

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Wednesday, 16 April, 1980

Time: 2:00 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 COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report same, and asked leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that the report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. NORMA PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs for the year ending March 31st, 1979.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with the question period I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 25 students of Grade V standing from Isaac Brock School under the direction of Mrs. Carlton. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

We have a number of students of Grade VIII standing from the Hugh John MacDonald School under the direction of Mr. Fedak. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

In the Speaker's gallery we have six students, together with Mrs. Hinchcliffe. Three of these students are from Thompson, Manitoba, and three are from Spain. They are on an Exchange Student Program and I believe these students are leaving tomorrow for three weeks in Spain.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you today.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General advise whether or not there will be a provincial presence, involving himself as Minister of Urban Affairs, with the representatives of the city of Winnipeg in their delegation to Ottawa pertaining to the relocation of the CP lines?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister himself be in attendance in that delegation?

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the only difficulty being that I would like to speak to the Opposition House Leader later today to perhaps discuss with him the order of estimates, which he has requested outside the House. It might be that my estimates might come up next week and I would like to move up the Consumer Affairs estimates and postpone my estimates, in order that I am able to attend that.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the Attorney-General that we will do everything within our powers here to accommodate his attendance.

Further to the Attorney-General, can the Attorney-General advise as to the strategy or the position that will be undertaken by the provincial government in respect to the relocation of the CP lines?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated on a number of occasions before, railway location or relocation of the yards is a desirable objective. However, to date the city and the province have taken the position by making an application under the UTAP Program that we support the construction of the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass. This matter, as I understand it, is to be discussed by City Council tonight. I have a meeting arranged early next week with the Mayor of the city to discuss an analysis of the study that was done by the federal government and to discuss with him whatever may be the results of the City Council meeting tonight.

But essentially, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, hopefully the federal government will indicate their position with respect to the matter. How far are they prepared to go under The Railway Relocation Act? Are they prepared to order relocation? What sort of financial commitments are they prepared to make? Because the costs are immense and there must be a specific and significant financial commitment from the federal government before the city of Winnipeg and the provincial government can afford to participate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Can the Minister of Northern Affairs advise whether or not he has received a request from the Friendship Centres of Manitoba for a meeting?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, I don't recall having received such a request.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the Minister if he would read his mail and check for a letter from the Centres dated February 27th of this year and then possibly he could take my question as notice and respond as to whether or not he intends to entertain the request by the Centres for a meeting, such a meeting requested of him February 27th of this year?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, I would be pleased to take that as notice, but perhaps the Minister of Community Services would like to respond to that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I thought I had responded to that question yesterday to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition with regard to the Friendship Centre Association. I wrote them, as a matter of fact, I signed the letter within, I think, about fifteen minutes before he has asked the question, advising them that we would gladly meet with them and their executive of the association. We are waiting for them to contact us to advise of a compatible date or a reasonable date for both parties to get together.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly, that the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs was, I believe, copied on that letter, that the letter was not to him, but there may have been another letter go out to the Minister of Northern Affairs that I'm not aware of.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in order to possible relieve the confusion, I would like to send a separate letter altogether, a separate letter from the letter referred to by the Minister of Community Services, which was forwarded to the Minister of Northern Affairs, February 27th, not March 3rd, is the letter which had been forwarded to the Minister of Corrections.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Minister of Health. Is the Minister in a position to answer my question of the 10th of April, which the Minister of Education took as notice, referring to the quality of milk in milk pouches under fluorescent lights?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): No, Mr. Speaker, but I am seeking an answer. I'll obtain it for the honourable member as quickly as possible.

MRS. WESTBURY: On another matter, a question to the Honourable Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise what is happening regarding the Winnipeg Area Airport System Study? Are there building plans at the airport, and is there discussion of a million dollar jet airport in Brandon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take the question as notice.

MRS. WESTBURY: Perhaps in taking it as notice, the Honourable Minister would also advise the House that he will be consulting with the Winnipeg City Council on this matter?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll obtain what information I can and pass it on to the member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Health. I wonder if the Minister could explain to the House the current department policy regarding these medical trips into town, as related to in a news story, because I wondered if the Member for Ste. Rose has ambulance service, because it's reported that a certain Paul's Taxi has medical trips into the city exceeding 300 kilometres, and I wondered if there is an ambulance service in the area. Can the Minister explain the policy and who signs the vouchers pertaining to the use of taxis for medical trips?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in some 75 communities in Manitoba, there is an ambulance service in place. In some remote areas where there is no ambulance service available, a contract is reached with a taxi company or a transportation company to provide ambulance services. I presume that it's this type of service that the honourable member is referring to. In that case, the arrangement was, in the past, made through the department, as it was previously constituted, as the Department of Health and Community Services, and the taxi company or transportation company in question, the vouchers were approved by regional officers of the Department of Community Services, I believe, and submitted for payment to the taxi company in question. I don't know of any change in that policy under the division

of the department into two separate departments, but I'll endeavour to pursue that further.

MR. WILSON: Then maybe I'd like to direct my supplementary question to the Minister of Community Services. Where are these line people or civil servants that sign the vouchers? Are they located in Winnipeg or are they located in regions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the honourable member's question as notice and get back to him with that answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister confirm that figures presented to members of the Cabinet yesterday by the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, the Manitoba Metis Federation, and the Manitoba Federation of Labour show extraordinary levels of unemployment in some northern communities, and is the Minister prepared to accept those figures as an accurate reflection of the current situation in regard to unemployment in northern Manitoba today?

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that we did, in fact, receive some figures yesterday which were approximately 50 percent of what the members of the opposition have been saying for the last period of time. The figures yesterday represented somewhere between 40 and 45 percent unemployment in certain areas of the province, particularly in northern Manitoba. I can't confirm the accuracy of those particular figures, I can confirm that they are certainly substantially less than 75 to 80 percent, which was what had been trumpeted by the members opposite for a long period of time. And I think they would share with me some satisfaction that their original estimates were incorrect.

What we did agree to, Mr. Speaker, both Manitoba Metis, the Indian Brotherhood, and the MFL, we agreed that the Department of Statistics in the federal government is not doing an accurate job in assessing unemployment and employment in the northern part of our province. I made them aware of the fact that I have talked to now, three different federal Ministers about urging them to implement better effort and better systems in establishing a true unemployment rate in northern Manitoba.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My supplementary will follow upon the comments of the Minister. Can the Minister confirm that members on this side have, in the past, stated that unemployment levels in certain northern communities approached levels of 75, 80, and even higher percentages of unemployment, and can the Minister indicate to the best of his knowledge that that is not, indeed, the fact today, that in certain northern communities, they are approaching levels of unemployment that are well over 75 percent?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that, and I don't think any member in the House can really confirm that. What has never been established, and it has to be by the federal government, what in fact is an unemployed person living in northern Manitoba, and the numbers of them. That hasn't been confirmed. I should say to the Member for Churchill that a proposal put forward by this particular group yesterday was rejected by myself, and I say that openly and candidly to him, and that was that the province get in the business of doing the unemployment stats. I think the federal government is responsible for it. I think they've done a poor job of it. I think everybody in this House agrees with that, and I don't think our government, at the expense of the taxpayer, should be picking up any more of the federal government's responsibility in the province of Manitoba.

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

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, as the Minister of Labour has been unable to convince anyone of three Ministers responsible for this at the federal level, and in specific terms, any one of two governments, both the Liberal and the Conservative government, to make those changes, and the Minister is not alone in his efforts, it has been attempted by those on this side too, can the Minister indicate now what actions he is taking in regard to pressuring the federal government to develop mechanisms which accurately and truthfully reflect the extent of underemployment and unemployment in northern Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, we were successful in one particular effort, we did have the period of waiting time extended from 10 week to 14 weeks, that was I think, by and large, due to the efforts of quite possibly myself for the people in northern Manitoba. We have a new Federal Minister from Winnipeg here responsible for Statistics and responsible for Immigration and Employment, and just approximately two weeks ago I had a good discussion with that particular member, federal member, and he assured me that they were going to get on with doing that. He is a Manitoban, I hope that he appreciates the problem and the frustrations of all governments, so I think he should be given an opportunity to get on with doing the job that we have been asking people to do for a long period of time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. I wonder if he could confirm to the House that the problem of underemployment and unemployment is not Manitoba's alone, that it is similar or almost identical in northern Alberta and Saskatchewan and Northern Ontario?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, well the problem with the unemployment situation certainly is a familiar one that rings across the northern part of our country, Mr. Speaker. We had a good discussion yesterday on the presentations presented by these three particular groups as related to unemployment, and in my discussions with federal people I have asked them to review the whole northern part of our country, and, of course, very individualistic as the Minister of Manitoba, I was primarily concerned about the situation in Manitoba, but concerned about the true rate as it applied right across our country.

MR. BLAKE: Just a supplementary to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he could confirm to the House that the problem in his particular area is evidence of some of the problems that are happening with unemployed in Manitoba, that there are many jobs gone wanting and no one will take the jobs that are being offered.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, it would take a fair amount of time to discuss all the unemployment problems in northern Manitoba. I have had that pleasure of going into it in great detail with the members opposite during my estimates, but, yes, in fact there are jobs in northern Manitoba that are going wanting for a variety of reasons.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour and Manpower. In view of the high and increasing welfare costs in northern Manitoba, that is to both levels of government, and in view of the shocking facts that were revealed yesterday in the document that was discussed by the 3M Committee with the government, can the Minister indicate if his government is prepared to develop a comprehensive program to deal with the shocking levels of unemployment in northern Manitoba and the resulting high welfare costs? Will he undertake to take the initiative in discussions with the federal government to deal with the unemployment problem and not just to deal with the numbers and the

statistics that we can bandy about here and argue all session and for many sessions to come?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, it was an extremely interesting meeting yesterday and it is documented now by the people in the three organizations presenting their briefs, that in fact they disagree with the ND Party in the province of Manitoba as to how to cure the problems in northern Manitoba, disagree with them wholeheartedly and it is documented now that they disagree with the type of make-work programs that were being implemented by the members of the opposition when they were in government, and they said this, and they said it in black and white in writing, copies all already available. They met with the people in the opposition in their caucus room after, so I am sure that they are aware of the problems and they are aware of the wording in the draft. I suppose if they had more to do with putting it together they would have made sure some of those words weren't in there.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that this opposition group in the Legislature has been pressing this government to come up with a comprehensive program to deal with the long-term solution, not the short-term but the long-term solution, what is the Minister prepared to do in the long term to deal with the unemployment problem and to create useful and productive employment opportunities in the communities and also to provide opportunities for people in the communities to take useful and productive work outside the communities and to deal with the very high unemployment problem in these communities?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, we do not want to (a) get ourselves into the position that Saskatchewan found itself in where they opened up a bunch of processing plants throughout their province and they adamantly said across this country that those processing plants shall be in northern Manitoba (sic) for the employment of the people in northern Saskatchewan. That went on and on for a year or two and the members opposite told me about it repeatedly. What Saskatchewan did, Mr. Speaker, was brought in the FFMC because they couldn't afford to subsidize them any longer and said, tell us what is viable and what isn't, and they shut down a lot of their processing plants.

Mr. Speaker, we are not prepared to open plants under those particular circumstances, ones that we may have to shut down, and tease and fool the people in northern Manitoba. That is what we are not prepared to do.

We have, in fact, and I think the group yesterday was quite interested to find out that there is approximately 1,700 people coming out of northern Manitoba that are involved in institutional training in the province of Manitoba. They are also interested, and I don't want to take up the entire length of the Question Period, but they were also interested in the number of people that were in the Apprenticeship Program. I think they were amazed. It certainly was in fact some figures that their friends in the opposition gave them before they came in yesterday.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate if he is prepared to bring in programs to deal with the unemployment problem in northern Manitoba in a way that will provide training and skills to people that are presently unemployed, in order that they may fill the jobs that are presently unfilled in northern Manitoba and, in fact, furthermore to fill those jobs that have a high turnover rate in the northern communities, namely, if you want to look at teachers, nurses, service personnel, in many of the communities in northern Manitoba, even bank managers as someone mentioned? Mr. Speaker, our position is that the communities should have the opportunity to have the training to fill these jobs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rupertsland gets on one track and doesn't want to listen very well. I said there is approximately 1,700 people

out of northern Manitoba that are being trained. There are approximately 900 that are going through industrial training in northern Manitoba. There are approximately 444 apprentices in northern Manitoba. We have a New Careers Program and it is working very well in northern Manitoba. We have Relocation Programs that are working very well in northern Manitoba. We are doing an awful lot of training, Mr. Speaker, in northern Manitoba and the people yesterday, again I say, were not given all the facts by our friends opposite, including the Member for Rupertsland and a few of his cohorts who fed them some of the nonsense. They, I think, listened yesterday and were appreciative of some of things that we are doing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet asked me about the circumstances relative to a resident of Lockport or Selkirk, Manitoba, who required transfer to Seattle for a bone marrow transplant. My information, Mr. Speaker, is that the resident's wife, the citizen's wife, contacted the Health Services Commission on the 15th of January to determine what financial obligations they would face and how much of the cost would be covered. She was given the information at that time as to the coverage provided by MHSC for out-of-country hospital and medical expenses and the commission informs me that they have not heard from the family since.

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

MR. SAM USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister whether or not this family would be eligible for coverage under the MHSC program for most of those costs that are outstanding and beyond what is normally the case.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the individual in question, as a Canadian citizen and as a Manitoban, is entitled to payment by the commission of either the equivalent to the hospital per diem which we would pay here, or 75 percent of his United States bill, whichever is the greater. And on the medical side, he's entitled to payment by commission of a fee for medical services equivalent to the fee specified in our fee schedule.

Now the honourable member is obviously concerned with additional expenses over and above that and there are special benefits that are available on the basis of financial ability or financial disability and certainly any citizen is entitled to make application for those special benefits.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister clarify whether in fact he is suggesting that there is a means test that the applicant must go through before one is approved for further support?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what terminology the honourable member wants to apply to it but the situation is the same as has been in existence in this province since The Medical Care Act was promulgated and Manitoba joined the medicare scheme. The fact is that the answer to his question is yes. If you or I require additional help in covering our hospital or medical bills in the United States or elsewhere, we can apply for that under the special benefits privilege in the Manitoba Health Service Commission but at that point in time there is an examination made of your ability to pay. If you do not have that competence to pay, then you qualify for the special benefit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a final supplementary.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister then indicate whether or not that person has been informed that they may apply for these extra benefits that may or may not be available according, to the Minister?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Sir. That information was conveyed to the family and the commission advises me that they have not heard further from the family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Manpower arising out of the answers which the Minister provided to the Member for Rupertsland. In view of the information which the Minister has revealed that in fact there are some 1,700 individuals in training programs during a period of time that the economic situation in northern Manitoba has not improved, when the unemployment rate, according to his own admission earlier is in the neighbourhood of 45 percent, is the Minister prepared to confirm that his programs have not gone beyond scratching the surface and that some form of action is required now in the province of Manitoba in order to reduce the 45 percent rate rather than simply continuing to talk about training programs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I think the people in northern Manitoba have agreed to one particular line of reasoning and that is education is part of the solution for them to get out of the problem they are in. I don't really care what party you belong to and I don't really care what community you go into, if you talk to the sensible people in northern Manitoba about part of the problem with the Indian and Metis people, it's educational opportunities that they will say to you are their salvation in the long run. That's what is going to get them out of a lot of the problems they are in, not the short make-work two bit projects that the members opposite implemented; the same projects that people yesterday said to us, they don't want any more of that kind of garbage. And we are not going to go into places like Norway House and Wabowden for a make-work program and put up an arena in such a mess that the damn thing can fall down and kill the people and the residents, and that's the situation we have found some of their make-work projects in. Physical and psychological, neither one of them are doing any good in their approach.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's ability to tell us what he does not stand for, we would like to know, Mr. Speaker, what the Minister is prepared to indicate that he stands for rather than continued unemployment insurance payments, rather than continued welfare payments to residents of northern Manitoba. We've always had education and educational programs in northern Manitoba. What has the Minister to provide that has not already been in existence for a number of years in northern Manitoba to bring about some fuller employment in the northern parts of this province?

MR. MacMASTER: The leader of today's largest group of NDP's, and I understand there's two groups now, but to the leader of today's largest group, I suggest to him that the education routine and the furtherment of it, and again yesterday, the members of the groups that talked to us, were in fact somewhat surprised when they talked to the Minister of Education about a couple of the programs that he has in place. They weren't really altogether familiar with some of them and in fact, Mr. Speaker, they appreciated the fact. They appreciated the increase in the programming that the Minister of Education is providing and I think they really, the people yesterday and the people in the north, not this nonsense we're listening to from across the way but the people that count, the people I am more concerned about, they appreciate what's taking place in northern Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in response to a question from the Member for Transcona about a case of abduction, I can advise him that as a result of continued investigation by the RCMP throughout Canada, Mr. Kosowan, was arrested in Montreal on Thursday of last week. He is being returned to Winnipeg and will be appearing in Provincial Judges' Court to answer to the four charges of abduction and one charge of theft. And I am further informed, Mr. Speaker, that Mrs. Kosowan was advised of the arrest and went to Montreal where she has now recovered custody of the four children.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I am pleased to hear the report by the Attorney-General on this matter that caused great concern to Mrs. Kosowan. I would ask if the Minister would look into why the Attorney-General's department did not issue the warrants for Mr. Kosowan's arrest in October or November when these crimes took place, but instead waited until January 15th, or January 18th, that period causing considerable anguish to Mrs. Kosowan and causing great uncertainty as to the health and safety of the children.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Education. Would he indicate to the House when he intends to introduce the two education bills?

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can we expect the introduction of the bills for first and for second reading prior to the dealing with the estimates of his department?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure at what time my estimates will be before the House, so it's very difficult to answer that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Education, further to an answer given earlier by the Minister of Labour, who had indicated that something substantial is happening up north with respect to education. I would like to ask the Minister how he then explains the fact that native education branch costs, in his estimates, over his years as Minister of Education, have decreased in each year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member had been here last year when I went through my estimates, there's a very logical explanation for those particular estimates. I'd be quite prepared to go into them again this year during my estimates.

MR. SCHROEDER: A supplementary question to the Minister of Education. Could he provide us with a brief explanation of the reduction and practical elimination of the New Careers program then?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, the New Careers program is still carrying on. My colleague in Community Services advises me he has 16 people in that category in his department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

MR. JIM GALBRAITH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. What progress has been made in regard to the building of a new personal care home at Winnipegosis?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, tenders for the new personal care home in Winnipegosis were re-called or called again on the 21st of March, and I believe they closed today, in fact. They were due to close mid-April, so I believe it's today that they close. It's expected that a contract will be awarded within three weeks of closing date. I might say that, as the honourable member and others, including the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose are aware, this is the second tender call

exercise. Members will recall that we refused to accept the original tender that came in, feeling that it was beyond the realm of reasonability as far as unit cost is concerned. The second tendering process appears to bear that out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, I promised that I would bring more information back to the House in response to a question from the Member for The Pas regarding the transportation of dangerous commodities in northern Manitoba. I'd like to report to the House that meetings will be held in Thompson on May 6th and 7th, and in The Pas on May 8th and 9th, 1980, with elected and other representatives from northern municipalities, communities and Indian reserves, mining companies and industry, to be informed by federal-provincial personnel, the CNR and highway transportation on the regulations and procedures for the transportation and handling of dangerous goods.

In addition, federal and provincial emergency organizations and departments will discuss the required emergency preparedness, planning and training for communities to have the necessary capability to deal with chemical emergency situations.

Mutual planning between communities and support from government departments will also be discussed and planned for.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister confirm and I'll make the question very simplistic for him that there are fewer people employed in northern Manitoba today than there were in October of 1977? Can he confirm those statistics?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, when the Schreyer administration started to wind down the hydro projects in northern Manitoba, which was before the 1977 election, there was a fair number of people working in those particular projects. That winding down, of course, has carried on, and of course there are less people in those particular projects. What is now taking place though, and I would think that the Member for Churchill would appreciate it, in his own particular constituency, in Leaf Rapids, for example, and the Lynn Lake area, that the mining activity is certainly going upwards. I think he would also appreciate, and I'm sure that he is being made aware of it, that in the fall of 1977 there was not one diamond drill outfit working in northern Manitoba. And about a month or two ago, the last figures I had were that there were 55 working in northern Manitoba.

I really think, Mr. Speaker, that at least the Member for Churchill and myself share one thing in common, I would hope, and that's that the mining exploration in northern Manitoba, which is creating a great amount of employment, increases and continues to increase. It is for the benefit of our people from our constituencies that that increase take place.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, we on this side wish to see the mining industry prosper in a progressive and a systematic way, which leads me to my question to the Minister which is, can he confirm that there are fewer employees at Inco today than there were in October of 1977?

MR. MacMASTER: I can confirm that in the fall of 1977, the international nickel market took quite a tumble. I can also confirm, and the member can check with the fellow that's being disputed in the newspapers, one of the presidents of the NDP that's having some problems also, but the one from Thompson, he can confer with him, and he'll find out probably from him that there is an increase in employment taking place in the Inco operation today, the same as there is in his constituency in Sherritt-Gordon in Leaf Rapids and Lynn Lake. And if he wants me to confirm that for him, I certainly can. It is a fact that there is increased employment taking place in the mining industry all through northern Manitoba, and I think the Member from Flin Flon would confirm that also.

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

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, in reference to the non-answers that I have gotten from the Minister of Labour, the fact is that there are fewer employees in the mining industry today; there are fewer employees overall at Inco; and that there are 5,310 job vacancies in northern Manitoba today. My question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, is, can he confirm that when the group spoke to him yesterday, that that group said that educational opportunities were indeed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I raise this matter in view of your ruling yesterday involving the question from the Member for River Heights. Questions of confirmation, in view of that precedent, are clearly out of order and this question, as well as the previous two, are out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Government House Leader for bringing that to my attention. I also relay it to the Honourable Member for Churchill. Maybe he would like to rephrase his question.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the advice from the House Leader and yourself, and would like to rephrase the question. Can the Minister indicate that the group that approached him yesterday said that educational opportunities were necessary, but unless they were accompanied by a long-term employment strategy, they were useless because they only created frustration and they only led people down blind alleys. Can he indicate that they said to him, Mr. Speaker, that they wanted educational opportunities, but also a long-term employment strategy, a strategy which his government has not provided in northern Manitoba?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that the group that I met yesterday certainly are looking for long-term employment. They are aware that there are some of those opportunities available in northern Manitoba, and they certainly confirm that they didn't want any more of the short-term make-work programs such as my NDP friends opposite implemented during the course of their years in office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. It pertains to not only workers in the north in the mining industry and others, but this pertains to the grain handling workers at Churchill. I wonder if the Minister of Labour has any further contact with the Honourable Jean-Luc Pepin in regard to the negotiations to be conducted between the workers and management in Churchill as to whether or not May 5th will be advanced because of the urgency of this matter.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, if I was directly part of that set of negotiations, I might be using some different type of strategy, but I think in the negotiating process in the province of Manitoba, at least, I hope for as long as I am Minister, that the two parties should be permitted to establish their own strategy, and I think part of the strategy is the meeting that will be held on May 5th. I did report to this House that I was in touch with the federal Minister of Labour and the federal Minister of Transport and others, and I have now been assured that that's the earliest date that both parties can get together. Again, I hope that they reach some satisfactory conclusions at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour for question period having expired, we will proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pending information I expect to receive from the office of the Minister, I am prepared to withdraw this motion, Mr. Speaker, and possibly reword it and present it again.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that acceptable to the House?
The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading, beginning with Bill No. 2, as they appear in the Order Paper.

ADJOURNED DEBATES - SECOND READING

BILL NO. 2 - AN ACT RESPECTING THE OPERATION OF
SECTION 23 OF THE MANITOBA ACT IN REGARD TO STATUTES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Bonjour, Mesdames et Messieurs. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to provide further evidence of my bilingualism.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 2 is a significant bill. It is one that has already had some interesting debate and no doubt we will hear from more members of the government and of the opposition parties. One of the things, I think, that we have to realize when I speak directly and narrowly in the framework of the bill is that the measure before us is, in fact, expensive and costly, and I think some of us have not yet fully realized and certainly the public hasn't fully realized that it will cost a great deal in terms of millions of dollars for such a simple measure as to bring Manitoba back to perhaps where it should have been some 90 years ago. Because since 1890, in effect, Manitoba has been officially unilingual and now, I suppose, from this point on, we will become officially bilingual. And the task, in the narrow sense, is formidable.

I note an article quoting the Attorney-General, just a few months ago, as saying that the initial step to bilingualism in Manitoba, namely in terms of translation, will cost \$500,000, but that, of course, is only the first phase, and my understanding is that it will take at least five years to catch up, at approximately \$500,000 a year, which means that the minimum expenditure will be some \$2.5 million. The task before the translators is to translate some 10,000 plus pages of statutes, I understand some 7,500 pages of regulations, and of course, several thousand miscellaneous other pages, as well as keeping up on the daily, or let's say, session number of bills, of Acts, perhaps the Orders of the Day, perhaps the Votes and Proceedings. Hansard is going to be excluded for now, since, although we regard it as official, it is in fact an unofficial record of the debate in the House.

So when you consider that there is going to be some 20,000 pages over the next five years, maybe 25,000 pages at a cost of \$2.5 million, you're basically almost looking at \$100 a page spent on translating these documents, and then of course, publicizing some of these Acts of the Legislature in both languages. This will take years, and of course after the catch-up period, it will then just continue on indefinitely in terms of the translation requirements of the government.

I believe, and I'm sure most members in the House, if not all, would agree that this should be at full federal expense, that the provincial government, in my judgement, should not have any sizable financial obligation because of the fact that it is a federal requirement in that we are a key province in the Canadian Confederation, and it's basically because we are a province in a confederation that we meet this requirement.

Mr. Speaker, although the nation is officially bilingual, we know that it can also be regarded, the Canadian nation, as unilingual in particular areas, multi-lingual as well, and certainly multicultural. It's interesting to look at the principal ethnic groups in the nation a whole and in the province of Manitoba. If I refer to a document called Manitoba Facts, I get the following 1971 census

figures in Manitoba: British, 414,000, French, according to this, 86,000. I must say right there, Mr. Speaker, that the number of people in Manitoba who are of French-Canadian descent is very confusing. Here is a document saying 86,000, I have seen many figures suggesting 43,000 or 46,000 and the commonest figure of all is 60,000, so I am not clear and certainly there is contradiction as to how many people in our province are French-Canadian. My own estimate is 60,000, taking a middle position.

People of German descent in Manitoba, 123,000, far more than most people realize; Ukrainian, 114,000; Native Indian, 43,000; Polish, 43,000; Dutch, 35,000; Scandinavian, 35,000; Jewish, 20,000; Italian, 10,000; Hungarian, 5,000; and other, 58,000.

My point, to the Member for St. Boniface, is that there are many groups. The Irish are included with the British. Now I don't whether they cotton to that, but that apparently is where the Irish are calculated. My point, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a vast array of various people of different cultural and linguistic heritage in the province and in the nation. This comes as a surprise to no one, but I simply say that when you are talking about cultural rights, when you are talking about linguistic rights, when you start to move in that area, then there are many groups and many individuals who watch, in the sense of watch their relative position, watch their relative strength, and may feel, correctly, that they have particular rights in certain areas, whether they are embedded in the constitution or not.

I also mention in passing that the number of people of British descent in Manitoba and Canada are roughly equivalent, namely that there are approximately 41 percent of the people in Manitoba of British stock and 45 percent in Canada. But then the figures begin to change quite dramatically, where some 30 percent of Canadians are of French descent, only some 4 to 6 percent in Manitoba are. Whereas in Manitoba some 12 percent of our population is of a German background, only 6 percent in Canada. In terms of Italian Canadians, only 1 percent in Manitoba, 3 percent in Canada. Any figures, of course, on the people of Italian descent must be radically revised upwards due to some massive waves of immigration to our country. Ukrainian, a sizable figure in Manitoba of 11 percent, but less than 3 percent in the nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, it was said many years ago by J.S. Woodsworth and I quote from him in 1909, and I think that he was, among many other things, probably one of the first social workers, in the broad sense of the term, in Canada, certainly in Manitoba. I guess he was a man with a social conscience. He was a minister of the church, he was a Member of Parliament, and he was active in the community. He didn't just preach from the pulpit, he actually worked in the north end of Winnipeg and probably in other parts of Winnipeg, Manitoba, and Canada. He said in 1909, writing in a book called "Strangers Within Our Gates", "Within the past decade Canada has risen from the status of a colony to that of a nation. A national consciousness has developed, that is a nation has been born. A few years ago Canadian-born children described themselves as English, Irish, Scotch or French, today our children boast themselves Canadians, and the latest arrivals from Austria or Russia help to swell the chorus 'The Maple Leaf Forever'."

Those seem to have been words of foresight and insight, I hope that we have continued to progress in keeping with that vision of J.S. Woodsworth. Some would think that we haven't lived up to what he had predicted or foreseen, others would say we certainly have.

Mr. Speaker, the BNA Act, which is the broad umbrella under which this particular debate takes place, is in my judgement a living document, and I believe as well that we have a document that is capable of evolving and that there has been a evolution in terms of the BNA Act and the relationships of the various provinces.

If I were asked to factually name the capital of Canada, I realize that the answer is Ottawa, but in fact I think if you look a little deeper, one can see that the real capital of Canada is Toronto, and that . . . Well, I see that some members of the press gallery don't agree. They are probably reacting with their hearts, rather than their heads. I simply say that the big city in this country is no longer Montreal. There was once a very close rivalry between Montreal and Toronto. But when one goes to Toronto and looks at that city, at the downtown area, at the population, at the new vibrancy which seems to have been caused by some of the newer immigrants to Canada, and as one charming young woman once told

me - she was from Toronto; she was of Italian extraction - she said it is because of the Italians that Toronto has pepped up. It used to be dull and gray and Anglo-Saxon, but it is because of our people and our food and our ideas. I don't think she is right, but she certainly is partly right.

Mr. Speaker, I say that in fact the true capital of this nation - and I am not saying this with pride, I am saying this in recognition - I believe is Toronto with its population, with its industry, its financial centres, head offices and so on. But the new development in Canadian history and Canadian economic history today is that the pendulum is swinging west, and this will place Manitoba in a very interesting position because the true historic position of Manitoba in Confederation is to go with Ontario and to go with the central provinces. That is the standard position of governments of Manitoba, it's the standard position of Premiers of Manitoba, but all of a sudden in the last few years with the development of the incredible oil wealth of Alberta, with the development of natural resources and industry in British Columbia, the development of potash and oil and mining, etc., in Saskatchewan, and with Manitoba trying to keep up, doing our best in a tough world, in a tough market, in tough competition, the pendulum is swinging west. With it will go the population and with it will go the political power. --(Interjection)-- Well, my friend from Emerson, of whom I expect his support during my statement, talks about doom and gloom. I am not talking about doom and gloom. I am saying that the west is burgeoning and growing and I don't call that doom, and I say that the result is that political power and economic power are shifting west and Manitoba may for the first time, "may" underlined, swing with the west. We are going to have to decide whether we are going with Ontario or with the west. The new west begins on the Ontario-Manitoba border.

I think there is an obvious dissatisfaction with the old central government coalition, the old liberal Quebec-Ontario coalition. We almost say the end of it temporarily but my friends in the Conservative party snatched defeat from the jaws of victory and, unfortunately, we will have to look again at another four to five years of liberal government. --(Interjection)-- Well there is no coalition, Mr. Speaker, there's competition, a lot of competition. The west is held by Conservatives and New Democrats. --(Interjection)-- My friend from Rock Lake says there is no difference. I have to remind him that there are some mighty interesting Liberals and Conservatives. There is an interesting Liberal named Jack Horner. There is another interesting Liberal named John Crosbie. I am sorry, I beg your pardon. He's a Liberal who joined the Conservatives - Mukluk Crosbie, the funny former Minister of Finance, FFF.

I say, Mr. Speaker, the political power has shifted in the west. It is essentially Conservative and New Democratic. There is still the anomaly of the former Member for Fort Rouge, who is now a Minister, 12 long years in the waiting. He had to wait from 1968 to 1980 to become a Minister but I'm sure he would say it is worth it and his colleague in St. Boniface, there are still two members of the Liberal Party. I see my friend, the Minister of Health smiling, I guess he could make some interesting observations on the House of Commons and on the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy.

We have heard all this great silliness about twinning. I could talk on that at great length. I've spoken on it before. I won't speak on it now other than to say it is a preposterous notion, bringing Liberals in, flying them in from eastern Canada to come out west and tell the local people that they regret that they were so foolish or near sighted as to vote Conservative or New Democratic, but they would be happy to represent them in Ottawa in their spare time. They will handle their own ridings, they will handle the other ridings, and never the mind the person you voted for, never mind this New Democrat or Conservative.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to ask the Honourable Member if he could tell me what section of the bill or what part of the bill he is talking about? I would hope he would stick to the subject matter of the bill at hand.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I thought we were talking on Bill No. 2, which is talking about the Canadian Confederation. It is because of the fact that we are in confederation that this bill was brought forward. This isn't a bill to translate some statutes, it's a bill because of the fact that we are in Canada and it

is because of the fact that we have a French Canadian population, we have an obligation to be a bilingual country, and I'm talking, I think, directly to the point.

Mr. Speaker, I also say that the problems of inflation and unemployment and energy are ones that are going to have to be dealt with and that the old attitude that was prevalent in Canada from 1870 on that the resources and the lands of the west were to be utilized by the central government and not for local purposes, not for the provinces, but for the benefit of the nation as a whole, that is now being challenged.

I want to talk for a few moments on the referendum in Quebec. We now see that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the honourable member that the bill before us is Bill No. 2, and I wish you would stick to the subject matter at hand.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am talking on confederation and I feel that I have a right to do that. --(Interjection)-- No, I have no intention of talking about that. I believe that, as was said by . . . Maybe the Speaker didn't listen to my colleague from Inkster, but when my colleague from Inkster spoke, he made reference to the relationship of Quebec and Manitoba and if the honourable member, the Speaker, wants I will read him the speech. The next time he challenges me, I will read him the speech of the First Minister, and see what the First Minister said in that regard, as well.

Mr. Speaker, on May 20th, there is going to be a referendum in Quebec. I think there are some people in Manitoba who think what we do in this bill is directly related to what the people of Quebec will do when they vote, namely that if the provinces outside of Quebec deny the right of French Canadians to interact with their government in their language and in the courts of Manitoba that there will be a certain reaction in the province of Quebec. The Member for Inkster said, and I don't agree with him, but the Member for Inkster, I believe, said that it is because of our concern with the English minority in Quebec that this legislation is being introduced. Perhaps I don't quote him correctly but he did deal with a point in that context, as I am attempting to do.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that it may very well happen and the more I read the more I think it may happen. I am dismayed by this but I believe it will happen or may happen, I hope it won't, that Rene Levesque and the PQ may win the referendum on May 20th. My colleague from Ste. Rose, I think, says that is so. He believes that will happen and I think others do as well. But it may also occur that Claude Ryan will win the election and that will be another interesting development. Regardless of what happens in those elections, and I note the comments of Allan Blakeney, the Premier of Saskatchewan and I note the comments of the Premier of Manitoba, we will never negotiate the destruction of the Canadian Confederation. I, for one, would never consider changes to the constitution which would result in the tearing apart of this nation. I think anyone would agree that there should be changes considered to the Canadian Constitution in relation to all the provinces, not just Quebec but in relation to the new power of the west, in relation to the place of Quebec, and all of the provinces.

Now there have been comments on this particular bill by people from the French Canadian community. The Societe Franco-Manitobaine commented on this bill. The Member for St. Boniface commented on the bill and many other Manitobans, Georges Forest commented. And I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I speak without any reluctance in support of the bill. I have no problem in supporting this measure; it's a step in the right direction; it is a necessity as far as I am concerned.

But I must say as well that I am disappointed in the reaction of the Societe Franco-Manitobaine, because I believe that by supporting, or taking an extreme position, or a radical position on not just this measure, but in the broad context of the national referendum, that they have made a mistake and that it is not in their best interest to support Rene Levesque, and that it is not in their best interest to support any move to separation. Because if separation ever occurred, then the French Canadian community in Manitoba would be abandoned. And I not only say that as my opinion, but I have spoken over the years, not too currently, but I have spoken over the years to people of French-Canadian descent and they have said

the same thing, that a separation of Quebec from Canada would, in effect, throw the local French Canadians to the wolves; that they would not be able to sustain a viable position; that they would probably lose all of their rights that were previously held.

And I must commend Georges Forest for his position. I was interested in what he would say about the referendum. I assumed that he would not support the PQ position and he said, quite clearly, that he felt it was a mistake for the SFM to support it and I quote from what he said a few days ago, he said, "Categorically, the Societe Franco-Manitobaine does not speak for the majority of Manitobans of French expression." He criticizes society for not performing a promised study on the effects of Quebec separation on Franco-Manitobans before taking a stand on the referendum. And he said, "The Manitoban of French expression who supports the separation of Quebec is either one who is prepared to go and live in Quebec, or while remaining here, is prepared to commit cultural suicide." Those are the remarks of Mr. Forest.

Mr. Speaker, not surprisingly, I also have to approach this bill as one who does not belong to either the majority group in Canada, namely those of English extraction, or those of French extraction. I speak as one from the large group of other Europeans, one of German descent, and I think there are in this House at least 6 or 7 of us who come from backgrounds that could be described as German language, or German culture. And I think that as a person with those historic roots, I believe that people who are German Canadians only ask to be treated with respect and to be given an equal opportunity to live and work in Canadian society. And a large number of our MLAs on this side represent urban ridings and represent a great ethnic diversity which, I think, reflects well the people of Manitoba. Those of us who consider ourselves north-enders, who grew up in an environment that was rich in German, Ukrainian, Polish, Jewish background and so on, I think appreciate and understand the Canadian mosaic and the multi-cultural background of this nation. I mention in passing, of course, that our former leader was the first Premier of Manitoba who was neither French nor English, the Honourable Edward Schreyer, who more recently is now the Governor-General of Canada and continues to play that sort of role.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk briefly on the, perhaps, position of the German-Canadian in society as part of the larger group of other Europeans in the context of Canadian confederation. I did some interesting research about the various waves of immigration to this country, and from what I can understand, the first German-Canadians came to this country in 1750 from the United States and many of them settled in Nova Scotia in the Lunenburg area. After the American Revolution more came, being of a conservative bent, moved up into Canada and settled in the eastern provinces. More came in the 1800s and my family, on my father's side, came again from this mixture, or melange in the Austrian empire from a province of the Austrian empire called Galicia in 1895. My mother's family came from England, from Germany, around the time of the First World War. And then there were, of course, a trickle of immigrants came between the wars and finally a torrent after the Second World War.

And it's interesting to see the linguistic background of people in the last few decades. For example, my grandparents spoke English and German, and my parents as well, but I, of course, did not speak any German. I, being the third generation, didn't take any lessons. There was no German language at home, so I wound up like many people in this Chamber studying French at school. And I know this will be of interest to my friend from Radisson, who enlivened our debate last night, when he entered the Government Services debate with the - just about overturned the table in the process - and he is one who is attempting to become bilingual, which is no mean feat.

I studied French for 6 years and I still don't think I can speak it, nor do I attempt. I beg your pardon? --(Interjection)-- Slow learner. Well, the trouble is, of course, that people in Manitoba who attempt to become bilingual have a fairly hard time because of the difficulty of practicing their language on a daily basis. So that what happens with graduates of high school is that they tend to learn to read the language, as opposed to speak the language.

So as I say, the average Manitoban, are they bilingual in terms of speaking both languages? Well, probably if they are born as a French-Canadian they can speak English with no problem. Probably if they are of English descent, or other

European extraction, they are not bilingual. They may have a smattering of French. In the old days, it started in Grade 7, nowadays, I don't know if it starts in Grade One, but I know that my own daughter, who is in Grade One, is learning French and learning German at a local school in Elmwood.

Mr. Speaker, I only say in passing, that I think the German-Canadian community in Manitoba, in Canada, has made a sizeable contribution. I think that this has not always been easy because of the fact that there have, of course, occurred in the 20th century, a couple of world wars, and to be Canadian-German, or German-Canadian has not been without its difficulty, and there has been, at various times in our history during the war years, anti-German sentiment and some pretty nasty things in terms of comments and attitudes expressed on the part of other people in our society. This is now behind us, but nevertheless, I still have to say, in passing, that I think the story of the Japanese Canadians has been told in our time, namely that they suffered during the war and now there has been a totally different attitude, there have been books written on this matter, and that is now past history.

What disturbs me is that one doesn't have to look back into the archives of Canadian history, or look back at old movies in archives, one can still go to a TV set or movie tonight to see some pretty ugly stereotypes of German people portrayed as Nazis or fascists, either as cruel or stupid in these particular areas, and I deplore that; I regret that.

I say that the German-Canadian has suffered in silence and has been proud of the cultural contribution made by the German nation in music, philosophy, art and science. But the German-Canadian is also proud to be a Canadian.

Mr. Speaker, I think the final point that I want to make is this, that when you talk about linguistic rights, you are only talking about one small aspect of the whole question, that it's not good enough to tolerate one's neighbour. It's not good enough to say that the laws will be translated into one or more languages. What must ultimately be sought is equality of opportunity. I think it's not a linguistic question, it's even more than a cultural question, it's a social and an economic question, namely that people, regardless of race or creed, must be given an equal opportunity to compete in Canadian society. That means minimum standards of health and welfare; it means minimum standards of education; it means social justice. It means that we must attempt to do away with hyphenated Canadians. When people feel they are under attack; when people feel that they are not welcome; when people feel hostility, they resort to their hyphenated heritage. When the environment and the milieu is warm and friendly, then the hyphens disappear and the Canadians come out in full force.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, in a sentence, I believe that Bill 2 is a step in the right direction, and as it has been said, a journey of a thousand miles begins with one step. But there are many more steps that must be taken and there must also be, as we advance along the way, appreciation for the multicultural diversity of the people of Manitoba and Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 3 - THE POWER OF ATTORNEY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER presented Bill No. 3, The Power of Attorney Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Subject to any points which may be raised in committee, we will be suggesting that this bill go to committee. At common-law, a power of attorney terminated on the incompetence or insanity of a person. Under current statute law, certain powers of attorney still are not affected, that is those which are not provided for consideration under the Law of Property Act where there is a power of attorney given for consideration. That power of attorney does not expire at the time of insanity or death or bankruptcy, so this particular change is one which we see some substantial benefit in. I've read the words of the Member for Inkster dealing with the question of the power of attorney as opposed to trusteeship for an individual who becomes incompetent, and I would expect that that matter will be raised in committee.

Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 5, the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I could have No. 5 and No. 6 stand. We're prepared to deal with Bill No. 7.

BILL NO. 7 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE MANITOBA EVIDENCE ACT

MR. GREEN presented Bill No. 7, an Act to amend The Manitoba Evidence Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill, in my submission, and I must admit not having been educated in the considerations that were given by those jurisdictions who, my learned friend the Attorney-General says have changed the law. Every time, Mr. Speaker, one changes the common law on a point which is not material to existing social and economic relationships, and sort of is not meant merely as keeping in step with might be the exigencies of the passing of time and new conditions in society, I think that, Mr. Speaker, we have to be aware that we are changing something which is many, many years old and is usually, Mr. Speaker, based on sound considerations.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know, and I'm going to ask the Attorney-General to see to it that committee is educated on the assumption that the bill is going to committee, as to what were the original reasons why this type of law was considered necessary, why it is no longer considered necessary, and what will be the implications, because Mr. Speaker, sometimes the law as it is, has reason which has escaped existing lawmakers because it's so old. We are discussing, Mr. Speaker, a very interesting kind of question. Up until now, by The Evidence Act of the province of Manitoba, and I believe by The Evidence Act of most provinces in Canada, no witness in any proceeding can be asked, or be bound to answer any question relating to the fact that he or she has committed adultery. And for years, Mr. Speaker, in divorce actions, it was sort of the common practice, because many divorces were proved by calling the offending party to the witness stand. It was standard practice that the petitioner would give his evidence, that there would be some evidence of adultery, and then the respondent would get into the witness stand, either the husband or the wife of the petitioner, as the case may be, and you would say, I am bound to advise you that under The Evidence Act, you need not be asked, or you cannot be asked, and you need not be required to give evidence concerning the fact that you or your husband has been guilty of adultery, and then you would say, are you prepared to answer such questions? Are you prepared to be asked, and are you prepared to answer such questions? And invariably, the witness would say yes, because if the witness wasn't going to say yes, he wouldn't subpoena them as a witness. And then the witness would say, yes, I live common-law with so-and-so. And many divorces, Mr. Speaker, and I know whereof I speak, because I was involved in many of them, were based on that kind of evidence.

--(Interjection)--

My friend asks a very interesting question, Mr. Speaker, and I tell him that as the law now stands, I am not bound to be asked, nor am I required to answer any such questions. --(Interjection)-- Unless I have gone into the witness stand and said that this was not the case, unless I did that.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that one can be amused, but this is no joking matter. Sometimes the law is based on things - Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a difference in the United States and Canada. In the United States, a witness cannot be asked a question by the constitution which may incriminate him, which indicates that he is guilty of a criminal offence. In The Canada Evidence Act, and I'm not going to sort of risk making mistakes in law which I will risk, you are entitled to ask for the protection of The Evidence Act, that your answers will not be used in another proceeding, but you cannot refuse to answer with regard to the commission of a criminal offence. I'm getting the nodding of up and down from at least one lawyer, so if I am wrong, I'm in some company, I won't say good or bad company, but I'm in some company.

You see, Mr. Speaker, that the law with regard to adultery and protection with regard to the questions, admitting adultery, is stronger than the questions with regard to admitting the commission of a criminal offence. You had to answer with regard to the commission of a criminal offence, pleading the protection of The Evidence Act so that that answer could not be used against you in a subsequent trial, but not with regard to adultery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be speculating, because I don't know, but I think that the people who formed this law did it out of wisdom, not out of trying to excuse somebody, but did it out of wisdom, because Mr. Speaker, adultery in all its connotations, particularly at the time that the law was written, and I don't think it has gone away today, had far more serious consequences than the commission of a criminal offence, not only for the person who was asked the question but for the other person, and I will deal with that in a moment. A criminal offence, yes, one can be punished for it, and the punishments can be very severe, but adultery could be the ruin of an entire lifetime, not a community, of a particular relationship. I believe that the people who passed this law were not trying to protect the answer, they were merely trying to reduce perjury. Now I hope that members will concentrate on that for a moment. A person going into the witness stand has to take an oath that he will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. People nevertheless sometimes tells the truth, sometimes do not tell the truth. I think that the common law must have been founded on the fact that people knew that at a certain stage the oath becomes something that will be overcome, and rather than reduce the sanctity of the oath and having people commit perjury as to what they have done in their private lives, this section is there.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know why it is being done away with, I don't why it is being done away with. I think that some of those same considerations will apply. I think that if a person is involved in an action where adultery is one of the bases of the action, then perhaps it is now considered advisable that he be asked the questions and be permitted to be cross-examined on them, even at the risk that he will commit perjury because he is unwilling to suffer the consequences of admitting an adulterous relationship.

Let's assume, Mr. Speaker, that we were to go that far with the Attorney-General and with those who are seeking these changes. There is another feature to admitting adultery. Adultery isn't saying I did something, adultery - except where it involves artificial insemination and that sometimes is considered to be adultery - adultery is saying we did something. You're answering not as to what you did, but you are answering as to what somebody else did. Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that those people who formulated this law did so on the basis not only of the fact that they did not want to create perjurers, but they also said there is such a thing as chivalry, there is such a thing as honour, there is such a thing as not ruining another person's life, and we are not going to require a witness to give evidence which will have the effect of ruining another person's life and that person might not even be a party to the action. I gather that this section relates to any trial, the other party might not even be a witness in the case, might not even be served. Now not only is this legislation, and I am not talking about either party, it could man or woman, or woman or man, going to say that chivalry is dead, is going to say chivalry is prohibited by law. I want to ask the Attorney-General, merely ask him, because we are departing from something

and we are moving into a world which I believe we do not know all about. I want to ask him whether these things have been considered and I must sort of assume that they have, because I think the law makers in other jurisdictions must be able to formulate the same kind of questions that I am asking. And if so, Mr. Speaker, what has the world missed all of these years, in that a person going into a witness stand has not had to testify with regard to his own adultery? What great inequities have occurred that we are going to rectify by saying that a man will have to testify that he had adultery perhaps with somebody else's wife? Either he will commit perjury or he will be going into an area which I am not satisfied that this law is going to do more good than harm.

I am saying all this, Mr. Speaker, with the hope that the Attorney-General is going to say to me, you have misread it, your fears are unfounded, and that none of the problems that you anticipate will arrive by virtue of this legislation. But if they do arrive, then, Mr. Speaker, just because it is an old rule and it is considered to be archaic and that it doesn't consider to be applicable any more, I am going to say that the people who kept it for 300 years maybe knew more about what they were doing than what I am being asked to do in voting on this bill.

The Minister has indicated that other jurisdictions have done it. No doubt there has been serious consideration given to the problems that I have raised. I would assume that the bill is going to go to Committee, although I, if asked to stand up and vote it to go to Committee, don't give my undertaking to do so. Perhaps there will be more in the debate that will make me do so.

I want to know what good will come out of this bill, what harm is being done by the existing practice which says that a woman will not have to go into the witness box and admit that she committed adultery, first, from the point of view of her own pride and secondly, from the point of view of the person that she is accusing of having committed adultery with her? What happens to these people? If I am told, well, the consequence of committing - if you are weak enough to commit adultery, you have to bear the consequences, then, Mr. Speaker, I am going to say that I will have more sympathy for human weakness than the person who would give that type of an answer. Also, not only the question of human weakness, but the consequences of what will result from that particular condition.

If my honourable friend says that there are trials where people who have been prevented from achieving remedies, which they are entitled to, and this is going to facilitate that, then I wish he would be more explicit when he deals with the matter, both at the close of debate or when the bill goes to Committee.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Morris MacGregor (Virden): The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We on this side have studied this particular bill and its provisions and with some reservations, I think with some qualified reservations, we would indicate that we have no opposition to seeing it go to Committee.

With respect to the questions raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster with respect to this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that as a fellow member of the legal profession, I do not share all his concerns about the sanctity of enshrined common law provisions. Mr. Speaker, very often the common law is indeed of drastic reform. Mr. Speaker, I think we can all think of matters that have come before this House where we have made legislative amendments and revisions to the common law which were long overdue and we have done that in order to reflect contemporary standards and contemporary lifestyle.

Mr. Speaker, I think when we look at this particular bill and its provisions, we must give consideration to the fact that the rule of law that excluded this sort of questioning in courts for so many centuries was essentially premised and predicated on ecclesiastical censure. For many years, Mr. Speaker, as I believe the Member for Inkster well knows, divorce was not even a matter for the secular courts, it was a matter only for the ecclesiastical courts. And the consequences of a divorce, and I might add that the only ground for divorce was adultery not other forms of mental cruelty, and in my submission, Mr. Speaker, adultery is just that, it is a form of mental cruelty. The consequences of that sort of affair, Mr. Speaker, was not only the breaking up of the marriage, but the dissolution of the respondent from his or her bonds with the church. So a person was cast out

from the church, and I suppose in a sense, Mr. Speaker, at that point quite literally in the belief of many and the belief of the church, incapable of going on to a heavenly reward. So it was a very serious matter for an orthodox Christian to be cast into this situation, Mr. Speaker, and I might add other communities even today have even more harsh and punitive measures for people who are divorced. I think in some countries of the world, notably in the Arab, mideastern world, women are still put to death.

Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to this, I have said that I regard, and I think that many in my profession today regard adultery as being a manifestation, a symptom of mental cruelty. I for one do not think that adultery is any worse than physical cruelty, although for years a person could not obtain a divorce in this country on the basis of physical abuse, and that, Mr. Speaker, was as a result of the common law. It was not recognized in this common law that the Member for Inkster would have us beatify and place on a high plateau that physical abuse and cruelty was grounds for divorce.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we in this forum, in the legislative parliamentary forum, can do much to redress the ills of the common law, which very often lags centuries behind the prevailing ethical and moral standards of our communities. Mr. Speaker, that, of course, is the very purpose and essence of the parliamentary system, and it is that which I address to my friend from Inkster.

Mr. Speaker, there are other sorts of privileges in our law. One of the most notable, which I think all of us are familiar with, is the parliamentary privilege, which allows members of this forum to say what we please as legislators under this dome with impunity. Mr. Speaker, I can stand here in my place today and I can defame, scandalously defame, any citizen and I can do so without any repercussions, because I cannot be put on the stand and have those statements put to me. I am immune, as long as I make the statement within the confines of this Chamber, from any sort of civil prosecution. Mr. Speaker, that is a function of the common law. Mr. Speaker, I say to you that it is long overdue that many of the provisions of our common law be assessed and evaluated in contemporary terms.

Mr. Speaker, when that provision of the common law was first enshrined, there was no public press. I suppose it goes back as far as the Seventeenth Century. I am even sure there was a Commons. So, Mr. Speaker, when the few literate men of the then society who had the privilege of sitting, perhaps as a result of being peers of the Realm, uttered statements, no matter how contemptuous of citizens, no matter how defamatory or libelous, they were thought somehow to be better and above all the others. They indeed were peers of the Realm and they could say anything they pleased about anyone else. It didn't matter if John Smith, carpenter, was defamed by Lord So-and-So in the old parliamentary or the then parliamentary system.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that this too is something that I would recommend for review by legislatures of this country. Time is long overdue when elected representatives also are to be held responsible for their statements. Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with an adulterer being asked whether or not he or she or a person who is rather accused of committing an adulterous act, an offence, is asked whether or not it is indeed true? What is the matter with that? We can ask in our courts whether or not a person in the, I suppose almost the classic stereotypical joke, we can ask a person when he last beat his wife, or when he last stopped beating his wife. We can ask questions relative to other aspects of marital life and discord. That's all fair game. That's within the common law.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have this one exceptional provision that says that a person prosecuting a case, a plaintiff in a matter before the court, can't put that question to the other side. And what would be the havoc and mischief if this bill is enacted and proclaimed and the question is put in our courts? If a person did not commit an act of adultery, presumably they would refute it and say I did not, prove it, just as they would in any other prosecution. Mr. Speaker, these technical defences plague our system of law. In the criminal courts, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Honourable Attorney-General that many more prosecutions would be successful than is presently the case, if there were not so many damnable exclusions, evidentiary exclusions, rules that work a hardship on the prosecuting attorneys representing the public interest in our courts. There are many such rules, Mr. Speaker. Some of them have a good reason but, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that they are unnecessary in many cases and they should be reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, I would personally - and I now am expressing a personal point of view, other members may differ with that - but I would personally say to you that I would commend the member for bringing in this particular amendment. I would indicate that it was called for by the Law Reform Commission, I believe, several years ago. The Manitoba Bar Association, Family Law Sub-section, I am told, has been in support of this for the past year, anyway. They have endorsed resolutions and forwarded them on to his department in this respect. I know of no opposition in the legal fraternity or amongst the legal community, and it seems to me it will expedite the procedures in our courts. It will bring them more into line with the common standards applicable in all our civil courts. So, Mr. Speaker, I for one can say sincerely that I commend the action of the government in this regard.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are we ready for the question? The Attorney-General, I believe, will be closing the debate. The Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, if I have not already done so, and I should have done so and I apologize for it, I will distribute to the Member for Inkster and the Member for Wellington and the members of each party, a copy of the Law Reform Commission report dated November 6th, 1979, which I think at greater length amplifies on the reasons I gave upon introduction of this bill. I had received prior to that a copy of the resolution of the Manitoba Branch of the Canadian Bar recommending the repeal of this section, and I had sent that resolution to the Law Reform Commission for their consideration and comment before deciding on whether or not to introduce any legislation. I think this informal report from the Law Reform Commission will help explain some of the concerns that the Member for Inkster may have had.

As I indicated when I introduced the bill, the Law Reform Commission in their report to me quoted from a lawyer who wrote to the commission, who said, "it has always seemed to me strange that since the passage of The Divorce Act in 1968, a person may be compelled to admit that he has beaten his spouse; committed homosexual acts or acts of bestiality, alcoholism or any other kind of misconduct conceivable, but only adultery, and no other marital misconduct is protected by The Evidence Act."

I think, Mr. Speaker, the report will indicate, as does this report and other reports of Law Reform Commissions, that this protection given in The Manitoba Evidence Act did grow out of practice, it was called ecclesiastical censure, over a century ago and in fact is something that probably should have been changed quite some time ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend the bill to members for second reading and again I will distribute this report, and if there are further questions that may arise out of this informal report, we can deal with them in committee.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are we ready for the question? The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable Attorney-General. As he understands the intention of this legislation, when a spouse is asked to admit the fact that they have committed adultery, will that in his view require him to reveal the name of the other party, which is somewhat different than beating his wife or not supporting his children. Will he be required to name the other party to this adulterous act?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: My first response to that question, Mr. Speaker, would be yes.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion No. 16, the Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, could we have 16 and 18 stand, and we're prepared to deal with Bill No. 20? (Stand)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion then, Mr. Minaker, No. 20. The Member for Logan.

BILL NO. 20 - AN ACT TO AMEND
THE CHANGE OF NAME ACT

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are prepared to let this bill proceed onto committee. It's too bad that the Minister, I know I'm not supposed to refer to it, I would hope that members will draw to his attention the few remarks that I have to make on the bill. We are prepared to let the bill go.

There is one point, Mr. Speaker, where the Director of Child Welfare may make application for a change of names, we feel that even though the child is a public ward, that the bona fide parents of the child so in public custody should be notified that a change of name is being contemplated. When we get to committee I also would like the Minister to, and I know I can't refer, Mr. Speaker, to specific sections of the bill, but dealing with the consent of a child over the age of 12 and why that particular age was picked rather than the present one.

And with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to have the bill proceed to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The next order on the order paper is Bill No. 27. The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Could I have that matter stand, Mr. Speaker? We're prepared to deal with Bill No. 28.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: 27 stands. (Stands) No. 28, the Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: I have adjourned this debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

BILL NO. 28 - THE SANATORIUM BOARD OF MANITOBA ACT

MR. SAUL A. MILLER presented Bill No. 28, The Sanatorium Board of Manitoba Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill, as the Minister indicated, and having read it, is really a new act to deal with the Sanatorium Board of Manitoba and replaces the old Tuberculosis Act of I don't know how many decades ago, but it's an old act and it is obviously obsolete because tuberculosis is no longer the dread disease that it was in years gone by. So this is a new act setting out new ideas for the Sanatorium Board of Manitoba. They are still operating in the TB field, it's true, but their emphasis has obviously had to change with change in the need for their services. And now they are broadening it to include the whole field of respiratory diseases, as I understand it, which of course still, as I say, covers TB but goes far beyond tuberculosis.

I do notice the deletion of one item here, one clause in the old act which I found rather strange. The reference to Christmas seals has been dropped entirely and I am wondering whether we have seen the end of Christmas seals. Ever since I recall the Christmas seals have come in every year. It becomes like - I don't know, it's not going to be the same if I don't get Christmas seals. And so I am wondering whether it was dropped because they are getting out of it or whether it simply will be included as in the past but now simply as one of their fund-raising projects which they will be able to undertake as a part of their aims and objects.

There is one aspect which perhaps at committee we could deal with, or perhaps the Minister could answer. As I see it, this act will permit the Sanatorium Board to get into areas even beyond respiratory diseases. I know that they are now, they still own and they operate Pelican Lake at Ninette for the Department of Health with regard to the Mental Retardation. They have about 70 residents there

and since it is their facility, they owned it when we took over the facility or when we decided to move into their facility to make use of it, they agreed to continue to operate it and manage it for us. I am wondering whether the Minister envisages the San Board as getting into other new fields in the health field, whether he sees them moving into other than respiratory, because certainly the Pelican Lake operation is in the field of retardation which is somewhat different from what the San Board deals with, and the only reason they are there is because they own the facility and so it is logical they manage it. But I don't think they are involved in anything beyond the straight managing of the physical plant. I don't think they are involved in the programs because really it is not their field.

And so I can visualize the San Board continuing as it has over the many years in Manitoba, but being more involved in the promoting of programs in the field of respiratory diseases. Just as the heart foundation is concerned with educational programs regarding notifying people about the causes and the methods of prevention for heart disease, I could see them getting involved in educational programs with regard to respiratory diseases. But I would hope and I am just wondering whether the Minister, because the wording is such, sees them going into a totally new field outside of respiratory, maybe into more retarded homes or something of that nature. I would hope not because I think that they have a full plate dealing with the one area in which they've become quite specialized and where all the resources are aimed, at and that the fact that they are operating Pelican Lake was simply done for administrative ease and that they are not now going to branch off into a whole new direction just to look for something to do; that they will limit themselves to respiratory problems, recognizing that, as I said, TB is no longer the major health problem that it used to be and certainly there is no need any more for the operating of sanatoria and everything else that went with it. Ninette as I recall was pretty well closed down a number of years ago. The last patients were moved out about seven, eight years ago as I recall, so the facility has had to be used for something.

So with those few comments, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to let the bill go on to committee and I suppose there will be people from the Sanatorium Board who will be there to answer questions if asked, and the Minister of course might even be able to respond to one of the questions I posed in my few remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks for his contribution to the examination of this proposed legislation at this point and acknowledge his comments and observations on this subject. I want to reassure him that insofar as I know, that certainly the Christmas Seals Campaign has not and will not become a thing of the past. He's correct when he points out that there's no specific reference to it in the new legislation, but it's my understanding, and I will pursue it and reassure the honourable member at committee stage, that the Christmas Seals Campaign is still one of the major fund-raising projects of the Sanatorium Board and it's their intention to continue with it in the future.

The honourable member points out that the Board still owns and operates the Pelican Lake Training Centre at Ninette and that is an institution for treatment and training and rehabilitation and care of citizens suffering from mental retardation. There is no change contemplated in the Board's activities or responsibilities in that area either. Nor am I aware, Mr. Speaker, of any intentions on the part of the Board to broaden their activities with which they're currently connected and general fund-raising promotion educational activities related to respiratory ailments and illnesses. I have no indication from the Board, certainly there has been no suggestion made to me during the process leading up to the development of the proposed legislation, that would either aspire to, or contemplate, an expansion or extension of their activities into new fields. They do intend to continue managing and operating the Pelican Lake Training Centre, but primarily, their interest is in respiratory health and the challenge of meeting the various threats and dangers that exist to good respiratory health and that is where their activities and their energies and their fund-raising efforts will lie.

It's true that it is no longer necessary for them to operate sanatoria for the care and treatment of tuberculosis patients. That, as has been pointed out, is the reason for the new legislation, and that reflects a major landmark of progress in the health field in our province and on our continent, for which I'm sure we're all grateful.

There still is, however, a great deal of work to be done in the field of respiratory health generally, quite apart from tuberculosis and the need for tuberculosis sanatoria, and this legislation recognizes that changed role, that refined role, that role that is to some degree more sophisticated perhaps than was the situation in the past and provide the Board with the opportunity of meeting that challenge.

So I think that I can reassure the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks with respect to his concerns in those areas. I will indeed pursue the question of the Christmas Seals Campaign and advise him further, either in the House, or independently, or at the committee stage, but in the main, I think the legislation will protect the kinds of interests and ambitions for the Sanatorium Board in which he's obviously interested, and broaden their opportunities for service. So I thank him for his comments and look forward to dealing with the legislation in detail at committee stage.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, we have agreed that it would be appropriate, rather than proceed into Estimates with the little time left, that we proceed now into Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there agreement we proceed to Private Members' Hour? (Agreed)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: On Wednesdays the first item of business on Private Members' Hour is Orders for Return that have been transferred for debate.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the responsible Minister is unavoidably away, I would like to have this matter stand and I believe there is mutual agreement on this. (Stand)

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 1 - ELIMINATION OF GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED LOTTERIES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order, I understand the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is prepared to go, but at the present moment he's on the telephone; he should be out shortly. If we can have the indulgence of the House for thirty seconds or one minute, he'll be ready to debate.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Honourable Member for Kildonan would spin out that explanation a little longer, we can maybe get him back here.

MR. FOX: Of course Mr. Speaker, having been with you and you knowing me for the last eight or nine years, you're aware that I'm one of those who is always very brief, but if you wish to have a discourse on any other issue, I'm prepared to oblige. I do not have any jokes that could be printed at the moment, but I see the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is coming in, so we'll proceed now.

MR. SPEAKER: We're now dealing with proposed resolutions. The resolution

of the Honourable Member for Inkster, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the Elimination of Government-Sponsored Lotteries; the honourable member has 15 minutes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I doubt if I'll need the 15 minutes, since I started this speech - I know that we covered the lottery during the Estimates of the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sports and I think that we know better now the policy of the government. The member that proposed this legislation - I don't think I would agree with everything he says, but I think we're fundamentally after the same thing. I think he understood that, because there were so many lotteries run in Canada, it might be naive to think that if we didn't licence lotteries here in Manitoba that no lottery tickets would be sold in Manitoba when all the other provinces are actually selling tickets and there is always a way to get them here if we didn't have our own. This is why the Western Canada Lottery Foundation was started, to try to stop the proliferation of lotteries; to regulate them; to bring accountability in this.

But the main thing is, Mr. Chairman - I think maybe I would like to take advantage of the few minutes that I have, to talk about the possibility - well, I should say, first of all, that the Minister did say that they were following the same policy that we had; that we were gradually, as fast as possible, getting away from the government of Manitoba participating in the revenue from the lottery. We took a couple of steps in that direction when we were in office, and I know that the Minister and the government has done the same thing. So that, I think, will go a long way in satisfying - it should, anyway - in satisfying the Member for Inkster, who brought in this resolution.

But Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate at times that you are misunderstood, not necessarily misquoted, but a paragraph taken here and there. I certainly hasten to say that I don't necessarily blame the news media on that. I'm referring to the debate that we've had during the Ministers' Estimates when we were talking about lotteries, and for some reason or other the question of the casinos was introduced - and that actually, by right, is under a different Minister. There was some statement made and some people got quite excited. There was a story in one of the newspapers - some of the things were not factual, some of the things were misleading - I remember we were asking the government for their policy. The Attorney-General was present at this meeting of committee, and it wasn't I, but somebody else asked for the policy of the government on gambling. And then I made a few statements. I was talking about the question of bringing in legalized gambling, off-track betting and so on, and I said that I was very much against it and always have been.

So there was a paragraph reporting that, another paragraph talking about the middleman, and the statement that I was supposed to have made about middleman was about the casino; and then we had the reverse also. But I was talking about the principle, and I was expressing - and I think that it is not only my right, but my duty, my responsibility, if that is the way that I feel, because I have great fears of seeing legalized gambling come to Manitoba. And it is very, very difficult - you talk to somebody - and I'm not suggesting that they are not right but they are always above reproach. They're always above reproach, but they agree with you, there shouldn't be too many lotteries and there shouldn't be too many casinos, once they're in. It's a good thing, mind you. Another thing, what is very, very difficult is to bring that and to talk about this seriously, because many of the times they hide behind people that are not using it as a business, either running a lottery or a casino, but people that are actually getting the revenue and most of the time they are worthy causes, non-profit organizations, and you can't fight them; it is very, very difficult.

But my point, and as I say, I was generalizing, and I'm doing so again. I am concerned that you start - I received a phone call - somebody in my own constituency - The Festival du Voyageur was mentioned and there were three paragraphs on it. One paragraph was, that The Festival du Voyageur - that statement wasn't made by myself, although I agree with that statement, that Festival du Voyageur was counting on the money that they received from the casino to stay solvent or they would have difficulty and they probably would go belly-up; that was a statement.

Then there was another statement made by me which was factual, but it was disjointed, it was following something else and it didn't make that much sense. I

said, well, if The Festival du Voyageur is permitted, why not - I think that the term that I used was the Plum Coulee lumberjack - it was a bit of a joke but I had a reason for saying that - I was saying, where and who is going to decide who should have a licence? You know, nobody has the God-given right to a casino and say, well we were the first one, or so on, we should exclude it. And I can repeat again, as I said before, that I wasn't --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon? Yes, well, all right. So that's it, if not one, why not the other?

And I did mention that to the gentleman that phoned me that was quite incensed when the Festival du Voyageur - and I said, well, I mean that. And they said, well, that's why, there's more than one, so we've got 12, or 13 - I said, why not 14, why not 15; why not hospitals; why not personal care homes? I think that the members that introduced this resolution, and many of the others that are against, feel that this is not, these games of chance are gambling, and I think we can talk about casino and so on, is an easy way to get money, but it causes a lot of problems. And if a program is worthwhile and if it should be supported, there should be another way of supporting it.

I think that I subscribe to it. I think that if we're going to be realistic, I know that this is not going to be approved, and the member also knows. Politically, and I'm not saying that the government is yellow, or they're chicken, or they're gutless, it is very very difficult politically to have somebody, especially when they are good causes, and I have made enemies in that because I did voice an opinion, but I will continue to do so and one was a group that was very dear to my heart, it was my alma mater of St. Paul's College, but I don't think that the end justified the means. And what I want to say, and what I tried to say before is that you will have, if you are not careful, if you have no set policies, that you will gradually have to increase the licences, the number of licences, and there will be a proliferation, and I speak mostly of casinos because God knows, we've got enough lotteries.

My point is that it's dangerous. I am not, and I never intended, and I never said that the people presently running the casinos now are crooked. I was talking in general, and I'm talking about legalized gambling, something that was advocated by some of the councillors in the city of Winnipeg, I think at one time they wanted to take the Selkirk and dock it somewhere and use it as a casino and so on. Well, I think that is ridiculous and I think it would be bad. We don't need that in Manitoba.

It's not something new. You've got to realize, I don't fault the people that are trying to get these licences, you are trying to better yourself and I'd be only too happy, and I'd be very careful how I ran the operation if I had a monopoly on running lotteries or casinos here. I am not faulting them at all. If it's legal, and if they are doing it according to the law, it's fine. But I am suggesting that we as legislators must be very, very careful. We mean well. If we've got 12 of them, and then something comes in dear to the heart of the Minister that happens to be there at the time that has the responsibility, and he'll say, exactly what I said, if one, why not the other? So you'll have 14, and then it'll be 15 and 16, and eventually it will be wide open. And that is where I am concerned.

You know, I asked the Minister to give me an application form. He gave me an application form, and I don't know, I can't suggest to him how to be tougher, but I am saying that it is the easiest thing in the world, if you have the underworld, the gangland groups, there is no easier thing than to have somebody front for you. And that is being done all over the States in many of these operations. And I wouldn't have time to read all that, but I say it causes a problem. And again, let me say that I am not accusing anybody, I'm not saying anybody is illegal, or that we have crooks in Manitoba. I am saying, and I am repeating that there is a good chance that you will attract undesirables, because an easy buck attracts undesirables and lots of money attracts undesirables, and they'll come from all over. And this is why I said that you'll have some fly-by-night operators also see what they can do and then move somewhere else if they're caught. That I'm not backing down at all. I mean that.

I happened to just look at the Christian Science Monitor. I think that we all received that. One was April 8th, the other April 11th, and they are very concerned. They started in Atlantic City now, and that's a big concern. It's a big concern out there, Mr. Speaker. They were going to do the same thing as us, and

they're having problems. You said to me about a minute ago that I had five minutes, so that means that I haven't got too long, but let me read a little bit with the rest of the time that I have. "Can something be done to offset somewhat the tremendous personal and family problems casino gambling has swept into Atlantic city? Yes, say a growing number of social service and church-related organizations trying to help compulsive gamblers, drug addicts, the destitute and others. But it's like people trying to help each other in a hurricane," says the Rev. Dudley Sarsaty a Presbyterian Minister, and so on. "Law enforcement and social service agency officials here point out that since casino gambling arrived in May 1978, the number of people who have become problem gamblers or drug users, who have had family problems, has mushroomed. Elicit drug use here, especially of cocaine, has increased dramatically in the last six months."

The rest of the article I could - well, I gave you the date, if the people want it, or if they want a copy of this, and the point that I want to make and I'm going to take advantage of this, that I share the same concern as I think the majority of the members of the House. And I did, although I was responsible in promoting up to a certain point, the lottery, but I was trying to get something where there would be accountability, and God knows we didn't have it before. I know that the Member for Inkster is quite concerned, and besides that, I think his main, from what I understand from him is that he doesn't like that form of raising money. And he feels if they're going to have lotteries, maybe he's not that much against lotteries, but get the government completely out of it.

And I will go with him, except get the government completely out of it. I think the government has to control. I share with him the concern, I would hope, and as I stated that previously, and I think that I must say that I believe that this is the policy that this present government is following, as I said that they are not, they are eventually, and they are going in that direction, that they will not share in any of the profits. But I think you must be on the ball, I think you have to administer it, I think you have to be very careful in what you do, and the main thing, I certainly don't want any proliferation of lotteries. I think it was a step backwards though when the Minister signed an agreement with another group, and he said if you don't like it, you could go back to the non-bearer's tickets which do not lend itself to proper accountability. And there, I made the accusation, and I will make it again, this is a government delivering on another of their campaign promises by helping some middlemen that are not needed under this service, and they operate a lot better with the non-bearer's tickets.

But again in closing, I know this is a bit disjointed because I thought I wouldn't use the 15 minutes, now I find that I have the time to say exactly what I wanted to say, I am not faulting the people, I am not making any accusation, I know of nobody that is a criminal or that is not according to the law here. But I am saying that my duty is to warn government, not close the barn door when it's empty, it's too late, and I say that you've got to have a policy on casinos mostly. I know where we're going on lotteries. But casinos, there isn't. And I fault the previous government just as much as the present government. I know, and I can reveal that at the risk of being told that I shouldn't say what happened in Cabinet, but I remember at one time we were all surprised that a licence had been given, we asked the Minister responsible, who happened to be the Attorney-General, and he said he didn't know anything about it, it was the Lottery Licensing Board.

And I am saying, and I know that I remember vividly that we instructed him to tell the board that this was considered a question of policy, and before any new licence would be given or approved, we wished him to come back to Cabinet. And I am saying to the Attorney-General, yes, my leader, - and by the way, he agreed with us - and I am saying to the Minister, I'm not going to fault you, maybe this is the case, but I'm asking the present Minister to develop a policy on this. Not piecemeal that eventually - because once you've got certain people that have it, a hospital, why not a personal care home, why not medical research, there's an abundance of good causes that you can't knock. The member, I'm sure is not knocking these causes, but he's saying, if they're worthwhile, you'll find out that the people will support him in a different way. And you won't establish a thing here that, the people that are running it, and I have no sympathy with them, I'm not blaming them, but my responsibility is not that much to worry about them, I'm not criticising them, but I won't bust out crying if they tell me, well, all the jobs that it's going to do if you don't have any more casinos. If that's it, then maybe we should have the casinos open all year round.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much, I think that I was at least able to make the main concern that I have and to straighten the record that I certainly had not, I'm not backing down, I'm not apologizing because I never accused anybody, I was talking about generalizing and I made the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. ROBERT ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to make a few comments on the subject of lotteries, and on the resolution which is at present before the House.

We have already heard from several members, and we have just now heard from the Member for St. Boniface who was the former Minister of Lotteries. I think he was more properly called the Minister of Health and Lotteries.

I have listened carefully to the Member for St. Boniface on this subject of lotteries, who has displayed a great capacity of insight which unfortunately has not always been matched by an equal capacity to show foresight, and the lack of foresight is what he is now trying to make up for with unlimited hindsight. But he is apparently not alone in that. The Member for Inkster, the Member for St. Johns, and the Member for Winnipeg Centre have joined them in the born again chorus of opponents to one or another aspect of government-sponsored lotteries. I was rather amused, to say the least, by the Member for Winnipeg Centre, who told us during the estimates recently, on Hansard Page 2044, that he, and I shall use his own words, and I quote, "and I really got sucked in on that, as a lot of people did," and he will probably be joined by others on the benches opposite who may now come forward and confess their guilt during the course of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak on this resolution because I was not here during the summer session of 1969, and then again in 1974 when The Lotteries Act was passed. I was not going to speak because I didn't possess the vast store of knowledge of lotteries which the Member for St. Boniface seems to possess - and I might say, which he uses with such intimidating force in this House from time to time. But I have listened to the debate, and I think I have gained some insights myself on which I would like to comment.

To start with, I think it is clear that all legislation and authority to operate, licence, and regulate lotteries was put in place under the stewardship of the NDP government. I think it is equally clear that the lotteries field was so riddled with problems when this government took over that it was necessary to appoint a commission of inquiry to sort out the mess, and it was their mess, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- Now they protest with indignation that the new Minister responsible for lotteries, who is the Minister of Fitness, Recreation and Sport, is not moving fast enough and is not radical enough in making the changes that they refused to make when they were in power. That is why I decided to rise and speak on this resolution, because I am frankly annoyed at how various opposition members, led by the Member for Inkster, and aided by the emotional outbursts from the Member for St. Boniface, are now trying to turn the table on the Minister of Fitness and Recreation and Sport, who needs to be congratulated on having done his best, and successfully so, in establishing a harmonious relationship between roughly 200,000 members of The Manitoba Sports Federation and the Manitoba government, and who is now trying to set up a workable and more tightly controlled lotteries structure in this province.

It seems to me that the Member for St. Boniface is using an approach on lotteries which is similar to the one the Member for Brandon East was using with regard to McKenzie Seeds, namely by accusing the government of doing what he proposed to do himself, but could not do, and that is to approve a sale, because the seed industry was the last industry his government wanted to be in. Now his colleagues, led by the Member for Inkster and aided and abetted by the Member for St. Boniface, are urging the government to eliminate lotteries as a means of raising public revenues.

Well, Mr. Speaker, who established lotteries as a means of raising public revenue, but the Member for Inkster and his colleagues, both in caucus and in Executive Counsel. And who exactly made the sports community, for example, dependent

on lotteries moneys to finance sports programs, but the Member for St. Boniface, who on the Saturday before the October 11th election in 1977 announced a major sports and fitness program so that no one would be able to make critical comments on it before the vote was in; who, I say, handled the use of lotteries moneys in a more cynical fashion when our friends opposite, and in particular, the Member for St. Boniface, were able to call the shot.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the member is pretty loose with his remarks. I wonder if he would permit some questions. I notice he didn't take part in the debate during the estimates, although he was there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to make my remarks, and if the Member for St. Boniface has any comments or contributions to make at that time, he will have that opportunity. If I can continue, Mr. Speaker? He has been quite critical of late because he does not seem to appreciate what the Minister has accomplished with a particular agreement with Total Community Involvement Incorporated. He said that it is the worst agreement he has ever seen, from Hansard, page 2010. He is raving and ranting against the middleman who has been around since the NDP Government set up and licensed lotteries under the now Leader of the Opposition. He will not accept that, as I understand it, the restrictions on the middleman are now much tighter and much more demanding than what they were before. I am given to understand that these new restrictions are so tough that the middleman may not think it worthwhile to continue his contractual obligations and may therefore disappear from the scene, altogether much to the delight of the Member for St. Boniface, I would understand.

But why does he get so carried away? Why does he accuse this government of political payoffs as he did the other day, Hansard, page 2034? If I were the Member for St. Boniface I would study the Haig Report very carefully and what was said about the lack of wisdom that the Member for St. Boniface displayed when he acquiesced to having his son-in-law appointed by a board, which prior to that had been appointed by him as Minister. There were doubts about the qualification of his son-in-law, who I understand was employed as an embalmer's helper prior to his becoming sales manager of WLND. This is from the Haig Report on page 93, Mr. Speaker.

Then there were some strange irregularities under the management of his son-in-law in a case referred as Dynamic Distributors, involving supposedly illegal out-of-province sales of lottery tickets with the proceeds going into an employees' coffee fund, with which a lot more than coffee could have been bought. I suggest you read, Mr. Speaker, the Haig Report on pages 94 and 95.

Now this very same member accuses us of engaging in political payoffs. This is outrageous, coming from someone who is rather vulnerable himself and who is sitting in a glass house and throwing stones.

There is a lot of work to be in lotteries, but what the Minister of Fitness, Recreation and Sport has already achieved is a promising beginning and we can already see some light at the end of the tunnel. Why should the Minister have to be apologetic about the good work that has already been done, and why this emphasis on total community involvement? Does the Member for St. Boniface really expect that the present government and the present Minister responsible for Lotteries have an obligation to continue the dog fight with the community organizations where the Member for St. Boniface has left off?

I had thought that it was made perfectly clear to him that the present government was going to end the attitude of confrontation which the previous government in its dying days had shown towards so many groups, community groups included. We had said we would negotiate in good faith and avoid steering a collision course if it could be helped. We would not treat every organization with paranoid suspicion, but would clearly assess every situation on its own merits and then make a decision accordingly.

Negotiation and compromise are an accepted mode of interaction in a democratic society. Everybody negotiates in this country, nobody wants to have things confiscated from them in an arbitrary manner. That is why I am rather surprised, Mr.

Speaker, that the Member for St. Boniface as recently as last week, when he was greatly exercised over the TCI agreement, gave the following advice to the Minister, and I quote from Page 2035 in Hansard, "And again I say you don't owe these people anything. You were in the driver's seat" and so on, referring, of course, to negotiations with the more than 200 community organizations which have banded together under the TCI umbrella to run a lottery that has now come to an end. If he feels so strongly about this group, why did he not have the courage to deal with that issue when he was Minister and was in a position to call the shot? Why did he not settle that issue for once and for all by showing TCI that his government, the NDP Government, did not owe them anything and maybe shut down their operation by issuing a licence so restrictive that it would have forced them out of business? He obviously could not do it, because his colleagues in Cabinet were not impressed by his "sound tough" approach and gained some attention, just as the Member for Brandon East could not get his financial reorganization schemes for McKenzie Seeds passed.

The members on this side of the House are not impressed by either the Member for Brandon East or the Member for St. Boniface with their present grandstanding and phony advice that they now offer so gratuitously to the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport, who is doing an excellent job, and from whom the Member for St. Boniface can learn a lesson or two on how you deal with the sports community and the community organizations in the lotteries field in a civilized and successful manner without making enemies at every step.

Maybe the Member for St. Boniface had the best of intentions, but got wrong advice, or surrounded himself with people who did not possess the good judgement and expertise to carry out the former Minister's intentions. He is the only one who would know for sure just where he failed when he was able to call the shot, but if he still does not know just where his administration went wrong, maybe he should consult the Haig Report. Anybody who has read the Haig report can tell you why the previous NDP Government had such a disastrously poor relationship with the sports community and the community organizations involved in lotteries. But the Member for St. Boniface keeps saying, as he said the other day in Committee, namely, and I quote, "I don't think we needed the Haig Report at all, to be honest with you. I don't think they said anything we did not know" - out of Hansard, page 2036. Maybe he does not want to know. He may therefore be condemned to have to repeat his mistakes if ever, God forbid, he becomes Minister of Lotteries again.

I would like to quote from Chapter IV, Paragraph V, of the Haig Report which discusses how something else was taken away from the community organizations without proper negotiations, because, I believe, as he said, he did not owe them anything, and I quote: "Shortly after the establishment of Corporation A as the exclusive distributor in Manitoba, the Lotteries Commission provided that Corporation with copies of the lists of retailers and purchasers, which had been assembled by community organizations for their own sales purposes. The object for doing so was apparently to assist Corporation A in quickly establishing a broad retail base within and without Manitoba. That use of the Lotteries Commission's list provided widespread and long-lasting antagonism from community organizations against the Manitoba Lotteries Commission and Western Lottery (Manitoba) Distributor Incorporated."

So there you have one of the examples, small as it may be, which created long lasting antagonism and sure enough the Member for St. Boniface probably has his own explanation, which may or may not be at variance with the Haig Report.

The former Lotteries Minister may also claim that this is a petty sort of example, but I would not want that to go unchallenged, because I think there is a much larger and more weighty reason why things went wrong between . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks on a point of order.

MR. MILLER: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, could you tell me what resolution we are dealing with?

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 1.

MR. MILLER: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the comments that we have been listening to for the last ten minutes apply at all to the Whereases or the Be It Resolved.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There has always been a rather fair degree of latitude used in Private Members' Resolutions. In many cases they are couched rather vaguely. I don't find the honourable member's comments to be any more vague than other comments we have heard in this same debate.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Surely, Mr. Speaker, two wrongs don't make a right. I can appreciate vagueness, but surely is not misdirection and total irrelevance important to the subject matter?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield on the same point of order.

MR. ANDERSON: I think if one studies the lotteries field, one has to go back through the entire history of lotteries and I found it relevant and actually quite interesting as I read through various aspects of the history of lotteries in this province, and everything I said to this point has dealt directly with that.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes left in his time.
The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. ANDERSON: I think what is perhaps - I am drawing conclusions from the reactions of members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that there may be one other aspect that bears more directly, and that is their attitude towards the role, or their lack of appreciation of the role of the volunteer and volunteerism.

I would just like to quote from the Haig Report on his appreciation of the volunteer and volunteer organization. Chapter VI, Section III: "The volunteer and the volunteer organization in our community has an important, unique and a special role, whatever that volunteer's area of concern may be. The volunteer brings as a contribution to the community a special quality of heart and mind and a special kind of dedication which cannot be purchased with salary or wages. The support of community organizations and of the volunteers who participate in them ought not to be limited only to the funding of them for the projects they undertake which appear worthwhile and for the benefit of the community, but such support should also be extended, in my view, to permit them to engage in the raising of the funds necessary for those projects or undertakings." To that I can only add that anyone who understands these things about volunteers will try and treat them with a measure of respect, but I can tell from the various statements by the Member for St. Boniface, as he made them recently in Committee, that he really does not accept an enlightened view of volunteerism.

However, I can assure him that the present Minister of Fitness, Recreation and Sport understands volunteers and so do his colleagues, and that is why we on this side treat volunteers with respect. That is why at least two major agreements were negotiated last year, one with the Manitoba Sports Federation and more recently the one with Total Community Involvement Incorporated, which is the one that has the Member for St. Boniface in a state of fitful discontent and displeasure from which he is not likely to recover.

But let me talk about a matter which is much more important than the mere tilting of windmills engaged in by some members against some of our most patriotic community organizations. I am thinking of the Royal Canadian Legion, for example.

Let me refer to the resolution sponsored by the Member for Inkster who wants government-sponsored lotteries eliminated as a means of raising public revenue. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the member, I don't understand why this Resolution is before us unless we recognize that we are dealing with a state of mind which has a captive hold on the member's thinking and colors his outlook. As far as I am concerned, government-sponsored lotteries were eliminated as a means of raising public revenues when the Conservative Government came to power two and one-half years ago. The Conservative party I should tell him, much to his surprise perhaps, never did have a policy of augmenting government coffers by means of lotteries. That may have been the policy of the party to which the Member for Inkster used to belong, but I don't think it has been at any time my Party's aim.

We better listen carefully to what the Minister of Fitness, Recreation and Sport has to say on the subject, because then he will know the only reason the present government is continuing its involvement in the lotteries operation is for the purpose of achieving effective control over lotteries and making sure that any tendencies and pressures towards proliferation are contained. So make no mistake, the present government has only one overriding concern for being in the lotteries field, and that is to assure that there are proper controls and that the public is protected in the best possible way.

I would suggest that there may be some cynics on the other side of the House who are not quite ready to accept that fact, but if this government needs money for programs, I suggest it will raise that money honestly through taxation, and that has always been our position on this side of the House.

Now it is true that there are several million dollars that accrue to the Lotteries Commission as a result of its operations and I would say that money is properly viewed as an embarrassment rather than a blessing. It is the money that has to be siphoned off in the interests of controls so that there are not fat margins left somewhere which might attract the rip-off artists or the Mafia, as the Member for St. Boniface keeps warning us. I would just point out to all members that when this government came to power, Cabinet exercised discretionary control over 87.5 percent of lotteries' proceeds that could be spent on projects. That ratio is now down to something like 49 percent and will very likely be reduced even further. It is my hope that this ratio could be reduced to zero. I have noticed that the Member for St. Boniface was rather surprised that this is the direction the Minister wants to go, but I'll quote the member and his response directly. It is always nice to keep something that you can use some other way.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The honourable member's time has expired. I am sorry, the honourable member does not have leave. The Honourable Member for Springfield apparently does have leave.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, moved by myself and seconded by the Member for Portage la Prairie, that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word, efficient in the first WHEREAS and by substituting thereafter;

AND WHEREAS the revenues from government-sponsored lotteries are not intended to form part of the general revenues of the province;

AND WHEREAS the revenues from government-sponsored lotteries are intended to enhance community activities in culture, recreation and athletics;

AND WHEREAS, the government has been responsible for implementing changes to the lottery administration systems which will improve the efficiency of administration, marketing, and accountability for government-sponsored lotteries;

AND WHEREAS, the government has the responsibility to ensure equal levels of accountability for government licenced lotteries;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Legislative Assembly encourage the government to pursue its present policies to ensure that administrative and marketing systems for provincially sponsored or licensed lotteries are effective and efficient, and that revenues are directed to the objects intended, and such revenues are properly accounted for.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now we know that the silent one can speak, or I should say read. This is about the first time that he chose to make a speech in this House. He had all the opportunities to do so in committee but he didn't have the guts to do anything about it because he didn't want the answers. Now he read a speech that he doesn't understand, that is not like him at all, that somebody gave him - it is quite obvious. He takes cheap pot shots. If he had been in this House and you would have had to accept the explanations and let me start with the first one that he wants to attack me directly and try to have me lose credibility. I guess that is fair enough in this House, but that is one of the reasons why we are not respected outside of this House, is when we try to play these cheap kinds of games as the member just did.

He said that my son-in-law was the general manager of the people that are wholesaling, the corporation that are wholesaling a lottery, and no doubt he wanted to make it clear that I was responsible for that. Well if that's what he means he's a damn liar, Mr. Speaker, and I mention that in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he temper his words rather advisedly. There are such things as unparliamentary words, and I would hope that he considers carefully the language he is using. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: There is also decency and honesty and fair play and that wasn't demonstrated by this member. When you try to ruin somebody's character when you bring something that has been proven, that has been brought in here, might tell you that this person in question, and I never heard that people had less right, because they know somebody or are related to somebody, somebody that is a politician. I resent that very much because I think that is very low and certainly not something that any member in this House should try to engage in.

Now the member might say, Mr. Speaker, that first of all that person that he is talking about was hired by the Loto-Canada, which has nothing to do with the provinces, which had nothing to do with the party that I'm a member of here, which has nothing to do with me at all. He was hired. He applied for the job and got it on his own. Then when he was working there he was hired - there was a board that was never tampered with, a board of the western Canada, Manitoba distributors who without me knowing or having any inkling at all that this was being done, hired him. And when I heard about that I wrote a letter that I read right here in this House, and the member was here. If he had anything to say, that was time to do it. In fact I wrote a letter advising them to be careful and that I would hope that I didn't know why and I was disturbed that he was hired. And then they had, they could stand on their own merits, if you want to say all these people are crooked, you go ahead, and they can stand on their merits that they had all kinds of tests and I think that he is delivering. I am not going to apologize for that. I've been 22 years in this House, and if anything I remember that when I was Minister of Health, my sister sent me a letter applying for a job and I sent it back and I said this is not something that you are going to do to me, because you are going to go through the other channel. And I resent that very much, if anything I've been punished and my family have been punished because I have been a member of this House and I don't have to take that kind of crap from - idiotic words like we've had today by somebody else who doesn't want to come forward and fight.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, that this was the main thing. Then he said that we used the funds for lotteries in a partisan manner. And that also - well all right, I'll be very parliamentary - is so far away from the truth, Mr. Speaker, and the members here can tell you that one of the programs that we had was to help the build, construction on capital cost, and that there were many more people because if they happened to be representing constituencies that needed them, that receive anything from the revenue. And the revenue then was given to sports associations, a cultural thing. It was the only one that had anything to do with areas or constituencies or municipalities, and I challenge the member to say that this wasn't done honestly, and I know that some of the members that were here today came in to congratulate me and said that was a good program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I didn't try to be holier than thou, and it is my responsibility and you won't intimidate me by saying that I can't warn the members of this House, and if he doesn't want to heed the warning that's his business. That's his privilege. But I am afraid of legalized gambling. I am afraid of what is going to happen, what can happen and what's happening in other areas. I do not accuse the government of that. We were all together, it was brought in by a former Minister of the Conservative government who brought in the lottery, and he lobbied everyone of us and some members from all sides voted for, and some voted against. It was supposed to be a one-shot deal and it was to help exactly all these volunteers that he is talking about. It was to be a one-shot deal and then it was brought in again. Anybody that believed that was naive, including my friend from Inkster. He should have known better, that when you introduce like this you can't go - it's practically impossible to go back in that direction. And then he confessed that he was wrong and he is criticized for that. Well all right, he voted

against it. And I remember that some of these members voted for it and they are now sorry. But he's talking about not knowing. He doesn't know what he was talking about and he just repeated, parroted a speech, read a speech, and you let him do it. He read a speech that somebody else wrote for him. And I haven't got the time, I'd love to have the chance, I'd like to tackle him in committee, but he didn't say a word. What did I say? A sentence here and there, what did I say about TCI? I never denied the right of the members to bring in, or the Cabinet to bring in, the government to bring in any partners.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they've got a contract with somebody and they say, come on in, they're going in the right direction and they say, non-bearers tickets, but if you don't like it go back to sell non-bearers tickets. And you're saying in your resolution that this is the government that brought in measures that help in the accountability, and this is what he's saying. Then he's saying, Mr. Speaker, and you know what I object to, not the group, of course it's easy and as I've said before, that people who haven't got the guts to do anything else will fight these kind of battles that he did today, try to turn all the legions - when did I say a thing about the legions, or St. Paul's College, that I'm against all that and motherhood and everything else, because I accept my responsibility. And I worked damn hard on this question of lotteries that very few people in this House understood. And I took my responsibility very seriously and I dare say that they inherited, and the Minister will tell you himself, a darn good set-up. It wasn't perfect politically and I recognize the fact that politically some of the things were difficult to do, and it's a picnic now compared to what it was, and it's bringing the money for some of these people that were sitting on this side and they were doing everything to knock the system. We brought in a system, we united the provinces together to try to do away with proliferation of lotteries, tried to bring in accountability, trying to bring in a fair deal if we had to bring lotteries, and trying to cut down on the expenses and try to amalgamate and working together, and this is what he is criticizing.

And we brought in - we wanted it successful, to do it right away, and the Minister was saying we were weak, we didn't have the guts to do it. The member, he can say it, maybe we should, and if I had my way and it was no secret, we would have had bearers tickets immediately because this is the only way. We've had a situation in Manitoba where at times more than 70 percent of the tickets were not accounted for. And this is what we moved on. Then there was when there was the partners what I objected to, they say we're going to create an equal partner, a group, that as a group, wanted their own lottery, they were criticizing the lottery, what we were trying to do to bring this thing together, there was no competition, there was only Quebec that had the lottery, but all the other provinces were building it and what happened now would have happened earlier if we hadn't been prepared. And now they want to come in and I have no objection to that. They did everything to discredit their plan. There were statements given to the press by some of the members, by some of the middlemen that they are talking about, to criticize the lottery to try to - everything was done - to try to make it belly-up. But it's doing well and it's getting a lot of money and now they want to be a partner, fine, fine. I'm glad, I would like to see it. This is the direction we want to see, less proliferation and do away with some of the lotteries. But when you say you are a partner, an equal partner, there's four partners, and I defy all these businessmen, the free enterprisers, to tell me if I'm not right. They said all right, this is a company that was given the right to wholesale tickets here in Manitoba, and there were three partners. First of all, the Sports Federation. The Sports Federation were invited in, but they wanted to run their own, because they had a middle man also, and they were given the right, so they were given this chance against - and he calls that a confrontation. Calls that a confrontation, they were bringing in these, there was a lot of unaccountability. And we brought in an advisory board, which is according to The Act, and we said all right, we are not going to deprive sports of that. And they made recommendations, and he objected to, I thought that you had to go --(Interjection)-- I'll answer you after, any time you want, anywhere, but in the meantime I'm answering him. All right. The middle men are some of your friends, but we'll come back to that later.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There is lots of time for all members to get involved in the debate. Let's have one speaker at a time.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface. And I should warn him that the House is closing at 5:15 today, not 5:30.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's fine, they'll find other ways, at least I have a chance to, while it's hot, still talk about some of the unfair methods that were used in this House by the great silent one.

Mr. Speaker, the Sports Federation was saying, we are invited in, they did want to be in, then they have to come, nobody would admit that they were wrong and now they're a partner, that's what was intended from Day One. And that group that I was talking about, the TCI, are not a member and that's fine, but they are said, there's a group getting together, and just imagine, three partners, anybody there and say, okay, we are going to form a company and we are going to wholesale certain things. But then, and this is what I objected to, the last partner, the one that did everything to destroy that, still has the right to go and wholesale in competition to their own company, had the right to go into wholesale tickets. And when I was talking about, well I haven't got that much time, when I was talking about the middle man, to some of the things that I objected, and I wish the heck I would have known that the silent one was going to speak today, or was going to read a speech, because I would have brought some of the things that will open your eyes, some of the contracts of those middle men. If you think that's fair, so be it, you're entitled to it. But some of the things that they said, that first of all you could never see what was going on in a contract, the contract was done with one of the non-profit organizations, and they had one line, promotion, selling tickets. And some of the tickets, that, even any money that they collected, although the promoter never had anything to do with it, he got 25 percent. And he got to start a retainer of \$20,000 before anything moved, that he received \$175 for expenses, minus the gasoline, that 75 percent of his gas bills were paid. And if there was any winner, the money that goes to the non-profit organization, if there was a winner, that he would get 50 percent of that, and that he would get 25 percent of the profit, and that is what you want to set up here? My criticism is not of them. Sure, of course they're going to declare me their enemy, they've got a damn good thing. We brought the lotteries, and it was sold to us by the former Minister of the Conservative government who said, it is to help exactly, the pious words that you uttered just a while ago, it is to help these people, and look at where the money is going.

And this is not the role of a government, who has a monopoly on it to start dishing out these kind of goodies. And nobody can say that this system was set up like this. Look at all the other provinces, look at Quebec, as I mentioned before, that anybody that had an area, and they were friends of the government in power, and that is the danger, and when an investigation was done, it was found that every single one of them had kicked back \$5,000 to the Liberal party, the then governing party in Quebec. And this is what happened on a small scale because it wasn't set up like that by some of the middle men, some of the middle men that wanted to conserve that, and I defy, and I challenge the government to have an investigation on these people, and I'll eat my shirt if some of them are not making in excess of \$100,000.00. A lottery that we are supposed to have for these kind of causes.

You know, this thing was said, I am incensed because I consider that a pretty low trick that was done, drop something here, take something here, or quote, misquote, try to misrepresent, try to discredit a man and he wasn't intelligent enough to know that with an amendment, he was affording me the chance to speak again. I'll challenge the member right now, in front of your own constituents, anywhere, I will debate from one to the end, everything you want to debate on that. Anything at all. If you can prove, and I defy you, and I challenge you today to prove that I used my position to give any relatives of mine a job, and you should apologize for that because that is unworthy of a member of this House. And you knew it, you knew it or you read something blindly. That's what you did. You were told to read that and that was your claim to fame because you haven't opened your mouth in three years, and all of a sudden you read and read and read, and you were so proud of yourself, that you forgot, you read something, you didn't listen to what I said before, you weren't replying to that, you wanted to get back in the last chance, of somebody, that you didn't have the internal fortitude to debate with when we were going through the estimates of the Minister. Where you

could have had the answer, the explanation. I never battled with your Minister, I said, and I sympathized with him, on that one thing, of having a partner, bringing in a partner, the last one, the people bill that against all the odds and the problems that that final partner has created for them and then say, you're equal partner but you're equal than the others. Because you will share in the profit of this corporation. But you will also on your own, and you will duplicate, you will duplicate things, there is an office of the Greater Winnipeg Manitoba distributors, there will now be one of TCI, and they are partners in the same outfit. Duplication. It'll cost more money, less of that money that we're thinking is for such a good cause will go to all these volunteers which we are supposed to be against, which is another assinine ridiculous statement. These are the kind of things he said.

Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when somebody wants to make a speech he shouldn't go half-cocked and not blindly accept to speak for somebody, maybe in his constituency, to speak. You have to have the guts that sometime even if it's your own constituency, when you believe in something to stand up and say it. And that's what I did and that's what I'm faulted for. And there has been a lot of politics. As I said before, you can't talk about middle men, or talk about their operation, for getting any information. And anybody does anything right, why are you afraid to be scrutinized? To know what's going on.

And the only accusation I said is that TCI should have been welcomed as a partner, that it had the right of the present government, but it wasn't a right and I suspect that the Minister wasn't too happy with this arrangement.

Now, we've talked about the Haig Report. One person. He could not find a darn thing, he brought in the question of brothers and son-in-law . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Private Members' Hour having expired, when this item next comes up, the honourable member will have three minutes.

The hour being 5:30, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow (Thursday).