

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 16, 1974

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 79. Fire Prevention. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we rose we were discussing the matter of the provision in the estimates for the section dealing with fire prevention and the fire commissioner's office, and there had been a number of questions raised, particularly the questions raised by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge dealing with high-rise apartments and the whole matter really of the building code and in relation to construction and high-rise apartments, and I had indicated previously that this was a matter of grave concern to the department. I'm pleased, Mr. Chairman, at this particular time to introduce to the committee some of my colleagues in the Department of Labour who are as concerned as I am and I'm sure Members in the Assembly, dealing with the matter of fire protection. I neglected to so do on the introduction of my estimates, Mr. Chairman, so on my immediate left, my Deputy Minister of the Department of Labour, Mr. Doug Cochrane; on my right is Mr. Cam Shepherd who is the Director of Research for the Department of Labour; and seated between these two distinguished gentlemen is the man who is responsible for fire prevention in the province of Manitoba, Gus Thorimbert, the Fire Commissioner for the Province of Manitoba. I do want to say that I must compliment these three individuals for their perseverance in putting up with the Minister that they have.

A MEMBER: There's more. . .upstairs.

A MEMBER: Jack King isn't around and there's others besides him.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh yes, but I can't introduce them from the gallery, no.

But, Mr. Chairman, before the House rose there were certain questions asked of me. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews had raised the question about the fire traps which were prevalent at the Haslemere Apartments. This matter is still under investigation. As a matter of fact, this is one of the cases where there was a grave tragedy and a loss of life, and it was not really caused, so I am informed or it appears, by faulty construction or this, that and the other, but I can only say that there is a person who has been charged with arson and the matter is before the courts. Now I can't discuss it any further but to indicate to honourable members of the committee that sometimes arson is involved in fire tragedies and apparently this is the case, or suspected - let me put it that way - insofar as the Haslemere Apartments.

But the point raised by my colleague the Member for St. Matthews is a valid one, where he indicated that in many instances the inhabitants or tenants in some of these accommodations are people basically on low income, of low income groups, and as a result they are more or less subjected, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, and other people, to the tragedies or the possible tragedies of the incidence of fire. He did indicate, or ask me a question, Mr. Chairman, regarding the price of smoke detectors, and the answer that I have over the luncheon hour, or supper hour, Mr. Chairman, is that considering a three storey walk-up apartment block containing 40 to 50 suites, the cost of installing an early warning system with smoke detectors would range from a minimum of 6 detectors in exitways only, approximately \$1,200 and a maximum of 15 detectors in all corridors and exits approximately \$3,600. And to install early warning system that will be able to ascertain combustion detectors would range from \$1,750 to \$4,800. Now that's just a quick appraisal, Mr. Chairman, over the supper hour.

Other questions that were raised. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: I wonder if the Minister would submit to a question. I'm wondering if he would be able to provide information, as well, as to what the effect might be on fire insurance rates if such safety measures such as smoke detection systems or the sprinkler system which was mentioned earlier, were introduced. It's my understanding that this may in fact reduce fire insurance rates upwards of 40 percent in many cases, in many particular areas, and I'm wondering if he has been able in his research to determine what the commensurate saving on fire insurance rates would be through these systems.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't believe, Mr. Chairman, that if there were provisions entirely or totally of these type of devices, whether it would have any real material effect on fire insurance rates, but I appreciate the concern of my honourable friend the Member for Fort Rouge, and if what I am saying is incorrect I have my friends in front of me that will supply

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . me with the information and I will be glad to give that to my honourable friend. I do know that insurance rates are basically governed by the provision of fire-fighting devices rather than fire detection devices.

Which reminds me, Mr. Chairman, of a fight that we had in this Assembly a few years ago, when a few of us attempted to have a resolution adopted to make it necessary for rooming houses of 2 or 2-1/2 storeys to be equipped with smoke detectors and other equipment, and our fight and our endeavour at that particular time was thwarted because of some of the honourable members feeling that this would be an imposition on the owners of rooming houses and the like, and I don't know how many fires have occurred where there have been fatalities as a result of not having proper fire detection devices contained within the rooming houses. I'm only guessing but it is conceivable that a number of fatalities resulted as a result of the rejection at that particular time of the endeavours of some of us in this House, (I confess I was in opposition at that time) to have proper fire detection, smoke detection devices compulsory to rooming houses.

However, Mr. Chairman, I've now been informed that there are glimmerings of hope which are appearing in the high-rise fire protection scene, that more and more people are being concerned, as some of the members of this House have indicated, with changes in the building code, the National Building Code, to make provision on a compulsory basis for such things as smoke detection devices and other pieces of equipment. I also want to say, Mr. Chairman, to my honourable friends in the committee, that I understand that Unicity at the present time has under consideration a new building code for Unicity and the details have not yet been revealed, but I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that there has been very close co-operation between the staff and personnel of Unicity and the staff and personnel of the Department of Labour in compiling a new approach insofar as the building code is concerned. I'm sure members are aware of the fact that basically we have a National Building Code and then, in addition to that, municipalities can, by legislation or by bylaw if you want to call it that, have a tightening of the regulations and the code itself. I give that information to my honourable friends, Mr. Chairman, to indicate that we are not isolated as far as the department is concerned from the endeavours of Chief Cam Shewan of the City of Winnipeg--and incidentally, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that honourable gentleman is doing a fabulous job of trying to cut down the incidence of fire and particularly the incident fatalities as a result of fire in the City of Winnipeg. That is his responsibility or the responsibility of Unicity, and we are trying to co-operate, we have real co-operation between Unicity Chief Cam Shewan and others in our endeavours.

Now the Honourable Member for Brandon West raised the question of construction of high-rise apartments. I think I touched on that before we adjourned for the supper hour. He then went on to talk of the training facilities and the suggestion of the possibility of taking over the Indian School at Brandon. It is true, as I indicated, Mr. Chairman, to the House some time ago, that we are looking into this and the way it stands, and where it stands at the present time, I have made a request of the Department of Public Works to have an assessment made as to the availability of the structure at Brandon and whether or not the Federal authority would, at a reasonable price - whatever is a reasonable price - make the accommodation available for our purposes in the Province of Manitoba.

I want to say to the Honourable Member for Brandon West that we're not just staying here. If we don't get that accommodation internally - and I mean by that of course within the Department of Labour and particularly under the aegis of the Fire Commissioner - we have plans to set up a group of concerned individuals in the area of fire on a consultative basis to see how we can further have an input into training facilities and training within the province, and I think this really also deals with the points raised by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

Now we do have regional conferences of fire-fighters and from time to time, just a couple of weeks ago we had the first training school or conference of fire chiefs of Northern Manitoba. I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, honourable members of the committee will recall that for the first time the Province of Manitoba appointed an assistant fire commissioner for Northern Manitoba. That individual is domiciled at Thompson and we did have a very fruitful conference in Thompson with the fire chiefs of the northern areas and also other areas of the province as well. --(Interjection)-- You know, Mr. Chairman, isn't that so typical of my honourable friends opposite that when I mention the word "Thompson" dealing with a very

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . important matter of fire protection in Northern Manitoba, they have to stoop to the dirt to raise a point about an individual rather than something we are endeavouring to do. How typical, how typical, Mr. Chairman, of that--(Interjection)--.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. Mr. Chairman, this government's addiction and love and affection for a certain Ben Thompson leads us tonaturally conclude that perhaps the assistant fire commissioner in the north is a Mr. Ben Thompson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in the distorted mind of the Member for Lakeside it is so typical to listen to remarks such as he has just made. I'm talking about the provision, Mr. Chairman, of fire prevention services for the people of Northern Manitoba, something that the previous administration never even thought of - they didn't even know there was a Northern Manitoba. And we're attempting in our way to try and offset the incidence of fatalities as a result of fire in Northern Manitoba, and the depraved minds of some of the members opposite try to correlate this to one of their idiosyncrasies. I am not concerned with that, I am concerned, as apparently the Conservative Party is not concerned, with the well-being and the lives of people of Northern Manitoba. That's what my objective is. Yes, it is true.

My honourable friend the Member for La Verendrye who was a volunteer fireman, as I was at one stage in the game, raised the question of the training of volunteers, and I want to say to him and to the House - and this of course applies to the Member for Swan River - that on request from the local fire chief or council, the office of the Fire Commissioner provides staff and equipment to train volunteers. The staff will also assist in the organization of fire departments and drawing up of proper bylaws to establish the local fire department. That's what we're doing now and it is our hope that if we can get the idea of a fire college off of the ground, that we will augment that so that better training will be available to the volunteers. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to my honourable friend, if he takes a look at the bill that I am proposing in respect to Workmen's Compensation, he'll find some changes in there for the protection on the basis of compensation to volunteer firemen that wasn't there before. So we are cognizant of the difficulties that are prevailing at the present time in the field with the involvement of volunteer firemen.

The Honourable Member for Swan River raised the question of a fire recently. He raised the question: Are fires on the increase in rural areas? I would suggest to my honourable friend the answer basically to that would be "yes", because there seems to be an increase in carelessness of individuals in many areas in rural Manitoba, and one of the pleas that the Fire Commissioner is making, one of the reasons that we have literature that we're distributing, one of the reasons that we're going into the schools under the jurisdiction of the Fire Commissioner, to try and get people to realize their responsibilities in preventing fires and to offsetting the incidence of fires. There appears to be approximately the same number at the present time of rural fires in the first three months of this year as there were last year. There has been a marked increase of fatalities, however, from six in the first three months of 1973 to 15, Mr. Chairman, in this particular year. Dollar loss is difficult to assess through inflation and other, but the major point that we're attempting to make at this particular time, Mr. Chairman, is the increase from six to fifteen in fatalities in rural Manitoba. Again, I say, much of this increase results from the human factor, people going to bed spificated, and smoking in bed; people using gasoline to try and get a fire going, and the likes of that, and we have a great problem there. I doubt very much, Mr. Chairman, whether we'll ever be able to educate the people, really, to take care of themselves, but we're doing our darndest in our endeavours to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for permitting a question. The Fire Chief of Winnipeg, Chief Shewan, to whom the Minister referred a few moments ago, did compile a report apparently on fire hazards and fire safety in apartment blocks and other buildings, and it was submitted at one point to the Finance Committee of the City of Winnipeg; it included a number of recommendations; and I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether there was any formal submission of that kind of formal recommendation from the Chief to the Minister's office or whether one will be forthcoming.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, on that point, I want to indicate to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that there has been very close consultation between Chief Cam Shewan,

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . the Fire Commissioner, and myself in this area. There was a consideration or an assessment - I think that would be the proper word to say - an assessment of requirements for raising the standards of fire detection and prevention in many of our buildings. It's unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that when bylaws are changed they're not retroactive in entirety. For instance, a building - and again I refer to the Haslemere Building which was constructed, I believe, in 1910 or somewhere around then - 1912; I was two years out - in 1912. At that particular time it was built in accordance with the building bylaws at that particular time. Subsequently to that, building bylaws of the City of Winnipeg were changed, upgraded, as to the requirements for buildings such as the Haslemere Apartments. It was felt, rightly or wrongly, that it would be an imposition upon the owner of the building - and I'm not referring really to the present owner of that building - to impose upon them the full responsibility of so changing the construction of that apartment to bring it up to present building standards, but there were certain requirements made under the bylaws, I understand, of the City of Winnipeg, for certain fire warning devices. Unfortunately as I understand it, in that particular instance - and I refer to Haslemere - it was an alarm system that had to be operated by an individual, is that correct? An individual rather than an automatic device. Now this is one of the problems that we have at the present time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I mentioned a moment or two ago that there is close co-operation between the City of Winnipeg and the Department of Labour in a new building bylaw, and to what degree a requirement will be made by the Council of the City of Winnipeg as to the upgrading of fire detection, I don't know at this present time. We cannot really appreciate that viewpoint until such time as the committee of the City of Winnipeg review the recommendations of the Engineering Department, coupled along with the fire chief of Unicity; and this is one of the problems that we do have, and I want to assure, Mr. Chairman, you and the members of the Committee that we are trying through an educational program to make people aware of the necessity of their proper conduct insofar as the incidence of fire is concerned.

At the meeting that was held at Thompson, that I referred to, fire chiefs, as I say, from pretty well all areas of the province were in attendance. I did take the opportunity or was given the opportunity of speaking to them similarly to what I am saying here in this House today, and there is an endeavour of the fire chiefs, particularly in the smaller communities, to become more involved. Some of the volunteer firemen, Mr. Chairman, are having difficulty with their employers in some of the rural communities. It was indicated to me at Thompson that some of the employers of volunteer firemen are not prepared to give to their volunteer firemen who are on staff the right to leave their job during working hours to go out and fight a fire.

A MEMBER: Shocking.

MR. PAULLEY: It is shocking, absolutely shocking, and it's my intention, Mr. Chairman to try and assess this in greater depth, but isn't it a travesty when here we have fellows like the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye, who was trained as a volunteer fireman, who may happen to work for an employer and there's a fire burning in the building next door, that the honourable member cannot leave the place of his employment to help fight the fire because his employer says, "Nothing doing; you stay on the job". This is a hell of a situation and that's the only way that I can describe it. But, Mr. Chairman, I found that to be a complaint when I attended the fire school at Thompson. These are the difficulties that we're having and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that more and more losses are occurring in the area dealing with fire every day, and it's up to each and every one of us to become a disciple to try and overcome some of the difficulties.

There is a cost involved. I know there is a cost provincially. I know there is a cost insofar as rural areas are concerned and rural municipalities. But if we will but face up to reality, we will overcome some of the problems that we have in the area of fire.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Just a question to the Minister, Mr. Chairman. Would he not agree, though, that as a whole the business community has been very responsive to providing both manpower and time, and sometimes energy, for the facilitating of proper volunteer fire departments in many, many areas, and that probably the instance that he is relating to is an isolated case, because I feel in my community, the riding that I represent, I know as a matter of fact some of the business people are encouraging employees to join the fire department, thereby providing protection for the community.

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. PAULLEY: . . . answer my honourable friend despite the admonition of the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party who doesn't want me to answer him--(Interjection)--Yes, because I don't think that the Honourable Member for Lakeside gives a continental how many people die as the result of fire. I do. I do. And I'm so damned used to his chirping that it doesn't really faze me at all. But in answer to my honourable friend, the Member for La Verendrye, who has a sense of stability not matched by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I would say yes to his direct question. But. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order. The Honourable Minister of Labour proceed, but the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party on a point of privilege.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It's a point of privilege of the House. It was not the Member for Lakeside who was the Chief Fire Commissioner when several people died in fires in this city in the past few months and who brought no legislation or regulations forward to prevent them. It's an unfair aspersion on the Member from Lakeside to suggest that he cares not one whit for the safety of the people of Manitoba when the Fire Commissioner did nothing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, how stupid can even the Leader of the Liberal Party be. When I indicated to this House, apparently he had shut his hearing aid off, in reference to the Haslemere incident, that the matter is before the courts and arson is suspected, and that was only as the result of the investigation of the Department of the Fire Commissioner of the Province of Manitoba. I've listened to his idiotic statements before on many instances. I think this is the most idiotic statement that the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party has ever made in this House. We have done something about it; we have legislation to do something about it, and we're damned well doing it despite your idiosyncrasies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just to get back to the point raised by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, I appreciate that there are good employers in the Province of Manitoba. . .

MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PAULLEY: . . . that do, that do allow their employees to be involved in volunteer fire-fighting capacity. But unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, in this area as well as in other areas, there are the poor employers who do not, who do not give the same privileges and the same rights to their employees who are. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: They do not give--you might be one, I don't know, but if you want me to investigate you I will.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: The Minister has indicated that there are employers. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a matter of privilege.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated there are employers in this province who would permit loss of life or destruction of property and not permit volunteer firemen in their employ to fight that blaze. I think there is some responsibility on the Minister. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is a matter of opinion, that is not a matter of privilege.

MR. ENNS: . . . all the garbage that we've heard from him. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. ENNS: . . . to name them. Name me one that--name me one such employer in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a matter of privilege.

MR. ENNS: You can't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. ENNS: Name one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour. . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was referring to matters that were raised at a meeting of fire chiefs in Thompson and this information was relayed to me. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye, who is a sensible individual in contrast to the Honourable Member for Lakeside indicated to me that there were, by and large, a number of employers who accept

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . .their responsibility and, transversely from that, there must be a number of employers who do not accept that responsibility as indicated by the discussions that took place at Thompson, and that was what I was referring to. At that particular time--shut up and sit down for a minute. . .

MR. ENNS: . . .point of privilege.

MR. PAULLEY: No point of privilege.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman there is a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside state your point of privilege.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't referring to any other meeting outside the jurisdiction of this immediate House, I was referring to a specific statement made by the Minister responsible for fire protection in this particular instance made right in this House a few seconds ago that certain employers in Manitoba, and he included me as being perhaps one of those employers. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. That is not a matter of privilege. The Honourable Minister indicated that that was information relayed to him in Thompson.

MR. ENNS: Then I want him to retract the statement that he just made in this House, that there are employers in the Province of Manitoba that would not give their employees time off to fight fires to save a life. That's what the Minister of Labour just said in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. That is a matter of opinion. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I make no apologies for saying what I said, that it was revealed to me at the meeting in Thompson that some employers will not grant--(Interjection)--The names were not revealed to me at all and I would suggest, I would suggest--(Interjection)--No, I almost was prepared to suggest that if the Honourable Member for Lakeside had an ounce of intelligence in his head, and I had that fleeting thought just for a moment and I discount the fact that he might have because I don't think he has, would the Honourable Member for Lakeside expect people who were attending a conference, as a conference was at Brandon, to name their employer without any protection at all? --(Interjection)--Yes. My honourable friend the Member for Wolseley, sitting on his fanny instead of getting up as he should, said that the responsibility was on me to name them. I don't think that is my responsibility. My responsibility is to indicate an attitude of employers. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye--ah, sit down, you nincompoop--the Honourable Member for La Verendrye quite properly indicated "good employer". I indicated that all employers are not good, and that applies insofar as fire-fighting is concerned, as far as labour laws are concerned, and maybe, maybe the Honourable Member for Wolseley falls into the latter category, I don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party on a. . .

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister has invited me to rise and not make my comments from my seat, so I rise and ask him: does he not feel that as the Chief Fire Officer of the Province, when allegations are made to him that indicate that employers of volunteer fire fighters will not permit them to leave their jobs to fight fires and thereby assist in the saving of human life, does he not feel that he has some obligation to detect and identify who those people were and to report it to this House instead of making these irresponsible innuendoes and bravado (?) charges?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, that individual has got so oriented toward muckraking that even in this instance he's attempting to do it. Of course, of course. . . --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: There he is sitting on his brain again and yapping and not knowing of what he yaps, the Honourable Member for Lakeside. This information or this complaint was relayed to me in general.--(Interjection)--What have I done about it? You know what I've done about it, Mr. Chairman? I've indicated to this House and through this House that there are such employers, and the reason that I am doing it is so that they will be warned. Not the stupid indication of the Honourable Member for Wolseley or for Lakeside. I can't name them; I would not name them. But I'm using this--you know, Mr. Chairman, you know, Mr. Chairman, that greenhorn in politics who poses himself to be an expert, and I don't know what type

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . .of an expert he is, surely to goodness any intelligent person - and apparently my honourable friend for Wolseley is not - would get the message that I'm trying to impart in this discussion without naming names - without naming names. I'm not making charges against individuals; I have no affidavits. Mr. Chairman, I have no affidavits that have no foundation as indicated by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, or the Honourable Member for Lakeside, to lay on the table today.

What I am trying to do, Mr. Chairman, is to tell the employers, I am trying to tell the employers of Manitoba who will not permit, will not permit their employees who are members of a volunteer fire department to go and fight a fire, that they are under surveillance. I agree, I agree, Mr. Chairman, there are others--(Interjection)--There's that character from Swan River. You know, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Conservative Party that they should follow the lead of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. He--(Interjection)-- Yes, he fights fires; he indicated, he indicated in his contribution - and it was a valuable contribution, unlike that of course of the Member for Lakeside - but the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye said that good employers allow their employees to go fight fires. I agree with him. He had a good employer apparently. But when we: . .

MR. ENNS: You said all employers were not good.

MR. PAULLEY: I never said anything of the like. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable member please restrain himself.

MR. PAULLEY: . . .and of course one of the difficulties, Mr. Chairman, one of the difficulties we've had ever since the House started at the end of January, was try to penetrate the skull of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. It's been an exercise in futility because my honourable friend will not listen; he sits on his butt and yap yap yaps. He doesn't know what in heaven's name he's talking about. All I am trying to do, Mr. Chairman, is to tell the employers of the Province of Manitoba that this government and this section of the government is so concerned with the number of fatalities that are occurring, that they should cooperate with their employees in order to allow them to go out and fight fires.

My honourable friend from La Verendrye made mention of good employers and I appreciate the fact that there are good employers. I didn't say anything to the contrary, but I did say that at the conference that we had at Thompson that some of the fire chiefs that were there indicated that their volunteer firemen were not permitted during working hours to leave their benches or their jobs and go out to fight fires. That's what I'm trying to impart, Mr. Chairman. I don't have to name individuals or corporations. I trust and hope that the Fourth Estate that is overlooking this Assembly tonight will document that, and that that will indicate to those employers who do not give their staff this right that they should mend their ways. I indicated to the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that I believe that in the Compensation Act amendments volunteer firemen will be covered from the time that they leave their plant to go and fight a fire, something they never had before. The Conservatives I don't think give a damn or a continental as to the coverage of volunteer firemen. We're doing it; we're doing it--(Interjection)--You weren't covered by Workmen's Compensation though. Of course not. My honourable friend shakes his head. One of the provisions, as I understand it in the Workmen's Compensation Act, Mr. Chairman, is to see that they are covered from the time they get up off of their job and go and assist in fighting a fire. This is the effort that we are attempting to do insofar as fire fighting is concerned.

The Member for Wolseley says, "Name them. Name them. Name them." Maybe I should bring in some affidavits and give to the honourable members of the House to indicate who are poor employers. I think there is a better way of doing it; the methodology that I am using at this present time, to indicate to this House and to this Committee and through this Committee to all employers in Manitoba, that they too have a responsibility insofar as fire and fire fighting is concerned. And that is what we're attempting to do.

My honourable friend the Member for Lakeside laughs. Maybe he doesn't feel that this is really an important field of human endeavour. I do. I've always been concerned about the loss as the result of fire. As I indicated, Mr. Chairman, a short time ago, when I find that in the first three months of this year there there are 30 fatalities as the result of fire, some of which may have been prevented, and here we have the Honourable Member for Lakeside laughing when we're considering the serious aspects of fire fighting--(Interjection)--Yes, maybe even you, maybe even you. Oh and telling you?--(Interjection)--Where?

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. AXWORTHY: Would the Minister permit some questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to see if we could get the debate back to the point that we originally started at, and to do it succinctly, that we began this exchange this afternoon by trying to find exactly what steps and measures the Provincial Government was taking to meet both the present and expected dangers and hazards of those older buildings and high-rises, and I'm afraid that we've wandered off that point succinctly, and as these sound and fury sessions often do they lead to absolutely nothing. I'm afraid that we were losing the point and I would like to come back to the questions that were raised this afternoon, namely: Two months ago, in a questionexchange in this House the Minister indicated that his Department was about to undertake a series of special studies related to investigating fire hazards in apartment blocks. I asked this afternoon whether in fact that was being done. Now I have heard from the Minister that they are co-operating with the City of Winnipeg to some extent, that they are encouraging education, that they are concerned about employers. I have yet to hear if the Provincial Government under the Department of Labour is specifically engaging in various forms of examination, assessment, analysis and demonstration to determine how we can better protect people living in apartment blocks.

For example, is the Provincial Government presently planning to undertake any demonstration projects utilizing the building services of MHRC and the construction grants of the Department of Industry and Commerce and the talents of the Fire Commissioner's Office, to begin actually putting on the ground new forms of buildings that would have within them innovative forms of fire protective devices; because as I understand it, one of the major handicaps at the present time for improved or enhanced fire protection is the lack of actual demonstration, on the ground explorations or research so that you can test out costs, so you can test out the effectiveness, so that you can test out the application and test out the inadequacy or adequacy of various codes and regulations. It would be a very significant step combining the efforts of three or four departments. It would enable us in the City of Winnipeg, those of us in fact who live in apartments, to find out whether in fact existing codes, forms of high-rise structures and construction arrangements in fact are providing effective safety protection. That is one example of the kind of initiative we would like to see coming from the Provincial Government so that the 4,000 or 5,000 apartment units that we build each year we can be assured are fully safe. Now I don't think that the kind of exchange that's gone on for the last thirty minutes adds absolutely anything at all to this debate, and I'm only sorry that we got into it because I think we're losing the point of what could be a very serious issue. So I would ask the Minister could he indicate specifically and succinctly exactly what steps right now the Provincial Department of Labour and the Fire Commissioner's Office are now taking to improve the ability of apartment block construction and the enforcement of the codes on that construction to provide safety for people, and what steps in the future are they going to take so that in the new building season and in future building seasons we can basically build safer apartment blocks and, more importantly, go back and repair and revise and renew the older ones so that they can be brought up to a standard which will also protect the people? Now can the Minister give us a succinct answer on that particular question? What, in fact, are you now doing?

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I am hoping, Sir, that the questions that were asked by the Member for Fort Rouge, and they were permitted by the Minister of Labour, are not going to be considered as an opportunity for the Minister to launch himself on another 30-minute tirade of nothing, that it's included in the 30 minutes that he's allocated in his contribution to this particular debate, because the member rose on a question, not as an interjection or as a participation in the debate, and it must be included as a part of the Minister's 30 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: You know, Mr. Chairman, I've listened to this Honourable Member for Morris on a number of occasions. I've never known an individual in this House. . .--(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm prepared, Mr. Chairman, to consider the estimates of the Fire Commissioner, Department of Labour, until such time. . . .



## SUPPLY - LABOUR

A MEMBER: Till hell freezes.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. Till hell freezes - and we'll put it out with a fire. I'm prepared, but that individual over there who presumes to be the custodian of the rules of this House, is so inept, who has no knowledgeability of basic rules of procedure but loves to stand up and rant and rave like his counterpart does down in Ottawa about the rules of the House, he was one of those that was involved with the making of the rules of this House. The Department of Labour estimates started about three weeks or more ago; it was shuffled or scuttled by the endeavours of the Conservative Party on Bill No. 7. We restarted the estimates, consideration of the estimates of the Department of Labour. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. We're dealing with Resolution 79, Fire Prevention. That matter has nothing to do with what we're dealing with here.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh yes it has, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Member for Morris stood on a point of order and that's what I'm talking about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you on a point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, that's right, in reply to my honourable friend that he said that I didn't have the right, that I had to only have 30 minutes. That is the suggestion of my honourable friend. He doesn't know what the rules of this House are, that when an honourable member interrupts then the Minister or any other one has the opportunity of again using his rights and his privileges, and that is. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order. The Minister has stated his point of order. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: The Member for Fort Rouge had risen to interject into the debate after the Minister had relinquished his seat. The Minister sat down in order to provide an opportunity for the Member for Fort Rouge to ask a question. That is not an opportunity for the Minister to launch himself in another 30-minute debate, and Mr. Chairman, I insist the rules be observed, because that was not an intervention in the debate, it was simply asking a question for clarification which the Minister has a right to answer, but within his 30-minute time limit. When somebody else gets up and speaks, then he has a right to come back for another 30 minutes, and I can assure him that there will be somebody else who has had plenty of opportunity to answer the questions. He stays within the 30-minute rule like everybody else in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 79, Fire Prevention.

MR. PAULLEY: On the point of order raised by the honourable member. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, the point of order is, Mr. Chairman, that our rule says that whether there's an interjection or whether there's an intervening incident, then the person has the right to speak again.

MR. JORGENSEN: No, Sir, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Labour knows not whereof he speaks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris has a point of order?

MR. JORGENSEN: Any member has a right to ask for permission to ask a question during the course of the debate. If the Minister allows that, Mr. Speaker, the member who is speaking has a right to refuse it. If he will permit it, that is included in the time allocated for his debate. Nothing more. The Minister knows that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, I have taken that into consideration. There were various periods of time in which questions were asked, statements were given; there were periods of time of one minute, three minutes, a minute and a half, a half a minute, in which a question was asked, at the same time other statements were added. That does not constitute just simply getting up to interrupt the Minister and asking a question. Therefore I allowed the Minister to continue as he was entitled to under our rules. The Honourable Minister of Labour; we have now just about the time to call in the Speaker. It might be a good time to--the Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I disagree with my honourable friend, but the only reason really that I allowed the interjection of my honourable friend the Member for Fort Rouge is because I, unlike some others in this House, happen to be a gentleman and I recognize - and I recognize the rights of my honourable friend the Member for Fort Rouge when he suggested by a speech, but not by a question really, that we get back to the point that the

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . Honourable Member for Fort Rouge introduced earlier this afternoon.

Now I'm prepared, I'm prepared as the Minister of Labour, to consider the consideration of the estimates of the Department of Labour, the Fire Commissioner's office, or any other part of the estimates of the Department of Labour, as the Honourable Member for Swan River said, "until hell freezes over". We are so proud, Mr. Chairman, of the job that is being done by the Fire Commissioner's office, by the Department of Labour, that I'm prepared - as indeed my compatriots in the Department of Labour - to answer any questions at any time posed by the opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being nine o'clock, committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee has considered a certain resolution, has asked me to report same and begs leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - BILL 35

MR. SPEAKER: The first item, Private Members' Hour is Private Bills. Private Bill No. 35. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSSON presented Bill No. 35 an act to incorporate the Red River Community College Students Association, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. JOHANNSSON: Mr. Speaker, after this very hot debate, the members can now relax. I have something that is very uncontroversial, I think, non-political. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JOHANNSSON: I'm introducing this bill as a courtesy to the Red River Community College Students Association and their counsel, and I'll outline briefly why they have asked that their association be incorporated by an act of the Legislature. The counsel for the students and the members of the Student Council have indicated that on matters of detail they are quite prepared to appear before the Private Bills Committee and answer any questions that members have.

The bill, as you can tell by reading it, lists some of the powers that the association is asking for, including those that are ordinarily conferred by the Companies Act, and it includes powers to, for example, run a newspaper, run a radio station, and a number of other items.

Now the reasons that they have outlined why they want to incorporate under an act of the Legislature rather than under the Manitoba Companies Act, are as follows: For the Red River Community College Students Association to function properly, all full-time and certain part-time students must be made members compulsorily. In addition, such a body must have the right to levy a membership fee. In the opinion of the Students Association, Part III of the Companies Act would not provide an organization incorporated thereunder with the right to make membership compulsory. To ensure continuity and that the duly authorized representatives of the Red River Community College Students Association make an application for incorporation, the names of the members of the executive of that organization are included in the act.

Under Part III of the Companies Act, any three students could apply for incorporation, notwithstanding that they are not duly elected representatives with the rights and responsibilities which elected positions entail.

Under Section 171 (4) of the Manitoba Companies Act, the directors of the Corporation must be 18 years of age. Although it seldom will happen that members of the Students Association Council will be under the age of 18 years, provision should be made for this contingency, since the council will in essence be exercising responsibilities comparable to those of a board of directors of a company incorporated pursuant to the Manitoba legislation.

## BILL 35

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd)

In subsection (5), there is a provision - pardon me, Section 5, subsection (3), there is a provision that the Manitoba Trustee Act govern any investments of the proposed corporation. It was the view of the Association that the government of Manitoba would probably wish that the investment of moneys raised at a public institution be regulated pursuant to the provisions of the Manitoba Trustee Act, and the Companies Act of Manitoba provides no such restriction.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other precedent for this sort of procedure being followed. The Students Association at Brandon University is incorporated similarly under an act of the Legislature. These are the reasons that the Association have given me for asking that their association be incorporated by act of the Legislature, and, as I say, the students and their legal counsel will be happy to provide detailed explanation at the committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 23. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Stand? (Agreed)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - BILL NO. 31

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

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't really see too much point in belabouring Bill 31 too much longer. I think the Member for Sturgeon Creek placed his case squarely before the House when he spoke some days ago when he introduced his bill, and I can concur with his reasons for wanting a change in the act to prevent the powers-that-be from depriving a man of his privilege to drive a motor vehicle in the event that he fails to pay his autopac insurance.

Now we have had the Minister defend the reasons for this particular section of the act, and he has told us that it's a method of collecting because there is some \$200,000 has been lost to the MPIC in defaulted claims or bad cheques--defaulted claims, not bad cheques, he reassures me, Mr. Speaker. But it would seem rather odd that there wouldn't be an easier way to recover the portion of unpaid vehicle insurance short of taking the person's permit to drive a motor vehicle in the Province of Manitoba. I am sure that the Minister is aware of the various methods of collection available to all those people extending credit throughout the province, and they certainly do not have a vehicle with a clout such as this that can take a man off the road and prevent him from driving a vehicle should he decide not to complete payment of his own vehicle insurance and place his vehicle in storage; and just because he refuses to claim some small rebate that may be due him by turning in his plates, they immediately suspend his driving privileges on the highways of the Province of Manitoba. This would seem like rather a large club to be used for rather a minor offence such as this.

The story has been told before by previous speakers that if you finance a chesterfield or television set for someone and they default on payments, you can't go and take their kitchen stove or their fridge, you must repossess the vehicle that has been financed; and it would seem to me there would be some simpler way. I know under the Mechanics Lien Act the garage keeper has some control over the vehicle and has some form of repossession available to him. It would seem to me that this would be a more realistic approach, Mr. Speaker, that the vehicle being insured, if the insurance bill is not paid in full that the province would maybe have some claim or some reason to take that particular vehicle and ensure that it not be driven on the highways, but I don't think they have the power to withhold the driving privileges from someone should he decide not to pay the insurance on his motor vehicle.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I can't see any point in belabouring the arguments on behalf of this particular bill. I think it's very simple. There's only about two paragraphs to it; it's deleting, or just adding two words in two sections of the bill; it's very simple and straightforward and the case has been stated plainly, and we've heard the Minister's reasons for having the particular section in the act, but it would appear to me that they are rather strong methods indeed for the end result, and I am sure that with some minor amendments to other sections of the act or some other method of collecting their unclaimed accounts, that they could make this a much more justifiable reason. And with those words, Mr. Speaker, I can certainly support the bill and I think the reasons have been stated clearly and the sooner we let

## BILL 31

(MR. BLAKE cont'd). . . the bill come to a vote the sooner we'll get it further along the way.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation (St. George): Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. URUSKI: Could I ask the member a question? In the first amendment that is being proposed, does the honourable member agree that there should be no method of collection for individuals who do not pay, or refuse to pay, or pay with an NSF cheque on their driver's license, which is the purport of the first amendment; is he suggesting that any method of collection be taken out completely in that area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: No, Mr. Speaker, we haven't suggested that there should be no method of collection. We're saying that there are other methods of collection that would be much simpler and much less severe than putting a man off the road. Are you suggesting that if he doesn't pay his driver's licence, that his driver's licence should not be cancelled?

MR. URUSKI: That is the purport of the first amendment. In other words, the amendment that is being proposed is that if he does not pay for his driver's licence of the first amendment that there's no way of collecting.

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

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, no, I think our intention is, the main contention was that if he did not pay his motor vehicle insurance he was being put off the road. If that is not the intent of the bill then there may be some modification required on it but no, if someone has paid for his driver's licence with an NSF cheque or for some other reason has defaulted on his payment certainly he'll be subject to the same loss as he would defaulting payment on anything else.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. HARVEY PATTERSON (Crescentwood): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas, that the debate be adjourned on Bill 31.

MOTION presented and CARRIED.

MR. SPEAKER: Private members' resolutions. Resolution No. 28. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

RESOLUTION No. 28

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would beg the leave of the House to make a slight correction on the resolution that I'm bringing forth and that change would be to strike out all of the words after "support" in the fourth line of the Resolved up to and including the word "welfare" and replace those words with "all efforts made to".

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable member has a copy so we could follow what he's trying to tell us.

MR. MARION: Pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: I say I would like to have a copy so I can follow what the honourable member is saying.

MR. MARION: Well after I've read it if I can have leave, Mr. Speaker. I haven't any scissors. Honourable Member for Radisson, have you any scissors? Might I obtain leave, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable member have leave to proceed amending before he introduces? The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, just on the question of leave, I would surely not want to in any way attempt to prohibit the honourable member from proceeding with an amendment. But I think, Sir, that you realize, you yourself realize at the moment that it is difficult for other members of the House to follow precisely what the proposed amendment is before us and perhaps a suggestion from you, Sir, that the amendment could reappear in the way the member wants it to would be the proper course of action.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the Chair would not want to deter any member from introducing any resolution. One of the paramount rules is you do not amend your own resolution. The honourable member hasn't even introduced it, now he's already amending it and therefore neither the House nor anyone else can give him permission to do what he's asking.

## RESOLUTION 28

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd). . .--(Interjection)--Well how can we agree to what we don't know? That's what I'm saying to the honourable member and I think the procedure is wrong. If the honourable member has a resolution he should give notice and do it in a normal fashion.

MR. MARION: Might I have leave, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: It's entirely up to the House. (Agreed)

MR. MARION: Thank you. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister for Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, that

WHEREAS Canadians from every walk of life and from coast to coast have been enjoying in ever increasing numbers by personal presence or by means of radio and television the sports spectacle presented by the Canadian Football League; and

WHEREAS Canadian football is playing an important role in forming a truly Canadian identity as can be witnessed by the Grey Cup match which is the outstanding single sports spectacle of the year; and

WHEREAS it is most important that our nation develop its own identity in sporting activities as well as in the social and cultural fields; and

WHEREAS the advent of the World Football League and the adherence of Canadian cities to this new formation could seriously affect the future of the CFL particularly in western Canada.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Legislative Assembly recognize that the Canadian Football League is a distinct Canadian athletic activity that should be maintained and encouraged, and for this reason it supports all efforts made to preserve and foster its integrity.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Is that the revised form?

MR. MARION: That's the revised form.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, it's rather an odd privilege that I have to sponsor along with the Honourable Minister this kind of a resolution because there are three men in this Chamber who have done a great deal of leg work and I would like to commend them before I strike out in support of the resolution that I'm presenting.

I think that the Minister from the very outset when it was made known that the World Football League was being touted and that entrance in the City of Toronto was becoming apparent, took up the cudgels with two other members of this House to let the Federal Minister of National Health and Welfare know that they were not in accord with the entrance of this new football league in the City of Toronto because of the effect it would have on the Canadian Football League and particularly in the west. These two members that worked along with the Minister are the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

Now I in essence--(Interjection)--Yes, there's one that's a former football player. I'm in essence carrying, Mr. Speaker, the ball for these gentlemen and I hope that they will have the opportunity to participate in the debate. I will be brief because time will not permit a number of the members of the House to add their contribution to this debate and it would rather be important that if the House deems it viable and wishes to support, we pass the resolution this evening.

I've mentioned that the Minister was the one who carried the ball and to make everyone aware of the method which he used, which is one that I commend, perhaps I might say that back on February 8th he invited a number of people to his office to discuss the values and the dangers inherent in the appearance of the World Football League. He invited all of the Members of Parliament of Manitoba along with his two other colleagues, the Members for Fort Garry and Assiniboia. Unfortunately the Members of Parliament were in Ottawa and were not able to attend this meeting but representatives of the Winnipeg Blue Bomber Football Club were in attendance as well as the members for Fort Garry and Assiniboia.

Later on the 14th after that meeting the Minister communicated with his counterpart in the Province of Alberta and the Province of Saskatchewan and elicited from them the following Telex which was sent to the Federal Minister Mr. Marc Lalonde and I would like to read this wire or this Telex to the members of the Assembly:

"In view of recent news reports indicating the establishment of a World Football League franchise in Toronto, we as Ministers responsible for sport in our respective provinces urge

## RESOLUTION 28

(MR. MARION cont'd). . . that the Federal Government fully explore all possible steps that may be taken to insure the continued viability of the Canadian Football League".

This was in concurrence with the two members that I have mentioned. He followed this up with further letters that were sent to Mr. Lalonde and signed by his other colleagues of the House basically sending the same kind of message - and I have a raft of paper here - basically stating the same position that he had in the original Telex. Might I read this letter? And it reads as follows: "As members of an informal House committee formed for the purpose of developing steps that may be taken to insure the continued operation of the Winnipeg Blue Bombers, we would like to express our sincere appreciation of the statement made by you in Regina on February 21st and your subsequent news conference of February 26th. Canadian football is very much a part of the fabric of life in the western provinces and the people of Manitoba would not be in favour of developments that would see the intrusion of American football in Canada. Such a development in our opinion would lead to the eventual disappearance of Canadian football as we know it today. Again Mr. Minister allow us to express our endorsement of your statements outlining the position of the Federal Government in support of ensuring the continued economic viability of the Canadian Football League." And that was signed by the Minister for Cultural Affairs along with the Members for Fort Garry and Assiniboia.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is rather evident that the unofficial committee that was headed up by the Minister were of common accord that there were inherent dangers in permitting the new World Football franchise of settling in Toronto because of the very negative effect it would have on the Canadian Football League, particularly in western Canada. I think that the stand that was taken was not anti anything but rather pro Canadian, and I think it was taken in light of the fact that when the National Hockey League made its first expansion Canada was found sitting on the sidelines and it was only after repeated pressures by the federal agency that finally on the second expansion that another Canadian team was added to the league, namely Vancouver. It was that kind of a step, the kind of a retrograde step that the unofficial committee was trying to avoid by supporting the Minister who was spearheading the work against the World Football League entering the Toronto area.

It has been reported and I'm sure that many of the members have read a great deal about the impending World Football League and the effect it could have or could not have and the desired effect of government intervention, so I think that I will have to dissuade those who have made up their minds that perhaps government should not intervene. I would do this by saying that if in their opinion the Canadian Football League has indeed contributed to the Canadian fabric, and if indeed the Grey Cup spectacle is one that we can all be proud of as Canadians, if they believe in those things then I'm sure they believe in the continued viability and integrity of the Canadian Football League. And it's an absolute fact that if the world franchise is permitted in Toronto there is no doubt that the viability particularly in western Canada will be placed in very grave doubt.

. . . . Continued on next page.

## RESOLUTION 28

(MR. MARION cont'd)

I would like to quote from an article written by Don Blanchard of the Winnipeg Free Press, and he quotes the disastrous effects that could result, and I quote: "The survival of Canadian football is at stake and every football fan has reason to be concerned." He is quoting Earl Lunsford. "It is incumbent on each club in the league to support the government aggressively if they support its position in the matter. I don't say they must support the government's stand, but what they must do is take a stand. If the attitude of the football fans is good they should let it be known. If the attitude is bad then there won't be any Canadian Football League. Public support is crucial. If the fans let the politicians know they are behind them that will add that much fuel to the fire." In response to the kind of efforts that were displayed by the fans, or the reactions that were displayed by the fans, might I say that the Minister responded and is reported on March 19th to have said that he could not have attracted more attention if he had personally chosen to be a stalker through the League of Decency's annual fund raising dinner. I would suppose that that would mean he's had a great deal of favourable comment. It is estimated that 80 percent of the comments that he has received are very favourable.

The Canadian Football League itself well illustrated in a brief by the Winnipeg Blue Bombers, that the meeting called by the Honourable Minister was one in which they fully subscribed and they placed at that time their case as they saw it before the ad hoc committee.

I would like to read at least one excerpt of the presentations they had prepared, and I think that it summarizes very succinctly the feelings of the western football clubs. "The member clubs of the league have adopted what" - and I'm quoting now - "what is in effect a form of internal subsidy. It is this structure that allows football to be maintained in the smaller centres such as Regina and to a lesser extent Calgary, Edmonton, Winnipeg and Ottawa; for without it the imbalance of financial potential of the clubs created by the imbalance of population in the various Canadian Football League franchise areas would doom the smaller centres of the league. Examples of the subsidies are the gate-sharing arrangements whereby revenues of all clubs are averaged and in effect the clubs who are over the average pay pro rata into a fund which is distributed pro rata to those clubs under the average. In addition there is a sharing of the television revenues whereby the substantial additional revenues received by the league for telecasts of games in large eastern markets are shared with the western clubs. It is safe to say that without this subsidization of the smaller centres by the major population areas, specifically Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver, the league could not continue to function."

I think that that is putting it really on the nose and it is admitting without doubt that if the Toronto franchise, which happens to be the key to the financial viability of the entire Canadian Football League, if that is permitted to be eroded by the entrance of another franchise in that city there will not be the kind of equalization of either the gate or the television receipts that would permit the smaller areas to function properly.

I think that it is also a point that no city - and this I can state after having done some research in the area - no city other than the megapolis of New York has been able to succeed with two separate franchises. And even it, Mr. Speaker, has had a great deal of difficulty in succeeding when the second team was introduced in the area.

I think that we should look at who will be the losers in the final analysis should the world football franchise be granted to Canadian cities. I think that certainly the losers will not be the community-sponsored western teams, there is no individual in western Canada who benefits by the operation of the western teams. The fans benefit by the spectacle presented to them and their ever growing support would indicate that they're thoroughly enjoying the spectacle presented. But there would be no individual who would be the loser.

In eastern Canada where the teams are not community sponsored but owned by individuals, again the case can be made that they personally will not be the losers because presently they are receiving no dividends from their investment in those football leagues. As a matter of fact all of those owners are independently wealthy people and are earning their wealth from other endeavours than football. They are in essence contributing to that Canadian fabric I talked about by spending hard-earned dollars in sponsoring these football clubs in eastern Canada.

I think that municipalities, however, and right across Canada, both in eastern and western Canada would be the great losers, because they in essence have erected these stadiums, are maintaining the stadiums and the football clubs are the main tenants. If you remove them or if the gate receipts decrease then you have certainly put those stadiums in a very precarious

## RESOLUTION 28

(MR. MARION cont'd) . . . . position. So the ratepayers of all of the municipalities stand to lose if for the reason I have mentioned the gate should begin to decrease.

I think that talking to football people revealed another aspect that one would not like to have happen, and that is that amateur football would certainly be a great loser should the financial viability of the professional football in Canada leave to be desired. Presently the CFL is subsidizing amateur football in Canada to the tune of \$150,000. The moment that this subsidy is no longer available you can imagine the kind of situation that amateur football would find itself in. Would young Canadians interested in playing this sport as we know it have the opportunity to partake. I advance that they probably would not.

Now I think that I would like to touch very very briefly on the kinds of things that have evolved in the last little while which I abhor and I think that my colleagues in this Chamber would also abhor. And that is the gestures made by the World Football League when confronted with the fact that government intervention was eminent to preserve the identity of the Canadian Football League. The first thing they did - and I think that the blame rests with certainly the franchise voter in Toronto - the first thing they did was to in concert with the other franchisees of the World Football League sign three of the greatest name players there are in the American Football League. I think that you'll remember that there were quite a number of headlines in the paper with respect to the signing of Zonka, Kiick and Warfield. This definitely was a confrontation and there were further confrontations when the Minister who is spiriting this said that he would not be intimidated by that action. It was then said that either we have the opportunity to operate the franchise in Toronto or we will go on an all out raiding campaign, which has already started, and every name player now playing in the Canadian Football League will have his services withdrawn and we will then be witnessing second-class football.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is no doubt that the franchise holder in Toronto is interested in but one thing, and that's monetary reward, there is no Canadian pride in that person at all, and for that reason I would like to obtain as much support as I could to this resolution.

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

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I do intend to speak briefly on the resolution before us. Without wanting to go into any details, I in one way or another have been associated with the Blue Bombers since 1948 unbeknownst to a lot of people in the province; first of all by being a fan of the Blue Bombers; secondly, by being involved indirectly with a few of their players. I used to wrestle with one of the players of the Blue Bombers back in the later 50s - amateur wrestling, being in the same club; and I equally played commercial hockey with one of the Blue Bombers for about three years.

We're not talking, Mr. Speaker, and calling to the House of paying grants to actually assure the survival of the CFL or our Blue Bombers here. We're discussing a strategy that is being contemplated by the World Football League in assuring that what is done on the national level helps promote Canadian football in general. I don't think that we can ask ourselves the question if the Blue Bombers are desired in Winnipeg; history proves that Manitobans do support this professional football team, so that is something that can be left aside.

I personally give my full support to the resolution before us since I have accepted to second the motion, the resolution. I in doing so would like to pursue following the acceptance of this resolution by the House a closer relationship with this meaningful professional team in our province, the possibility of closer co-operation, of encouraging amateur football in all different areas of the province. And I see that as maybe being more important of the survival itself of the CFL. There has to be in this province like anywhere else in the world close co-operation, especially in sports, pertaining to all levels of government and those sports in question assure that a co-operation takes place in regards to training of individuals, financing of facilities, the operation of those facilities and making kids aware of what is available in sports and how it contributes to the formation of character of individuals in our society.

We may talk, Mr. Speaker, of health and welfare as being a basic necessity in life, but once we look around us and talk about sports, culture, and how that contributes to the development of character of individuals, I think it plays a tremendous role in helping individuals be patient first of all with themselves and allowing them to co-operate more closely with their fellow neighbours. We could talk for hours on what sports in general at all levels can contribute to society, apart from financial gain for a very few. If we're only concerned with those involved with the playing of Canadian football, that's one thing, but if we can see the ripple



## RESOLUTION 28

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) . . . . effect on society I think that is definitely the beneficial aspect of having an attraction in our province. And for what has happened in the past, first of all, and what can be possible on a joint basis between the Blue Bombers to a greater extent than we've seen in the past, I would certainly ask every member of the House, from all sides of the House, to support this resolution and form a team in helping our professional team here in Manitoba develop more facilities, train more kids, encourage more individuals to become involved in that good sound sport and assure not only the survival of our team here in Winnipeg but that it's spread all over the province including the great north.

So in these few words, Mr. Speaker, leaving aside what has been done by this unofficial committee of the House, I do hope that every member of the House will be able within his conscience to give support to this resolution. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, without in any way attempting to discount the importance and the significance of the Canadian Football League and its impact on the life of Canadians, without in any way attempting to detract from the desirability of maintaining the Canadian Football League, I find it extremely difficult to support a motion such as this which intends to prohibit something in this country that goes against the very nature of the people of this country.

Sir, the motion that has been introduced by the Member for St. Boniface I'm convinced was introduced with the best of intentions and I don't intend to treat it lightly. Supported in a way that I find difficult to follow by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, who talked about the need to develop youth in this country; who talked about the need to develop a sportsmanlike attitude. That's got nothing to do with what is contained in this resolution. Those things can be done with or without this resolution that is now before the House.

Sir, what we are talking about is the interference of government into something that they have no damn business interfering in. We're talking about is the government attempting to dictate the kind of sports that will be carried on in this country. The bill that was introduced in the House of Commons purports to tell the Canadian Football League how many players they're going to have on their teams. I say that's the business of the Canadian Football League, not the Canadian Government.

The resolution purports to tell the Canadian Football League what teams should play in Canada. I say that's not the business of the government. That's the business of the Canadian people. And what I find rather strange, Sir, is that the man who's perhaps most affected, the owner of the Toronto Argonauts, Mr. Hodgson, appears to have no objection to the introduction of the World Football League team in the city of Toronto; he welcomes it and says that it will sharpen the kind of competition that will encourage better football in this country.

If the man who is most directly affected, the owner of the Toronto Argonauts is not opposed to the introduction of the World Football League team in the City of Toronto, then I ask you, Sir, what business has a government interfering - what business has a government interfering in a matter that does not concern them? To suggest, Sir, that by legislation you can prevent people from doing that which they want to do has to be the height of stupidity. If it is possible, and indeed we have an agency of the Canadian Government, the CBC, bringing to Canadians across Canada the spectacle of the American and the National Football Leagues in this country, if that's to be provided for all people across this country, what is wrong, Sir, with a team belonging to an American league establishing a franchise in one of the cities in Canada?

Sir, let's take the reverse of that situation. How many Canadian hockey players are playing in the United States? What restrictions are there in the National Hockey League, or in the World Hockey League for that matter, how many restrictions are there for players playing on those teams in the United States? What kind of reciprocal or what kind of countervailing action will the Americans take against our Canadian players if we dare to impose this stupidity here in Canada? It's difficult to say.

Sir, people of this country go to a football game, or when they go to a hockey game, or when they watch a baseball game, because of the advent of television they are accustomed to watching the very best players that are available, the very best. They've become accustomed to watching the topnotch players in the world engaging in any sport. The signing of the three players in the Toronto Norsemen team was no different as far as I'm concerned than the signing of Bobby Hull here in Winnipeg or Gordie Howe in Houston.--(Interjection)--

## RESOLUTION 28

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd)

Well, the Minister of Finance has interesting comments to make not related whatsoever to the subject under discussion right now--(Interjection)--I was talking about the similarity between the Canadian Football League signing American players as opposed to the American team signing Canadian players in hockey. I see no difference. If Americans are anxious to see the topnotch Canadian hockey players - and in Canada we do have the topnotch players - then surely Canadians if they choose to should have available to them a Canadian team; a Canadian team which is no different than the National Hockey League which have most of its team in the United States. What's the difference?

Sir, the fact is that the owner of the Norsemen did make an arrangement, did provide a brief or a suggestion to the Canadian Government that in my view would remove most of the objections that they appear to have against the establishment of the World Football League in the City of Toronto. To say that the establishment of that team in the City of Toronto is going to destroy the football league doesn't say a great deal for the Canadian Football League as it exists at the present time, and I have a great deal more confidence, Sir, that that league is going to exist. In fact I have some confidence that it will thrive and perhaps it has a greater chance of survival as a result of the competition rather than because of it. --(Interjection)-- Yes, surely.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable member if he would agree that the resolution before us does not deal with ratios of imported players in either the CFL or the WFL in regards to Canadian players. All we're saying within the resolution is that we should do everything in our power to safeguard and promote the CFL.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: That's in fact true, Sir. But the implication of the resolution is that this Legislative Assembly supports the actions that are being taken in Ottawa. And the fact is, Sir, that according to the bill that's introduced in the House and that's part and parcel of the whole arrangement, is that there be a limitation on the number of American players that play in the Canadian Football League on each team. If you accept the limitation that is imposed on the introduction of different teams into this country, then you must accept the other as well. It's the same bill. And just because it is not mentioned in the resolution that is now before the House does not mean that the purport of that resolution is to support the efforts of the government at Ottawa. The government of Ottawa have made very clear what their intentions are.

Sir, what has happened is very simple. The government at Ottawa, recognizing its failing popularity across this country, wanting to find something that they hoped and expected and prayed would meet with the approval of the people of this country, latched on to this nationalistic attitude knowing that it has been fanned a great deal in this country, this anti-Americanism, thinking that by introducing this bill they could rally the people of this country behind the Liberal Party. Sir, it will not work. And the Minister of Health and Welfare in Ottawa knows darned well it won't work. He's getting more opposition from within the ranks of his own party and the only people who support him fervently because they like to support this pseudo nationalism that is inherent in this bill, are the socialists in Ottawa. Notwithstanding their support, Sir, I predict that the bill will be defeated. It will be defeated because the very principle that is inherent in the legislation that is introduced in Ottawa is repugnant to most Canadians, the interference of the government in something that is not their business, and I suggest, Sir, that this House, if it recognizes the importance of maintaining Canadian integrity, reject this resolution because it does nothing, as far as I am concerned, to preserve the Canadian Football League. The Canadian Football League, in my opinion, will survive and indeed thrive in spite of government, and thrive with the advent of the World Football League franchise being located in the City of Toronto.

The owner of the Norsemen has made a proposition to the government which guarantees that the equalization payments will not be lower than they are at the present time in Toronto, and that any extension of that franchise will be the prerogative of the Canadian Football League. In other words, if anybody wants to expand into any other city in Canada, then they must apply to the Canadian Football League for permission to do so, so they have control; and there are other conditions that are attached to the presentation that was made to the Canadian Government by the owners of the Toronto Norsemen and the World Football League.

## RESOLUTION 28

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd)

Sir, there are safeguards and no one can deny that the safeguards exist. To suggest, Sir, that this resolution in any way is going to preserve, as its sponsor seemed to hope it will do, the Canadian Football League is laughable. It will do neither. The CFL, in my view, will and can survive. Indeed, it will thrive on more, not less, competition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to just rise for a few minutes to express the utter amazement and dumfounderment which I have been experiencing for the last 20 minutes as I listened to the Honourable Member for Morris, who has now completely and totally cut himself off from every lie, tradition and historical precedent of his own party, because here is a gentleman who stands up and says in no way at all can he tolerate the kind of suggested interference into the actions of private people for the defence of some form of pseudo-Canadian nationalism, I think he called it. And all of a sudden it struck me back that wasn't John A. Macdonald interfering in the whole development of railways when he prevented and developed and interfered in the economy to sort of stop private railway lines, gave away immense amounts of land, immense amounts of capital, kept other railways out - for what reason? In order to defend that kind of pseudo-Canadian nationalism. And wasn't it John A. Macdonald at the same time in that old national policy, who developed a very high artificial wall of tariffs in order to once again interfere in the economy in order to protect that, in quotes and I use the Minister's, "pseudo-nationalism". Wasn't it his honourable leader of just a few years ago, the Honourable Mr. Diefenbaker, who in many cases stormed up and down this country talking about the requirement, for example, to interfere in the whole field of communication, and established a communication policy and a broadcasting policy in order to provide - because there was problems of monopoly - to keep American ownership out? And wasn't it sort of to establish Canadian content and to make sure that Canadian stations were owned by Canadians and set up elaborate regulatory machinery to do this?

Mr. Speaker, we could go through decade by decade and find out the Conservatives to their credit have always been a party that have understood the basic fact of life, that is that we live on a North American continent which in the southern portion is operated by a monolith of sort of large population, large amounts of capital and large kinds of organization, which if it desires can take over. And of course you can listen to the old metaphor about sort of the elephant and the chickens, and when the elephant decides to dance it's the chickens who get stomped. Well unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we're in the same situation as those chickens. We just don't have the same kind of protection; and that is essentially what our government in Canada and what this Chamber is being asked to do, is simply to provide some protection. And I take great umbrage, serious umbrage at a member of this Chamber getting up and beginning to suggest that members of this House who have a deep and strong feeling for the requirement to preserve in this country a distinctive culture, a distinctive set of institutions, a distinctive way of life, which encompass not simply sort of economic enterprise or governmental institutions, but also involve culture and sports and recreation, each of which has its own sort of simple place. And certainly in a world which is being homogenized by massive sort of universal multi-national organizations and technologies, where everything is becoming the same and everything is being wound up so that it all comes out in a Pepsi Cola container, surely to goodness we should be making some effort to try and preserve what is our own, to say that whether it's a football team or a broadcasting system or a currency, or the way that we part our hair or the style we cut our clothes, there is some requirement to preserve islands of specialty, islands of difference, islands of a culture and a tradition which is different.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, I can only stand in utter amazement at a member of the Conservative Party, a party which for hundreds of years has established as a tradition that basically it is the responsibility of the Government of Canada in times of threatened dangers to the culture and identity of Canada, to step in to preserve itself. And I think what has simply happened is that members of this Conservative Party in Manitoba have allowed themselves to be captured by an economic philosophy which is so out of date that is so irrelevant to the kind of modern, contemporary, economic system, that they in fact are prepared, and are saying so if the Whip of their party speaks for them in any way, to totally and completely deny themselves of that tradition, and I think it must bring great shame and great horror to their supporters throughout this province that in fact members and representatives they have elected have so

## RESOLUTION 28

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . wilfully and arbitrarily decided to abandon what at one time was an honourable tradition, a tradition which I think they are now trying to make a dishonourable one . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable gentleman will have an opportunity to carry on the next time. The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Wednesday)