directly contacting the Wheat Board and urging them to put in cars to ease some of the pressure and to facilitate some of the farmers.

I am getting a report prepared by the Department on the exact permit situation and what has taken place. I have also instructed the Department and expect a report back through the regional directors, to contact individuals in areas that are low lying. I realize that certain grains and certain particular storage facilities, now it's going to be almost impossible to remove them because of road conditions in certain areas, and possibly other restrictive things that take place when water comes up at an awful fast rate. However, we are keeping a very close touch with the local people through our ag reps, the regional directors, and warning people or prepared to work with people in co-ordinating the movement of livestock and grains, if it's still possible to move them, to make every effort to protect the people who could be in those areas.

However, I think it's important that we all are concerned about this. I would say that we will continue to contact the people who have the authority which is the Canadian Wheat Board as far as allocation of cars. I think we have received good co-operation in the past. The individuals involved I am sure recognize the problem and if they don't, we will certainly bring it to their attention as an urgent matter and hope for their full co-operation to facilitate the removal of the farm product that is in danger.

**MR. MCGREGOR:** Mr. Chairman, yes, especially when it's like this, when many of us foresaw this type of condition coming if it's a late spring as this is, and these are the kind of things I would like to think we have some way of working this quicker in the years ahead.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The two lines in my area are scheduled for being abandoned. I refer to the Ste. Rose subdivision from Ochre River to Rorketon, a distance of 37.1 miles involved, and also a portion of this 37.1 miles comes under the Prairie Rail Action Committee, Ochre River to Rorketon. The entire portion comes under the Prairie Rail Action Committee, and also C.N. Winnipegosis subdivision from Sifton Junction to Winnipegosis, a distance of 20.8 miles. That entire line comes under the jurisdiction of the Prairie Rail Action Committee. Of course, like the Member for Virden, I want to express extreme disappointment to the fact that these two lines have been recommended to be abandoned in 1983, I believe it is, and I want to express my disappointment.

I'd like to ask the Minister first, whether he does support the recommendations of the Prairie Rail Action Committee? Does he support their recommendations?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Not totally, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. ADAM:** Pardon?

**MR. DOWNEY:** No, not totally, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. ADAM:** Not totally. Well, I would wonder what part does he support; what part of that?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Well, you know, to get into specific rail lines at this particular time, we could enter into it and I could have a complete mile by mile or section by section. I think that there are certain things that have been brought forward by the Prairie Rail Action Committee that don't agree with some of the figures that have been presented by people within local communities and with certain statistics that are not totally in line with the thinking of what came out of the Prairie Rail Action Committee. That is why I'm concerned in saying that where there is some question from within the community, we as a department are prepared to do research work, and put together more substantial information which can assist local retention committees in the retention of that line. Again, I go back to say that we are in a period of an election where we have a possibility of some change in authority at the federal scene — in fact, I'm very confident that that is going to take place. I think to have any real meaningful input at this particular time, as far as the provincial government is concerned, other than building their cases within these communities won't mean a lot.

I think the clear indication in some of these lines that the rail companies are saying that they will continue to operate elevators, and the collection facilities on some of these lines, there's a definite indication that those lines should be kept. But if, for example, you're looking at a line, Mr. Chairman, where in fact the grain companies may possibly not be going to keep their elevators in a serviceable condition, or they're not going to keep them open, then we're in a situation where, what are we doing by keeping that line open. We're going to have a line that hasn't got any facilities to service the farm people anyway, so I think it would be the wrong approach to take to say we're going to support that line, regardless of whether there's going to be any grain elevators to service the people.

So that's the position I take, and I know there's a combination of those types of lines in that particular report.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is giving us an overview here, but I don't think that the government puts a strong enough case forward to retain some of these branch lines, including some of those that are in the Member for Virden's area. Jack Murta, the Progressive Conservative MP for Lisgar, says . . .

**A MEMBER:** Fine man.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, fine man. And he indicates that the Prairie Rail Action Committee did a very commendable job. And he's happy ' and I want to point out to the Member for Virden what his colleagues in Ottawa are saying. If he will —(Interjections)— if the Minister will reflect, and the Member for Virden will just read the statement that was presented in the House by the First Minister in regards to the Premiers' Conference, or meeting, in Prince Rupert — if he reads this over, he will find that rail abandonment was not a concern, not a concern of the First Minister at that meeting. I'm not sure whether the Minister of Agriculture was there with him, but I'm certain that the Minister must have had some input in preparing that statement. And rail abandonment is mentioned only once in the entire statement that was tabled in the House, and if it had not been for the Premier of Saskatchewan, rail abandonment would not have been a discussion at Prince Rupert. That is the only position that was put forth, was by the government of Saskatchewan in regard to rail abandonment, and I'm not satisfied that this government is concerned about rail abandonment.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the railroads have been . . . these reports that are coming forward, particularly the last one, by the Prairie Rail Action Committee, I'm not satisfied at all, because they are taking figures from the railroads to estimate the cost of rehabilitating roads and, Mr. Chairman, the railroads have been claiming depreciation for years and years and years, since 1905 on some of these roads. They have received millions of acres of land for absolutely nothing, as subsidies. Where they have had losses on branch lines, they have been subsidized for losses on the particular line and this is the point that I want to bring forward. The railroads have had losses on certain

lines and the public has to come in with a subsidy and the railroads have not used that subsidy to rehabilitate those lines. They had it both ways, Mr. Chairman. They were taking depreciation on their equipment, they were getting subsidies on the losses of a branch line and they took the money and used it on some other line or some other place. That's where the money went and that is where the problem is, Mr. Chairman.

Well, the Prairie Rail Action Committee have dismissed entirely the cost to the province as far as roads are concerned. They have said that it would be insignificant. Well, Mr. Chairman, we've had questions in the House today by the members of the House requesting that heavy traffic be stopped on certain roads. Are they going to tell us that there will be no cost to the province? Even on highways like Highway 5 will have to require more maintenance and I don't think that this government, particularly the First Minister, who seems to be bent on getting rid of the crowrates and I will again refer to an article that I read here from the C.N. President himself, and I believe the minister was there at this meeting. The C.N. President was not afraid to take on Otto Lang, he says, but Mr. Bandeen says, according to this article, that by Premier Lyon, Mr. Bandeen said he told a closed meeting that there would be no solution to the grain movement problem until railroads get compensatory rates, something a lot higher than the statutory Crowsnest Pass grain rates, long considered holy of holies in the west. This is your leader that's making those statements, that Mr. Lyon announced that all in the room were agreed on the need for compensatory rates to railroads. Mr. Bandeen himself, the Presid was astonished to find that that was indeed the mood in that meeting and I'm very disappointed. I asked the First Minister in the House whether he was in support of the Crowsnest rates and, you know, he skirted around the question like he skirts around every other question that's posed to him and didn't answer. That is a well-known fact of how the premier answers questions and he uses every Question Period to make his own little speech in a sarcastic manner and insulting manner.

Mr. Chairman, what is happening here is that we are looking in the past. These recommendations are coming forward; they're always looking in the past, they do not take into consideration the fact that we have to increase our production and we expect double the production by 1985. They do not take into consideration the cost of fuel, of energy that is going to be going up. They do not take into consideration whether there will be any fuel to haul grain by rail. They do not apply themselves to that question, Mr. Chairman, and it's the same as what the minister did with the MACC land lease program. He got rid of it before he had something else in place. Now, they are proposing to get rid of all the branch lines, not knowing whether they will be able truck grain in the future. And we're not satisfied that this minister and this government is taking strong enough action in this regard.

It seems that there are some people in this country who are hell bent on destroying a lot of communities in the Member for Virden's constituency, in the constituency of Ste. Rose, in constituencies all over the place. I have all this stacked here —(Interjection)— well the Member for Gladstone says that he has no problems in his area. Well, I got all this from one of his constituents, from Neepawa, in his constituency, that's sending me all this and do something, because my member is not doing anything. Well, that's why I'm bringing it up now, Mr. Chairman. This is an opportunity, I intend to introduce a private member's resolution in the House and I expect to get just about 100 percent support from the Conservative bench, except the premier.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, it is quite amusing that the Member for Ste. Rose brings up the history of the short time that the Conservative government have been in office, because rail line abandonment started several years before we got into the position of being in government and I would have to say that a lot of rail lines were abandoned in their times. I really don't know why he hasn't put that on the record. It appears that he is just trying to paint the picture that all at once, all at once in the last six months, the rail lines have started to be abandoned in Manitoba. That started happening about 1974, Mr. Chairman. The day, the time in which the member had a good opportunity to discuss with his Minister of Transportation, his premier; I would have to check the record, but I don't suppose, Mr. Chairman, that that was ever put on a Premiers' Conference agenda either. And that was the time it should have happened, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the Hall Commission was in fact, but what was the follow-up, well, to discuss the Hall Commission, what was the follow-up and we will check the records of the agenda, the material that was put forward by the past government. I don't want to get into that debate, but I just want to show that rail line abandonment certainly has not started since we came into office. In fact, it was an on-going thing when we got in. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lac du Bonnet says it has accelerated. Well, if there would have been a lot more work done prior to that, it might have slowed the acceleration up. That is what we are doing at this time, Mr. Chairman, we are definitely concerned about it. It's a continuing process which we don't particularly like, and I think there has to be a lot closer assessment made of the viability of these

lines and a lot more substantiated information put forward.

As far as the accusations made by the Member for Ste. Rose, that in fact, it is our ambition to get rid of the Crowrate, that's totally untrue, totally a false statement, Mr. Chairman, because when we look at what really happened and let's get into really the history of what happened since we've been in government. Truly identified by all the west, by all the First Ministers of this country last November that one of the biggest things that could be done, one of the most effective things that could be done to increase the economy, to affect the economy in a positive way was to get the grain moving to markets that were truly identified. And what was the follow-up to that, Mr. Chairman? Well, I think the Premier of Manitoba is to be commended in the position that he took. He called a meeting immediately the first of the year to have all the people involved in the industry to sit down around a table, which is right in this very room as industry, government and organizations that handle farmers' grains. That's right, Mr. Chairman. There was a meeting held, a non-political meeting with the federal-provincial governments and the industry people, right here in this room. Never before, Mr. Chairman, had any government, the past government, taken on their shoulders the responsibility of trying to get something done, to get the grain moved, Mr. Chairman, to markets that were truly identified in the world. And that took place, Mr. Chairman, because of the leadership that was shown right here. And he comes out with the statement that all we are trying to do is remove the statutory rate.

Mr. Chairman, the follow-up to that, at the Western Premiers' Conference, was a suggestion that there should be a group of the people involved should sit down and discuss it. I think, when you look at what you hear some of the farm leaders in Manitoba saying, that in fact they are prepared to sit down and discuss what has to be done. We're not saying to get rid of the Crow — we want to retain the benefits for Manitoba producers, and I can assure the Member for Ste. Rose that our objective is to get the farmer's product to the market, to return the highest dollar to them, and of course, which will be of benefit to the total Manitoba and Canadian economy.

There has been action by our government. But for him to sit here and make accusations that we're not concerned about rail line abandonment, rail retention, which started in his day, and he didn't do anything about it — we in fact are. We're working with communities to put a good case forward to retain the lines that are truly identified by those retention committees.

I think it can't be stated strongly enough that there are positive steps being taken. I think that we can definitely look for further outcome to come from a committee that's being struck on the whole area of grain handling and transportation of ministers that are designated to sit down as western producing provinces and discuss a common position so we can, in fact, put pressure on the federal government, when we in fact know who the new minister responsible for the handling and transportation will be, which we will know after the 22nd of May. And I can assure you that Mr. Jack Murta, who the member referred to, is a very credible individual. What he has indicated, that Mr. Murta fully supports the PRAC recommendation, I don't think is totally correct. I think that I've heard Mr. Murta has been attending many meetings in support of retaining a line which has been recommended to be removed, and that is the Morris to Hartney line. In fact, I think it's very much the reverse. I think Mr. Murta is fighting very hard to keep that line. In fact, I can assure you that he is.

So, I think that when we discuss this whole area of what is being done, we're looking at a big job that has to be done, and we don't have the authority because of the fact that it is under federal jurisdiction. But we do have an opportunity to have input into it through the way in which we're approaching it, and I'm sure we'll get an effective result.

**MR. ADAM:** Well, the Minister can talk all he wants, and it's pure rubbish for him to say that they're doing a credible job — his government's doing a credible job of putting our case forward for the retention of rail lines. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that sure, the Premier needed an issue when he tried to have . . . well, he succeeded in having a meeting in Winnipeg to discuss this problem. And he needed an issue, and he pre-empted the federal minister. He was trying to pre-empt the federal minister whose responsibility it was . . . —(Interjection)— Yes, well, he upstaged . . . —(Interjections)— Mr. Chairman, the Premier discovered that his popularity, and the popularity of the Conservative Party, had dropped by about 5 percent, and they needed an issue in a hurry. So he decided that he would try and get a meeting going on transportation and I don't know whether . . . and rail abandonment . . . —(Interjection)— But since then, all we've heard from the First Minister is that he's interested in reviewing the Crowsnest rates, and in the discussions that he's had with the other premiers at Prince Rupert, not a word, not a word, on rail abandonment, Mr. Chairan. Where was the Minister of Agriculture? Not a word; not a word as to what this is going to cost the prairie farmers, not a word as to whether we're going to be able to get grain to market under a new system that has been recommended — not a word on rail abandonment, except from the Premier of Saskatchewan, Allan Blakeney. Not a word about concern about the rail abandonment

in the Constituency of Virden, not a word about concern about the two rails being abandoned in the Constituency of Ste. Rose.

I say, Mr. Chairman, the farmers will have to demand better representation from their government on this matter. I'm going to see where the Minister stands when my resolution comes up for a vote. I'd like to see whether he's going to support my resolution, or whether he's going to . . . if they're going to bring in an amendment to emasculate it such as he's done with the Right to Work Legislation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (c) (1)—pass; (c)(2)—pass — the Member for St. George.

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make a few comments with respect to rail line abandonment within the Interlake, and I wanted to ask the Minister what the provincial position is with respect to the recent PRAC recommendations on the off-track facility at Fisher Branch on the Inwood subdivision, the Grosse Isle-Fisher Branch line — has it changed at all from the previous submission made by the provincial government to the Hall Commission?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, maybe the member would clarify what their government's position was; I'd like clarification, I think I have a pretty good idea.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, that's really what this debate has been all about. The Member for Ste. Rose was very accurate in his submission that the province has not been playing an active role, not been taking a very strong position with respect to the abandonment of rural rail lines. We know that within the Interlake, the Inwood subdivision line is up for abandonment, however the Hall Commission recommended an off-line elevator to service the Community of Fisher Branch and Broad Valley, wherein the grain would be trucked from those two elevators to the Arborg CP line.

Mr. Chairman, the provincial position, if the Minister wants to know, that the previous government recommended that the line be not abandoned, and if it was to be abandoned, that the least that should be considered . . .

**MR. DOWNEY:** You should never let them abandon it.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, now the Minister says, "You should have not let them abandon it". We placed alternatives on that line, that the least that should be provided is a spur line between the CP line, between Poplarfield, or Broad Valley, and Arborg. That would be the least that should be done to preserve the service and the elevator services to the farmers in the area. Mr. Chairman, that is the position of the previous government.

The PRAC recommendations indicate that the line should not be abandoned before 1980. However, they indicate that the grain should be trucked by farmers to the Arborg elevator, and to pay the additional cost over 20 miles to producers. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, since the Minister did not remember or did not avail himself to the recommendations that were brought in by the Prairie Rail Action Committee which really I believe was . . . —(Interjection)— well it wasn't even a hatchet job, it just took the federal Minister of Transportation off the hook as a time filler until the federal election was out of the way and then he could proceed with abandoning the lines as they saw fit.

But, Mr. Chairman, that will happen regardless whether the Liberals elected or whether the Conservatives are elected. The same policy will flow. There's no doubt that this government has not stated its position with respect to the Prairie Rail Authority, whether that authority should have been put into place. We have not heard any comments by the provincial government whether they are pushing for the rail authority to make all rail lines public. That submission, that statement was concurred by all the western Premiers when the Hall Commission Report was set down. That was an agreement by all western Premiers. We have not heard any statements by this provincial government, whether they concur in that position to bring in the prairie rail authority and make all the road beds a public utility. And so whether it be a CP or CN train that the trains could be run on either of the lines. There is no doubt that the rail lines consider those branch lines a losing entity, Mr. Chairman. The railways have made a case that the lines are costing them money.

Well, there's one way of handling that, Mr. Chairman, and that is to adopt the position that the lines should be made public. If they are so expensive for the railways to run then do what was recommended by the four western Premiers and make those railway lines public. We have not heard the position of the provincial government, whether this is their position, whether the rail lines could be made public. It was very easy for the federal government to make the passenger transportation end a public utility. They combined the transportation facility between the CN and



the CP, they created VIA Rail as a public utility and it is being run as such. Mr. Chairman, I wonder what the position of the provincial minister, on behalf of the provincial government, is with respect to making the rail lines a public utility and being able to run them as we do our highways, as we do our airports, Mr. Chairman. There is ample precedence of having the rail lines as a public service to all the people of this country. We do that with the airlines, all the ports are public, all the airports are public, our highways are public, they are not privately operated. But yet we continue to say that, well look, those lines are costing too much, the railways are losing money so we will abandon those lines, Mr. Chairman. There is no doubt that if those lines were retained strictly for grain handling there would be no problem of running a special grain train on many of these lines for many years to come even without putting any funds into them if it was a private utility. If that is the greatest cost of the railways, that the railways claim that's where they the most of their money, then why are they afraid to give these lines up, Mr. Chairman. I would like to hear what the provincial government's position is with respect to that.

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** Well the first point that the member tried to make is that, in fact, we a position as far as the elevator or line in which he refers to in the Interlake area. I think I made it very clear in my comments earlier that we were in fact quite prepared to go to work with those people to retain the rail line, which in fact he indicated they were prepared to let go. We feel that with the retention committee put together, we've indicated as a government our position that we are quite prepared to go battle with them and make recommendation on their behalf with them at any CTC hearings and help them present their case. That is probably one position that is somewhat different from the Member for St. George, who has indicated, well if in fact there was a decision made to abandon that they would go along with it. But in return would support

paying for the movement of grain to another elevator. Well, I want to clarify that point. As far as the nationalization of the rail system that he's referring to, I would have to say that the agreement of the four Premiers is somewhat . . . I just don't know what period of time . . . what date in 1977 is he referring to?

**MR. URUSKI:** Prior to your. . .

**MR. DOWNEY:** Prior to our . . . yes in which we had four western Premiers, two of them which were of the Socialist leaning and two of them which were of the open free enterprise system. But I would like to think that the situation can be worked out without that kind of approach. I think that though the member does make a good point that we do have a lot of our transportation systems that are operated by government. But I do not support that. At this particular time I think that it can be worked on a consultative basis such as been proposed the Manitoba government. I think that to take the steps of nationalization are far more severe than really have to be done to ever accomplish what we want to do. In fact —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lac du Bonnet says, get with it! Well, he in his philosophy has always been in favour of total government control. I happen to think that the other system —(Interjection)— well it's government control that he is referring to. So at this particular point I don't think that we could. . . any more than the approach we have taken. I think that we are on the right track. If in fact the western Premiers who are now made up of a different makeup, if that recommendation were to be rediscussed by them I think it would only be fair to leave the Premier of the provinces to speak for themselves and with the new combination that there is, that we cannot use that reference as the way to get out through nationalization. So I don't support that. I think the approach that we have taken is the proper one and will resolve the problems.

**MR. URUSKI:** Well, Mr. Chairman, now we know the Minister's position or at least we know where he stands. He indicates he's on track. Mr. Chairman, he's not been on track with the railways he's not been on track with the national marketing schemes, he's missed the boat. He's been off the rails, if one can put it that way, on all the major issues facing rural Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, he hasn't had an accident but he's off the tracks. The Minister has deviated specifically on the line that I mentioned from the previous provincial position. He did not know the provincial position and now he is saying we have allowed the line to be abandoned.

We indicated that service to those communities was a prime concern and our position was that service should be provided. Now whether they wanted to continue the line as it was on the Inwood sub, we said that service was there, Mr. Chairman. Now the Minister says: "What if the elevator companies likely would be gone?", Mr. Chairman. That's really the game that is going to be played and has been played, where the provincial government will sit back and say: "Well, if the elevator

companies will pull out of their railways, then we'll let the lines go". The provincial government will sit back and say: "Well, it's the railways fault and it's the elevators fault". And we will sit on the fence and we will say: "Who will do the dirty work?" But while we will throw the blame on one or the other, we will sit back and let the rail lines be abandoned.

That's really the position of this Minister. He is not prepared to do anything. He's prepared to sit on the fence and say that irrespective of what PRAC says, we accept most of his recommendations.

**MR. DOWNEY:** No, I didn't say that at all.

**MR. URUSKI:** Well, he didn't say that. He hasn't denied it. He said: "We accept PRAC's recommendations, or some of them".

**MR. DOWNEY:** I did not; I said exactly the opposite.

**MR. URUSKI:** Now he hasn't told us which recommendations, he said. Now let him at least clear the air, Mr. Chairman. He indicated that he accepted most of PRAC's recommendations. Now he hasn't told us which ones he's accepted and which ones he hasn't.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that really it was a Socialist plot to make the rail lines public. Mr. Chairman, is the Premier of British Columbia, Mr. Bennett, a Socialist? Is the Premier of Alberta, Peter Lougheed, a Socialist? Those two radical red-eyed socialists were two of the western Premiers, along with Schreyer and Blakeney, who agreed on the position that most rail lines should become a public utility that will take the burden of costs off the railway, the costs that the railways say are crippling them from giving the service.

Since when, Mr. Chairman, will raising of the costs of hauling grain increase the service, would give farmers better service? Can the Minister of Agriculture assure this committee that if the freight rates are increased to the railways to the scope of what they call compensatory rates, that the farmers will be assured of better service? Can the Minister assure that because that's really what his Premier was saying in the Prince George Western Premiers' Conference, that we should examine it; we should examine the freight rates.

Mr. Chairman, why should we be even talking about the crowrates? Mr. Chairman, that was an agreement, I believe, between the railways and the Federal Government historically. Why should now, the provinces and even the Manitoba Pool Elevators be involved in a discussion of saying that: "Look, we should have compensatory rates." I ask the question again, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, since when can the Minister prove to us that if the freight rates are increased, that the farmers will be assured of better service? I have yet anyone to show me that when costs are increased to anybody, and in this case it will be directly on the producer that service will be improved, in any utility, in anything, that better services result. I have yet to see that, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I find it quite interesting because in fact with the implications that the Member for St. George is making with his nationalization program, that in fact if the provincial governments were to take over the railroads as he is suggesting, that in fact if the grain companies were not going to sit there and provide services for the farm people, that he would in fact . . . I could carry it right through and say he's going to nationalize the grain companies which is right up his alley. He's in fact saying that, Mr. Chairman. I have indicated that our position as far as we're concerned, that if the communities, if there's a retention committee put together, we will go to work with them and support the retention of that rail line.

However, we're all quite aware of the fact that if there aren't going to be grain companies providing service on those particular lines, what is the point in having a rail line without an elevator? And I truly would say that it would indicate at this time that the Member for St. George not only would nationalize the railroads, but would in fact nationalize the grain companies. And, Mr. Chairman, it follows right down his line of thinking that in fact that it would be complete state-owned grain companies in this country.

Again I would like to remind him of the statement, and he goes on to talk about some of the comments that were made by the Premiers. The Premier of Manitoba stated in the House in reply to the comments that were made as far as the changing of the statutory rates or the looking at the compensatory rates issue. It's the head in the sand approach that the opposition have taken over their many years in government, in fact, we've had the Premier of Saskatchewan even say that there has to be discussions take place. Mr. Chairman, they've gone that far. They're not taking that dogmatic approach that the opposition are taking in Manitoba. It's been clearly stated and repeated in this House that in fact the Premier of Saskatchewan has clearly indicated that there has to be an approach taken that is open for discussion. We, Mr. Chairman, are of the attitude

in Manitoba, that there have to be discussions take place.

He says can I guarantee, can I guarantee if there were more money. I'm not saying that the farmers have to pay more money. I'm saying that the benefits of the statutory rates have to remain with the farmers of western Canada. We've clearly stated that and we'll stick with that position. But, Mr. Chairman, again, the member goes back and says that the nationalization approach, where you take out of the taxpayers' pockets, the full cost of operating the railroads, the grain companies. . . He's gone that far to say that in fact the grain companies should be nationalized, that in fact we will then have a better system. We will have a better system if the government owns the total system. And again we can follow it right through that if the government owns the railroads, owns the grain companies, really what is there left for the individual freedom of this country? Really, there is very little, and that of course, follows right along with his line of thinking.

So I think it's been clearly clearly demonstrated in this committee today that the approach that the Member for St. George would like to take is the nationalization approach of the total system from rail line to grain companies, so that in fact he, if he were in government, could do that. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I think he should put on the record: if he were to return to government, he would continue to go ahead and nationalize the railroads plus the grain companies, to accomplish what he says has to be done.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Agriculture is prepared to resign, I will tell him what I will do, and there is no doubt that we at least would return to a position where the provincial government would advocate the putting into place the retention of all the branch lines and making them a public utility in the western provinces and right across this whole country, Mr. Chairman. There is no doubt about it.

At least, Mr. Chairman, we would not have an issue, if the rail lines were public and we ostensibly have a pool, a farmer owned and operated grain company, but what we find ourselves, Mr. Chairman, in, is while the farmers of the province pass resolutions indicating that the crowrate should not be touched, that the crowrate should remain as is, there should not even be any discussions with respect to the changing or examining the crowrate. We have the president of the farm elevator company, the Manitoba Pool, saying: "Look, let's not put our heads in the sand; we have to examine it", the same position that the Premier of this province has taken in his statements to the western Premiers.

Mr. Chairman, let's see what kind of position the Premier of this province took to the Grain Commission. The Minister says that no, it should not be touched, Mr. Chairman, and I quote from page 10 of the document to the Western Premiers' Conference, Prince George, British Columbia, March 26, 1979, by Honourable Sterling Lyon, Premier of Manitoba. On page 10, and I quote the paragraph; I'll read two paragraphs in fact, Mr. Chairman:

"There is an agreement that the crowrate has allowed western agriculture to expand and prosper. It has permitted the farmer to stabilize a portion of the costs he faces. During the ups and downs of the agricultural cycle, the crow rate has remained constant. Mr. Chairman, that's by the Premier of this province. I go on to quote, "Over the decades the western farmer has enjoyed the benefits of the crow and I maintain that in no way can the farmers of western Canada be expected to give up those benefits unless it can be demonstrated that a superior system will result," Mr. Chairman,"unless a superior system will result. All of those benefits as well as the detriments of statutory rates must be specifically identified so we know what we stand to gain and lose in any discussions of compensatory rates. " Mr. Chairman, that is the position of the provincial government "unless it can be demonstrated."

Mr. Chairman, our position is that the crowrates should remain inviolate. There's no way that the crowrates should be touched. If there is a desire on behalf of our national government to give the railways extra money that is their business. That is their business. Mr. Chairman, on the basis of providing a national transportation system I believe that the provinces should not be involved. I believe it is the responsibility of the people of Canada to provide a national transportation policy and a national transportation system to the benefit of all people.

Certainly it is in the national interests to have our grain exported world wide, it should be exported world wide. It has done immense for our balance of trade. With respect to Canadian exports, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the national government has a responsibility in this and the provinces should not be indicating that unless a superior system will result, we can look at it.

Mr. Chairman, there was an analysis done in Saskatchewan on the crowrate, Mr. Chairman, and based on 1977 costs, not 1979 costs, 1977 costs, Mr. Chairman, the costs to the producer if the crowrate was removed and compensatory rates came into play, the cost would be close to 50 cents per bushel to the farmer, Mr. Chairman, if the crowrate was elevated. Mr. Chairman, this was done

by the Saskatchewan government. That would be a net loss, Mr. Chairman, in Saskatchewan to prairie farmers in 1977 of approximately \$330 million if the crowrate is abolished. Mr. Chairman, the Saskatchewan farmers will suffer the biggest loss, Mr. Chairman, about \$200 million a year. Mr. Chairman, the loss will be proportionate to the Province of Manitoba. We know now that if the crowrates were abolished in the Province of Manitoba it would result in today's cost I would venture to say close to 60 cents per bushel in additional costs. Can you imagine the farmers today on the price, Mr. Chairman —(Interjection)— if the member has some better figures to challenge this, Mr. Chairman —(Interjection)— from the government? Mr. Chairman, I am giving you the figures. If you think the figures wrong, then you challenge me that the figures are wrong. Based on the Saskatchewan figures it will be . . .

**MR. USKIW:** Based on the Snavelly figures.

**MR. URUSKI:** Actually the costs that Saskatchewan derived their figures from on 50 cents per bushel was on the Snavelly Report based on the 1974 costs which Snavelly took into account in his study. When you extrapolate them, Mr. Chairman —(Interjection)— I don't care what the federal government wants to do, my position is . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. Order please. Could we have the remarks directed to the Chair and could we have one speaker at a time. The Honourable Member for St. George.

**MR. URUSKI:** I'm speaking to you, Mr. Chairman. Oh yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the facts are straight. If the Member for Minnedosa has some other facts, I'd like to hear from him and let him put them on the record. But, Mr. Chairman, there will be a direct loss to producers I would venture to say of close to 60 cents per bushel if the crowrate was removed in western Canada. And if it is removed, Mr. Chairman, the producers are ill prepared to pay that kind of costs. All we have to do is look at the U.S. system as to what the costs the producers are paying, Mr. Chairman. That's all we have to do is look at that system.

And this Minister is not prepared to at least put a strong position with respect to the crowrate. They are prepared to look at them if they think a superior system will result. Well, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that is a sellout of the farmers of Manitoba. He is prepared, he and his Premier are prepared to sell out the farmers of Manitoba. He is prepared to add a cost to every bushel of grain delivered by the farmers of Manitoba between 50 cents and 60 cents a bushel at today's costs. That's the kind of position this Minister and this Premier have taken and that's the kind of sellout that he is putting forward to farmers of Manitoba.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, again the Member for St. George really amazes me that he sits here and he says that we haven't been responsible in our approach and that in fact we have said, unless clearly a better system can be worked out to benefit the farmers of Manitoba that we are wrong. It's a totally defensible position when you state that those farmers are going to be in a better position when they are able to market the grains — two markets that have been truly identified. The Wheat Board has stated that we've lost between \$300 million and \$400 million worth of sales to western Canada. Mr. Chairman, that is on the record. It's been said many times.

But then for the Member for St. George to go to a Saskatchewan report — a report, Mr. Chairman, why did Saskatchewan have a report done? They were quite prepared to take a look at it in that light. But no, Mr. Chairman, again the government of the last few years in Manitoba did not even so much as have one scrap of information available for anybody to sit down and say really what position are we in, in Manitoba as far as the whole picture of grain transportation handling and what our capacities are, where we are in regard to benefits to farmers. There wasn't one scrap of paper, there wasn't one bit of research work done here in the Province of Manitoba so that anybody could come forward with a credible position. He clearly indicated that today that the backup information that he has is from Saskatchewan. The figures that he is using as far as cost to the farmers are completely way out of balance. I think it is a known fact that there's a discussion taking place, that it could cost somewhat three times greater than it is, compared to the statutory rate. We're not saying we want the farmers to pay that. We're, in fact, saying the very opposite, that we don't want the farmers to pay one nickel more than they do now under the statutory rates. We want that benefit retained for those farmers.

But, Mr. Chairman, until we have a report done which is being done by a very credible individual at the University of Manitoba, through the university. In fact, I'm sure that we look forward with great interest to some of the material that we are going to see this next several months when we get the report. In fact again, it's the head in the sand approach that the last administration took.

They didn't want to equip themselves, Mr. Chairman, for the people of Manitoba. They couldn't make one comment because they didn't know. They were flying from the seat of their pants as they have always done, Mr. Chairman. They didn't know what the farm communities wanted and weren't blasted well prepared to find out. And that's what we are faced with.

Go back to the Rail Retention Committee and the whole input as far as they were concerned. Mr. Chairman, they were again criticizing us for allowing rail line abandonment. That didn't start under our administration. That started during their administration. We were caught in a situation where we had to take over from where they left off. Again, he says we should pick up their position of nationalization. That isn't the key to every answer, that the government should nationalize everything. Nationalize the railroads, nationalize the grain companies, Mr. Chairman, that's totally unacceptable. He refers to a farmer organization which is Manitoba Pool. He can refer to United Grain Growers who are totally farmer operated grain companies. Is he saying, Mr. Chairman, that if they aren't prepared to continue on with the operation of facilities for farmers in the grain business that he's going to nationalize those farm grain companies? Is that what he's saying? That he's going to serve notice on Jim Devison who is a very credible leader in the farm community, that I'm sorry Mr. Devison, on a certain rail line because we now own the rail line as government, that you are not leaving an elevator there, that we'll nationalize that and that will be a government elevator. Is that what he's saying?

I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for St. George really is in tune with the farm community. In fact the debate in which we are entering into at this particular time is one that is very important as far as he is concerned because of the preliminary work that he had done or his government had done in preparation to speak for the farm people.

Mr. Chairman, I think that any day we'll put our record against theirs as far as taking action to get to the people of this province the money they need to operate the farms that they are operating, we all know the cost of interest. We all know the high input cost. Mr. Chairman, how can he go out to farm people and say, we as a government should bury our heads in the sand and not pay attention to the fact that you have to pay 13 percent or 14 percent interest to go and put in a crop this year. How can he go out and say that you are sitting one or two years grain supplies on hand but you know we fully support not changing anything so that we can get this grain to market. How can he fully support that position, Mr. Chairman.

Well let's look at Manitob let's really look at the grains that are grown in Manitoba. Let's look at sunflowers for example, Mr. Chairman. We grew sunflowers in Manitoba. We were up to something like; we one-quarter of a million acres several years ago dropped back to 80,000 acres; we are now in excess of 200 and some thousand acres again this year. Mr. Chairman, who is paying the freight on those particular crops? The farmer, Mr. Chairman, is paying the freight on those crops and why is he paying the freight on them, Mr. Chairman? It is because he can sell it and put cash in his pocket. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we can go through several other crops that are grown in Manitoba, grain corn, for example.

Why, Mr. Chairman, do we see the total Province of Manitoba sold out of grain corn? Because, Mr. Chairman, the people have to grow crops that they can market. They have had to make this kind of moves to make a living. You cannot totally sit with your head in the sand such as he would have us do and sit here with that dogmatic approach. We are in a changing time, Mr. Chairman. We have to sit down with the people who are responsible for the job that has to be done, the grain companies, the grain transportation system. It has to be a joint effort and never before has that been done. Well, again, he says that we should sit with our head in the sand and not pay attention to it. Being totally responsible to the farmers of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, we are in fact looking at the total picture. We are going to continue to look at it and work with farm people, farm organizations, Manitoba Pool, United Grain Growers and the grain companies that are involved.

We're not going to serve notice on them that they are being nationalized because in fact, they are not. They are not doing the job that is expected to be done. They are farm run organizations, Mr. Chairman. They are what the people of this province want and it isn't in fact, to have them taken over by government. So I just want to really clarify that we are being responsible to the people of Manitoba, the farmers. We want to put the cash in the farmers' pocket so they can live. In fact when we look at the record, Mr. Chairman, this year all cropping intentions for Manitoba of those grains that particularly will generate a cash return are the ones that are showing increase.

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. David Blake (Minedosa):** In accordance with Rule 19(2) the hour of 4:30 p.m. having arrived, I'm interrupting the proceedings of the Committee for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 p.m.

**SUPPLY — EDUCATION**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen (Crescentwood):** Would the Committee come to order. On Tuesday evening we left off at (e) Teacher Certification, Records, General Educational Development and Education Data Services. The Minister of Education. **KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Chairman, I have some information that was requested by the Honourable Members Opposite previously, I'll send this over at this time. I believe the Member for Seven Oaks requested summary of the transfers in the Department of Education and the Department of Labour, I have that material; and a staff man year reconciliation for 1978-79, I believe the Member for St. Vital requested that, but perhaps it could go to the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

That's all the material I have at this time, Mr. Chairman. There have been other requests that I will be able to fill shortly.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. On this particular item, I don't want to repeat the debate that was carried on the last time this item was before us, but just to clarify the Minister's position relative to the TIP program and TERM program, the induction programs for teachers, it seemed to me that what the Minister was saying that it was his position that the costs of such programs should be borne by the divisions; that the province, on completion of the pilot project, intended to wind these programs up. Now, I would ask him to clarify the position, because if I'm wrong, I'd like to be corrected.

**MR. COSENS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, just to clarify that particular position the TIP program, which had been a pilot program for the induction of new teachers. I said had been terminated and had been a pilot program. The TERM program, which is a different type of program, actually part of teacher training, but it does serve the purpose of getting teacher candidates out into the rural areas, is one that is continuing, at least for another year, and we are conducting an assessment of that program at this time.

**MR. BOYCE:** Yes, I understood the Minister when he said that TIP had been terminated, but I just wanted to clarify that it was his position that he felt that if such a program was to be continued, it should be directly borne by the divisions?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, the situation with people who are new to the classroom has usually been handled by the local school administration and senior teachers in the schools of the province, and this is a situation I think they are quite capable of handling.

**MR. BOYCE:** Well, the Minister and I may debate that point whether they are or are not, but before you proceed, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could take as notice a question on figures, so that we talk about the same figures.

In the departmental report for 1977-78, the enrollment figures are based on September 30th, and Table 12, on Page 64 of the report, gives up to September 30, 1977. I wonder if the Minister could provide us with the figures as of September 30, 1978, so that when we're discussing the declining enrollment and things of that nature, that we will be in order.

I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, on this general item of Salaries, relative to Teacher Certification, if this would not be a good point to discuss the Manitoba Teachers Society's intention to forward to the government a bill relative to professionalism.

Now the Minister of Health, in his Estimates, had suggested that there were 14, as I recall it, different professional groups had forwarded requests to the government for some amendments to the acts which govern the professional association in any of those 14 fields.

Now, I know that there is an intention, or at least we have been advised that there is an intention for the Manitoba Teachers Society to forward a draft bill or draft recommendation to the government asking that some self-governing authority be vested in the Manitoba Teachers Society or some other organization, outside of the Department of Education. So, perhaps the minister at this time could advise us as to what the intention of the government is in the ensuing fiscal year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Education.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I can provide the figures for 1978, for the Member for Winnipeg Centre. I should mention this was obviously an oversight in the report. Those figures should have been included for 1978 under Special Education, it should read 2,854; under Nursery 1,677; under Kindergarten 14,632; Grade I 16,639; Grade II 16,423; Grade III 16,351; Grade IV 15,804; Grade

V 15,392; Grade VI 15,355; Grade VII 16,703; Grade VIII 17,698; Grade IX 18,017; Grade X 17,757; Grade XI 16,012; Grade XII 14,356; a grand total, Mr. Chairman, of 215,661, and those figures, of course, are as of September 30, 1978.

To respond to the member's second question, in regard to the Manitoba Teachers Society professional bill, any discussion we would have at this time, I suppose, would be rather hypothetical. I have not seen the bill. I understand from the media that such a bill has been prepared and I also understand that it may be forwarded either to myself or to the Attorney-General for consideration.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (e)(1)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I wanted a clarification from the minister as to the present position of the department in regard to private and parochial school teacher certification. Is this handled in the normal way by the department, or have there been any changes or any strengthening in past practices in relation to teacher certification?

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

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, just in reply to the Member for Elmwood, let me say that until the legislation that was passed last year by this government there was no requirement for there to be any record of certification by teachers in private schools or independent schools in this province. Of course, now under the new legislation, that requirement now exists for those who would be seeking shared service funding and that particular provision has now been made in the department to record the certification of teachers in these independent schools.

**MR. DOERN:** Is the minister indicating that previously there were no qualifications for teaching in these schools? And secondly, what is the date the minister is speaking of? Is he speaking of regulations now in effect, regulations about to be proclaimed, what is the date of this change in policy?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Elmwood is absolutely right. Prior to the passage of that legislation last July, there was no requirement and no record of any certification for teachers in independent schools in this province. The regulations came into effect following the legislation.

**MR. DOERN:** And I assume that they are now in place and again, if the minister could give me the precise date, I would be interested in knowing the precise date and then I asked him for clarification. Do the same standards now apply to private and parochial school teachers as applied to public school teachers vis-a-vis certification? Are they identical?

**MR. COSENS:** Well first of all, Mr. Chairman, the precise date of the passage of the legislation, is this the question the Member for Elmwood is asking, or the precise date of the coming into force of the regulations? The regulations were applied as of the beginning of schools in this province last September of '78 and are of course now in force and if that date is not precise enough, I can look into the actual date that the regulations were drafted, if that's the preciseness that is required in this situation. I can assure him that the same certification requirements are required of teachers in this province now, regardless of what type of schools they're teaching.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to get a general reading from the minister if we could, on the proposals mentioned by my colleague and briefly commented on by the minister, the proposed professional bill, in terms of certification. The teachers are obviously interested in being an autonomous body and they have passed a resolution to this effect and are forwarding it to the department to discipline their own profession and to suspend teachers if necessary. Privileges and powers that are common to other professions in our society, such as the lawyers and doctors, I assume that there's no reason why members of the teaching profession should not have similar powers. Apparently they are taking a broader point of view, that even though this would be a professional bill it would apply to their own profession. They are also recommending that some members outside the teaching profession be included in the Certification Board, so I was just wondering if the Minister sees any particular problems with this proposal. I realize that he will have to examine it in detail, and it may take him several months to make up his mind, but I'm just saying in principle, does he see any practical problems with allowing teachers to establish their own certification and, as a result, be responsible for their own profession.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, in replying to the Member for Elmwood, perhaps I could just go back to a previous question, and clarify my answer — I don't want to mislead him, when he was talking about the certification of teachers.

In independent schools, I said that they required certification, and that is quite correct, but that only applies to those private schools that may be applying for grants under the shared-service legislation. If they are not applying for grants, of course, that requirement does not exist.

Going ahead then to the question in regard to the Teachers' Professional Bill, I have to tell the member quite candidly that I don't think I'm in a position to really comment on that bill until I've had an opportunity to read it, to study it, and to give it some serious thought, and anything I would say at this time would certainly be premature.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I guess that heads off another question, which would be whether if that bill were introduced it would apply to all segments of education including the private and parochial schools, but I'll pass on that question.

I just want to follow up what the Minister just said, when he qualified his answer about standards of certification and standards of teaching in private and parochial schools, when he said that, of course, it did not apply to schools that were not applying for provincial grants, or I suppose, previously, for inclusion in shared-services. I would simply ask him this, and I must confess to not having had some of the experience and information of my colleagues, who had the honour to serve as the Minister of Education — I did not have that privilege — but it strikes me as somewhat bothersome that there are private schools and parochial schools, presumably, in the province of Manitoba in which there is no standard set for the teachers in those particular schools. I wonder if the Minister has any similar gut reaction, him having had the advantage of being in the Minister's chair, but does he intend to perpetuate that system, or does he have any interest in attempting to raise the standards of the teachers in those schools? Because, if I read him correctly, it means that there are a number of schools, in this province, attended by Manitoba children in which anybody whatsoever, who walks in the door and calls himself a teacher, may teach, and it would seem to me as a former teacher that that could only be described as a deplorable situation in that there is no assurance, whatsoever, that those children are receiving an adequate education. They could be amused for 5 or 6 hours a day by somebody, but as to whether they are receiving any training in academic excellence, that is another matter. So, I ask him whether he intends any movement in that direction, or intends to prescribe any minimum standards.

**MR. COSENS:** In reply to the Member for Elmwood, Mr. Chairman, I would mention that the number of situations we have of this type are actually quite small, however, that certainly begs the question a certain amount. I might also mention to him that since we now have a field unit and do have people out in all parts of the province representing the department, they do visit this type of particular school, and urge them and work with them to improve the standard of the particular curriculum offerings. They work with the particular parents, who are trustees of those particular schools, and urge them to improve the qualifications of the teachers in those particular situations.

But by the same token, Mr. Chairman, I have to remind the Member for Elmwood that there is no legislation that prevents parents in this province, or to my understanding in any other province, from putting their children in what they would call an independent situation and having them instructed by someone who they feel is satisfactory to their standards. I would refer the Member for Elmwood to a recent court case in Alberta, where the province of Alberta pursued this particular concern that the Member for Elmwood has, and I should tell him that in that particular case, the province lost, and the findings of the courts were that as long as the parents of the children in that particular school situation were satisfied that they were receiving an adequate education, then they had that particular right. I would refer the Member for Elmwood to that particular decision, which I believe is as recent as a year ago.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, just one final point, Mr. Chairman, although we may not be able to prevent parents from putting their children into certain schools, I wonder whether it is not a requirement of attendance, or of the terms of reference of The Education Act, that children are supposed to in effect attend public school? Looking at it from the other point of view, I assume that if a student is not attending, there is an Attendance Act, and there is obviously an emphasis and a pressure on people to have their children attend schools, and that is normally taken to mean the Public School System in the general sense.

So I'm simply saying that the problem is that anybody, as I see it, could withdraw their children from the school system, the public school system, and under the guise of establishing their own school, they could then keep them in a state of perpetual ignorance.



If you had a family of 5 or 6 children, who are of school age, you could say I'm establishing my own school in my own house, and I'm therefore withdrawing the children from the local school. I gather that under those conditions the Minister and the department are completely helpless. Given the front and the cover of a "private school", those children could be withdrawn from the public school system, would be truant, would be failing to attend a legitimate school, but the department and the government would be helpless in that particular case, and it just strikes me as a rather surprising and shocking situation and I just wondered if the Minister would confirm that that is the case, and whether he throws his hands up in the face of that problem or whether there is any solution to it.

**MR. COSENS:** The problem, Mr. Chairman, is not quite as grave as the Member for Elmwood portrays it. In fact where a situation exists such as he describes, where parents do take children out of the public school system, or in fact out of an independent school system and put them into their own home and instruct them, they must satisfy the school officials that they are offering an equivalent education. Having done that, it is quite legal for them to follow that particular practice.

**MR. DOERN:** Then I would ask the Minister whether they would be regularly inspected and whether, if in the judgment of the department, they were not meeting departmental standards, whether that would be closed, and also whether the department has any record of closing such "institutions" as that.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I can tell the Member for Elmwood that yes, there would be regular inspection, if that's the correct word for that type of situation, to satisfy our department and educational officials that in fact an equivalent education is being offered. I am not aware, in recent years, of there being any case, either by the previous government or the government previous to that, of a government taking action in a situation where they felt that adequate education was not being offered. In other words, when I say "taking action", I believe the Member for Elmwood is inferring legal action, court action. Certainly I know of cases where action has been taken by educational officials to upgrade the standard of education being offered in a particular independent situation, but not, certainly, legal action.

**MR. DOERN:** Could the Minister provide the committee with some figures on the number of private and parochial teachers in Manitoba and also if he has a further breakdown of those that would meet provincial certification prior to his new stronger policy of last September?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, as of February 15th, the records on the teachers in the private schools show the following information: 383 holding Manitoba Teachers' certificates, 115 being uncertified for a total of 498. That was as of February 15th, 1979.

**MR. DOERN:** And do I now understand that of the 115, based on the new policy, that they will now have to meet provincial standards?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, only if that private school is in fact applying under the shared-service legislation for funding.

**MR. DOERN:** Then could the Minister indicate, of the 115, which of those fall under that category and which fall outside it?

**MR. COSENS:** I don't have that particular information with me, Mr. Chairman. I can get it for the Member for Elmwood.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (e)(1)—pass. The Member for St. Vital.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday evening the Minister took as notice a few questions that were raised on this item. I did miss the first couple of minutes of this afternoon, and if the Minister gave the answers at that time I will apologize to him, and if he did not, I wonder if he has the answers at this time.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Member for St. Vital would refresh my memory on what those two questions were that he's referring to. I did provide some information that had been requested. I don't know if that fulfilled his particular questions. I have some additional information

for him that I did not hand out because he wasn't present at the time. I'll send it to him at this time. This information is in regard to a situation in a particular school, and building requirements for schools.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I can recall two other questions that I asked the Minister that he took as notice. One of them had to do with membership fees. He said he would find that for me. And the other one had to do with the teacher induction program or project. He said that he did have an assessment of that, and I understood from his remarks that he would table that for the benefit of the members of the committee.

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'll endeavour to have that information here as soon as possible.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, on this particular item in the Estimates, I'd like to ask the Minister if there is any change in the teachers' salary grid for this year, and if not when was the last time there was a change?

**MR. COSENS:** Actually, Mr. Chairman, that particular question would be more suitably asked under 3(a), where we do cover teacher grants, but I will answer here. There is no particular change this year, and I am informed that the last change was in 1967.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (e)(1)—pass. The Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Just following up what I was previously talking to the Minister about, could he comment on this remark, because I get a completely different impression from what he said in this remark which I quoted to him the other day and he did not comment on. G. M. Davies was quoted in the Free Press last September, and this was in regard to McGuay College, and I don't want to get into the McGuay situation, but I do want to ask him if he would comment on Mr. Davies' comments, where he said that the department has no formal control over private schools except to ensure that children of compulsory school age conform to attendance laws, and that the laws allow children to go to private schools as long as they get an education equivalent to that given in public schools. Does the Minister agree with that statement? Is that a correct statement?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I think I can agree with that statement. It probably needs some qualification in the light of the reference to a particular private school where the students, to my understanding, were 16 years of age or over, and that probably makes that statement a little clearer in that particular definition.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, one question is, how do you determine the equivalency of these private schools in relation to public schools if they're not inspected on a regular basis?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, they are inspected on a regular basis. Certainly, I believe, the school in question that the Member for Elmwood has referred to only operated for a matter of . . . was it weeks, or was it a couple of months, or was it one month?

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

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister what is the composition of the Discipline Committee?

**MR. COSENS:** Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, we could move ahead with other questions while we're finding that particular information for the honourable member.

**MR. WALDING:** Perhaps the Minister could tell me just offhand how many members there are on that committee; perhaps he would know just offhand how many teachers there are on the committee?

**MR. COSENS:** It's my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that there's a total membership of 13 on the committee, and that there are 4 teachers on that particular committee, of that 13.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, the Annual Report of the department indicates that there were only two cases heard by this particular committee during the year. Is this a particularly unusual number?

it seems extremely low.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that that is not at all unusual. Some years there may only be one case heard in this regard, so that one or two would represent a typical year.

**MR. WALDING:** Could the Minister inform the Committee whether any teachers lost their licence during the year — their certification to teach?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, there were two people who lost their licences during the year, two people.

**MR. WALDING:** The next item in the report, Mr. Chairman, dealt with Teacher Supply, and I notice that out of a total of 894 graduates, some 173 of them did not find employment in the province. I would like to ask the Minister what his policy is regarding provincial input into either the number of student teachers taken in or teacher supply in general? Does he think that as Minister he should have some influence or input into this topic?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I believe I have remarked on this particular topic before, but I certainly have no hesitation in speaking to it again. I find it rather interesting and, in fact, sometimes a little bit sad, when I know that we do have perhaps 173, and in some years I understand as many as 200, graduates from our own Teacher Training Institutions who are not employed in the province, and at the same time I find that we bring in some 300 teachers from outside the province to fill vacant places, and particularly so in northern Manitoba and in rural Manitoba.

I had the pleasure of attending the opening of the school in Berens River a couple of weekends ago, and I would hazard a guess that one-half of the staff of that very modern, well-equipped and pleasant school is made up of people from outside the province.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, one reason why I raise the matter with the Minister at this time, is that similar concerns have been raised about other faculties, notably medicine and engineering. I'm informed that anywhere from 25 percent to 50 percent of the graduates from those faculties leave the province immediately upon graduation. Now, I'm not suggesting that a large number of the graduates from the teaching faculties leave, but the question arises as to what numbers of graduates should we be turning out? The fact that public funds are being used to train people, should it be that we are producing a surplus of people in different professions? Could the Minister tell me what his policy is in this regard, does he think we should be graduating less teachers, for example?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, the problem of teacher supply, of course, is one that has always been a rather complicated problem, but I would suggest to the Member for St. Vital, that I am reasonably happy with the numbers that we are graduating from our Teacher Training Institutions. If we were to cut down on that particular number, then we would, I suppose, be providing the opportunity for more people to come into the province from outside our particular boundaries. As I say, if we have 173 graduates unemployed, and at the same time we have to bring in over 200 teachers from outside of the province, we are not overtraining, but we do not direct the graduates as to where they must teach, that of course is their choice, and we can never determine what type of decision they will make after graduation as to whether they will venture out beyond the Perimeter Highway, or whether, if they don't receive a job within the Perimeter Highway, then they will decide to seek some other type of employment. That certainly is their choice, but it's a situation, I would suggest, we would not solve by cutting down on the number of people that we are graduating. If we did that, we would merely provide more openings for people from outside the province.

**MR. WALDING:** That being the case, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister prepared to leave it to either the particular faculty or the universities themselves to make the decision as to how many entrants there should be into the education or teacher training courses at those institutions?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, this is something that we follow very closely, of course, and we dialogue with the universities on this particular topic. I might say that over the past few years their record in this regard I think has been a rather admirable one. They have been able to keep the number graduating, I think, in a reasonable state in regard to the number that are in demand. The supply and demand situation has been well researched by the universities, and I would say that they are producing a reasonable number in relation to the demand that exists.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I raised the matter of certification with the Minister last year. He said that it was something that he had not had time to look at, but he would certainly study it and let me know his policy on it. The matter that I raised with him was of interim certification for teachers who were landed immigrants into this country, and who had moved to Manitoba. My information is that teachers in this position were allowed interim certificates for a total of six years, and after that time if they were not Canadians, that they were thereafter barred from teaching.

I suggested last year to the Minister that this was highly discriminatory, and he said that he would look into it. I would now like to ask him has he had the opportunity to check into it, and what is his policy in this matter?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, in looking into this particular problem, I find that we are perhaps more liberal in this province than many of the other provinces in this regard. I understand that in Ontario and Quebec, that they adhere also to this particular six-year policy. I understand that we also will extend this to eight, we'll provide a further two years where it is required.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I want to know what the Minister thinks of the principle involved of taking away a person's right to his livelihood, because of his nationality?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I don't know if we're right down to that particular principle or not. I think each province has its requirements as to certification; if people can meet that particular certification and become citizens, I can see no problem at all. If they're not prepared to become citizens of this country, then by the same token, I'm not sure that we are being particularly discriminatory.

**MR. WALDING:** Well, I'm still not sure that I know the Minister's policy on this, Mr. Chairman, and I will tell him in advance that I had the same problem with at least two of his predecessors in this particular department. What other provinces do, I believe, is irrelevant in this regard. What we are talking about is that the province is in a position to assess the teaching qualifications of a landed immigrant, and is prepared to allow that teacher to teach our children for a number of years — six years, although he says it may go to eight — at that time, they are then prepared to take away that person's right to teach our children. Not because of anything that he might have done wrong; not because of any incompetence to teach; but simply because of the colour of the passport he happens to carry in his pocket.

If the Minister would like to read The Human Rights Act, he will find in there that it forbids discrimination in employment in a number of different categories, including nationality. I'm suggesting to the Minister that this particular policy, and I don't know whether he agrees with it or not, because he hasn't said so, I suggest to the Minister that this particular policy is frankly and blatantly discriminatory.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that the particular policy that the member refers to was recommended by the Board of Teacher Education and Certification. It has representatives from all educational organizations. I can also tell the Member for St. Vital that this particular situation was checked with the Attorney-General's Department and it is not discriminatory in the view of people in that department.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I ran into this problem several years ago, when I was looking into it at that time, and I've raised it I think every year since. The Human Rights Act has to do with employment, and I believe it's alleged that in this case that the province is not the employing agency. It is the school boards that actually employ, but it remains a fact that if the teacher does not have a teaching certificate he cannot be employed.

I've also heard it argued that citizenship and nationality are not the same thing, and the discrimination in this case is on the grounds of citizenship where the Human Rights says that discrimination cannot occur on the grounds of nationality. Now maybe the difference between those two things is clear to the Minister, it is not clear to me, but as far as the legality of it is concerned, there is still a moral issue involved with it, and that is whether the Minister wants to take away a person's right to continue his occupation merely because of his nationality.

Now, if he agrees wholeheartedly with that, and never mind what some board recommended to him that had various representation on it, what does the Minister think?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I think the problem is a little more complicated than is outlined by

the Member for St. Vital. He knows, of course, quite clearly that the principle that's involved here is that those who teach in the public schools of this country, and inculcate the rights and duties of citizens in our society should be expected to be citizens, /. I suppose that's the principle that is governing this particular action. As far as I'm concerned, I have of course been following the recommendations that have been set down for some time. In this case I suppose set down by the previous government of this province. I have had no legal indication that what we are doing is not right in a legal sense. Before I would be prepared to give him my own personal feelings in this regard other than of course I have to tell him that I do feel that if you are going to work in the educational process of a country for some time, that it would seem to be desirable to me that you become a citizen of that country. But as far as all of the legal implications and so on, I would have to check those out before I would be prepared to give him any definitive answer in this regard.

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

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not arguing legalities with the Minister, and I'm sure if he does obtain legal advice on it, he will get the same story that I got several years ago, that taken very narrowly, that this particular policy is quite legal. It's legal to do it. What I'm suggesting to the Minister is that it's an immoral thing to do.

Nor am I arguing about the desirability of someone who comes to this country of taking out a citizenship. It's done by the thousands every year, and he knows that there are thousands of people who take out their citizenship every year. I believe they do so out of a sense of commitment to the country and a desire to want to be citizens. I believe it is wrong of the Minister to in fact threaten people by saying, "You have got to take out your citizenship. Otherwise we will take away your right to carry on your chosen profession." Now if the Minister does not see that as a moral issue, if he does not see anything wrong with such a threat, you know, overhanging someone, then I suppose I have no further argument. But I would remind him that there is no such provision for superintendents who work in the school division for the staff in the offices. I believe there is no such provision for school trustees, and they are just as much involved in the education system as the actual teachers are.

I would remind him also that citizenship is not a prerequisite of being elected into this particular House, where the education policy is made overall for the whole province. Now he might wish to consider that. He might also wish to consider various other trades, occupations and professions within this province, and I know of only one where Canadian citizenship is a prerequisite to get a license to practise your particular profession, and that is in the profession of law. An argument is made by the Law Society and people involved with it that it's because they are officers of the Crown, being lawyers, that there is an argument for that. But in no other trade or profession that I know of is that condition of citizenship held out as an axe over somebody's head to force them to become a citizen. If the Minister thinks that is a proper and moral way to proceed, you know, good luck to him. I don't . I object to it strongly.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to pursue this argument at great length with the Member for St. Vital. I know he feels strongly about it. I can remember him bringing this point forward last year at this time as well. I do suggest to him that in all fairness, when people come to a country and enter a profession or a particular business, I'm sure that they have some responsibility to ascertain at that time what the requirements are and what they will be six years down the road and so on. So that if in fact they do choose to take that particular route, I don't think they are unaware at all of what the requirement will be after some six years, seven years, eight years, whatever the requirement will be. If he's talking — and he uses the word threat — I don't think it's a threat at all, Sir, it's a requirement that is clearly stated I am sure, when a person enters a country and considers entering a particular profession or occupation. In this case it happens to be teaching.

**MR. WALDING:** Just one last thing on that, Mr. Chairman. I seem to or I suspect, let me put it that way, that one reason why this particular limitation was put in there — because you might be aware, Mr. Chairman, that up until about four or five years ago an interim certificate could be renewed indefinitely — I suspect that some limit was put on there because of an oversupply or a potential oversupply of teachers. I've been informed that when that particular regulation came in there were something like 1,000 teachers in this province whose jobs were at stake. Now, many of them took out their citizenship at that time. But to use a measure such as this to solve a problem of employment is totally unacceptable as far as I'm concerned and there may still be a problem with an oversupply of teachers. We dealt with that just a few minutes ago. But I understand that the Manitoba Teachers'

Society at its annual convention one or two years ago passed a resolution condemning this particular measure, or at least there was such a resolution before the convention. Possibly it wasn't passed. I didn't get a copy of it afterward.

But if the Minister at this stage says that his policy is to go along with the previous one, even though it was a policy laid down under our administration — as I said I was opposed to it then and I'm still opposed to it — I would just urge him and beg him to review this policy in the light of human rights.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, just on one point. I should inform the Member for St. Vital that the resolution that he refers to did not pass. Did not in fact pass at the annual general meeting of the teachers.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (e)(1)—pass. The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** I was just sitting listening to the debate between the Minister and the Member for St. Vital, and I was just wondering if the Minister's feelings would apply to teaching at university also. But earlier in response to a question from my colleague the Member for Elmwood, the Minister used the term "independent school", and I wonder if this is something new creeping into our conversations.

But a couple of questions I have, one on the teachers from outside the province and the country. Is it still the policy that the people coming in on exchange don't pay income tax in the country? That's the first question. Then my other questions are related to table 7 on page 58 of the Annual Report of the department. And it shows that — or on page 59 of that report rather — the statement of professional standing for teachers leaving Manitoba, so we have 424 teachers leaving Manitoba. And the Minister used the term "200 teachers come in", and we have 424 leave. I wonder, you know, sometimes tables are prepared on a different basis and I wonder if the Minister could reconcile that for me.

When I was asking some questions earlier on the Minister's position relative to the teacher induction program. I still think from what he has said that he is not in favour of the program to the extent that they're willing to make available funds to encourage teachers to deploy themselves throughout the province. It was in yesterday's article in the Free Press — I don't know how much of it they had to correct — but they said that the medical profession was spread out in the province something like 1,100 in the city of Winnipeg and 400 outside of the city of Winnipeg. And thinking back to some discussions that have taken place, that outside of the city of Winnipeg we had no ophthalmologists at all.

Now, the Minister says it's a difficult question in how to get teachers to go outside of the city of Winnipeg, outside the perimeter highway, I think was his term that he used. Now as good or bad as the program was in teacher induction program, this was but one step to try and help teachers integrate into new communities. But with specific reference to Table 7, from some of the debates that have already taken place in the House, that some of the programs that were initiated to try and attract people to the teaching profession who were more interested in teaching outside of the city of Winnipeg than they were inside, I would ask the Minister if he is in a position to advise us what their budgetary policy is relative to IMPACTE, PENT and BUNTEP. We show in 977-78 that on those four programs which includes the Winnipeg Centre Project, that they graduated 21 on IMPACTE, 14 on PENT, 16 on BUNTEP and 6 in the Winnipeg Centre Project. And of course these were programs which were designed to try and attract people to the teaching profession who would not try to just apply for positions in the city of Winnipeg. I had asked the Minister previously how many people were teaching on permits in this year, and I don't know whether Table 7, in showing this, where they say the number of permits issued in the elementary school, secondary school substitute teachers, whether a person should sum those four figures given to get the number of people who are teaching on permits. So perhaps the Minister could advise us on that also.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Winnipeg Centre refers to a number of special teacher training programs, in particular programs training native people in the province to go into teaching. Those are better dealt with under Special Projects, which I believe are 4.(o), yes, 4.(o) or 4.(n) in the Estimate considerations. I'd be quite prepared to go into the detail of those programs there any more than I can assure him at this time that in some cases, when we get into the detail, he will find that there has been some diminution of the number of graduates in one program, some expansion in another. In other words, these are special projects and as such they change from year to year and some can receive more emphasis, some less emphasis, according to the determined needs of the particular areas.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre also was interested in the number of permits issued in 1977-78.

I can tell him it is 128, with 32 letters of authority issued in that time. Of those 128 permits, 51 were issued to substitute teachers, 32 to teacher training graduates who got in the spring term prior to the issuance of their certificates. In other words, right after graduation they were employed, and the remaining 45 were mainly part-time teachers with special qualifications or perhaps teachers in isolated areas. And the 32 letters of authority were issued either to certified teachers teaching outside their certificate entitlement or to partially trained teachers. We're talking here about people with an elementary certificate, who because of the particular remoteness of the situation were required to move into the secondary area to teach and as a result required a letter of authority.

**MR. BOYCE:** Well, I thank the Minister for pointing that out, that those programs that I mentioned are under No. 4., but nevertheless to relate the Annual Report to the Estimates, these are statistics relative to the teachers' certification; that's what we're discussing at the moment, is teachers' certification. I wonder if the Minister could provide us with the information as to the location of the different classifications of teachers within the province. We assume that, as we go through the Class 1 to Class 7 teachers, that there is some reason for paying teachers additional salaries for having more qualifications. I wonder if the Minister has available for us the disposition of the teachers in the various classifications in the City of Winnipeg, for example, and Brandon, and rural and remote communities.

And also, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise, when he says that the figures that we were talking about when we first started this afternoon, that student enrolment by grades on Table 12 is 215,661. This does not include, I assume, those who are enrolled in private schools. If this be the case, I wonder if the Minister could provide us with the numbers of private schools, the numbers of teachers employed in those independent" schools, to use the Minister's term, and the number of students enrolled in those schools.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, it will take me some time to get the first information for the Member for Winnipeg Centre. The information regarding the number of teachers in the private schools, I believe I provided earlier. He also wanted to know the number of private schools in the province, I believe, was the other question that he was concerned about at this time. I'll have that information for him in a minute. There are 66 private schools in the province, with an average enrolment of 8,197.

**MR. BOYCE:** What do you mean by average enrolment?

**MR. COSENS:** It was taken over the whole year, rather than as of September 30th.

**MR. BOYCE:** So, as I understand the Minister, that there was an enrolment of 8,197 for the year ending September 30, 1978 in the 66 private schools in the Province of Manitoba. And from what the Minister said earlier, this would only be the schools which are receiving grants from the government.

**MR. COSENS:** All private schools are receiving grants — all private schools.

**MR. BOYCE:** Well, when the Minister responds, he can put that on the record, that this is all . . . and I'm not trying to be cute with the Minister, either, I just want to make sure that we understand each other. So that there are, in addition to the 215,661 students enrolled in public schools, an additional 8,197 enrolled in private schools. Now, could the Minister give us the figures for the year ending September 30, 1977, we we can compare the two figures?

**MR. COSENS:** Just a point of clarification, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Winnipeg Centre is asking for the figure for the enrolment in the private schools for 1977 — he has the figures, of course, for the public schools, it's the private school he requires — I don't have that in front of me, Mr. Chairman, but I will get that information for him.

I can advise him before I get the information that there's little difference in the total.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)—pass — the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that, since this appears to be an ongoing thing as a result of the amendments passed last year — and I'm not going to get into the debate on the removal of doubt part of it — but since it is an ongoing thing, should not that figure be included in the report of the department?

and, Mr. Chairman, I had asked the Minister whether it was still the policy for teachers here on exchange not to pay income tax.

**MR. COSENS:** They do pay income tax now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (e)(1)—pass — the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** When the Minister says "now", could he advise us — I'm sorry to jump up and down on this — but could the Minister advise us when this was changed, because it was a federal it had nothing to do with the province, it was a federal negotiated agreement with foreign countries.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not absolutely certain. I understand it was some two or three years ago.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, we had asked the Minister for a breakdown of the staff man years — oh, this is just on the reconciliation' this isn't the staff man years for which this amount of money is requested. On the \$331,500 for salary, perhaps the Minister has the staff man years for the two years that he had given us in the global figures earlier; I thought that he had provided us with the breakdown of staff man years relative to each item, but this is just the reconciliation.

Specifically, Mr. Chairman, under 1.(e) — Teacher Certification, perhaps the Minister can give us a breakdown of the staff man years at the beginning of the fiscal year, and at the end of the fiscal year.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, the SMYs for 1978-79 were 22, and this year, 1979-80, under consideration is 23, an increase of one.

**MR. BOYCE:** And, of course, this amount would not include any anticipated increase.

It being almost 4:30, Mr. Chairman, perhaps, unless somebody else has some questions, we can pass this Salaries part of 1.(e); and I'd like to spend a few minutes when we resume under Other Expenditures.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (e)(1)—pass; (e)(2) — the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** The items under this Teacher Certification, I would like to spend some time on it when we come back at 8:00 p.m., because under this was included the funds that, I believe, were for Ontario and Saskatchewan, for a veterinary school. Perhaps the Minister could advise me on that, or is it under another item.

**MR. COSENS:** 1.(f) — Interprovincial Agreement.

**MR. BOYCE:** Oh yes, that's down with the dental nurses. On the other expenditures, when we resume, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could give us a comparable breakdown, as he gave us on the External Administration on the \$267,000 which is requested.

We noted under that other item that the cost of computers had gone up from \$19,000 to \$54,000, and we'd like to look at this item, just to see what the increase in expenditures are relative to the items which are requested.

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

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** We are now under Private Members' Hour. Adjourned debates on second reading of public bills.

Bill No. 29 — An Act to amend The Clean Environment Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland

**MR. ARNOLD BROWN:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 34 — An Act to amend The Fatality Inquiries Act — the Honourable



for Rhineland.

**MR. BROWN:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Adjourned debate on second reading of private bills.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. James, Bill No. 33 — the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** May we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

### RESOLUTION NO. 1 — RIGHT TO WORK

**MR. SPEAKER:** Resolution No. 1 of the Honourable Member for Inkster — the Honourable Member for Wellington has 16 minutes.

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I hope you'll recollect, Mr. Speaker, at the termination of the last day, when we were continuing debate on this motion as amended, I was citing the hardships that had been caused residents of northern Manitoba, and most particularly those of native ancestry, and I'd been attempting to indicate that I felt there was no clearer example of the need to have affirmative employment policy than that provided to us by the social upheaval and disorder that was consequent of conditions in our northern communities, and had at that time been manifesting itself in the occupation by the Metis Organization of the Canada Manpower offices in this city.

And, Mr. Speaker, I indicated that it was indicative of the tragic plight of those peoples, and our times, and our society, that that sort of problem — a problem, essentially, of economics — was being perceived by those affected as being a problem, not necessarily limiting itself to financial matters, but one that bespoke cultural differences, and discrimination and biases within the larger framework of our society.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think that when that sort of feeling of alienation and disaffection sets in to a society, it's indicative of a deep state of malaise. The real disintegration of all that's best, all that's most supportive within that fabric. And so, Mr. Speaker, I was asking members to share my concern and to empathize with those people who were confronting this problem. But, Mr. Speaker, I should say that although, and it bears repeating, although I address members' attention to the third recital and I did that the last day and I think it merits wherever possible being repeated and read into the record, because I think it's a significant recital. The recital that indicates, "And whereas the inability of individuals to gain employment is destructive of the individual." Mr. Speaker, as I've said, that's most certainly been proven to be true in the case of our friends from the north, and the Metis community in particular.

But today, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the second recital. And, Mr. Speaker, this too bears repetition and should stand, I believe, should stand on the record as indicative of the feelings and the general outlook of all members of this Assembly and indeed, all members of our provincial society. And that second recital, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows: "And whereas the economic system under which we live fails to provide adequate opportunity for citizens in our society to perform productive work." And, Mr. Speaker, we've had clear indication in the past few years, if not the past few decades or generations, but most certainly in Manitoba in the past years, that the system simply has in many respects failed to meet the needs of our people. It has, I suppose, it can truly be said that it has disfunctioned.

Mr. Speaker, my research indicates that in the time since January of 1977, five of our northern communities lost a total of some 3,500 persons. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** May I suggest to the honourable member that we have an amendment to this resolution and I believe the amendment has not as yet been voted on.

**MR. COWAN:** It was voted on. Wasn't it voted on?

**MR. SPEAKER:** I apologize to the honourable member. The honourable member may proceed.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, in our province in the past two years, we've had five communities who have lost a total of some 3,500 persons. These communities, northern communities and I'll cite them, because I think again, the record should be clear and it should be respected and appreciated that this loss has occurred. These communities are Churchill, Thompson, Lynn Lake,

Gillam and Sundance. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that all these people have been lost to the province. I'm not suggesting that all these people have fallen on the welfare rolls. Some of them have been relocated within the province, but Mr. Speaker, it's my firm belief that most of these people have suffered the ill effects, the harsh effects of social dislocation and that that loss has been afflicted upon them as a result of an economic system which very often fails to give otherwise creative individuals the right to be gainfully employed. Mr. Speaker, one need only note that in that same time frame, some 15 percent of the mining work force in this province was cut back from 1977 levels. Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously there is a high degree of correlation between the population loss in those five communities and that 15 percent cutback. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it's necessary, it's incumbent on us, in dealing with this vital topic to ponder, stop for a moment and ponder, and try and determine why this loss has been effected. What has caused this tragic situation?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have all the answers, but I know that it's most certainly associated with the cutbacks that took place at the INCO mines. Most certainly we know that in the past few years, some 4,000 miners have been laid off by INCO in their various mines across Canada, and that includes Sudbury and Thompson. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that it's necessary that this matter be now put in the crucible and be given deep consideration by the members of this House. Something is very much the matter when people are brought to a community, induced to make significant, private investment and we should be mindful, Mr. Speaker, that these people have built homes, have established families, some of the people, I suppose, we should also talk of those who are dependent on the mining work force. Some of the people have commenced business, taken great risks in that regard. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but I should indicate that all Manitobans have contributed to the public infrastructure which lays the foundation for a community, such as Gillam or Thompson or Lynn Lake. It's all of us, all of those taxpaying members of the public, who pay for the schools, the hospitals, the roads and all the other municipal and other services that are necessary to the well-being of our communities.

So, Mr. Speaker, we indeed face a tragic perspective. We're faced with a situation where not only do we have to indicate and record a private loss; people who are socially dislocated, but also, Mr. Speaker, we have to address ourselves to the public loss. Because, Mr. Speaker, although I don't live in any of those five communities, I willingly, gladly invested my tax money in order to assist those other Manitobans to gain the opportunity to be beneficially employed, to seek out a better way of life.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have to direct ourselves not only to private losses, but public ones, and we bemoan the fact that we, in this province, had so little control with respect to matters of this nature. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that in the late 1970s, at the end of this decade, anyone, any rational person, could suggest that such a commiseration, such a consideration is in any way out of order or undue. For that matter, Mr. Speaker, I think in these times most right-thinking people will now agree that it's necessary, it's incumbent on government to participate meaningfully, in a co-operative manner, but in a manner totally consistent with the public will and interest, in order to safeguard and protect the lives and investments of Manitobans who confront these particular circumstances and situations.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps you can indicate how much time I have left?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member has five minutes.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it's time for this House once again, to contemplate ways and means by which we can stabilize the economic situation particularly within the northern regions of our province, and I think, Mr. Speaker, as I've suggested, that it is no longer radical to suggest, if it ever was, that there should be a good measure of government intervention in order to effect this stabilization. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it goes further than just the right of some to work. It's also a question of the right of the many to realize their birthright.

In this case, Mr. Speaker, I think that it's of imminent necessity that we recognize the fact that it is every Manitoban's right to share in the development of our natural resources, and in so doing, Mr. Speaker, if we can create stable employment, if we can create a wholesome economy, particularly in regions of our province which have been traditionally denied that opportunity, then we do double well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would commend to you, not only this particular resolution, but I would commend to you the former policy of the former government, relative to joint ventures in mining matters, in exploration matters. I would commend to you the need for government policy that will provide a direction, a positive direction, that will provide the comprehensive framework for a future development in our province. I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is only through this sort of

this sort of co-operative and co-ordinated spirit, that our underprivileged regions will indeed, be developed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I call on members of this House to consider supplemental public involvement in economic development and growth, and I also ask them to consider the alternatives. As I've suggested, Mr. Alternatives, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection)— well, you are an alternative, Mr. Speaker, in the sense that you're not of our choice, although you are of our liking, of course. Mr. Speaker, there is an alternative to a 15 percent decrease in the mining work force in Manitoba; there is an alternative to a loss of some 3,500 persons in our northern communities; there is an alternative to a 23 percent increase in the social assistance caseload in northern Manitoba, and that, Mr. Speaker, is a documented fact, and that has taken place over the past two years. There is an alternative to that, Mr. Speaker, and that's through vital government intervention and programming and that necessitates immediate policy formation.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that and in order to facilitate members present in their attempt to explore this problem, I would propose an amendment to the motion put before the Assembly by the Member for Inkster. Mr. Speaker, the amendment, of course, would be moved by myself and seconded by the Member for Flin Flon.

**A MEMBER:** He's not here.

**MR. COWAN:** Oh, excuse me, the Member for Churchill. That the amended motion be further amended by adding the following after the word "work"; "Coupled with the right to freedom of association, free collective bargaining and the right and responsibility of employees to benefit from and honor terms and conditions of employment negotiated by the bargaining agent of their choice."

**A MEMBER:** Hear, hear.

**MR. SPEAKER:** You've heard the motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington, an amendment. The wording of the amendment is that the amended motion be further amended by adding the following after the word "work", the following words: "coupled with the right to freedom of association, free collective bargaining, and the right and responsibility of employees to benefit from and honour terms and conditions of employment negotiated by the bargaining agent of their choice".

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, we aim to facilitate our honourable friends in making this right to work that they are prepared to vote for, meaningful. Because we all agree, Mr. Speaker, that the right to work does not mean the right to slave. The right to work involves those things, Mr. Speaker, which are referred to in the preceding "whereases" and the introductions to the resolution, and we have seen, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party vote against the right to work being coupled with an appeal, Mr. Speaker, an appeal to the government, to see to it that the public and private sectors a completely undoctrinaire appeal. If they wanted to do it all in the private sector, it would be a wonderful thing.

But what we said is that we wanted the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, to appeal for programs in the public and private sector which would make it possible for those people seeking employment, to have the opportunity of obtaining it, Mr. Speaker. And nobody expects 100 percent success, but I'm sure that the members would want that kind of an appeal to be made.

But, Mr. Speaker, so wedded are my Conservative friends in their ideology to the maintenance and preservation of unemployment, that they struck out and voted, Mr. Speaker, every one of them, every one on the Treasury Branches, every one on the backbenches, voted against any urging of public and private programs for the creation of opportunities, Mr. Speaker, so that its citizens in our society will have the opportunity to work. Mr. Speaker, in effect, they voted that the Legislature not ask for public and private programs to be implemented so that people in our society seeking employment will have the opportunity of working.

And, Mr. Speaker, we are going to smoke these Conservatives out of their seats and see just what they mean, Mr. Speaker, by the right to work, because we know now, to Progressive Conservatives the right to work does not mean the right of citizens to obtain employment because the only way citizens can obtain employment, if there are opportunities, and we did not reserve it to the public sector. I think that my honourable friends would agree that there have to be some opportunities in the public sector. I mean, I heard the Member for Wolseley say that I was seeking to undo employment in Manitoba by closing up the little huts where people sit and charge \$2.50 to everybody to go into a public park. They agree that it doesn't merit the cost, Mr. Speaker, but

they say here is a guy employed, sitting in a shack and every time a car drives by, he says to them, would you give me \$2.00 or whatever it is, to go into this public park. They believe, r. Speaker, that that is personality fulfilling employment and that's why they keep it, not because it's of any value to the park system, not because it couldn't be handled without any increase in taxation on the part of the people of the Province of Manitoba or an increase that is so small, that it would be more than made up for by the efficiencies that were created in cars not having to stop. I would guarantee, Mr. Speaker, that the wear and tear on the tires costs more than what it would cost to eliminate that program and have everybody pay for parks by means of taxation in the same way that they payed for other parks.

But, Mr. Speaker, it's not to end there. I mean, the Conservatives, who are so pathologically against adding anything to the expression "right to work", which they want to use because it means something entirely different to them, are going to vote against this amendment and we're going to see them standing up in their seats, Mr. Speaker, voting against freedom of association, voting against free collective bargaining, voting against, Mr. Speaker, the fact that every person in a bargaining unit should benefit from and honour the obligations that are contained in terms and conditions of employment negotiated on his behalf by a bargaining agent of their choice.

They're going to vote against it, Mr. Speaker, because they're against free collective bargaining. And they're against, Mr. Speaker, those items, and I am going to relish in seeing the Minister of Labour get up and vote against those things so that they can isolate the phrase "right to work", so that they can walk around saying: "We voted for the right to work, but what we really meant is that we voted to union bust against closed shop agreements, and that's why we took everything off that phrase".

Well, Mr. Speaker, if they're going to have their luxury, they're going to have to get up in their seats, on a recorded vote, and stand up and vote against those words, just as they had the courage, and if one might add, that sometimes courage is foolhardiness and perhaps that's a better word, the foolhardiness to get up and stand up and vote against urging the implementation of programs in the public and private sector, so that people would have the opportunity of obtaining employment. They all got up, Mr. Speaker. You know that the First Minister had to go over to the Minister of Labour, practically while the vote was being taken, certainly while the division bells were ringing, telling him that we had to vote against that resolution because the Minister of Labour couldn't see anything wrong with it. And the next day in this House, when asked, the Minister of Labour tried to indicate, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— Pardon me? That's the team approach, yes, team approach, like — follow me. —(Interjection)— Oh yes, I agree, Mr. Speaker, it's an assumption. I agree that it is an assumption; I did not hear what was being said. All I did, was see the First Minister frantically talking on his knees to the Minister of Labour; that I saw, that I saw. What he said, Mr. Speaker, I will make my assumption. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek will make his assumption.

But I know that the Minister of Labour wanted to vote for that resolution. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know it not as an assumption, but because the Minister of Labour got up and said that the words of that resolution appealed to him, and the Minister of Highways did too. But, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives want to play a game. They want the words "right to work" to be isolated so they can go to that megalomaniac, George Aitken, and say: "Look, we passed a resolution requiring the right to work". Isn't that what you want?

Well, Mr. Speaker, the right to work means something and has meant something over the ages. And, Mr. Speaker, before there was any politician who talked about free collective bargaining, who talked about workers getting together to form an association, to use their collective bargaining powers to improve their terms and conditions of employment, it was happening. You know, the labour movement have been indoctrinated in our day and age into thinking that politicians gave them collective bargaining rights. That's a bunch of nonsense, Mr. Speaker. The only thing that politicians did, is to take away collective bargaining rights.

The first statute that was passed with respect to trade unions was not an act which facilitated trade unions, it was an act which made trade unions criminal. That was the first statute that politicians got together to talk about what they're going to do about trade unions and they made it a crime to be a member of a trade union, Mr. Speaker, and that was in 1799. Now do you think, Mr. Speaker, that at that time there were no trade unions? Do you think that in 1799, people were not getting together for the purpose of improving their bargaining position and using their collective rights to do so? Mr. Speaker, if there were no trade unions at that time, no Parliament would have got together and said it was a crime to belong to one.

The reason Parliament got together is because the spontaneous desire of working men to get together and use their joint efforts to improve their position, is something that didn't need a politician, that didn't need a lawyer, that didn't need a judge, to tell working people about. And immediately that the politicians got into the act, Mr. Speaker, they restricted trade unionism and have been

restricting it ever since. And every act that has been passed, with the euphemism that every person has the right to belong to a trade union which some politician granted them, has been an act which has removed trade union rights, and, Mr. Speaker, I can quote you chapter and verse if I had the time to do so and I did so in this House, on many occasions, particularly between 1966 and 1969.

But ever since the first act restricting trade unions, the trade unions have been fighting against laws which have been designed, Mr. Speaker, to further their interests. And what we have put into this resolution, are laws which everybody in our society now has and the only ones who have them restricted to any degree, are trade unions, because of trade union acts.

So we ask the members of the opposition, will you in giving your consents to the right to work, or expressing your approval of the right of people to work — and of course you haven't used that phrase and I am interested now to see how the Member for Roblin is going to vote — will you say yes and they're entitled to freedom of association which the doctors have? And which the doctors, when they tell the Minister of Health that they collectively are going to get together and say that they are not going to deliver health services unless they get a better deal from the government, the members of the Conservative Party don't say pass a law requiring them to work or put them in jail, it's a conspiracy. They say, give them the money, they're doctors. They have that freedom of association, Mr. Speaker, and there is no act, interestingly enough, that says every doctor has a right to belong to a trade union and to go on strike and to collect more money when he goes on strike. They have it because there is no act, and the same as lawyers have it, the same as engineers have it, the same as banks have it, the same as every other group in our society has it because there is no act, Mr. Speaker, which gives them that right.

We're asking the Conservative Party to now vote for free collective bargaining. Do members in this House think that the closed shop came about by virtue of legislation. Nonsense. Most of the closed shop agreements in this province preceded the Legislation. What happened was, that a group of carpenters who were skilled, said to employers, that we will enter into a collective agreement with you provided that you hire people who belong to our association, which everybody in society has the right to do, Mr. Speaker, except now, trade unionists have to do it in accordance with The Labour Relations Act, and people are urging our Conservative friends to take it away from the trade unionists that now have it: Not something they got through any Legislation; not something they got with the assistance of a politician; not something they got with the assistance of a state; but something they got solely, Mr. Speaker, by virtue of their affinity to one another and their willingness to stand together.

And because they couldn't be beaten by The Builders' Exchange, who precipitated in this province a six-month strike, for no useful reason whatsoever, but to glorify the vanity of the leaders of The Builders' Exchange, and because they were beaten, they come crawling on their hands and knees and ask their Conservative friends what we couldn't get out of the electrical workers by means of trying to lock them out for a year, would you please grant?

Now we're going to ask you to vote. Do you agree with free collective bargaining? Do you agree that everybody who is an employee of an employer, where a bargaining agent has been selected, will have a right to benefit from the terms and conditions of employment that are negotiated for on his behalf, and will have to honour the obligations that are put forth in the collective agreement?

And I largely suspect, Mr. Speaker, if they run true to form, that my Conservative friends will vote against this resolution. But, Mr. Speaker, that won't take them off the hook, because there are other good things in the world which we will tack onto the resolution, which I'm sure my Conservative friends will vote against as well. And we will have them voting against goodness in various forms, Mr. Speaker, as they have demonstrated that they want to do, by their vote on the resolution yesterday.

Yesterday, they voted against full employment. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because they treasure unemployment. When this comes to a vote, they will vote against freedom of association, they will vote against free collective bargaining — why, Mr. Speaker? Because they are against trade unionism, they are against the whole concept of free collective bargaining. It'll be easier for them, particularly the Member for Roblin, to vote against this resolution than it was for him to vote against the other one, because his heart is against this one. He doesn't believe that working people should be able to associate with one-another at all.

Well, Mr. Speaker, he is shaking his head. He is shaking his head. The physical action that I will be looking for, Mr. Speaker, is not whether he shakes his head sideways or up or down, but whether he stands and votes in favour of this resolution. So that when we talk about the right to work, we will talk about it in some meaningful way, Mr. Speaker.

I know what the members of the Conservative Party are trying to do, and in trying to do it, they are going to — and I look forward to it — they are going to bring us closer and closer to

that one Manitoban in ten, who has to say, "Well, I did vote for them last time. But if they're voting against full employment, if they take a stand against collective bargaining; then," Mr. Speaker, "I believe that I have misjudged them, because I didn't think they were against those things." But there it is, Mr. Speaker, and the records for Hansard will be published in this respect, and distributed, that the Conservatives moved a resolution eliminating a request for full employment; that the Conservative Party voted against a resolution calling for freedom of association and free collective bargaining.

**MR. WILSON:** Why do the union leaders make more money than the MLAs?

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, because they're worth a hell of a lot more money than the MLAs — that's right. Mr. Speaker, I tell my honourable friend, and you know sometimes I have a little problem, because I say, "Well, maybe a union leader shouldn't be making more money than the Minister of Health — maybe." But, Mr. Speaker, then I look at the Member for Wolseley, and I say, "God, the union leaders are worth a hell of a lot more money than the Member for Wolseley." So therefore, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to know why the union leaders make more money than the MLAs, it's because they are doing more, they are performing a more useful role in society, and therefore they are entitled to better remuneration. And although that is not always the standard that guides the amount by which we pay people in our society, with respect to union leaders, it happens to be correct. And if the honourable member therefore wants an answer to that question, he has one.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, that's not the real issue, as to whether they're making more, or making less. The real issue is right before my honourable friend, on this resolution. The right to work should be coupled with the right to freedom of association, free collective bargaining and, Mr. Speaker, the right and responsibility of employees to benefit from a collective agreement which is bargained by a bargaining agent of their choice, and the responsibility of adhering to its terms.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, you have all mouthed those preferences in the past. Here's a chance, Mr. Speaker, to stand erect where your mouth is, and the opportunity will come in a vote on this resolution, and we will count you when the vote is made, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to the Honourable Member for Inkster, and this resolution, the way he's conducted himself, and he challenges me to stand up and either support this resolution, or oppose it. I have no problem with the resolution, except for maybe three or four words. —(Interjections)—

Mr. Speaker, real quickly, to show the tenor of the House where I stand on this resolution, I'm going to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that after the word "negotiated" in the second-last line of the amendment, that the words "either individually or" be inserted after the word "negotiated".

**A MEMBER:** You're not even a lawyer.

**MR. SPEAKER:** You've heard the motion of the Honourable Member for Roblin. I think I should probably take this under advisement, and we will see whether or not it is in order.

#### RESOLUTION NO. 5 — MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Roblin has seven minutes.

**MR. McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, in summarizing back over this resolution which I spoke on the other day, I referred to the minimum wage, and the possibilities that might arise by increasing the minimum wage, and tried to instruct the Members of the House of the things that likely would happen when the minimum wage is increased and I have one more thing, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to discuss very briefly before I sit down. And that is, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how the increase of the minimum wage will ripple into the wage salaries of the rest of the people who are on salary in our province. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, will every production worker, or every production wage contract of all the salaried people in our province have just grounds to demand similar increases, or larger increases, to their hourly rate of wages, or their percentage of salary, whichever the case.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, by doing that — by increasing the whole — is that going to guarantee

higher productivity for industry in our province? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, is that going to guarantee that our manufacturing sector, after meeting these wage demands, can compete on the world market with their goods and services? The manufacturing sector had a very good year last year, according to Statistics Canada. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, by that ripple effect, will the prices of food go down or up after the minimum wage is increased in the province and the ripple effect goes into the other sectors. Would the price of food go down? Will our energy costs go down?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest they won't. Not at all. They're not going to go down. And I suspect, Mr. Speaker, we'll have another round of inflation — double-digit inflation — and we'll have another problem of the same parcel of goods that the Honourable Member for Churchill brought in, of people that will have to go with maybe one item or two items less. It's inevitable, Mr. Speaker.

I also wonder, Mr. Speaker, will it create more unemployment, which I raised the other day. I suggest that it will, and it's a vicious circle, it's a very vicious circle. Politically — I don't think there's a politician in this province who won't stand up and support an increase in the minimum wage. He'd be a fool, politically, to oppose it.

**A MEMBER:** You did.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Oh, come on. We'd be a fool to oppose it, politically. The timing, and the place and time of it, is the thing that's important, Mr. Speaker. And at the same time, we must understand the consequences that are going to happen as a result of it, and have an understanding, so that we can tell the people of this province, "Certainly, by raising the minimum wage, and by the rippling effect of the other wages and contracts in the province, food prices are going to go up."

And how can the members opposite justify that, when their leader at this time, Mr. Broadbent, is going around this country on a tirade, saying, "We've got to cut the food prices down. We've got to slow it down. We've got to do every way possible to reduce the cost of foods in the grocery stores." And he said he was going to do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, how are we going to do it, if we're going to increase the salaries. There's only one place the grocer can put the cost of goods and services in his store, if he's got to pay more wages to his salaried. He's got to put it on the food item that's on his shelf.

And yet, the national leader of the members opposite is telling the people of this country that the NDP party are opposed to higher and higher food prices. And I agree with him. I agree with him — I agree with your leader, I certainly do. But how are we going to do it, if we're going to escalate, and continue to let the wages rise. We have to have a stopping place someplace along the line, or a bench mark, and we'd say, "That's as far as we can go at this particular time in our history." But I don't see in the way we're debating this, and . . . sure, I know the Socialists say, "Sure, we'll boost the salaries up — let them go." Food prices go up with them, gasoline goes up with them, cost of clothing, shoes — it all goes up.

And that's the difficult part. And yet, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, politically, you've got to support the increase of the minimum wage. It would be political suicide for a politician to stand up and oppose.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say the marketplace, productivity, world markets, plant efficiency, all these factors pretty well are pushed to the side when we in this Legislature, or the Members of Parliament in Ottawa, sit around a table and they start setting the wages for the people of our country. I agree, it's a very very difficult matter, and I feel sorry for the man today at home that's only taking home a paycheque with a minimum wage. But by us, by resolution, or by statute, increasing the salaries, or maybe we're agreed, then, that we're going to live, and the inflation factor is going to increase and increase and increase, but I suggest it's a very very difficult thing to deal with.

I suspect, Mr. Chairman, by raising the minimum wage in this province, we're not going to solve the problems of the poor man that can't take enough groceries home to his children at night, at all. What effect is it going to have on our economic base? Members opposite are not saying, but their leader is. He's saying all kinds of things across this country, which I agree with; that some day, some place, we've got to say "No, that's as far as we can go." And if we arrive at a bench mark that's agreeable to all politicians, which I doubt very much we'll ever see, maybe we will then be seriously attacking the inflationary factor, which has got to be such a tremendous disease in this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say, certainly the resolution — it's like a motherhood resolution — it's very difficult to oppose it, and I suspect the Labour Minister will be standing up here one of these days and announcing a new minimum wage schedule in our province.

**A MEMBER:** It's announced over here, not over there.

**MR. McKENZIE:** I suspect he will be, but he hasn't told me yet. But I suspect he will, because politically . . . but certainly, Mr. Speaker, I want to put on the record, the consequences that the people of this province are going to face by us . . . I would think that the wage levels should settle themselves across this country, and not by resolutions and statutes from members.

**A MEMBER:** That's what makes the country tick. You know that.

**MR. McKENZIE:** With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the members certainly should recognize that we are not seriously threatening or concerned about the inflationary factor, or the higher prices that we're going to face as the wages increase — and that's inevitable to come from raising the minimum wage.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** No, I'm staying here.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** I won't be very long, Mr. Speaker. I, quite frankly, hadn't really intended to become all that involved in this resolution, so, as I said, I won't take all that long.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution by the Honourable Member for Logan is very definitely something that can't be done in the Province of Manitoba at the present time.

Let's remember, Mr. Speaker, that this province presently is in a position of . . . If we raise the minimum wage by five cents as the Premier has said, we would be the third in Canada at the present time and so certainly, we have to take a look of whether that should be done or it shouldn't be done. The most important thing in this province, Mr. Speaker, is when you drive along on Sunday afternoon or Saturday afternoon and you find that people aren't working because people in the service industry cannot afford to handle the minimum wage. What really makes it bad is the minimum wage increase might be able to be considered from a different point of view if the previous government hadn't put in on Sundays and holidays in this province, double time-and-a-half. Now every time we talk about minimum wage and we get into the service industries on the Sunday afternoons and holidays in this province, we are talking double time-and-a-half. And the people that pay for many of these things, Mr. Speaker, are not the people buying services that they need; they're out for some pleasure.

You know, at the Civic Centre in St. James, the staff has to be paid double time-and-a-half and the public pay for that, the place where they go for recreation. Do you think the city can keep it open for nothing? It's just not possible; and the public have to pay it while they're out for recreation.

So, you know, Mr. Speaker, it's not just as easy as the gentlemen on the other side figure. The basic trickery and the basic political things that they try to put forward for political gain, it's something that has to be thought out very thoroughly as to whether we're in line with other provinces as much as possible. I have been a person who has stood in this House in opposition on many many occasions and said: "Let's not worry what other provinces do". I remember when the previous Premier of this province used to say: "Look what's happening in other provinces", it used to annoy me. I don't think that we have to be governed by what all the other provinces are doing. What we have to be governed by is the experience in other provinces and learn from their experiences, gain some knowledge from things that they have done, and better still gain some knowledge from things that were done by the previous government.

So, you know, when they stand up and talk about indexing and probably 60 percent, or up 60 cents, or something of this nature, —(Interjection)— Yes, they forget the two-and-a-half times one problem, but they also forgot a lot of other legislation that has to be taken into consideration before a move can be made on the minimum wage, and I have just explained one of them that was probably the most drastic piece of legislation that ever came into this province which will have an effect with the minimum wage. There is no other province, or no place else in the North American continent that has to pay double time-and-a-half on holidays and I'll make an assumption at the present time, Mr. Speaker, I'll make an assumption that the previous Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Member for Brandon East, stayed out of this House while that legislation was being debated because he knew the effect it would have because I've watched and spoke on that legislation and I happen to know.



**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I point out to the Honourable Minister that it is highly unparliamentary to talk about previous decisions that have been made by this Chamber. I would ask the Honourable Minister to take that into consideration when he is making his speech.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how we can possibly continue any debate in this House if we can't consider previous legislation, Mr. Speaker. I am referring to legislation that has been passed by this House while the NDP government was in power, that has a very definite effect on the minimum wage changes that would come about, and they just say, well, we won't consider any of those things, we'll just stick this resolution in on the basis because it's politically popular at the present time and we don't have to consider the consequences of what we did before, we don't have to consider the consequences of piling on other things that they did. So if you want to keep putting problems on top of problems as they are intending to do, or would do with this type of resolution, that's up to them. But we did say when we were elected that we would have fiscal responsibility and that's what we intend to have. We have said that we are taking a very close look at it. We have said that we are taking a close look at what effect any change in the minimum wage would have on other legislation that's presently on the books in this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's really ask the honourable gentlemen on the other side to come down to earth and start thinking about what has to be done in the province, come down to earth on the basis we have to be practical in this province, come down to earth on the basis that anything we do in this area costs people that are out on recreation or going into your community clubs, more money all the time, so, let's really be practical. That's really what you have to say; be practical, common sense. I really like the words of the Premier of the Province of British Columbia when he said: "When they're out of power they talk like Groucho Marx and when they're in power they talk like Karl Marx".

So while they're out of power at the present time they just are talking silliness, they're not being practical at any given time, when they put in resolutions that are going to be a disservice, a disservice to the people of this province, that will help create unemployment at any given time, with the type of increases that are suggested by this resolution. And, Mr. Speaker, as I said, we will be responsible on this side of the House at all times and at no time will we tolerate, or be jibed or goaded into doing something that is not good fiscal responsibility, regardless of the fooling around of the honourable members on the other side.

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

**MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to, if it would be possible, to call 5:30, because I have quite a few comments, you know, and it will be impossible for me to say them in two minutes, or one-and-a-half.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is there unanimous consent that we call it 5:30? (Agreed) The debate will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Point Douglas. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development that the House do now adjourn.

The Committee of Supply will be meeting both here and in Room 254 at 8 o'clock.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House accordingly adjourned until 10 o'clock Friday morning

Committee will meet tonight at 8 p.m.