

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 7 June, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

## OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Community Services. I would ask him whether it is the intention of his department and the government to take over the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I'd almost think that's a facetious question coming from the honourable member. If any such major move were ever contemplated or seriously considered, it would certainly be preceded by a major analysis, review, public hearings, etc. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asks a policy question.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister describes it first as a facetious question and, secondly, as a policy question. So if government policy is to be viewed in a facetious light, then I suppose those two descriptions jibe, but I think that in view of the announcements over the weekend and the anxieties expressed by members of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, that the question is legitimate.

I would ask him where the government intends to go from here on the White Paper on Family Law that was prepared by Family Court Judge Robert Carr, and specifically where it intends to go with respect to the proposals or recommendations coming out of that White Paper having to do with the Winnipeg Children's Aid Society.

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, since that report was prepared for my department at my request, I think it's appropriate that I answer that question.

The press announcement accompanying the release of the report made it perfectly clear that this was no more than a paper prepared by independent counsel retained in order to look at various aspects of Family Law and present recommendations and that, thereafter, the report would be distributed as it has been, first of all, to members of the House through caucuses, secondly, to interested groups and individuals to receive comments over a period of time. Based on the

comments, by fall we would see what requirements there might be for public hearings related to the entire report.

It's interesting that the press - and the press is entitled to report news as they see it - fastened on what really only amounts to about 10 percent of what the report deals with. The main impact of the report will be on other aspects of Family Law particularly having to do with the concept, which is not a new one, of the unified Family Court and the consolidation of Family Law Statutes so that there's some rationalization.

It dealt with some aspects of the Children's Aid Society operation. I have not, I must admit, read the report in total; I've read the recommendations. It's not my recollection that there was any recommendation having to do with government taking over the Children's Aid, and if so, it was the recommendation of independent counsel reporting on his particular views of the legislation. It certainly does not reflect government's position which has not yet developed on these issues. That will develop after we've had input from interested groups in the community and after, by fall, we deem it necessary or otherwise to have public hearings.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. B. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Honourable Minister of Community Services whether his department and his office is, at the present time, studying or examining the structure of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg with a view to either decentralization into four district offices, as is suggested in the Robert Carr Report, or with a view to any kind of changes in administrative structure and authority.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, the short answer is, no. I have seen a copy of the Carr Report and I have read parts pertaining to child welfare and they make some very good suggestions. We are trying, through the department, to get all children's aid organizations, not Children's Aid Society per se, but there are many other organizations that deal with the welfare of children, Children's Home of Winnipeg and many other organizations, we are making an effort to try to get better coordination among them, in view of some of the serious problems that have been expressed in the public media in the last few months.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, on the same subject, the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, can the Minister advise the House whether he can inform legislators and the public of Manitoba as a consequence of concerns that have been expressed, the parameters of Winnipeg Children's Aid Society policy and practices on the assessment of infants and young children's intelligence prior to placement or adoption and whether, in fact, the case having to do with the request

for personal records by a former ward of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg which has received some publicity in recent weeks, represents a precedent that will be pursued by his office in the future when similar requests for records arise?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't consider this a precedent, to answer the honourable member's question, the latter part of his question. This is a very special case, as I'm advised by staff, and it's a file that the individual has been seeking, I understand, for about eight years. I also am advised that he was given access to the file at least to read over, some years back. So it's not as though what has happened now is a matter of providing new information to that individual. I can appreciate the necessity for confidentiality of files, but this is a case dealing with the medical history of an individual and it was deemed to be a very special situation.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the specific and special nature of the particular incident and the particular case, but in view of statements that have been made or reported to have been made by spokesmen for the Winnipeg Children's Aid Society, can the Minister advise the House whether he will make known the agency's policy and practices on intelligence assessments of its wards, particularly of infants and small children; the practices and policies followed by the Winnipeg Children's Aid Society with respect to assessing the intelligence and potential intelligence of its wards?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member should know as a former Minister in this area, the Children's Aid Society, not only of Winnipeg but the other Children's Aid Societies we have in this province, have procedures and practices which they have evolved over the years. They are a Society which has a certain responsibility under legislation and they carry out these practices and procedures to the best of their ability. I don't think it's for me to get into the detail as to these kinds of assessments that the honourable member asks about.

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In view of the fact that the Canadian dollar reached an all time recorded low of less than 80 cents over the weekend and today's trading has stayed below 80 cents; in view of the fact that the First Minister in February supported a Canadian dollar at the level of 75 cents, even though that would have an effect of increasing the debt of all Manitobans by over \$200 million, can the First Minister advise if he has been in touch with either the Office of the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance of Canada urging them not to support the Canadian dollar in order that it may fall to the desired level that he advocated in February?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Leader of the Opposition misunderstood the basic

thrust, not only of the Premier of Manitoba but other Premiers which I believe by vast majority are Conservative Premiers, at the February 2nd to 4th Conference of First Ministers and that is that all Premiers called upon by the Federal Government for a lower interest rate policy.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, to get back to the original point, in view of the fact that the First Minister of Manitoba supported a 75 cent Canadian dollar at the last February conference of First Ministers, does he still hold to that position even though it would cost the taxpayers of Manitoba in terms of increase on their debt something in the area of \$200 million dollars?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, though I do not necessarily disagree, the reference to a 75-cent dollar came from the Leader of the Opposition's former colleague, the Premier of Alberta, Peter Lougheed, who indicated specifically that a 75-cent dollar might indeed be in the interests of Canada. Our position was, Mr. Speaker, that we should be moving towards a clear-cut policy thrust on the part of the Federal Government in support of lower interest rates and secondly, that there should be less concern in regard to superficial propping up of the Canadian dollar. That is a view that is shared by, I believe, every Premier in Canada presently. I'm not sure about the newly elected Premier of Saskatchewan who was not at the conference, but certainly all other Premiers, that the emphasis and the thrust of the Federal Government is misplaced.

I think, Mr. Speaker - and I am pleased that the Leader of the Opposition has given me this opportunity to further comment - that the thrust that came from Versailles is that, indeed, it is time that we do deliver a message to Washington that has been the architect of high interest rate policy, a policy which has had devastating effect, not only on the economy of Canada but the economies of all western countries.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, if I can return the Honourable First Minister's mind to the question at issue which is the 75-cent Canadian dollar which he advocated in February of 1982, has he been in touch with the Office of the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance over the weekend to urge them to follow the policy that he just espoused, namely, not to prop up the Canadian dollar at the 79 cent level, but rather to let it fall to 75 cents, notwithstanding the fact that this would have an impact of costing the taxpayers of Manitoba some \$200 million on the debt that they already owe?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, again it appears that the Leader of the Opposition has incorrectly interpreted the efforts by all the First Ministers at the First Ministers' Conference, February 2nd to 4th. I know, indeed, that there is a strong inclination on the part of those across from us to favour a high interest rate policy. That is not the position of the Government of the Province of Manitoba or other governments in various provincial Legislatures across the country. We have said and we say again that we want a lower interest rate policy; that the present interest rate policy is such as to strangle economic activity in Canada;

it is to create bankruptcies; it is to torpedo the creation of jobs throughout Canada and a clear-cut message must be delivered to Ottawa, so that Ottawa in turn delivers a clear-cut message to Washington.

Indeed, I would like to take this opportunity to call upon the Leader of the Opposition and the party across the way to join with us and nine other Premiers in Canada, at least eight out of nine other Premiers in Canada, in delivering that clear-cut message to the Prime Minister of Canada to be related to Washington.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, at the risk of stating the obvious and thereby aping my honourable friend, may I say that this party is in favour of motherhood and against high interest rates. My question, Mr. Speaker, is this. Has the First Minister communicated to the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance his urgings of last February that the Canadian dollar be allowed to drop to 75 cents and has he concurrently urged them not to prop up the Canadian dollar as they are doing with hundreds of millions of dollars of borrowed money at the present time to keep it at somewhere in the mid-79-cent range?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, again, I remind the Leader of the Opposition that the specific reference to a 75-cent dollar came from the Premier of Alberta, Peter Lougheed. Our position is very clear again, that we support a lower interest rate policy; that we are opposed to the superficial propping up of the Canadian dollar; that the main objective should be to lower the interest rate throughout Canada. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that even if the Canadian dollar did decline as a result of that practice, the economic stimulation that would be generated throughout Canada, including Manitoba, along with the achievement of greater self-sufficiency that would flow within the economic and social structure of Canada, would more than offset any additional costs that would be required in order to meet any payment in regard to bonds and other debentures.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps we'll be more successful in getting a clear answer from the First Minister on this question. In view of his reported comment to the press Thursday last, I believe it was, to the effect that the Government of Manitoba would not be contemplating any exemptions to its invidious payroll tax; in view of the explanation that the First Minister is alleged to have given that this might provide the Federal Government with some excuse for calling it a discriminatory tax, does this mean that the First Minister or his government have now received a written opinion from the law officers of the Crown as to the constitutionality of this tax vis-à-vis this Legislature of Manitoba applying a tax against the Federal Government?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I do gather a sense that the only concern regarding the legality of the proposed tax appears to be originating with the Leader of the Opposition and, I believe, the Member for Provencher in the Federal Parliament that once, along with other Federal Members of Parliament, opposed what Ottawa was doing by way of cutbacks, by way of federal transfer payments, but appears to

have joined with the Leader of the Opposition in attempting to create some doubts in regard to the legality.

Mr. Speaker, no one else appears to be questioning, certainly the Federal Government's not questioning the legality that I'm aware of in regard to the proposed tax. There had been, to my understanding, no lawyers that have shared with either the Minister of Finance or with myself any concerns about the legality of the proposed tax.

This concern appears to be centred chiefly within the minds of two Conservatives, the Leader of the Opposition and the Member of Parliament for Provencher.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, to get the First Minister back to the point again, Sir, this Legislature within a matter, we hope, of a few days is going to be asked to consider the Enabling Legislation for the payroll tax which this government has inflicted upon the people of Manitoba or hopes to inflict upon the people of Manitoba. In the course of giving consideration to that tax, this Legislature is going to be asked, Sir, to pass a tax which purports to affect the Federal Government. Thinking members on all sides of the House would, I think, want to have assurance from the law officers of the Crown that the Act that we are about to pass or are being asked to pass, aside from its invidious nature, is constitutional insofar as that Act purports to tax the Federal Government.

Can the Honourable First Minister answer the question very simply, yes or no: has he had a legal opinion from the law officers of the Crown on the constitutionality of this legislation and if so, could the House please have that opinion before we're asked to consider this legislation?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I have no legal opinion. I am satisfied, indeed, that this tax is one that is legitimate and that we would, if challenged, defend in any court of law, but we don't have to because, Mr. Speaker, if we are challenged then the Province of Quebec will be challenged and the Province of Alberta would likely be challenged; the Province of British Columbia would likely be challenged; the Province of Ontario would likely be challenged.

Mr. Speaker, the only unfortunate aspect is that when the Province of Quebec initiated this tax some years ago affecting the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba and other taxpayers throughout Canada, if the Leader of the Opposition at that time felt it was illegal, that he didn't undertake action at that time in order to prevent the imposition of that tax by the Province of Quebec because it would have, according to his thinking, illegally been affecting Manitobans to the extend of millions of dollars.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, the more I listen to the Honourable First Minister, the more I realize that this House needs an opinion from the law officers of the Crown as to the constitutionality of the legislation that he or his Minister of Finance will be bringing in.

Can we have an undertaking, Mr. Speaker, from the First Minister that he will provide this House with a legal opinion from the law officers of the Crown which will back up the position which he takes off the cuff

without apparently the benefit of any legal opinion?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I point out to you that the question of the Leader of the Opposition is repetitive and has been answered and insofar as the legality of the tax, we have no concern. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to initiate somebody to challenge the legislation, then I suppose that is up to the Leader of the Opposition. We have had no indication of any intention on the part of Ottawa, because if Ottawa was to deliver any such intention, they would deliver it to a number of other provinces as well and not just to Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, what the Leader of the Opposition indeed is suggesting that in some way or form, we cannot do in the Province of Manitoba, that we lack within the power of the jurisdiction of the Province of Manitoba to do that which other provinces are doing in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I find that sort of thinking reprehensible and certainly would not reflect the thinking of this government as long as it is in power.

**HON. S. LYON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only regard as unfortunate the thinking of a First Minister of this province, who is at one and the same time a lawyer, if he regards it as reprehensible to seek advice of a legal nature on the constitutionality of a problem.

My simple question, Mr. Speaker, is this - and I won't go out on a limb and say whether it's constitutional or not. I asked the question though because it is a moot point as to whether or not the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba has the right to impose a tax upon the Federal Government.

Can we have an opinion from the law officers of the Crown of Manitoba telling this Legislature that it has the right to impose that tax? Yes or no?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I do have to turn to you as to whether a question asked for four times in the same form is indeed appropriate in this Legislature?

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Could the Attorney-General inform the House as to how much notice is required to the RCMP, how much lead time is required for them in order to provide emergency police services in the City of Winnipeg if necessary?

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** I regret any implication that there may be in the question that that situation prevails. It's my information obtained as recently as this morning that negotiations between the City of Winnipeg and its Police Union have been taking place over the weekend in a very good atmosphere. The atmosphere in fact is, if anything, considerably improved over late last week and there is every reason to expect that rationality will prevail and there will be a settlement.

However, directly to the question: as I explained in the House when the question was first asked of me, what would have to happen is that the City of Winnipeg would have to be in such a position that the

Executive Policy Committee or the Council itself felt that there was the need for some assistance. There would have to be a formal request; there would have to be some discussion as to whether or not that formal request ought to be met. But dealing if I may, because I would prefer to hypothetically, it's my understanding that if there should be at some future date an emergency requiring the assistance of the RCMP in terms of policing duties within the City of Winnipeg other than those that they normally carry out with respect to Federal statutes, the RCMP can be available in some considerable strength in less than 24 hours.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, as the Attorney-General knows, no member of this House wants to see a police strike in the City of Winnipeg. My concern in asking a question arises from the fact that there has been an indication that the City of Winnipeg Police Force may go on strike without notice.

The Attorney-General has now indicated it would require up to 24 hours for the RCMP to be in a position to provide a full emergency service. I can only ask the Attorney-General if he would use his good office to ensure that a time lapse does not occur where the City is left without any police service at all.

**HON. R. PENNER:** I did say that it would be less than 24 hours, is the information I have, for the RCMP to provide emergency service should it be required in the event of some civil calamity and I don't think any greater assurance than that is needed at present.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, on another matter to the Attorney-General, could he advise whether he has completed his review of the rent control legislation and first contract legislation which he undertook during consideration of his department's Estimates, to review in terms of whether or not they comply with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms under the Constitution? Has he completed that review and if so, what is the result of that review?

**HON. R. PENNER:** I have not completed my review of The Rent Review Regulation Act with respect to the questions raised by the Member for St. Norbert during Estimates. I don't recall him raising any similar question with respect to The Labour Relations Act, but if he did I can assure him that my understanding of that legislation - and I've dealt with almost exactly the same legislation as it pertains in British Columbia, Quebec and under The Canada Labour Relations Act - is that there is no conflict at all with the Charter of Rights.

If there is any conflict, and I don't think there is, between certain specific provisions of The Rent Regulation Review Act and the Charter, it is only in terms of some minor provisions having to do with enforcement but there is, in my view, no conflict between the substantial provisions of The Rent Regulation Review Act and the Charter.

There are one or two questions which we are looking at in general with respect to all statutes in the Province of Manitoba where there are search and seizure provisions. These are the main areas that one would look at to see whether they comply with Section 11 of the Charter, I believe it's Section 11, having to do

with the guarantee of reasonable search and seizure.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, a final question to the Minister of Natural Resources. Will he be providing any relief to senior citizens with respect to his increase in park fees and campground fees?

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, in respect to park users' fees, as indicated earlier, the revision in the fee structure represents some increase, such that the recovery of costs, I think, are increased marginally from 25 to 30 percent in respect to all users of park services, regardless of who they are.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Has the Minister of Finance yet been able to determine what the cost to the taxpayers will be of the proposed settlement with Manitoba Government Employees Association?

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, as I had indicated previously to the Leader of the Opposition, we expected that there would be a cost in addition to what has been budgeted for in the Estimates for this coming year, to be an additional cost of approximately \$6 million. It's been refined somewhat by the Department of Finance to be somewhere between \$5.4 and \$8.7 million in cost additional to what is contained in the Estimates, including the provision of \$10 million additional which had been shown as an approximate, expected increased cost as a result of a settlement.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the Minister of Finance undertook to satisfy himself that, in the case of a couple from St. James by the name of Hayes that were involved in a tax problem with the Federal Government, the law had been applied fairly and equitably in this case. Does he yet have a report to make to the House?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable member that in accordance with the investigation we have carried out, it appears that the law has not been violated in any manner by the officers involved in that particular event.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Community Services. I would ask him, Sir, whether he has completed his independent review of the needs of children at the St. Amant Centre?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House who is supervising or leading the conduct of that review?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should know the answer to that. There are people in the department who are responsible in this area of activity, the Director of Mental Retardation Programs, Dr. Glen Lowther, and certainly my Deputy Minister, to name two senior people.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the reason I ask the question is because I don't know the answer to that and I'm glad to have that information from the Minister that Dr. Glen Lowther is involved. How would the Minister describe the independent aspect of the review? Who is providing the independence to the review?

**HON. L. EVANS:** If the honourable member relates back to the - I guess it was the discussion during the Estimates review of my department - I indicated at that time that it was my hope to have a small, independent appraisal made of this particular question. By small I mean to the point, a very brief, concise effort made to review this and for various reasons, this was not put into place. But we're looking to other people and we've talked to a number of people to get other views. In particular, I'm awaiting an early reply from some of the people who are working on the Mental Retardation Task Force which the honourable member, I believe, set up when he was the Minister responsible.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, when does the Minister expect the report of that ministerial task force on mental retardation?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the task force has taken a great deal of time to complete its work; I think far more time than anyone imagined. The task force did ask for, I think, at least two extensions over the years. We are hoping that we will get a report very very soon from the task force. I can't be very precise as to the date or the week but we're looking for it in the very very near future and we're not sure to what extent it can or will address the problem of institutionalization versus community living. But this, as the honourable member knows, is a very serious matter, a matter that causes some differences of opinion among people concerned with mental retardation, but we would like to get that report as soon as possible.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the merits of the St. Amant Centre - and they are many and mighty and considerable and subscribed to I'm sure, by everybody in this House - can the Minister now give this House and the community living advocates in the mental retardation field, the assurance that I asked him for and didn't get from him last week, that no decision on capital expansion of an institution in the mental retardation field will be made no matter how meritorious, until he has received the results of his independent review of the needs of children at St. Amant and the report of the ministerial task force into

mental retardation?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, we will be making a final policy decision based on certain actions, certain processes and one of which I alluded to and the member alluded to. I explained already the difficulty we had with this Independent Appraisal Committee that the member refers to. I'm satisfied that we're taking all the steps necessary to take a rational look at a very important question and we will be dealing with it on a rational basis, using information from various sources.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the community living advocates are not so satisfied.

When will the Minister sit down with the community living advocates in the M.R. field and discuss this whole question with them and explain to them what he is doing and reassure them that their ambitions are not being trampled?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, the member should know and indeed the people throughout Manitoba who are concerned with fulfilling objectives of community living, should know that this government has made great strides in the past few months towards enhancing community living. As a matter of fact, if you look at the Estimates of this department very closely, you'll see we've increased by 29 percent the funding for mental retardation people to live in the community, whether it be some extra funding through the Day Care Program for Mentally Retarded; whether it be additional funding for Respite - and the member knows what we're talking there about, the parents who have mentally retarded children who need a break once in awhile so that they can keep their children at home - or whether it be for more community living in the various group homes that are being talked of and —(Interjection)— name one what?

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Name one community residence that you've approved.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been hundreds of thousands of dollars set aside in the Budget, approximately half-a-million dollars are in the Budget for community residences and these monies will be allocated in a very careful way. There are many organizations involved in the field of mental retardation beyond the CAMR.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General approve, or is he consulted on the contracts or arrangements with lawyers when the government needs or requires outside legal advice?

**HON. R. PENNER:** The General Manual of Administration requires that the appointment by any department of government of outside counsel must come through the office of the Attorney-General. At that time, I refer the matter to the Director of Civil Litigation. The Director of Civil Litigation and the Deputy

Attorney-General arrange for the actual contracting with, or the retainer of, outside counsel so appointed.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

Is the Minister considering asking the Federal Government to change the agreement between CMHC and MHRC with respect to subsidies for senior citizen housing in Manitoba, which limits their rental payments to 25 percent of their gross income?

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with any initiatives in that respect of recent days. Certainly, we are concerned about the cost to seniors of rents and I think we're doing our utmost to ensure that there are sufficient units available for senior citizens. I have been happy to participate in the official building ceremonies in respect to substantial senior citizen development in the Lions' Place in Winnipeg. Certainly, we are concerned about the ability of seniors to find decent accommodation at reasonable cost.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for Oral Questions having expired, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where there are 12 students of Grades 5 and 6 standing of the Julie Lindal School under the direction of Mr. Noel and Mrs. Eileen Hapley. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### ORDER FOR RETURN

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Tuxedo;

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the total Provincial funds paid since their inception to:

1. The French Cultural Center, St. Boniface, as follows:

- a) Capital
- b) Operating
- c) Deficit Reduction
- d) Special Grants, and
- e) Programming

2. The Mennonite Village Museum, Steinbach, as follows:

- a) Capital
- b) Operating
- c) Deficit Reduction
- d) Special Grants
- e) Programming

3. The Ukrainian Cultural and Educational Center, Winnipeg, as follows:

- a) Capital
- b) Operating
- c) Deficit Reduction
- d) Special Grants, and
- e) Programming

**MOTION presented.**

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we'll endeavour to get that information as quickly as possible, although I just caution members that some of those organizations have been in existence for a number of years in the Province of Manitoba and it will take some time to get the information to complete the Order for Return.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

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

### COMMITTEE CHANGES

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, just before calling Second Readings, I would like to make the following substitutions for the Committee on Economic Development meeting tomorrow.

The Honourable Minister of Economic Development will substitute for the Member for Inkster.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services will substitute for the Member for Rupertsland and the Member for Riel will substitute for the Member for The Pas.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** For the same Committee, Mr. Speaker, in the Economic Development Committee for tomorrow morning I'd like to substitute the name of the Member for Roblin-Russell for the Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, would you please call Second Readings on Bills 26 to 47 inclusive?

### SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS BILL 26 - THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

**HON. R. PENNER** presented Bill No. 26, An Act to amend the Human Rights Act for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill No.

26, An Act to amend the Human Rights Act incorporates, first of all, the provisions of The White Cane Act into The Human Rights Act where it more properly belongs and The White Cane Act will be repealed. This is, I think, a move that's been planned for some time.

Secondly, mental handicap has been added as a prohibited ground of discrimination. For several years The Human Rights Act has sought to protect the victims of physical handicap from discrimination and we have determined that the same protection should enure to the benefit of persons who suffer from some mental handicap. I might just point out here that this provision is incorporated in the Charter of Rights under Section 15 which comes into force in something less than three years.

The Act has also been amended to include family status as a prohibited ground for discrimination in all parts of the Act. It presently exists in some, but by oversight has not been applicable in all parts of the Act.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, where a board of adjudication is appointed to hear and decide on any complaint under the Act the board must, under the proposed change, report to the Attorney-General where a decision or finding is not rendered within 90 days after the conclusion of a hearing. The reason for this proposal is this, that recently a board of adjudication did not render a decision until 16 months after the conclusion of the hearing causing acute embarrassment for the Commission and indeed for my department and for the complainant, and indeed for the defendants. The amendments would permit the Attorney-General to revoke the appointment of a board of adjudication and appoint a new board of adjudication or fix a time within which the board must render its decision or finding, subject to that 90-day lead time.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these amendments to Members of the Legislature as being improvements to the Act. I hope that all members will join with me in supporting these amendments which are intended to strengthen human rights protection in this province.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### BILL 30 - THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION ACT

**HON. R. PENNER** presented Bill No. 30, The Legislative Assembly Management Commission Act, Loi sur la commission de regie de l'assemblee legislative for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, in introducing this bill at Second Reading I would like to commend the Member for Springfield who is really the architect, in a very substantial way, of this bill. I would like to commend him, not only for the work, the

energy, the enthusiasm that he has put into it, but for the way in which he has consulted with members opposite to try and arrive, and I hope time will prove that he has arrived at a consensus with respect to this important piece of legislation.

The Legislative Assembly Management Commission Act replaces The Board of Internal Economy Commissioners Act which, until this time, has provided for the management of the Assembly and its associated officers up till now by a three-person board chaired by the Speaker and consisting of the Speaker and two Cabinet Ministers.

This new bill will provide for a commission of eight members, once again chaired by Mr. Speaker, but including members of both recognized parties currently in the Legislature. The bill also provides for membership on the commission in the event there is a third recognized party in the Legislature. The major principle embodied in this change is to remove the responsibility for management of the Assembly from the direct authority of the Executive Council and provide that the Assembly will be managed on an all-party basis by all members in the House. Representatives to the commission are appointed by the respective caucuses. Management authority similar to that now used by the Board of Internal Economy will be given to the new commission. In addition the commission will have the sole responsibility for settling the Estimates of Expenditures for the Assembly, the Assembly offices, the Provincial Auditor, the Chief Electoral Officer and the Ombudsman and their respective offices.

As is the case with Estimates prepared by government, these Estimates must still be submitted to the House for examination and approval. The commission will be expected to make recommendations to the House with respect to changes in The Legislative Assembly Act or any other statute, insofar as these statutes may deal with the management of the Assembly, the provision of services to members or the specific needs of various Assembly officers. The other provisions in the bill provide the approximate equivalent of ministerial authority to the commission with the specific intent that the Legislative Assembly manage its own affairs. I view this bill as a progressive instrument which compares favourably with similar provisions in other jurisdictions and I take great pleasure in recommending it to the House.

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

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** On a matter of clarification, did the Attorney-General in his remarks say that this commission shall have the sole authority for the Estimates of the Department of Legislation?

**HON. R. PENNER:** Prepares the Estimates for submission to the House; as with all other Estimates, it is the House which has ultimate authority over the Estimates.

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

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

### **BILL 37 - THE MANITOBA HEALTH RESEARCH COUNCIL ACT**

**HON. L. DESJARDINS** presented Bill No. 37, Loi sur le Conseil de la recherche medicale du Manitoba, The Manitoba Health Research Council Act for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

### **BILL NO. 37 - THE MANITOBA HEALTH RESEARCH COUNCIL ACT**

**HON. L. DESJARDINS** presented Bill No. 37, Loi sur le Conseil de la recherche medicale du Manitoba, The Manitoba Health Research Council Act for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Manitoba Health Research Council was established by the former government in December of 1980. The Council reports to the Minister of Health and the Council is chaired by Dr. L. Israel of the Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation.

All members are serving two-year terms pending the proclamation of The Health Research Act at which time membership would conform to the provision of the Act. The Act also will provide legislative authority for the Health Research Fund with appropriate staff to administer the Fund. The establishment of the Fund will enable the Council to receive gifts, bequests and monies otherwise made available to the Council in addition to funds from government.

In the interim, the staff, a single administrative secretary, is a term-staff position and the responsibility for the funds are located in the Research Branch of the Department of Health with policy direction provided by the Council via Dr. Israel, an administrative supervisor provided by the departmental Research Director.

Following the proclamation of the Act, the Council will require an Executive Director to supervise the fund and its staff and to actively raise monies for the research funds for the Council. It should be noted that due to the low level of funding to date and the lack of a long-term funding commitment, the Council has not been in a position to fund any projects for more than one year. This is an acceptable position for a new funding Council but one which we'd hope should change within the next few years.

The third competition in 1982-83 is currently in process and they have received 105 applications. The review process will be completed by June 15 of this year, but it is unlikely that more than 40 applicants will be able to be funded with the current \$600,000.00.

When the Council was established, the Federal Government had simply frozen or cut back funds available for Health Research in Canada, through



which Manitobans were affected by a reduction in funds for which they could compete. The Council, therefore, undertook to fund basic, clinical and applied research in the health science and services; they have personal awards, that is, scholarships, studentships and fellowships and project grants such as equipment and research-operating projects. British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia had already established and funded similar provincial councils prior to the Manitoba decision to do likewise.

Since that time, the established program financing reduction of federal funds in both health and education had further reduced the level in amounts of funding available to Manitoba health researchers, in that federal grant funds have not been increased to compensate for these reductions, and these competitive funds are being used more and more just to maintain existing programs. This serves to reduce funds available for Health Research and inflation has further eroded the value of the funds for research. Therefore, as federal funding has become even more precarious that when the Council was established the Health Research one has become even more important to Manitoba health researchers.

Without such a fund supported and expanded level of our government, and appropriately staffed, Manitoba will continue to lose its valuable human resource of health researchers for those provinces and countries with better health research funding levels. Such funding decisions will have an impact both on Manitoba's ability to teach in the health disciplines and on the quality of health care available to all Manitobans.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Charleswood, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes. Oh, I'm sorry, there's still another bill on Second Reading.

### **BILL NO. 47 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE FISHERIES ACT**

**HON. A. MACKLING** presented Bill No. 47, An Act to amend The Fisheries Act for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of bill that I really don't think that any explanation is necessary. I think it could be passed and go to Committee. It merely changes the figures, the words "\$2 million" for other figures. To be in accordance with the rules I won't give the precise change, but it's an increase in funding.

This is a program that is of long standing. It's money that's voted. The funding for fisheries, for fishermen is provided for under this Act. The money is administered under the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. It provides loans for fishermen who otherwise would have difficulty securing funding from the private sources. Because of the higher costs involved in fishing and the fact that the return of money through the loans has not kept pace with the loans demands, it's necessary to increase the amount of capital.

It's as simple as that, Mr. Speaker, and I would think honourable members would like to see this go to Committee.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Tuxedo, that the debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, there'll be no Private Members' Hour today. I spoke to the Opposition House Leader about that and —(Interjection)— well, why check again, I spoke with him once.

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

**HON. S. LYON:** I just spoke to the Opposition House Leader and was under the impression that there was to be a Private Members' Hour today. It's within the gift of the Opposition not the Government to make that determination.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Of course, I understand that fully well and don't need those kinds of instructions from the member opposite who doesn't even know about the presumption of constitutionality of bills introduced into this Legislature.

I spoke to the Opposition House Leader as it was my duty to do and he said, well, it's entirely up to you since the first bill standing on Proposed Resolutions under Private Members' Hour is in the name of one of your members, and I said fine. If it's up to me then we want to get on and complete Estimates. On that understanding I would move, seconded by the Minister of Labour —(Interjection)—

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

**HON. S. LYON:** I'm not aware of that understanding, Mr. Speaker, and it will take just a few moments to get the House Leader. If he made that understanding, we'll stand by it, but that's not the information that was left with us.

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** I'll simply move, seconded by the

Minister of Labour that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote and the Honourable Member for The Pas in the Chair for the Department of Executive Council.

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

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

**MR. CHAIRMAN, H. Harapiak:** The Item we have left is on No. 1. General Administration: 1.(a) Premier and President of the Council's Salary - the Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** A couple of general questions, Mr. Chairman, that I don't believe I asked the other night, relating back to Items 1.(a), (b) and (c), which are shown on the Estimates as having a cost of \$776,400 for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982 and then the same Item for the fiscal year that we're voting, 1983, \$978,000, roughly \$202,000 increase or something in that order. I realize that information was given to us about the number of employees and so on. Could we have some general breakdown as to what is the cause of that \$200,000 increase?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** First, there was the French Language Services. I believe that is an Item that would have been included under this year's Estimates, not included under last year, because last year it was under the Department of Cultural Affairs.

**HON. S. LYON:** I think that comes later on, though. These are figures in the mid-column, midway down the column.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Under 1.(c) Management and Administration?

**HON. S. LYON:** Yes.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** There is the addition of a Coordinator's position and the Premier's Secretary, which is one net gain in staff in the Office of the Premier. There is a provision for merit increments. Three, there's a workload change and under Other Expenditures, which would be included in that total figure, would be the - I should point out that in 1981-82, there was a vote of 127,300 to our appropriation this year of 220,300 which appears large. However, I am told the actual 1980-81 level was 225,500 and the actual 1981-1982 required an additional 126,300 by way of Special Warrant and sub-appropriation transfers, resulting in actual spending of \$253,600 last year rather than the sum as indicated as being the last year's expenditure.

So, the increase is due to far too low an appropriation in last year's printed Estimates.

**HON. S. LYON:** Could we have some idea of how much of that \$200,000 print-over-print increase is involved for merit increments?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Now, I would hate to hazard a guess on that. I could obtain that information. I'm fearful of guesstimating without checking out the exact amount. It would not be a significant amount. The main is the difference in the sum that was not appropriated last year that ought to have been.

**HON. S. LYON:** There was a report before the government for consideration of senior excluded personnel's salaries. A study had been commissioned, I believe, by the Department of Labour on this category, which showed that Manitoba, by comparison, was running rather well behind in senior executive salaries to deputies and to other senior personnel. I am just wondering if the First Minister, Mr. Chairman, has had an opportunity, and the government, to look at that report. What are its views about its implementation or partial implementation or whatever?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** It is still under review and I must indicate to the Leader of the Opposition it is not a matter of priority at this point to the government, in view of the overall circumstances that we are confronted with.

**HON. S. LYON:** Would it be safe to say then that the merit increment that will be offered to the senior Civil Service within the Executive Council, and I realize this would apply to other senior positions as well, would then follow the percentage of settlement that is being offered to the Manitoba Government Employees Association.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** No, it would be too early to indicate that we have determined that we will apply to out-of-scope employees the same percentage settlement as we have provided for with the in-scope employees.

**HON. S. LYON:** What would be the view, Mr. Chairman, of the First Minister with the finding as I recall it and I'm only going from memory, I presume the reports are still about in the files somewhere, to the effect that in Manitoba over the years there had grown up a situation whereby the senior professional levels of the Civil Service were very, very close to those included within the bargaining unit, with the result that, as I recall the report saying to the government, the wages of the senior people were in some cases barely competitive with those who were within the bargaining unit. Of course, because of that fact, it was difficult at the levels of salary that Manitoba was offering to recruit senior personnel.

I can assure the First Minister I had some views on that. I don't necessarily accept all of the views that are given in reports any more than he does, but I would ask if he would care to reflect upon that recommendation as I recall its appearance in that report.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** There are certainly some instances where I think there are problems and the most noticeable example is the psychiatrists at our provincial institutions. I am afraid that, I am sure the Leader of the Opposition recalls during the previous government's term as well as certainly during our term so far, we are not providing the service to the institutes of mental diseases that we should from the point of view of psychiatrists. So, there is a very distinct weakness there, salary-wise.

In other areas, I have not sensed a problem competitive-wise to this stage. We have just completed, as I mentioned Thursday night, a competition pertaining to the appointment of a Deputy Minister of Cultural Affairs and we've had applications, many good quality applications, from all across Canada. I was pleasantly pleased to sense that salary appeared not to have been a barrier in obtaining many attractive applications. So, I think we have to look at the different groupings, some indeed that could be argued, but in a carte blanche way I think that in most instances the present salary ranges to the out-of-scope people are not providing us with any barrier toward recruitment.

**HON. S. LYON:** Have we any up-to-date information, Mr. Chairman, on the comparable salaries being paid to the Chief Commissioner and the other Commissioners at the City of Winnipeg which again, according to my recollection, were somewhat ahead of the salaries that were being offered - I think it's Senior Officer 6 is the top categorization for a Deputy Minister. Does that situation still obtain? Is the city still ahead of us in terms of salary ranges for its senior officials as compared to our deputies or what is the situation?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** It's our understanding they're definitely well ahead of us. The city is well ahead of the province.

**HON. S. LYON:** Just again on that topic, 1.(a), (b) and (c), the difference of roughly \$200,000 between the 776,400 and 978,000, I'm sure the First Minister doesn't have a detailed breakdown of it with him, but if he could undertake to provide that breakdown as to what that amount represents at some future time before the House adjourns, it would be quite satisfactory.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Yes, we can do that. Right, we'll do that. I'm sorry. Did you say before the . . .

**HON. S. LYON:** Sometime before the end of the Session. I'm not asking for it before this committee adjourns. We all live in hope that this committee might adjourn before the end of the Session.

Just a few general questions, Mr. Chairman. The First Minister has had an opportunity now to meet with the Prime Minister. As I understand it, first they had a private luncheon and then secondly, in the course of the Federal-Provincial First Ministers' Conference on the Economy in February. We had some discussion in the question period today about the 75 cent dollar and the advocacy of that particular point by the First Minister and, as he says, by other colleagues among the Premiers. Just to make certainty, double sure, I take it

that the First Minister still advocates the 75 cent dollar for the Canadian economy.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, what I indeed do advocate is that we not track U.S. interest rates, as indeed has been the case since 1975 under the existing monetary policy. It is then argued that if we do not track U.S. interest rates that will affect the dollar. The response of the Premiers, including myself, was of the effect that we should cease to superficially prop up the Canadian dollar, that we'd be better to be developing a long range economic strategy of developing our own self-sufficiency in Canada, rather than superficially propping up the Canadian dollar, if indeed that is the price of insuring - if the net result of that is higher interest rates which appears to have been the case.

**HON. S. LYON:** Realizing, as we all do, Mr. Chairman, that each province has different circumstances and realizing, as we do, that Manitoba has, I think now, the third highest per capita debt of any of the provinces in Canada - we used to have the second highest, but I think that's one of the benefits that perhaps flowed from the previous administration that we were able to keep that down to the third highest, but realizing that that still is a huge debt for a province of this size to carry, can the First Minister tell us if he took into account and consulted with, for instance, the Board of Manitoba Hydro before engaging in this advocacy of a 75 cent dollar because of the impact, of course, that would have on their debt repayment, realizing as well that debt repayment schedule, which is outlined in the Budget papers certainly a year ago, I presume it's in the Budget papers of this year as well, shows that there will be heavy repayments to be made 1983-1986, in that period?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** First, I would like to just again underline that I think the only reference to the dollar being pegged at 75 cents came from Premier Loughheed of Alberta. What the other Premiers, including myself, indicated was that we felt that the price of superficially propping up the Canadian dollar indeed was disadvantageous. Insofar as the price of the existing policy and I want to go into some detail in regard to some of the discussions that we had with Governor Bouey during the closed sessions in Ottawa, and I think the Leader of the Opposition will appreciate this, because they relate to the scene in Manitoba and the effect upon Manitoba's economy and the long term ability of the provincial economy to indeed pay debt, in the discussion that we had with Governor Bouey, Governor Bouey acknowledged that the monetary policy that has been pursued since 1975 on the part of the Federal Government has been such as to create disproportionate impact in various areas of Canada.

Some provinces have suffered more than other provinces and Manitoba is amongst those provinces, including the Maritimes and Quebec in fact that have suffered more than other provinces. Heavy concentrations of small and medium sized businesses, not as accessible to means of capital borrowing as some of the large corporate and multinational entities and some of the more prosperous provinces. So we've had a greater share of the bankruptcies and lack of growth

than has indeed been the case in some other parts of Canada, creating greater imbalance. Unfortunately, Governor Bouey in fact acknowledged that this was foreseen in 1975, that some parts of Canada would have greater adverse effect upon them than other parts of Canada. I was not able to find out from Governor Bouey or the Prime Minister whether there had been a signal given by the Bank of Canada in 1975-1976 to the Federal Government so that the Federal Government could undertake offsetting fiscal measures to assist provinces such as Manitoba.

So, obviously, we are faced with a situation by which we have monetary policies that are discriminatory to some parts of Canada, that have widened and deepened the gulf that exists between have-not provinces and have provinces; provinces receiving equalization and provinces not receiving equalization.

Now, I say to the Leader of the Opposition, that we have to - and I don't accept necessarily that there would be additional cost, but even if there were some additional cost, this would be by far offset in the longer term interests of Manitoba if we pursued a different monetary policy in Ottawa than the present monetary policy. The dollar would be strengthened in the long run and we'd have greater job growth. Manitoba's manufacturing base is committed to increased emphasis upon exports, so that our economy would be strengthened and in a much stronger position to repay debts.

I would just like to emphasize as well to the Leader of the Opposition, when reference is made to the third-highest debt and I'm sure he would agree with me, that we have as well more assets per capita than most other provinces. I don't think we can look at one side of the ledger without the other. We're fortunate in Manitoba that we do have Hydro, for instance, and the Telephone System. Ontario doesn't have the telephone system; doesn't have the insurance system that we have here in the public arena. So, though we have debt, we also have assets that other provinces do not enjoy.

**HON. S. LYON:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to hear the First Minister confirm that the message we used to convey, the Minister of Finance, Mr. Craik, the Minister of Finance, Mr. Ransom, and myself on a number of occasions to Mr. Bouey, the Governor of the Bank of Canada, that federal policies, sometimes monetary policies, certainly sometimes fiscal policies, impacted in an adverse way upon the Province of Manitoba. For him to have reconfirmed that to you means that the lesson that we were reading to him over the years apparently stuck.

That being the case, can the First Minister tell us, is the Governor of the Bank of Canada in the same position that he used to state to the Premiers in my time, certainly as recently up to the 30th of November, 1981, that he had no alternative because the Federal Government in effect had robbed him of all of the fiscal elbow room that any Governor of the Central Bank should have. There was no fiscal elbow room for offsets such as the First Minister talked about, such as we talked about and so on, because of the danger of increasing the federal deficit thereby contributing further to inflation and to the offspring of inflation; unemployment, high interest rates and so on.

I am sure that the First Minister wouldn't want to leave the impression that high interest rates somehow or other exist in a vacuum, but I would be interested to hear his view as to whether or not he does or does not regard them as being part of the overall spectre of inflation and one of the concomitant parts of inflation which has apparently been baffling Mr. Trudeau for a good number of years. He talked rather glibly last evening on T.V. about no problem in wrestling inflation to the ground, if you're prepared to ruin the economy. Mr. Trudeau seems to have been able to ruin the economy without wrestling inflation to the ground and I just wondered if the First Minister had any views on that topic.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** First, I have a disagreement with the Federal Government, and I don't know what the Leader of the Opposition's view is in this regard, to the extent that I do not concur with the Federal Government that inflation is the number one problem confronting Canadians. I think that we have reached a stage where unemployment is number one problem. Inflation is a major concern, but I think the major, the top problem that we must come to grips with at the present time in Canada is unemployment.

Getting back to the question of the value of the dollar and economic strategy insofar as Canada is concerned, I regret that we appear not to be pursuing an economic strategy that will emphasize the development of the self-sufficiency of the country and that cannot be done. I don't intend to leave any impression that I have all the answers to this very difficult economic situation that the Western World is particularly confronted with. It seems to me that there has been no strategy developed as to building up the self-sufficiency of Canada, building up our exports, gradually reducing our reliance upon ever increasing imports, often of products that we could replace in Canada. I fear that there has not been enough emphasis in regard to that economic strategy and the result now is, in my view, the major economic woe that we have to come to grips with is growing unemployment and lack of job growth, lack of productive growth.

**HON. S. LYON:** I take it that, without wanting to get into a long philosophical dissertation, the First Minister generally though subscribes to the view that these problems, and they're very serious problems, of unemployment, high interest rates and inflation still running at double digit figures in Canada are not separately compartmentalized, but rather tend to flow one out of the other. Whilst one is dealing with high interest rates, which certainly is a scourge of the worst order in terms of economic recovery, one at the same time cannot be feeding inflation which was probably what triggered the high interest rates in the first place.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I think regrettably that the major contributing factor, and I think this has been spelled out in Versailles this last weekend, that the massive deficit that U.S. Government is now confronted with, in the fact that the U.S. Government saw fit to cut taxes a year, year-and-a-half ago and at the same time to build up even more massive debt, mainly geared towards military expenditure, has meant that the U.S. Government now has become by far the major custo-

mer on the bond market, the world money market, thus driving up interest rates.

So, I think that there has been a lack of fiscal responsibility to increase the deficit to enormous, indeed to record levels, at the same time that you reduce the tax levels. It hasn't stimulated the U.S. economy, but it certainly put the U.S. Government in a position of being the principal borrower on the money markets of the world and having a tremendous impact, as I understand it from those that advise us in regard to borrowing on the world money markets.

**HON. S. LYON:** I wonder if the First Minister, Mr. Chairman, would care to reflect upon the one bright factor that we do see in the U.S. economy, namely the sizable reduction in the rate of inflation to something in the area of 4 to 5 percent, I guess it is, on an annualized basis at the present time. Even though interest rates seem to be clogged at a certain level, I am sure the committee would benefit from having his view on how he regards that reduction in inflation.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I think that insofar as Canada is concerned, the variation in our interest rate from the U.S. interest rate - I'm sorry, the rate of inflation - a great deal that is explained by the driving up, and I don't intend to argue the pros and cons of this, but the driving up of oil prices in Canada in the last two years, that's had a tremendous impact upon the rate of inflation in Canada.

The U.S. situation has indeed become a very peculiar situation, rather unique situation. As the Leader of the Opposition points out, the inflation rate has gone down sharply, but also, as the Leader of the Opposition's acknowledged, the interest rate has not at all reduced at the same speed that the rate of inflation has gone down. The net result of that has been, of course, the contribution towards the kind of economic decline that we witness in the United States today as well as here.

So I say to the Leader of the Opposition, there appears to be rather unique and peculiar situations that have occurred in regard to the handling of the American economy that I suspect economists, two or three years ago, would not have thought possible. They might very well have assumed that with the reduction in inflation, as I think the Leader of the Opposition implies, then there should have been a reduction in interest rates along the same pace. That, unfortunately, has not been the case.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, there are, of course, opinions to be read on a daily basis and different financial journals and so on. I was reading one only this morning, I believe, in the Financial Times of commentators saying that in effect the reason that the inflation rate has come down in the United States is that organized labour and unorganized labour in the United States and governments with respect to public sector settlements are much more realistic. They are not asking for 13 percent settlements in the face of a four or five or six percent inflation rate and indeed are much more concerned about preservation of jobs than they are about a 13 percent increase in a job that may not exist if the 13 percent increase goes through.

Only a week or so ago, we had the Canadian Labour

Congress in Manitoba at its Annual Convention and I'm sure the First Minister was there bringing greetings on behalf of the Province of Manitoba. Could he reflect for the benefit of the committee on what his views are on the rather militant stand that has been taken by the CLC with respect to no wage cutbacks, no wage freezes or anything of that sort at all as contrasted to what the United Auto Workers and many of the large unions in the United States are doing in face of the same tough economic circumstances in that country with the resultant, or at least with one of the results being a sizable reduction in inflation? What are the First Minister's views on the CLC's position?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** First, I would like to just relate briefly to the American situation. I think that the emphasis upon the preservation of jobs is again directly attributable to the kind of U.S. monetary policy that presently exists by which U.S. Government has tightened up the money supply and at the same time has become a heavy borrower on the world markets. I think that the major concern would not be the preservation of jobs if there was, in my view, and I know this is a view that the Leader of the Opposition might not necessarily share, if there was a different emphasis on the part of the U.S. Government as to dealing with the economic and monetary policies of the United States. So I don't want to suggest for a moment that it need be the situation that workers, their major concern has to be the preservation of jobs. I think there's alternatives to that kind of end result.

In the Canadian situation, I think that workers democratically must make that decision within any given bargaining unit, any given situation, as to proposals that might be made from time to time through the collective bargaining process.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, what would the First Minister's reaction be to this statement that's contained on Page 2 of the Annual Legislative Presentation to the Premier and the Cabinet on June 1, 1982 by the Manitoba Federation of Labour? I quote from the third paragraph: "Organized labour cannot, should not and will not agree to concessions! We were created to challenge the status quo and we will not accept more inequities and more injustices! Today, rather than having more job security, Canadian working people are more worried than ever - and for good reason. In March, 1982, the unemployment rate reached the highest levels since Stats Canada began compiling figures. As for those with jobs, real incomes are below where they were five years ago."

Very simply, does the First Minister support that view of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, which seems to be an echo of what the Canadian Labour Congress was saying, that organized labour cannot and should not and will not agree to concessions even though this is being practiced in the United States by organized labour with some apparently beneficial effect upon job security and certainly upon the inflation rate?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** My answer is the same as before. I think that it is a matter that has to be decided within any bargaining unit within the workplace through the democratic process. I can certainly understand the

frustration that working members must feel within a workplace when they're asked to undertake cutbacks when, over the last four years, the rate of earning power has actually declined at a rate which is considerably less than what has occurred by way of inflationary increases. I think what working people are indicating, that it's time that rather than their being singled out for special attention that we need a new stimulative Budget on the part of the Federal Government to replace the debacle we had last November known as the McEachen Budget.

**HON. S. LYON:** I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister will permit us one divergence of view about the use of the term, "working people." What I was referring to was the brief of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, which is not necessarily representative by any means of all working people in Manitoba anymore than the CLC is representative of all working people; that represents the view of the executive of the particular organization, certainly not of all working people in Canada. If it were the view of all working people in Canada, then we would have a national and ten provincial NDP governments, if you can believe Mr. McDermott, but that doesn't take place.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I am not arguing that point. I want to just again mention to the Leader of the Opposition, I have a worry though if it's not democratically determined that indeed it's going to be the unorganized working people that will be forced into even greater concessions than those in organized units, so that you have a disproportionate shift in income within society. You will have the stronger, whether it be working people or whether it be businesses and capital accumulation, that will do best. If there is anarchy at the policy level federally, my fear is that you will have the gap widen. I'm sincerely concerned about this widening as amongst different individuals and groups in our society, whether it be labour or whether it be business, between large business and large labour, and on the other hand unorganized and small business. If it becomes a question of concessions being wrung out of certain people, it's going to be the weaker bargaining units or the unorganized that will make the greater concessions and it will be the smaller business that will, awesome fear, be placed in that situation.

**HON. S. LYON:** I don't want to engage the committee too long on this topic, but surely the First Minister would agree that the United Auto Workers of the United States of America is hardly what you would call a weak bargaining unit. Would he care to comment upon why a member of the United Auto Workers working in Detroit for the United Auto Workers can bargain down there to hold the line on wages, given certain guarantees or undertakings by management with respect to job security, whereas up here the United Auto Worker under the leadership, ultimately, of the CLC and Mr. McDermott are saying, no concessions. We're going to bargain as though the situation was normal, with the result that there have been thousands of layoffs in Canada. The worker, far from obtaining the 13 percent, is not obtaining anything at all by way of a salary because the company is not able in these

times, as it states, to pay that increase in salary.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Again, I think that it is a matter that the United Auto Workers in Windsor or in Oshawa have to determine in their own given circumstances. They democratically vote as to whether they agree or will accord concessions or not. I think, again, it's a question of people seeing some leadership. If we are going to indeed ask some to make concessions within society, then that has to be equitable and proportionate throughout the balance of society. Certainly, interest that's being paid in liquidity in banks, often going into non-productive purposes or non-priority purposes, is not a very, I think, effective emphasis for our economy to be functioning under at the present time. I would think that the auto worker, looking at that kind of situation, would be somewhat reluctant to feel that they should be the so-called example.

**HON. S. LYON:** Again, I can appreciate this gets to be a hypothetical discussion to some extent in Manitoba. It's certainly not hypothetical for the auto worker who's laid off in Ontario but, given the fact that the productivity, on average, of the Canadian auto worker is lower than the productivity of the American auto worker and, given the fact that in some cases at least the Canadian auto worker is remunerated at an equal or better rate of pay than the American auto worker, can the First Minister offer any rationale for logical or reasonable support of this do or die position that is being taken by Mr. McDermott and his colleagues and apparently by the leadership at least of the Manitoba Federation of Labour?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** First, I don't know what the Leader of the Opposition's calculations are on productivity, Canada versus U. S. auto makers. I am not so sure that premise is correct. It's my understanding that health care costs paid out by the auto companies in the United States is much higher per worker, per employee, than is the case in Canada. So I think there's some question as to whether that is indeed true, that the productivity of the average Canadian worker in the auto field is much less than what it is in the United States.

I don't pretend, I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition would not pretend, to be an authority as to the situation in Oshawa and in Windsor. I sense what labour in general, as well as unorganized labour, is doing is demonstrating a great deal of disappointment and frustration, indeed anger at the lack of general economic leadership being provided in this country. They do not want to be singled out as special targets.

**HON. S. LYON:** I dare say, Mr. Chairman, that's the case and one can understand the frustration of any worker in Canada today faced with the lack of leadership, particularly at the Ottawa level, extending now back over a good number of years by the same man who spoke about wrestling inflation to the ground.

My point, however, is this. Would it be the policy position of the Government of Manitoba to agree with the statement that I read, quoted from the Manitoba Federation of Labour brief and from the statement that we all heard last week from the Canadian Labour Congress as mouthed by its President, Mr. McDermott,

mott, that there should be no concessions whatsoever, given the economic recession, if not depression, that the country is passing through at the present time? Is that a policy position which in reason and in logic can be or is supported by the present Government of Manitoba?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** No, I consider that's a policy position that should be taken democratically by union members where indeed it's part of a collective bargaining unit or, if it's unorganized labour, by the individual worker in each given circumstance. I do not believe that it is an appropriate area as far as the Manitoba Government is concerned because we don't see this to be the major, overall root problem of the existing economic crisis in the country.

Also, I must say to the Leader of the Opposition - I'm sure he will accept this - that I think that one can expect labour, business, other groups, during these difficult times to be presenting pretty tough bargaining positions. I accept that to a large degree as a presentation of a pretty tough, hard initial bargaining position against a background of ever deteriorating economic circumstances throughout the country.

**HON. S. LYON:** Given the fact also, Mr. Chairman, that government has a responsibility, acknowledged by all parties in this country, to give leadership from time to time and that forced up against the wall with certain very tough fiscal decisions, such as I take it the Government of Quebec is at the present time, does the First Minister find anything objectionable or wrong in terms of public policy or the service of the public interest in the Province of Quebec for their adopting the position of rollback that they are with respect to their Civil Service?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** It is my understanding that the Quebec - and I wish I had the scales in front of me - but it's my understanding that the Quebec Public Servant is at the top of the list, province by province, insofar as salaries and earnings are concerned. Also, it's my understanding that there are by far more civil servants per 100,000 population in Quebec than in any other part of the country. So the Quebec situation is a unique situation that has developed and grown over many years and it's been brought to a head by the difficult economic circumstance.

Now, insofar as Manitoba's concerned, the last figures I had seen is that the Manitoba public service pay - I probably shouldn't say this before our ratification of our collective bargaining - the agreement is at the second from the bottom, second only to - I believe Prince Edward Island is at the bottom of the scale. So we certainly are dealing with apples and oranges when we compare the Quebec and the Manitoba situation.

**HON. S. LYON:** I was talking more though about the principle involved that a government, such as the Government of Quebec, faced with what it conceives at least as being a fiscal situation of serious proportion is forced, notwithstanding the exhortations of Mr. Louis Laberge and Mr. McDermott and other labour leaders in Canada, is forced, according to the best judgment of its Ministers and its Premier, to engage in

rollbacks with respect to the Civil Service; never mind how high their salary is. Does the First Minister find that philosophically objectionable?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I don't find it philosophically objectionable in the Quebec situation. Indeed in Manitoba, if we were way above the average throughout Canada, then I would think that rollbacks would be quite acceptable. That's not the situation in Manitoba.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, then if we find certain categories within salary ranges that are paid to organized or unorganized labour for that matter in Manitoba which are at or near the top of the national list, then I take it that in the private sector the First Minister would have no objection if management were to say to those people at the negotiating table, you've either got to freeze or rollback, given the fact that you're the highest in Canada. Is that what the criterion is going to be?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** What we have to do is look at the total bargaining unit because we are looking at total packages rather than individual segments of a total package in each given case. Manitoba as a whole, our wage levels from the information that I've seen are amongst the lowest, province-by-province comparison, whether it's in the public or in the private sector. In fact, I want to just quickly add that I think the Leader of the Opposition will agree, our labour movement in Manitoba has been very, very responsible insofar as the bargaining of contracts.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, I suppose it all depends on whose ox is being gored and the vantage point from which one views these different levels of remuneration, but I believe I heard it said by the steelworkers who just went on strike against Inco in Sudbury that they wanted to achieve parity with what the steelworkers were earning at Thompson in Manitoba and they have gone on strike for that. Now, if that means that, by and large, the steelworkers in Manitoba are receiving a higher wage than steelworkers engaged in similar work across the country, is the First Minister's criterion, given his explanation with respect to the Quebec rollback, that the steelworkers in Manitoba should accept a freeze or a rollback when next they come to the negotiating table?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I wouldn't begin to dictate to steelworkers what they should or should not accept. I think it depends upon the circumstances in any given situation. Of course, the price of nickel, the price of copper varies from one space of time to another space of time and productivity differs. Also, it is my understanding, though I can't verify it with information documentation in front of me at the present time, that nickel can be mined much more economically in Thompson than in Sudbury by the company. It's much more costly to mine in Sudbury. Now, that being the case, then we are dealing with two different circumstances in Sudbury and Thompson. I would understand both company and collective bargaining unit to want to take that into some consideration.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, we can take it then that - and I am not trying to put words into the First Minister's mouth. I'll take nothing; I'll ask him. Has he then philosophical objection to the position of the CLC and the Manitoba Federation of Labour for that matter about no concessions. It would seem that, in the one instance, he said, concessions are all right if the wages are the highest in Canada, e.g. Quebec Civil Service. What really is the policy of the Government of Manitoba with respect to rollbacks, freezes of salary, in the public or the private sector?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** My position is that it should be determined in each given circumstance by the bargaining unit involved, through democratic vote, because the circumstance varies from time to time and from unit to unit.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, unless I am mistaken, it takes two people to make a bargain and you can have a democratic vote in a union asking for 22 percent more or some such figure, but if management either can't afford or won't pay that, then you end up with dire circumstances. You either have a strike or you have an enterprise going out of business or whatever. That's why I'm wondering, given the emphasis that is being put on this topic in Canada now by the CLC which is an admitted political ally and friend of the New Democratic Party and by the Manitoba Federation of Labour which is an admitted ally, friend and supporter of the New Democratic Party, that they believe in no concessions whatsoever, what is the attitude of this government going to be in terms of offering economic leadership to the public and the private sector on this very crucial topic?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** The leadership that the New Democratic Party of Manitoba and the New Democratic Party Government of Manitoba tends to proceed as not one that will deal with this on a piecemeal basis or in an isolated fashion. First, we have to, (a) get monetary policies in Ottawa that reflect of all parts of this country; a stimulative budget, early budget, that will provide stimulation because I mentioned earlier, I do not believe inflation, despite what is being espoused in some sources as being the main economic problem confronting our people, in my view, the main economic problem is the lack of job growth and unemployment.

So I would not single out, I say to the Leader of the Opposition, workers in any collective bargaining situation for some special treatment. In view of the lack of overall economic leadership, they must some way or other accept responsibility and accept the yoke of responsibility in the collective bargaining process for a situation that, I say, they have not been the authors of.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, we keep hearing rumours and speculation, which is only as strong as the source from which it emanates but I am sure the First Minister is concerned about this as well, rumours that the Federal Government is going to impose a form of wage pause or wage freeze or whatever upon the public service of Canada. What would we expect and I expect that, as and when, if this is announced the

House may well not be sitting, what may we expect the reaction of the NDP Government of Manitoba to be to such a policy, given the fact that it's only hypothetical speculation but it grows stronger day by day if one reads the speeches of the President of the Treasury Board, Mr. Johnson, and so on?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I think it would be very, very unwise to speculate until I would see the proposals in question. Let me just quickly add, if it's a program that is going to single out one segment and ignore other segments; if it's going to be as inequitable as the previous wage control program that we had a few years ago, then I would take a negative view to same.

**HON. S. LYON:** You would not support that policy with respect to the public service of Canada and it follows from that, of course, that you would not support then such a policy with respect to the public service of Manitoba?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** In my view, the economic problems that we are confronted with in Canada go far beyond the public sector.

**HON. S. LYON:** Oh, indeed, I don't think anyone would argue seriously with the First Minister on that rather self-evident proposition.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Therefore, I would not single them out for any particular attention and indeed, this is what I fear, that we are going to witness from Ottawa, because of Ottawa's desperation in being unable to work out constructive economic strategy, some pretty simplistic solutions, such as, a Federal Government public sector freeze and then the Federal Minister of Finance and Prime Minister will think their problems are going away when, in fact, we'll probably end up then six months later realizing that little has changed because there's still a vacuum at overall economic strategy. I'm sorry, if I could just add, I should also assure the Leader of the Opposition that was a view in February, at least, that was shared by every Premier with the exception of the Premier of British Columbia.

**HON. S. LYON:** Probably latterly the Premier of Quebec. I read on the weekend a statement that was printed as a fact, and I accept it as such barring any evidence to the contrary, that the voting control within the Canadian Labour Congress now resides for the first time with public service unions: that is, with unions representing public employees, I take it, of the federal, provincial and municipal level of government in Canada, all of whom receive their remuneration, of course, from the taxpayer in one form or another.

First of all, does the First Minister share my interest, and I must say my surprise, at that fact; and No. 2, does he see the attitude of the CLC as mirrored in its statements by Mr. McDermott here only a week ago as reflecting that new emerging majority of public service employees as the majority group within the Canadian Labour Congress?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I couldn't dispute whether or not the Leader of the Opposition is correct insofar as the makeup of the CLC. I haven't looked at the makeup of



the various unions. I would sense that the degree of frustration varies within the public sector unions and also within the private sector unions, but I would think in general you would have discovered at that CLC Convention a fairly high degree of frustration both amongst those employees that are public sector union and private sector union groups. I would not think there would be, with the possible exception of the postal workers, much variation; the postal workers being the most disturbed by their own experiences in collective bargaining with the Federal Government.

**HON. S. LYON:** I would add, just by way of clarification, that statement about the makeup of the CLCs was not mine. I believe it was carried in either the Times or the Post on the weekend by one of the observers who was at the meeting in Winnipeg and commented upon it. One of the other factors, of course, was a number of the construction trades had left CLC and that this had had the effect of putting askew the traditional membership ratios in the CLC but, given the fact, of course, that within the Manitoba Federation of Labour for some time now, I guess the Manitoba Government Employees Association has been the largest single union. I don't say it represents the majority of organized workers in Manitoba but the largest single union.

Are we, in your estimation, facing a situation in this country where public service unions are beginning to have a much larger impact upon the message given by their association groups at the national and the provincial level than perhaps was ever ever contemplated when back in 1965, I guess it was, Mr. Pearson first legislated bargaining in the public service units at the federal level and similar action was taken by most provinces in and around that same time.

I'm seeking the First Minister's opinion on this because I think this is something that all governments, his and the national government, are going to have to grapple with in terms of determining the intonation of views that are coming forward from the CLC, from the MFL and so on with respect to freezes on public sector wages and matters of that sort. I'm sure I would, for one, appreciate having the First Minister's views on that.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Well, I would want to give a great deal of additional thought to that. There's no doubt that the public sector unions would influence the CLC, the various Federations of Labour. That's I suppose again what one would naturally anticipate in view of the decision by membership in the various public sector unions to become formally a part of the House of Labour.

**HON. S. LYON:** I'm reading from page 15, Mr. Chairman, again from the document: "The Annual Legislative Presentation to the Government of Manitoba" by the Manitoba Federation of Labour, and I'd be interested in having the Premier's views or observations on this comment: "At the recent convention of the Canadian Labour Congress, delegates debated and endorsed a document entitled, 'Labours battle to protect our economic rights.'" It stated clearly that the current recession is no act of nature but "has been deliberately planned by government." Continuing the

quote: "High interest rates, cuts in public services, tax cuts for wealthy corporations and individuals, massive layoffs and shutdowns and demands for wage rollbacks are all part of a conscious strategy."

"It represents the ability of the wealthy and the powerful to pass the burden of the economy's poor performance onto the backs of working people. If that doesn't work, they will employ the full weight of the law to enforce economic subservience on working people through the use of wage controls."

Does the First Minister agree with that statement of view with respect to what's been happening in the country in the last few years?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** There is no question from the discussion that I had with Governor Bouey of the Bank of Canada, that the monetary policy was conceived and was developed in 1975 in Ottawa and that the direct result of that has been ever-rising interest rates, unemployment and business bankruptcy and indeed, as I pointed out earlier, has been a widening of the gap between various regions of Canada where Manitoba, for instance, has suffered proportionate to other parts of the country where large companies have benefited, while smaller companies have slipped in their position; where strong labour may very well in some parts of the country have benefited, while unorganized or weak labour in other parts of the country have gone downhill.

So basically, though I might not have used the same phraseology, the existing monetary policies that have been pursued since 1975, rather than create greater equity regionally and within business, within labour, has widened the gaps to a point unfortunately where I feel and I fear the frustrations and the angers are building to a boiling point. They will continue to build until such point as there is a much more rational and well thought through strategy and design at the federal level. Now, I don't claim for a moment to have all the answers for the Federal Government to pursue. I just sense, though, that the existing design and monetary policy has contributed to the kind of situation that's described in the brief read from.

**HON. S. LYON:** The First Minister will know that, because I've heard him dilate on this topic, that I was certainly never one who was known throughout this country or within the province as a great supporter of the present Prime Minister of Canada. I hasten to assure the First Minister that my view, to which he will if he hasn't already come, is one that he will soon be joining after he's had the opportunity negotiating with that gentleman for a while. Even in my darkest moments, I must say that I never consciously attributed to the Prime Minister and to the Government of Canada this idea used again on page 15 of the MFL brief, "The weapons used to keep workers in check are inflation and unemployment." As I say, even in my darkest moments, I wouldn't attribute that to Pierre Elliott Trudeau and the Liberal Government, that they are consciously grinding the worker down by somehow or other increasing inflation and unemployment. I wouldn't attribute that to Mr. Trudeau; I wouldn't attribute that to any government in Canada, be it Liberal, Conservative, Social Credit, Separatist, or whatever the case may be and certainly not New Democratic.

Can the First Minister not quickly put us all at ease and tell us that when he was being given this statement of policy by the MFL that he interjected at that point and made precisely the same statement to the Manitoba Federation of Labour that I have just made to this committee?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** The statement that—(Interjection)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I am not going to debate at this point because I don't claim to have delved extensively into the workings or the economic system. But I do know this, that the consequences of the monetary policy that's given rise to the lack of job creation, the lack of productive growth, the increase in unemployment has had the direct consequences that the MFL have outlined and I'm not surprised that working men and women would therefore feel that there has been a deliberate plot to create that situation. I'm not surprised that they would indeed view it as a plot; I would not for a moment. I think it's academic in any event. I think the consequences have been as outlined by the MFL, whether it's been deliberate or not.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, the First Minister has me at a disadvantage. I have never been one who has been addicted to either determination of the class system somehow or other was responsible for all of the ills that affect mankind or the idea that the free market economy system which we have in this country was responsible for all of it either. Indeed, strongly as I might in a partisan way argue against any government, including the government of the First Minister here with respect to legitimate differences that we have in our philosophical outlook on public policy, surely the First Minister is not saying that he would subscribe to the view, "The weapons used to keep workers in check are inflation and unemployment," the implication being that any government in Canada is consciously trying to inflict inflation and unemployment upon the people. Does the First Minister find that not as unacceptable as I do?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** First, as I understood the process, and the Leader of the Opposition has attended briefs previously as well and we receive many briefs from different groups, the Chamber of Commerce, the Manitoba Federation of Labour, my view is that basically we're there to listen, to digest, to discuss and to take the briefs under consideration. In this particular case, as I say, I think it's rather academic as to whether it's a deliberate plot or not. I think, myself, that the consequences are brought about as a result of a lack of government action federally, rather than as a result of any direct plot, but I think the consequences are in practical form as outlined, not just for working men and women, but for small, medium sized businesses and, as I mentioned earlier, for provinces such as Manitoba.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, the First Minister is not going to find any argument from me or I think from any reasonable person in Canada that the whole

economy in this country is suffering from inflation and from, if I may use the term, one of its bastard offsprings, unemployment and high interest rates are a part of the baggage of inflation as well. Nobody's going to argue that these do not beset our economy at the present time and that it is the responsibility of government working in concert with the private sector to overcome them.

I'm merely trying to get an understanding from the First Minister that he does not subscribe to the view that any government, regardless of its political makeup, is consciously engaged in a conspiracy which is what the innuendo is here to keep workers in check by inflation and unemployment. Surely to heaven, that statement would elicit a tut-tut at least from the Ministers who were listening to this brief, unless they too are so addicted to the conspiracy and class theory of life's makeup which has been proven to be so barren and untrue that they find nothing unobjectionable about that or find nothing objectionable about it.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I think I have indicated that in my view the consequences are as a result of omission on the part of governments to provide economic leadership rather than as a result of a plot, but I say to the Leader of the Opposition, what is indeed occurring by the kind of policies we've had over the last few years has been to intensify what he referred to as class conflict rather than to generate class harmony.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, without getting into a lot of tedious quotes, I am sure the First Minister will recall and I read with interest, on page 13 of the MFL brief to the government, the comments about the philosophy of the previous government and anti-government points of view and so on and so forth. I was particularly intrigued by one comment at the bottom of para three on page 13, "Government economic leadership" and I'm quoting, "is an unfamiliar concept to many, discredited by a lifetime of anti-government propaganda. In fact," it goes on, "the anti-government point of view has gained force in recent years." Then there is a further explanation of the fact that, "you hear comments about government interfering in the private sector, but you never hear comments about the private sector interfering in the government sector." Was that not a point where the First Minister or one of his colleagues at least must have interrupted and said, my heavens, you know, is this serious? What was said at that point?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I would appreciate and I don't want to delay, but just so that I can fairly answer the Leader of the Opposition, I wish he would just read that quote that he's referring to again.

**HON. S. LYON:** This is the third paragraph. I'll read it in total. "Policy implications vary. One version would see government merely providing a few services that the private sector cannot provide, making marginal adjustments where the market does not function properly, keeping the currency stable and balancing the Budget so as to minimize its impact. Other versions have more tolerance for large-scale government activities as well as for active fiscal and monetary policy and allow for a certain amount of incentive

planning. Yet, none of them," to redo the quote, "yet none of them visualize government taking the initiative and actively shaping the structure and direction of the economy. Government economic leadership is an unfamiliar concept to many, discredited by a lifetime of anti-government propaganda."

You'll pardon me for laughing but, Mr. Chairman, I have the First Minister at a disadvantage because I have this policy implication statement in front of me. I think he has to read it or if it passed through at the time he heard it, he will perhaps wish to read it again. There's only a minute or two left.

What I'm seeking is this. In the face of what some would regard as breaches of common sense or abject straying from historical fact and from the makeup of the country and so on, is it not the policy of this government, as I'm sure it has been with all previous governments faced with a statement that is obviously either ridiculous or untrue in the face of it, to interrupt and say, well, obviously now, we disassociate ourselves from that and we don't agree with it.

I give only this one example and I put it on the record because one of the persons involved is regrettably now dead, but years and years ago I remember the Manitoba Federation of Labour making its annual brief to the Roblin Government of which I was then a member. The secretary of the Federation at that time was Bob E. Russell, who was one of the great figures in Manitoba's labour movement after whom, by the way, the Roblin Government saw fit to name one of the schools in Winnipeg because of the role that he had played. He was reading a tract, and I can use no other word for it, containing suggestions somewhat like this that round is square and up's down and black's white and so on. It got to the point where, as I recall the words in the Brief, that the Manitoba Federation was saying solemnly to the Government of Manitoba that they were grinding the workers to death with the coils of capitalism or some of those other exciting phrases that are used from time to time by ideological team-mates of the NDP.

At which point, Bob Russell stopped to draw a breath and the then Premier of Manitoba looked across at Bob Russell and said, do you believe that? There was silence in the room for a minute and Bob Russell looked up at the Premier and said, of course not. Then we carried on, having got rid of the nonsense.

Now, I'm just asking, aren't there any pregnant moments of realism that occur when the Federation gives its brief to this government like that?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I'll answer later.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour is 4:30. I'm interrupting proceedings for Private Members' Hour. The committee will reconvene again at 8:00 o'clock.

### **SUPPLY - CANADA-MANITOBA ENABLING VOTE**

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** The Committee will come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote. There is no single Minister responsible for this. How would the Committee like to proceed, line-by-line? Line by line.

Item 1. (a) Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote, Value-

Added Crops Production Agreement.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In terms of the Estimate process, the department has \$2.139 million in total budgeted in the Value-Added Agreement, Appropriation No. 8 in the Department of Agriculture Estimates and, in that appropriation, it is shown that \$1.711 million is voted. The additional \$427,000 is voted in the Finance under the Enabling Vote. The Department of Finance take 20 percent of our total allocation and place it in the Enabling Vote and that is, basically, the amount of funds. We did have discussions on the AgroMan Agreement in terms of the responsibilities of our department, the Department of Agriculture, under this Agreement.

There is also the additional funds that are voted under the AgroMan, which would be the Water Development Agreement, that is also part of the Federal-Provincial Agreement but this portion deals with the various components of the Value-Added Crops Production Agreement dealing with irrigation, corn production, soyabean production, potatoes, rangeland, livestock production and a whole host of agreements or subsidiary agreements within the master agreement. If there are any specific questions that we're not asked during the Estimates, I will endeavour to supply the members as much information as I am able to.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I just have a few questions, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to direct to the Minister. A bunch of this was actually covered under the Estimates already, to some degree, and I'm wondering whether there are any changes, specifically in the Marsh River Value-Added Crop Agreement where there were three major drains involved. This possibly reflected more on the Minister of Natural Resources. Either one could probably answer as to whether there has been any changes, whether there has been any deletions, additions?

To the Minister of Agriculture, I'd like to direct a question; there is a program in the southeast at the present time, under the AgroMan Agreement, where certain trials, plots, etc., it's a more limited program and I think we discussed it under your Estimates to some degree, and I have a further question. Is it possible, under this agreement that is in place right now, to have additions or extensions under this, because various meetings have been held by the SPADA group in the southeast regarding the water management, the drainage problems that they have there and I think there is action afoot to try and possibly request the government to see whether they can have an agreement, together with the federal people, in terms of doing a major study, a major undertaking in terms of the drainage requirements in the extreme southeast in conjunction with the Tree Line Program and the various programs that are in place right now.

I think we touched on that, to some degree, during the Estimates and I have three specific questions which I've raised and I think the Member for Morris probably wants to pursue that a little further. I think

the Minister of Natural Resources can possibly answer the one about whether there has been any changes in the Marsh River Agreement and the Minister of Agriculture can answer the other ones.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I don't recall any change having been suggested or made to the Marsh River Drain, but I will confirm with staff and advise on that.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, with respect to - I believe the honourable member, I'm not sure that I caught him correctly, he was asking the question with respect to the agreement with the SPADA group in the southwest - I don't believe there's been any new signing of any contracts this year with that group. There have been other contracts which have been signed with other groups. I have, as a matter of policy, so that an adequate assessment be made of some of the contracts that have been flowing, that contracts be signed on a one-year basis, a review be made and then to see whether or not further funds are necessary. Rather than go on a full three-year, we would go one-year at a time in terms of new contracts but the specifics of the area that he speaks of, and I speak from memory, I don't believe that there has been any change, in terms of change, in the contract. Once a contract has been signed, unless it is being discontinued, and I have no knowledge that is happening at all.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** To clarify that, by the Minister of Agriculture, is the Minister indicating that from now on it will be on a year-to-year basis, because initially a three-year program was entered into and their planning was done on the basis of three years? Is the Minister suggesting now that particular agreement is going to be reviewed on a year-to-year basis? That agreement that they signed would still be in effect for the period that they entered into, am I correct?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the planning process and the development of the agreement would continue as has been the case. If there were a new agreement to be signed it would be signed on a one-year basis and then would be reviewed to see whether the objectives and the projected results or deficiencies of results were achieved as a result of that agreement; to see what changes would have to be made in a year or two, rather than go on for the three-year period. The planning and the suggested outlines would still continue as they have been in the past, over the three-year period, but there would be a confirmed reassessment made and an evaluation made on a year-by-year basis to see what changes, if any, should be made in year two, based on the experience that were in year one; or to see whether or not maybe the program or the analysis was achieved that it may not have to continue, but with respect to the specific one, I believe that the contract is there. It has been in place and is continuing. I don't think there's any, that I'm

aware of, changes contemplated.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The question that I have then, is the Minister suggesting that if new proposals came forward, for example, from this SPADA group that he is prepared to look at these things and possibly enter into a new arrangement with them that they could, referring specifically to the major requirements of drainage of a major study to be undertaken, if this SPADA group came up with a proposal to the Minister, is the Minister suggesting that he would consider new proposals and try and work that out with his federal counterparts in terms of setting up? Because if the Minister is indicating that he's going to be reviewing and signing these on a year-to-year basis, my impression would be that if it's open for new applications and considerations based on the Minister's discretion, of course, that this could be done.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I should advise the Honourable Member for Emerson that we have already had discussions with the Federal Government and there are staff discussions presently under way to look at the future in terms of when this agreement starts winding down, what comes next; what other federal-provincial agreements might take its place and other areas of priority that we might want to just sit down and discuss the future of.

With respect to other ideas, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that any group that presently has a contract with the province, at any time would be free to make submissions with respect to either changes, or additions, or deletions. Those submissions, of course, would be taken in the course of other submissions that are received and in terms of the planning for the next year's programming.

So I would see as groups that at any point in time they feel that there may be a new thrust, a new area that they may want to embark on or have considered, they will do so without anyone even telling them that it's now open for submissions. That, I think is an ongoing process and each request is, of course, evaluated on the basis of other requests and, of course, departmental priorities in terms of how we carry this agreement on forward in future years.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I would just like to indicate to the Minister, that particular agreement, especially in the southeast with the SPADA group, has been very beneficial to the whole area. It's been a very successful program I think for all people involved and I would like to encourage that kind of a program to continue there as well as in other parts.

More specifically though, is it the Minister's opinion that what I mentioned before, the possibility of a major drainage study, that this would be something that could qualify under the Agro-Man Agreement in the future if a proper proposal was set forward to the Minister and it met with the guidelines that are within the requirements, that something of this nature could be considered, because this is an item that would fit in very well as a continuation of the present program that is in place? All I'm asking, as to the receptiveness of the Minister of either Agriculture or Natural Resources, in conjunction with the program that's in place, if a further proposal was presented as the Minister indi-

cated that it would be viewed at, what are the personal views of yourself and the Minister of Natural Resources in terms of maybe having a continuation along those lines?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I would see proposals being accepted and reviewed along in concert with other proposals that are being made from other areas. I should tell the honourable member that there is no doubt that there always are many more proposals, and good proposals and good ideas, than there are funds for, and drainage, in terms of drainage projects, I could probably list on a major sheet of areas where there have been requests for studies and concerted work for specific drainage programs throughout the province, including the southeastern part of the province. So without giving the member any undue expectations, I don't want to tell him that oh, yes, there is all kinds of flexibility and room to maneuver and change within the program. There are many more requests than there are funds that can be allocated and as well those - and I don't want to rule on the merits of any suggested proposals that anyone might have. That's why I've left it open because there may be some that would be considered without saying to the honourable member, yes, it's wide open; there is ample funds; that's just not the case. But certainly any proposal that would be received would be considered along with any others, and in terms of overall government priorities and objectives.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I thank the Minister for that comment, but I would just like to draw to your attention the situation of the southeast, which I think a bit of a more unique situation than you run into in most municipalities where they, let's say, want to undertake a drainage study of a certain area.

Here we have two LGDs in a large geographic area where you do not have the normal patterns that apply in many other areas. You have a very low assessment area where you have a lot of Crown lands, LGD invested lands, and these things should all enter into the picture to some degree when an assessment is being made.

As I indicated before, the initial program that is in place has been very advantageous to the area in terms of crop development; the experiments that are taking place; the equipment that is being used; and now we're to the point where the amount of land that is being cleared and broken in the southeast, mainly through the programs that have been in place of selling LGD vested lands, the selling of Crown lands, and the Tree Line Program, a lot of this land is being cleared and the next step, of course, is the roads and the drainage problems.

Instead of doing an ad hoc type of drainage in the area, I think a major undertaking has to be done in terms of the major drains and to some degree this affects the Roseau River Development Program that the United States is proposing again at this stage of the game, because some of the water flows from eastern Manitoba into the States and then consequently back through the Roseau, back into Manitoba again.

One thing that the LGDs, the Councils, are facing is, first of all, very limited funds and in order to hire, let's say, the water resource people under their program,

they find it virtually not accessible to them in terms of the dollars. This is why, if we could work out a program under the Agro-Man Agreement where we have federal, provincial and local money put in too, maybe a major plan can be established. It doesn't have to be something that would have to be undertaken, let's say, the physical part of it could be planned over a period of years, so at least they have a direction and I think possibly this is why I'm forwarding this kind of a proposal, and I think the SPADA group will probably be following up on that, but this is the kind of thing that I think would go well hand-in-hand with the money that has been expended to this date and would really help develop the area.

We have, from time to time in this House, referred to it as the last agricultural frontier, but there is a lot of potential there and I think that if working hand-in-hand, with the receptiveness of the Government of the Day, together with the federal people, we can work out some major plans in terms of how they should undertake these major programs. I know it's going to be a long-term thing but the planning aspect of it is the key thing and this has worked so well with the present program that they have in place, the planning, the illustration of what can be done.

With the amount of land that has been cleared, as I indicated before, if we're going to start ad hoc draining my quarter and draining it onto the neighbours, it doesn't solve the problem and they realize it and I think we all realize it and this is why I'm saying the cost itself of doing a total study of it is a little too dramatic for the financially handicapped LGDs to undertake and that's why I'm putting this forward that something of this nature could maybe be undertaken under that kind of a federal-provincial municipal program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to add to what my colleague has said, that there is a large number of areas that are looking to further assistance with respect to their problems dealing with the diversion of water, the reduction of water in certain areas and he may have been advised by his colleague, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that just last week the Honourable Member for Lakeside visited my office with a delegation from his constituency in respect to another problem in respect to drainage and it's a very formidable problem in that area. The Honourable Member for Lakeside left the problem with me; it's been a problem that's been around for something like 30 years; the problem is in the Dennis Lake area, but the proposals involve perhaps a couple of million dollars to alleviate the higher water that has developed there over the course of the years.

There are demands for extended facilities in significant areas of the province, including the southeast, and the honourable member knows that I have been talking with people from the wild life group in the Emerson constituency in respect to a possible co-ordination of development in respect to a multipurpose program there that could involve some improved drainage, some further retention of water for wildlife and so on. One thing I made clear to the group that attended at my office the other day was that in any of these drainage proposals what I, as Minister and

hopefully my colleagues concur with my philosophy, that in respect to any drainage proposal we're not going to look at the limited proposition of drainage only, we want to look at what's happening in the area in respect to those proposals; what happens downstream and what happens to the entire environment in respect to any drainage proposal.

We will be looking and will welcome proposals wherever they are in the province but, of course, as my colleague has pointed out, there are only so many tax dollars that are available for these projects, because in order to fund these projects, whether we involve the Federal Government or not, there are many hundreds of thousands and many millions of dollars involved in development and we have to raise the money. I'm sure my honourable friends opposite wouldn't want us to increase the taxes any further than we have already; they indicated in their remarks earlier that we're taxing too much. Well we have to tax if we're going to spend and we're getting requests from all areas of the province to spend more. We can only spend in accordance with a reasonable scale and certainly we won't reject proposals because they're from the wrong area of Manitoba. We have to look at the interests of Manitobans generally, and where a project is advisable and worthwhile we'll certainly want to look at that in a positive way, but we have many demands and we're going to have to weigh our priorities very carefully in respect to them.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, just so there's no misconception, I was not, at this stage of the game, proposing any physical undertaking; what I was proposing is that some planning take place so that the councillors can look at a long-range program, together with the government, in terms of what has to be undertaken. I'm not saying that the Government of the Day should start undertaking major drainage projects at this stage of the game, just the study itself, so that the councils know where they're at in terms of what they should undertake. Let's say, through the professional people that we have available, the resource people, the engineers, that they can indicate this is sort of the direction that should be gone over a period of years.

I don't want to leave it on the record that I'm proposing that physical undertakings should be part of the program right now. What I'm suggesting is that maybe the services of our people, funded jointly, could be made available to the LGDs so that they can plan on a long-range program in terms of where basically should be third-order drains and which would be second and first-order drains so that a long-range program could be worked out. I realize full well it's going to take many years until we have a system in place there that would be anywhere close to what some of the municipalities have at the present time. I know full well that when I was Reeve of the RM of Hanover for a number of years that we had a good program in place. The major drains were down and it was a matter of the municipality tying in some of the other drains to provide a good service and it's working well.

This is what I'm suggesting, that the planning stage of it for these people in the area there, and the problem that they have, as I indicated before, a lot of it is Crown land, we have forestry, what have you. A lot of this land

we don't want drained, there are pockets in areas, valleys, land that is adequate for agriculture, so that proper drainage could be set in place so that the farm populace out there that is expanding can have the services of drainage and still retain the natural resources - the forests, the bogs that we don't ever want to drain - that we still have our wildlife resource back up there. But this all takes planning and it is not within the realm of the LGDs to undertake this and this is why I'm suggesting a joint type of effort to do the basic planning, not the physical undertaking which probably we're looking at many years down the road. I'm hoping that the SPADA group - and that's why I brought it up here - because they have a very good program in place right now and this is why I was suggesting if they came forward with a proposal in terms of just doing the planning end of it, which would be beneficial for the Minister of Resources as well as the Minister of Agriculture, in terms of the long-range development for the area.

Development is taking place right now, there is a lot of land being cleared and I just wouldn't want to see ad hoc crazy drainage taking place and this is why I'm proposing that maybe something jointly could be worked out that would be advantageous. As I indicated before it's not like when some municipality comes up and says we'll have a drainage undertaking. It's a little different with the organized municipalities that have funds and already have a basic system in place. We don't have any system in place and part of the proposal, as the Minister of Resources mentioned, in terms of the water management group or the wildlife management group that is proposing a program, which is only just a small fraction of actually the total southeast. This is why if there was a major plan in place and things of that nature, as he's considering it right, now would be an automatic in there. It would fit into a total plan.

That pretty well concludes my remarks, but I just wanted to draw that to the attention of both Ministers, that it is vitally important that we do some basic planning in the area and we need you people to help and assist the people in the area with that.

Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like, in the next couple of minutes only, to try and get a better clarification as to how these AgroMan, these joint agreements, federally and provincially, how they work, particularly in these areas.

I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, firstly, whether there have been any significant changes in the thrust or the direction in certain areas that he inherited from the former administration, within the Department of Agriculture, under the AgroMan projects, specifically, if there are any changes in projects? I know there may be a difference in the scrutiny or the monitoring from year to year, and that I understand, but are there any other changes?

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, in terms of the program that is presently in the Estimates, there is basi-

cally no change whatsoever in terms of the program at all. There's no doubt that we will be, over the summer, conducting a review in terms of what options are open to the government and what thrusts we might want to undertake under this program that may be open to us, but that determination has yet to be made, in terms of what is available, what funds may be open for future years. The present program, other than what I have indicated earlier, there's basically no change in the program.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Thank you. I'll ask the same question to the Minister of Natural Resources and maybe he can also tell me in his answer, or give to me in his answer, the number of AgroMan projects which he inherited? I know if I went back to the Estimates figure, in that total number of Capital Projects I think there would be probably eight or nine or ten under Natural Resources. Maybe he can tell me how many were originally presented in his Estimates and whether any more than one, I know one has been cut, and whether, in fact, others have been also?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I don't recall the numbers. I'd be guessing if I indicated a number, but there are not a great many as the honourable member knows. I think we reviewed them all during the course of the Committee Estimates. So far as I can recall, I don't think there has been any change or any significant change that I'm aware of, other than perhaps timing and phasing in respect to the developments, because of time limitations or we want to spread it over another construction period. The only program that I'm aware of where there has been a portion of the agreed program cut is in respect to the one item and that's the Domain demonstration project that the honourable member is familiar with. That's the only one that I know of.

One of the other members asked earlier about the Marsh River Drain. I want to be specific about that because I know that we did look at that. It may have been a phasing change or something, I'm not sure of that, but I can't recall of anything being cut other than the one item.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Thank you. I'm wondering if the Minister could provide for us, some time in the next month, the actual status of the remaining AgroMan projects under Natural Resources. As you indicate, a hard decision has been made on one of them and maybe varying degrees of a phase-in decisions have been made on the others. Possibly he could give those to us.

I'm more concerned about how fixed, in fact, these agreements are, in a sense now where the Minister has indicated one project has definitely been cut. What say or what input to that decision does the Federal Government have, not only in that specific project, but in all these projects across the board if, in fact, the Provincial Government of the Day wishes to stop funding in a certain area? What is the responsibility of our government; first of all, as far as giving that type of indication to the Federal Government; and what say does the Federal Government have, if any, in the uni-

lateral decision provincially to make a decision regarding any one of these projects?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me have an understanding that I think the honourable member wants to have confirmation or a status report on, I think he described them as the AgroMan developments, those are the Value-Added Crop Developments, presumably, the water-related Value-Added Crop Developments. Is that correct?

In respect to the role of the Provincial Government and the Federal Government in any change, I'm not expert in that, Mr. Chairman, all I know is that it must be possible to affect change from time to time and I have indicated that change was required in respect to the one project. I haven't heard any difficulty in doing that; if there is difficulty we'll all have to face that difficulty. I think there are times when the decision has to be made in respect to policy thrust, not destructive completely of programs, but a clear indication that certain change is required and I think it has to be possible to make change from time to time. I haven't heard any problem back from the Federal Government in respect to that change.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister has, in fact, answered my question. I guess what he is saying is that maybe this was represented the first time, a major change has occurred in one of these projects and, in fact, maybe it isn't even recognized at the federal level as yet. I'm satisfied with that answer and I think my questions in this whole area have been satisfied.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(a)—pass; 1.(b) Tourism Agreement.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'll be brief because the Minister was kind enough, during the Estimates, to give me the rundown of Destination Manitoba, with the enabling dollars in it. I would like to ask the Minister, though, if there has been any further advancement regarding the Rural Incentive Program, and I think she knows what I mean by, are the qualifications and everything nearly in place for the industry to make applications under this program, and the regulations and guidelines? I think they were close to that during Estimates.

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

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Chairman, I apologize for not being in my Chair when we started to consider the matter at hand. I'm not sure I've fully grasped the intent of the question. I take it that you're inquiring about the existing Rural Small Enterprise Incentive Program under Enterprise Manitoba.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** I was looking down. I didn't notice she wasn't in her chair or I wouldn't have started.

No, we're on section (b) Destination Tourism Agreement of the Enabling Vote and I mentioned that

the Minister had been kind enough to give me the rundown of Destination Manitoba, the six different programs under Destination Manitoba and the Enabling Vote dollars are there in the Budget.

On the Rural Incentive Program under Destination Manitoba - that's the one where there is \$7 million for Rural Tourism Industry Incentives - when the Estimates were on, the Minister said she was close to having the regulations ready for people in the industry to make application under this program. I'm just wondering if these regulations are ready, if the program is moving.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, three of the six programs were not operative at the time of the Estimates and the state of all three of those now is the same. The province has agreed on their half and we're waiting federal confirmation. So as soon as that's obtained, we can proceed with making the application forms available.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** I take it then, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is referring to the Winnipeg Destination area, the Rural Destination areas and the Rural Tourism Industry Incentives? Those three programs have been submitted to the Federal Government for approval of the regulations that have been submitted by the Minister's Department. I'm fully aware that the Federal Government is a partner and I'm also very aware of the anguish we've gone through for several years trying to get a program that could be acceptable and would be able to be presented in such a way that wouldn't show a lot of favouritism to different areas. Can the Minister give us some indication as to when the Federal Government is going to give its approval? This is not like the Northern Agreement, or I hope it's not going to be like the Northern Agreement, where the Federal Government holds it up. The money is already here in this one and there's been a lot of hard work done. Is there any indication of when it will move? I say that, Mr. Chairman, knowing full well that we had a hard time getting it into the position where we wanted to move.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Chairman, we don't expect any delay. There was only one minor point that had to be cleared through and it didn't require very elaborate decision-making at the federal level. I think it's been about 10 days in their court and we're expecting to hear shortly now. That can be another 10 days or shorter.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Does the Minister expect that we can spend in the Rural Incentives - you have budgeted for close to 1.1 million which would be a benefit not only to the hospitality industry as far as upgrading is concerned, but would be a benefit to the construction industry in many of the smaller areas. Is the program structured in such a way that when applications are made that they can move fast and hopefully have some of this benefit during this year?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, we've certainly had that in mind in our attempts to move the program into an active phase. There are a lot of applications in already just where people have submitted not knowing quite what detailed information we would require.

That will speed up the final process because some of them will perhaps only be asked for a little bit of extra information. It also indicates that there's a high desire for takeup of the program. Now whether a rural Tourism enterprise would be able to move right into construction, especially during the height of the summer season, is still uncertain. However, there should be quite a bit of money on stream by the fall for some late fall construction and in cases where the work is internal to a building, it can go on during the winter months which, of course, is very good from all points of view because that's when employment in the construction trades tends to be down.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Well, I'll try and combine two questions into one and possibly she can do the same because I know the situation that they're in. I just would wonder what the program, would Destination area for Winnipeg, is there work going on with the city to try and find a specific program. Is it in the way of a study, is it the way of parks or what type of program are you looking at for the city? And in the rural Destination areas, have the specific Destination areas been laid out regarding the province? In other words, have you chosen Thompson, Gimli area or the Interlake areas such as Destination areas at this time?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Chairman, the City Capital Programs, there's already quite a banking of potential projects and they are varied. There are parks, there are Tourism attractions, there are hotel-type projects. The selection among those or the prioritizing is not complete, but we are substantially aided by the extensive study that was conducted during the previous government's term and with which I'm sure the member opposite is very familiar. We were helped considerably by the analysis that was done in the Tourism study because it not only analyzed the particular opportunities, particularly in the rural areas, the natural surroundings and, therefore, the type of tourism that would be most appropriate, but it did also indicate what the current state of development in those areas is and therefore gave us a lot of guidelines in terms of where to move. That study will be available for wider circulation shortly. As I say, we're not following it absolutely, but it's given us a very substantial set of guidelines with which we're basically sympathetic.

The rural areas, there have been a number of priority areas identified, basically the Whiteshell area, the Winnipeg Lakes area, the Riding Mountain, Duck Mountain area, the No. 1 Highway strip, the Snow Lake, Cranberry, The Pas, Flin Flon area as main areas; then there are a few additional specialty areas which can be dealt with at the same time. The study provides us with a long-term tourism development plan, not all the components of which can be dealt with under the five-year Destination Manitoba Agreement, but we have prioritized the proposals that came out of that plan, so we're not flying blind as it were. We do have a rationale for where the allocations will be made, but the actual allocations, if any, of course, are down the road a bit as yet.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b) Tourism Agreement—pass.  
1.(c) Industrial Development Agreement - the Member for Sturgeon Creek.



**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** The Industrial Development Agreement, Mr. Chairman, I would have a question on, really the Rural Small Enterprise Incentive Program, which is certainly not the most money in this program but has a very high profile. We're now getting down toward the end of the funds in that particular program. In fact, at one point when I was Minister we were concerned it wouldn't last the length of the five-year agreement, but as the Minister knows there is flexibility within this program to transfer funds from one program to the other. Is it the intention of the government to consider transferring funds into the RSEI if the applications are such that appear, after evaluation by the different committees, to be beneficial for the expansion of manufacturing in rural Manitoba? Is it the government's intention to, if it's available, consider putting more funds into it or negotiating a further agreement with the Federal Government on this particular program?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Chairman, yes, we are considering all of those options. The question of internal transfer will be considered as we move along. At the current moment the take-up on the RSEI is somewhat slower. I'm told that's the normal development pattern for a program; it's slow to start, it peaks and then it tends to drop off towards the end of the program.

However, we are - this is required in the terms of the agreement - monitoring the success of the program and we'll be using that evaluation when it comes to renegotiating the entire agreement with the Federal Government.

We've already had preliminary discussions with them as to when we can most effectively start discussing with them and I would say that will occur in the late fall. Meanwhile, if we're finding an increased take-up in the RSEI Program relative to the other components, we certainly will consider internal transfer.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That report that I was given by the Minister bringing the program up-to-date till the end of February, 1982, showed approximately 675 jobs created in the rural area. It's quite right it did move up very fast to a peak and it has moved down, and I would just suggest to the Minister that the program may need some changes regarding the dollars. It may have to be considered, instead of \$60,000 to go to \$100,000 and because the amounts, today with inflation, do not really provide enough money to get a viable business going, but I'm sure the Minister has looked at that.

In the Infrastructure Program, had the Minister said that there was, I believe, one or two applications for infrastructure? Has there been any more applications from the rural area for the Infrastructure Program in the last . . . Well, maybe she could bring me up-to-date of how many they have at the present time.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Chairman, I don't have any detail on that available, however, I would be happy to provide the honourable member with the information. We have the same people in the field looking around at the opportunities and doing the kind of development work that is required for such a program. I think it's no secret, however, that the priority in the field in so many cases in the manufacturing area, has shifted to

trying to keep alive many of the industries that we have. Because of the deepening economic recession, the department is attempting to maintain a balance though in its work between development of new opportunities and protecting and maintaining what we have.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** I think I might not have expressed it properly. The Infrastructure Program, the one being when a city or municipality has on their own, found an industry and they make application to the province for infrastructure, under that program there were usually two or three potentials or a couple of applications in at all times. I just wonder if the Minister has any applications from any of the towns or municipalities for infrastructure at the present time.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Chairman, there are four or five but I don't have the names of them to hand so, once again, I'll undertake to see that the honourable member receives those.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Just one more question, Mr. Chairman. On the Manitoba Research Council, I know that they're responsible for the operation of the Winnipeg Technology Centre and the Portage la Prairie Food Technology Centre and I'm wondering if the Minister has had time to take a look at the structure. I have heard, I might say, that the terms of reference for the Manitoba Research Council are being, as a matter of fact, changed and if that's the case, is the Minister looking to have separate boards responsible to making recommendations on these two programs, the Winnipeg Technology Centre to her or to the department, rather than to the Manitoba Research Council. I think the Minister said during the Estimates that the structure had been laid down by the agreement and I'm aware of that, but she was looking at a possibility of hopefully changing that structure of having a board report to a board that was a little unwieldy.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Chairman, the structure has not been decided on yet except that the tech centres will relate directly to the MRC. As the member opposite knows, the MRC has been undergoing a self-analysis for some time and had quite a lengthy set of proposals as to how their structure and their general mission, as it were, should be revised. We've been going through that and our general intent is to make the MRC more of a planning, co-ordinating body for research relevant to manufacturing and technological development here in Manitoba, in a sense, to broaden its focus in that way and to ensure that its time was not unduly occupied with the day-to-day operation of the technology centres. To date our plan is still to keep the both tech centres under the umbrella of the MRC.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(c)—pass; 1.(d) Energy and Energy Bus Agreements—pass.

1.(e) Water Development Agreement - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister of Natural Resources. Is this where the Flood Protection Agreement regarding the Red River Valley comes under?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, Mr. Chairman, under this item we have projects that have been reviewed with the Federal Government and for which commitment has been authorized. I can read them to you if that would be agreeable. It's the Morden Dam: to raising the full supply level of the Morden reservoir by seven feet and increase storage capacity there from 2,100 to 3,100 acre feet and increasing the yield of the reservoir. That's one item and that's well under way. I think it's intended to be completed this year.

The Grandview Water Supply Dugout which is now going to be under way - it should be under way right now - that's being built under PFRA. Then the Edwards Creek Reservoir in respect to rehabilitation of the existing water supply reservoir for the Town of Dauphin; there's one appropriation that was in that vote entitled "Unidentified" and it provides for the identification and evaluation of a number of options to meet water demands of specific areas. We have reduced the scope of that; there was \$200,000 in that. We haven't identified any areas. We've cut that back to \$24,000, but those are the items there.

The items that the honourable member was referring to, provision was made for the Main Supply or Capital Estimates of the department.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you. Under this program then, the Minister kindly indicated the programs that are under way are covered here. Can he indicate whether there are any other proposals, major projects that are contemplated in the future that would not be here but that are being looked at? He indicated that he was cutting back from \$200,000 to \$24,000 for projects under consideration in terms of study. Am I correct in that interpretation? If that is the case, I wonder why he would cut back. Are there no more major projects that are being looked at, and if there are, are there any that are being proposed under this agreement for the very near future?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Perhaps if my staff were with me, they would be able to confirm what further requests have been made. I know that there are a large number of requests for drainage and things like that. But for water supply and that's what each one of these items involves, Morden Dam, the Grandview and the Edwards Creek; I'm not familiar with any other current requests for improved water supply for communities. There may well be that some correspondence has come to the department's attention and not mine. If there is, of course, we'd be committed to advance that. My understanding is that it was appropriate to reduce the amount here because of there not being identified any considerable numbers of projects.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** What the Minister is saying then is that the reduction from \$200,000, which was basically for studying of these projects has been reduced to \$24,000, because there's been no projects that are actively in the mill right now. Would that be a correct interpretation?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, that's my understanding, that under this type of shared costing with the Federal

Government that those are the only items right now that they have agreed to. I don't know whether there's any additional specific water supply item that has been advanced but the department has seen fit to indicate a reduction in that amount, so that indicates to me that is so, that there's a very limited demand for additional water supply for many communities.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Just for further clarification then. That does not exclude that if any municipality or community project was forwarded that it could not then be forwarded again to the federal department for consideration on a joint cost-shared venture. Am I correct? Okay, thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(d)—pass; 1.(e) Water Development Agreement—pass.

1.(f) Manitoba NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT Agreement - the Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I'm wondering if the Minister can advise the committee as to the current status with respect to new programming in Northern Manitoba that would normally be expected to be included in the new NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT Agreement that has not been signed yet. Can the Minister indicate whether there are, in fact, any programs going on at the present time that the province is funding 100 percent?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, who is away on government business, staff is expected momentarily. We have indicated our concern to have someone available should there be any detailed questions.

In respect to that item, I'm not in a position to indicate. I think the specific was whether or not that particular project was included in the proposed agreement. Correct?

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Yes, there are so many dollars allocated here to ongoing sub-agreements that were signed with the Federal Government and those programs are continuing on a cost-shared agreement. But I'm wondering if there are any other programs that the province is currently initiating that they're having to provide 100 percent funding, that normally would be expected to be covered on a cost-shared arrangement with the feds or whether the government is holding back on any new programs pending the signing of a new agreement.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I hesitate to speculate on that in the absence of my colleague because I think it might be indicative, it might be used by the Federal Government to suggest, "Well, if they're going ahead and funding it 100 percent anyway, they really don't need our assistance." I think my colleague has been pressing the Federal Government very reasonably but steadily in respect to the need to sign this agreement because these works are important to Northern Manitoba. I wouldn't, in making any comment, like to jeopardize the position.

It has been difficult to secure ready Federal Government approval to that signing, but I think my col-

league has indicated that he still remains optimistic that they're going to be able to negotiate and sign a formal agreement.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I'm wondering if there has been any assurance from the Federal Government as to retroactivity on any of the programming. I would expect, perhaps, that is part of the ongoing negotiations, as well, but would you have any comment with respect to retroactivity?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that my colleague, on behalf of the government, is insisting on that because in order to provide full funding for some of the programs that are ongoing it would be necessary in equity to get that kind of provision, otherwise, it would be changing the shared cost that existed before.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I don't want to get into any detailed activities when the negotiations are still being dealt with, however, I wonder if the Minister of Natural Resources might give us some indication as to what progress the Minister of Northern Affairs is making with the Federal Minister in getting a new agreement signed. Is there some likelihood that we can expect the signing to take place in the very near future?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to speculate on that again because I don't know at this point what stage the negotiations are in. I know that the Minister, although it's been very difficult, remains optimistic that an agreement is going to be reached. Now whether or not it will be as comprehensive and as full as he wants or we desire, I don't know.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(f)—pass; 1.(g) Winnipeg Core Area Agreement—pass.

1.(h) Special ARDA Agreement - the Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Special ARDA Agreement expired at the end of March and I understand that there are negotiations under way at the present time with respect to a new Special ARDA Agreement. I'm wondering if there's been any activities in the Special ARDA field, since the 1st of April without any agreement in place. What have been the activities in the Special ARDA field since April 1st of '82?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, in the absence of my colleague, the Minister of Northern Affairs, I wonder if, on his behalf, we could take that as notice because I'm not familiar with that area and neither of my colleagues are. Perhaps we could take it as notice and give that information to the honourable member.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** In view of the fact that the Minister of Northern Affairs is not here at the present time, I would thank the Minister of Resources for maybe taking that question as notice. We would appreciate getting the details of the Special ARDA Agreement with respect to activities that have taken place in that field

since April 1st of this year. As I mentioned earlier, the previous agreement expired at the end of March and, I believe, the Minister of Northern Affairs during Estimates indicated that a new Special ARDA Agreement was being negotiated. I'm sure that this has been a very successful program over the past six or seven years and I'm wondering what's happening to many of the Northern communities without an agreement in place at this time; and whether or not we can be assured that there would be some retroactivity in the Special ARDA Agreement, taking it back to April 1st of this year.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I've made a note of the honourable member's concerns and I'm sure at the earliest opportunity the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs will respond to them.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Chairman, the Energy Agreement went by fairly fast and I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to answer one question I have on the energy.

One of my constituents - he doesn't have a business in the constituency but he lives there - is very involved in solar energy. He has a very deep concern with the department's attitude toward solar energy because of the Unies Report that apparently came out which is not favouring solar energy to that great an extent. Naturally he believes that he's in a business that's a growing business and he believes sincerely that it's a potential and something that would be good for Manitoba, but he has the feeling that the department is not really taking an interest in the solar energy type of energy programs because of that. I wonder if the Minister could assure me that's not the case and that there is an interest being shown to his type of industry.

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

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** This may, in fact, have been the person who was written up in the paper a while back. I sent that down to the department asking for their comments about that whole area. I do know that I want the whole area of alternative energy reviewed; I want to spend a bit of time on that. I really, frankly, have not had as much time as I would have liked, to date, to go into the specifics of that. I've been dealing with some of the larger items that are within my portfolio, but through the course of the summer I did want to get into a detailed review of all of the conservation area and the area of alternative energy. I can assure the member that I will give solar energy very serious consideration, that I think we should be neutral on this, look at the economics of it and the feasibility of it rather than starting off with any dispositions. We do have a fair amount of sunshine in Manitoba compared to other parts of Canada and compared to other parts of North America, so it's something that deserves serious consideration. I'll give the member assurance of that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I'm wondering if I could direct a

question to the Minister of Mines and Energy. A couple of years ago, during the Northern Affairs Estimates, the present Minister who was on the Opposition side at that time indicated that he had fairly reliable sources in Ottawa with respect to negotiations on the new NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT Agreement. I'm wondering if the Minister could give us some indication as to what he's hearing from his sources in Ottawa these days, as to getting a new agreement signed in the very near future.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** You know, I've been so busy with all the other questions that have been raised with me over the course of the last six months that I just haven't had the luxury —(Interjection)— no, they haven't dried up I don't think. I haven't had the luxury of enough time to contact different sources that one has, to try and check out what the various state of negotiations, or problem solving, or the state on various issues is, so frankly I have not been in touch with them since that time.

I always felt that it's one of the tasks in Opposition to try and check out some of these things and that's why I had from time to time explored possibilities like whether, in fact, the Federal Liberal Caucus would be neutral enough when it came to distributing aerospace developments across the country. I always had concerns about that. I think some of my concerns were justified at that time and I think there were probably some concerns within the federal bureaucracy about that. I haven't been able to check my sources with respect to the state of NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT negotiations.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(h)—pass.

Resolution No. 126. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$11,383,800 for Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

That completes the Estimates scheduled on the list so far. I'm leaving the Chair and I will return at the will of the House.

Committee rise.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour. The first item on the agenda for Private Members' Hour is Resolution No. 8.

### RES. NO. 8 - FEDERAL REPORT ON WIFE BATTERING

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

**MS. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by the Member for Radisson, the following motion:

WHEREAS a comprehensive report on wife battering prepared by the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs has been tabled in the House of Commons, and

WHEREAS the report indicates that 1 in 10 wives are victim of this abuse, and, with their children, lack the protection of our legal system, and

WHEREAS the report outlines 17 recommendations relating to police training, the courts, emergency shelters, treatment programs, public education, and the federal-provincial conference and the administration and enforcement of the law with respect to wife battering,

THEREFORE BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba commend the Committee on its thorough study of this deplorable situation and urge the Federal Government to move with all possible speed to implement the recommendations of the Committee, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Attorney-General, and the Ministers of Health and of Community Services and Corrections review the report in the Manitoba context with a view to recommending improvements that can be made within provincial jurisdiction.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MS. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin my remarks on this resolution with a bit of background.

In mid-February, 1981, the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs received the following Order of Reference:

That the Committee be empowered to examine, enquire into and report from time to time appropriate measures for the prevention, identification and treatment of abused persons involved in interfamily violence and in particular without limiting the generality of the foregoing, to address the issue of battered wives and dependants for such other measures in the same matter as the Committee may consider desirable.

The motion empowered this Committee to study a vast subject, that of interfamily violence. The Committee chose to limit its deliberations, however, toward the behaviour that a man exhibits towards the women with whom he is emotionally involved, lives with or is, in fact, married to. The reason that they didn't attempt to study the entire area of interfamily violence is that the area that they decided on was so incredibly broad and the other areas, such as the abuse of children and the sexual abuse of children, in particular, is at the present time being studied on three different levels in three different studies.

The indication of violence toward elderly members of the family does exist, but we don't have enough statistics to do a thorough study of this area. For all of these reasons, the federal committee decided to limit their study to wife battering. I think that through the proceedings on this motion, through the speeches on this motion, all of us will understand why that area in itself could be subdivided, could be broken down and treated. It's been a long, overdue problem.

What is the problem? What are some of the things that they came up with, that the study found? They found that wife battering was, in particular, not just a matter of throwing dishes around or of slapping another person. Battered women are choked; they're kicked; they're bitten; they're punched; they are assailed with lethal weapons. The men who assail them are not just men who've had a bad day; they're

not men who just have had one drink too many; they're not men who become temporarily belligerent because of some mental derangement. In fact, only 12 percent of the cases of wife battering occur when the man has had too much to drink or that drinking is related to the incident.

In only 3 percent of the cases has it been shown that the man had some kind of organic brain damage or mental illness, only 3 percent; added to the drinking, that still only comes up with 15 percent. The best unofficial estimate that we have, based on hard data, is 1 in 10 women involved in a relationship being battered. We'll see, I think, as we proceed that this is very much an underestimate. The hard data that particular fact is based on though is from the number of women in transition homes across Canada, the number of divorces sought on the basis of physical cruelty, and the number of police calls for domestic assault. It's interesting to note at this point that in studies done in the United States proportionately more college-educated men approve of hitting wives "on appropriate occasions." In fact, the studies have shown that victimization actually occurs in either one in five or one in four cases. Approximately 90 percent of all the cases of wife battering are never reported to doctors or to the police.

The characteristics of battering are several; one is that it's aimed primarily at women in an attempt to control them or to punish them. It is seen that the wife or the woman with whom the man lives is the rightful object of such abuse. Another characteristic of battering is that it's ongoing, it's pervasive. Studies show that one-third to one-half of battered women who have been interviewed, these are only the ones that have been interviewed, were attacked daily or weekly or on some regular interval such as payday; that seems to be a popular day for battering.

There seems to be no way that the woman is able to change her behaviour in order to stop the abuse, in other words, no matter what she does to change her behaviour, if that's what she chooses to do, it does not stop the abuse and it does not stop the regularity of the abuse. Another rather frightening factor, since we consider ourselves civilized, is that battering seems to most often take place during pregnancy. In various studies, and the studies do vary on this area, between 40 percent and 80 percent of women indicate that battering either started or was increased during pregnancy, 80 percent. Results, of course, are miscarriages, birth defects and it goes on and on. Researchers have concluded that pregnancy seems to be a major incitement to violence in assaulting men.

The men who do this kind of battering cut across all kinds of social lines, and I think that's something that has been brought home to us with newspaper articles recently, the results of studies. It's not true that only men involved in violent work habits are violent towards women; it's not true that the poor batter more than the rich. Social, economic, age and cultural levels, a microcosm of these exist in every transition house in the country.

It's interesting to note too that where studies have been done, where women have been interviewed and their backgrounds studied, police, doctors, truck drivers, lawyers and business executives were among the top groups in the levels of battering. It does seem

at times that unemployment and economic stress has a detrimental effect on battering; it increases the battering. I personally found this to be true in talking to people in the Thompson Crisis Centre where the situation always worsens when unemployment increases. The regional perspective - I'm going to try to continue with giving you statistics and let other speakers talk about background and the Manitoba situation, so these statistics will be taken from across the country.

During one 18-month period in Vancouver, 1,361 women sought help as victims of wife battering, that's just in Vancouver; in Edmonton, the Family Court Conciliation Service Counsellor stated that physical abuse had occurred in 33 percent of the couples that he worked with; in Quebec, one-third of all of the divorce applications cite physical cruelty as the reason; in B.C., one-quarter of all of the divorce applications cite that as the reason; in Charlottetown, PEI, 50 percent of all police calls are classed as domestic disputes; Canada-wide, where we have 73 transition houses, the federal report I think states 86, but a more recent report, even that shows only 73. Some have been reduced in funding to the point where they've had to close their doors, and two-thirds of all of those exist in Ontario and Quebec. Only one-third are in all of the rest of the provinces. In Manitoba, just to draw the parallel, at Osborne House alone, there were more than 430 women admitted in 1981 and with them came more than 625 children.

Where do these women go for help? Well, if they happen to pick up the phone and ask for help, if they happen to decide to bring a charge, what can they expect to receive? The police and the courts do little to protect them; shelter is available if you are fortunate enough to live in Winnipeg or in Thompson and there happens to be room; existing welfare legislation is not flexible enough to provide for them. As far as the batterer is concerned, he goes relatively free, free to batter again; he is not treated as a wrongdoer; he's not even treated as someone whose behaviour society finds intolerable. Criminal charges are rarely brought against him.

I would like to read into the record a case history from the report. Ellen has been separated from her husband for two years. Following an incident in 1979, during which she was severely beaten and the husband threatened suicide with a knife in front of the children, she fled to Mission Services Family Apartments with her two young children. Ellen initiated custody proceedings during this time and was granted interim custody. Her husband grabbed the children from their school, in spite of the custody order. Ellen didn't know where they were for three weeks. In an attempt to get her children back, Ellen went to her husband's house where she was threatened and repeatedly raped. At the final custody hearing the judge ordered both Ellen and her husband to see a psychiatrist in order to determine which one was the fit parent. While they were waiting for the court's decision the husband continually phoned his children threatening suicide if they didn't go with him. After reading the psychiatrist's report the judge allegedly felt that the husband was unstable and that Ellen was a totally competent mother. However, he gave the children to their father because if he did not get them

Ellen and the children would be under constant threat of violence. Ellen believes that her husband has been committing incest with their 11-year-old daughter for a period of time and is continuing to do so. Both children are terrified of their father. His new girlfriend has called the police from Ellen's home because she, herself, had been beaten up when she caught Ellen's husband having sex with her 15-year-old sister. Yes, she can call the police.

A study in Vancouver showed that the police force responded to a little over 50 percent of the calls involving a male-female dispute. The other 50 percent went unanswered. Hamilton, Ontario files show that 1,200 police calls a year come in that involve domestic violence. We can condemn the police, I suppose, but why should we? Let's look at their background.

They've had no training in helping the victim in these cases. They are usually on a return trip or if it's a first-time trip, they know that they'll be back again. Their instructions, you see, in these cases are only to arrest the aggressor, the assaulter, if they catch him in the act of hitting the victim. Well, normally this doesn't happen. It's easy to put your hand down when the police walk in. In a number of jurisdictions they may only arrest the assaulter in a domestic case if the victim requires a certain number of stitches —(Interjection)— I wish I knew. I think this is just so unacceptable. It's unbelievable that we still have laws like this or the lack of laws in Canada.

There is no recognition for police who do handle domestic violence cases well. They are rewarded for the number of arrests that they make. If they are told not to arrest, of course, they are not rewarded for pursuing a domestic violence case. Many policemen and I use the word men because most often in these cases it is two men who answer these calls - figure that the wife will return to her husband anyway and therefore, for some reason, she must like to be beaten.

Well, the fact is she doesn't like it but she can't afford to leave in most cases and even if she did have enough money to get her out of the house, where would she go? She has no place to go. Often too, she fears for the safety of her children because her husband has threatened violence to them if she leaves. If the woman happens to have the kind of support that will get her to the courts, she may find out that the case will eventually be heard but what happens then? She can expect that her tormentor will be free and, of course, will be exceedingly angry and most probably beat her again. He will be free on bail; he will be free on probation.

In Canada in 1978, a third of the men on probation for assaulting their wives violated the terms of that probation. Men who kill their wives are in fact given lighter sentences than murderers who kill complete strangers. One Charles Baker was sentenced by the Ontario Supreme Court Judge to two years less a day for killing his wife. The judge said and I quote: "He probably deserved more but a longer sentence won't bring Mrs. Baker back."

If a woman has access to the emergency shelters, the transition houses, then she is indeed fortunate but that is only a short-term stay. There is very little of what we call second-stage housing and the economic and emotional support that is needed to get women into them. In Winnipeg, in the first 11 months of 1981,

Osborne House had already sheltered over 400 battered women and only 15 to 20 percent of these calls could be accounted for on what they call returning clients. These were new cases. In Thompson, the Crisis Centre there which has been granted extra funding by the government has only space for six small families in the second-stage housing and those are the only second-stage housing spaces available in all of Manitoba. There is no help for women in the rural area. There is no help for Native women on reserves. There is very little help for women anywhere.

The recommendations of the report include those for the Federal Government which includes recommendations for RCMP training and teams for domestic violence cases, funding of shelters and second-stage housing, perhaps most important, the publicizing of the problem.

The federal report recommends that provinces and private organizations also must be involved in finding a solution to this problem. At present, no province has a law that allows a court to prevent a man from entering his house or apartment or on the grounds that he has assaulted the woman who lives with him. So even if he is on probation or on bail he may still enter his own home; she cannot keep him out.

We must find ways to temporarily fund the victims. We must put in place an advocacy service for assistance during court hearings and appearances. We must provide for the education and encourage the education of the doctors who deal with these women, of the police, of judges and of children in our schools through courses in parenting in particular.

Why did I propose this amendment? Well, I'd like to close with a statement that I think will tell you why. Half of all the women in a relationship with a man are battered and half of these are assaulted regularly, especially if they have the misfortune of having conceived a child. Every 29 minutes in Canada one of us is raped. If we happen to survive the battering, the raping and live to be 70, three out of four of us will live at or below the poverty line. I don't think anyone would dare to question why we are angry. I don't think anyone would dare to question why we are demanding that something be done about these problems and be done now.

When we come to a vote on this resolution, I hope that we have the unanimous approval of this House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the Member for Kildonan for introducing this resolution. It's a good resolution and certainly one well worth supporting. I also want to commend the numbers of women's organizations who have been doing the groundwork and have been supporting all along the battered wives of our country because it is a country-wide problem. Although I'm not going to go into statistics, I think the point must be made time and time again that wife-battering is not just an isolated argument that has got out of hand.

Battered women, as the Member for Kildonan has mentioned, are choked, kicked, bitten and punched. I'd like to just read one little section out of the report that went to the Standing Committee on Health, Wel-

fare and Social Affairs. It said: "According to our research, the physical violence battered women experienced at their husbands' hands ranges from assaults causing bruising to injuries requiring extensive medical treatment. Their husbands hit them on the head and face, punch or kick them, stab them and in some cases, try to murder them. Women reported being assaulted with such weapons as the burner rack from a stove or broken bottles, as well as with knives and guns. Assaults resulted in bruises, broken bones, internal injuries, torn ligaments and dislocated joints. For many women, the battering began early in their marriages. For others it began after years of marriage. For some, their husband's assaults were a regular occurrence every day, each week. Other women were assaulted sporadically.

Wife battering must not be treated as a personal problem. It is our problem. Battered wives need protection and help. What we are dealing with here is a crisis situation. Battered women are rarely beaten only once. To get away, a battered wife must leave home. This is a ridiculous situation. Here the victim is treated as the criminal. She has to leave her home, with her children, but I wouldn't have it any other way with the kind of protection that we have now, because if she stays at home she'll probably be and will be brutally beaten time and time again. Battered wives have no real protection. Battered wives are made to feel that they are the guilty party.

In the report it suggests that the police should be laying the charge and I couldn't agree more. It takes it out of the hands of the battered wife. It's pretty darn hard to be battered, degraded, violated and then have the gumption to get up and lay a charge. It should be in the hands of the police. If her husband had assaulted a stranger, he would then have been charged in criminal court. Why should this man be treated differently just because he has beaten his wife? He certainly shouldn't. To try and save the marriage in this circumstance is ridiculous. What we need is help, and help right now, for these women.

The police should be trained in family matters. They should be working closely with the people in Osborne House. The husband should be removed immediately from the situation so that the woman can get out and can get help.

Police officers themselves are often frustrated by the legal system. They may make the first charge but then it carries on and if the courts don't carry through, and if they let them off, then the woman is once again left in the home with the same man who is going to beat them again.

I think the first priority, and as it's been shown, is the transition homes, transition houses such as Osborne House. They need continued guaranteed funding, Mr. Speaker, and a woman and her family are only allowed to stay for 10 days. Now I know they won't put them out on the street, but this is as long as they can afford to keep them. Now what possible action can a woman take in 10 days? We need, and desperately need, second-stage housing; places where women and their families can go and stay till they can get on their feet - longer certainly than 10 days - where they have options open to them, where they can receive counselling. They need to know the kinds of jobs that are available to them, the kind of training that they are

able to get funding; and when we talk about funding, they need immediate funding. There needs to be a source of funding that they can have to tide them over for a month or two till they find and can get the kind of help to apply for welfare.

Applying for welfare after you have been beaten and degraded is a degrading situation in itself and it's slow. I think often that women who have left home with just the clothes on their back and the same for the children, they need to be encouraged and helped to be able to stay away. Often they're discouraged and they go back to their husbands only to find themselves in the same situation all over again.

They need to know that there's day care available to help them. Most of the women, I think, that are in these situations have been under the thumbs of their husbands in the marriage with no money, they do not have control of the funds and so they're in a position where they probably, if they ever worked, haven't worked in a long time. They need the kind of support system that social work and social workers often don't give them today.

I think that the social worker system has mainly been a source of helping the family stay together and this is a situation where the family cannot stay together. We don't have time to help the batterers, but we do have time and we have to make the resources available, to help the women who have been battered.

We don't need women who are so discouraged that they have to go back to their husbands. I couldn't agree more with an advocate system. We need someone to act as a volunteer to help women get through all the legal hassles that they're going to encounter, just helping them to get through their daily lives for the first while that they're out of their homes, women helping women, as they have been doing all along.

One of the problems is public awareness. It's very difficult convincing men in particular that wife beating is as prevalent as statistics are showing. It's difficult for people, and men in particular, who are not violent, to imagine a friend, a neighbour, an acquaintance, that they could perform such a violent act on someone that they supposedly love.

What happens to the children in these homes? The fright. It's just inconceivable to me that we have allowed such a situation to go on for such a long time. This is what's called a hidden act of violence and I certainly believe it.

We need public education and mass media campaigns to make the public aware of what is going on behind closed doors. We need to let women know that there's help available. We need to tell them about Osborne House. We need programs in our schools, in the Junior High Schools and at the High School level. We need programs for the social agencies, they must be aware of what is happening. I think often they're not, that the little bit that is told to them is very inadequate.

Very often, Mr. Speaker, the first contact is at the hospital. Women who have been badly beaten will turn up at the hospital and their first contact will be a nurse. We need awareness training for nurses. They should be able to, supportably, ask a woman if she has been beaten when she first comes in. We don't need a woman sitting in the waiting room, frightened for her life that her husband might come in and drag her

home, and this has happened. We need someone that will take a look at this woman, give her some supportive help. Not only that, but when the doctor is checking out the patient, if they don't have the time and they should have - there's no excuse for not having the time - they should be recording all the injuries, possibly pictures should be taken at this stage because they need evidence to take into court. Certainly, I think the same procedures that we're using for child abuse should be used for wife abuse.

Section 244 of the Criminal Code is clear. No one has the right to beat anyone. I think in the instance of wife beating I couldn't have been more appalled at reading some of the cases that were brought up in the report on the Standing Committee of Health, Welfare and Social Services. At the beginning, reading the committee notes, you could see in some there was a bit of skepticism. I don't feel that was there as it went along and certainly towards the end I think everyone was very supportive of the motions that they're bringing in.

Dr. Peter Jaffe of London, Ontario, of the Family Court Clinic, said it has an effect when the Attorney-General of a province or the Solicitor-General of a country says we are not condoning family violence. This is the kind of statement that we need and we want from the Attorney-General of this province. Something must be done and where better than to start in this Chamber?

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

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to speak today on this motion and to speak wholeheartedly in favour of it. I believe it's a problem of concern to us all in this Chamber and of concern to us generally as citizens of this province. I think it's quite appropriate that we should, as an Assembly representing the people of this province, send a message to the Federal Government that we wholeheartedly support the resolution put forward to us here and, more specifically, we support the recent report on Violence in the Family tabled by the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs in Ottawa.

I would recommend that report to members here. It's rather a lengthy report but it certainly outlines the problem and has a number of interesting suggestions for tackling that problem. The two previous speakers dealt at some length with some of the parts of the report; I don't intend on doing that today myself. Rather, I would like to try and provide a different perspective on it by mentioning some of the experience of the Thompson Crisis Centre in handling problems such as this because it's not a new thing, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we've had various programs aimed at trying to tackle this problem for the last four or five years and that experience I think would enlighten members of this Assembly and would prove, I think, very enlightening for members of the Standing Committee itself.

Now, the Crisis Centre in Thompson goes back to April, 1977 when a rape workshop was held in Thompson to determine the need for a service directed towards victims of violence. At that time, a Steering Committee was set up to prepare the foundation for a

Centre specializing in crisis support, intervention and public education. The concept of the Centre was also enlarged at that time to include the problems of battered women. Funding was initially started in 1978 through the Canada Works Program and the Thompson Women's Crisis Centre was officially opened on January of 1978 at which time it began a 24-hour crisis line.

Originally it was established as the Thompson Women's Crisis Centre, but in 1979 that label was changed to become the Thompson Crisis Centre. I think personally it's a very interesting approach to the whole problem, an approach which I think could be recommended to other communities in the province and other communities throughout Canada, because we recognized in Thompson the fact that this is a problem that involves not only women but men as well, and it involves men who are the batterers and other men who want to help to try and solve this particular problem.

I should say also, Mr. Speaker, that this change of name was more than just that, it also encompassed a change in the focus of the Crisis Centre and also in the involvement of both men and women. Shortly thereafter, sessions were held for volunteers to help in counselling in crisis situations and, while the basic support groups still came from women, there was a significant number of men involved. I, in fact, was one of those involved with some of the earlier counselling sessions and I would certainly commend the Centre for the quality of those sessions and the quality of counselors they've produced over the last few years.

Since that time the Centre has expanded and consolidated its activities. In 1979 it was funded by Canada Works, but in 1980 it was funded by the Department of Community Services and Corrections of the Province of Manitoba for the first time and with the combination of this and local donations its activities were greatly expanded.

1981, once again, Community Services and Corrections funded the Centre and, in fact, 1982 it was once again given funding - significantly increased funding I might add. The Crisis Centre is presently getting \$69,000 per year in the way of a grant.

So, that is the Crisis Centre itself, Mr. Speaker, which was one of the first efforts in Thompson to try and tackle this problem. A more direct connection with this resolution here today is the most recent development with the Crisis Centre, and that is with the establishment of a shelter for women who have been the victims of family violence. This was established just recently, Mr. Speaker, as the North Win House; the Win standing for women in need; it's certainly greatly needed in the Thompson area, Mr. Speaker. As proof of that I point to the fact that over its first few months of activity it has already been at full capacity in terms of the number of women there, in both the stages of the North Win House being that of the emergency shelter and also the transition shelter.

It's also an interesting development, Mr. Speaker, because it relates to the kind of shelter that is mentioned specifically in the report on Violence in the Family, because it is located in a former apartment block which has been leased from the CMHC which is, of course, operated by the Government of Canada; and also in that it provides not just temporary but also



long-term shelter for women and children who are the victims of physical and emotional abuse.

Now, I've mentioned the two facets of the shelter, Mr. Chairman, specifically, there's the second floor of the shelter which is operated on a short-run basis as an emergency shelter for women who come in off the street with a particular problem or come in from another community with a problem related to family violence.

The second portion of it is the transition house at which women and their children can stay for a period of up to one year. The objective of the Transition Area, as it is called, is to have the clients develop into self-assured, self-sufficient persons at the time of their departure. The general philosophy is that each client will take part in house programs which are designed to move a person at her own speed of self-assurance and self-sufficiency.

So there's been some rather novel developments in Thompson in regard to this particular problem. Now, for those who aren't aware of the exact magnitude of the problem, I would quote from the report of the Crisis Centre, a report which was issued for the 1981 year and I think you'll find that the figures can be rather staggering at times.

These are, Mr. Speaker, by the way, the number of interactions and the nature of the interactions in that period. In 1981, there were 113 interactions in regard to battery; 157 in regard to marital relationship, some of which overlap with the battery problem; and 84 problems related to what is labelled as family problems. In general, there've also been other problems in terms of violence on women. For example, there were 10 calls in regard to sexual assault and rape; five in regard to incest; 13 in regard to child abuse.

Those are the statistics, Mr. Speaker, but behind every one of those statistics is often a rather tragic human story of violence, of terror even, because the situation that many of the women are in is that many of them are without major roots in Thompson or are from outlying areas. They have nowhere to go where they will be safe from further violence from their husbands and the only group that exists, really, that can help them in this particular situation is the Crisis Centre in Thompson.

Until they had the transition house, they could do little more than counsel them, try and get them back on their feet quickly, try and redirect them through counselling and other moral assistance, but with the introduction of the Northwyn Shelter in Thompson, they finally have the shelter plus the support, that vital combination of the two which is vital in protecting them from further violence and also getting them back on their feet in society.

So if you look at the situation in Thompson, Mr. Speaker, with the Crisis Centre, you can see that a number of the points that are listed in the recommendations of the report on violence in the family are already being followed in Thompson and I'd like to list specifically some of those for the record.

First of all, on page 26 of the report, a summary of the recommendations pointed out that Recommendations (1) to (4) were in regard to the training of RCMP officers. Now, the Crisis Centre in Thompson has already held a number of seminars with RCMP officers, aimed at obtaining co-operation in the activities

of the Crisis Centre and that cooperation has been given, Mr. Speaker. I would commend the local detachment of the RCMP for their co-operation because in cases involving family violence, the RCMP has, since the inception of the Crisis Centre referred cases to the Crisis Centre for help and for counselling, so that is already being undertaken in Thompson and with some success. I would certainly second the sentiments of the report.

On the same page, 60 (b), Recommendations (5) to (9), refers to the funding of emergency shelters. Well, as I've just said, Mr. Speaker, Thompson has an emergency shelter which has received funding for this year from the Federal Government and already it's full. So it's certainly a needed facility.

The report under 60 (g) mentions the need for public education on the issue of wife battering and, once again, Mr. Speaker, the Crisis Centre in Thompson has been doing that since its inception. It has gone to schools; it's gone to community groups and organizations; it's held joint seminars with Provincial Government employees, with RCMP officers and with other interested community people on the problems of family violence. In general, the recommendations are actually in effect already in Thompson.

Now I think in summary, Mr. Speaker, the experience of Thompson shows that there's a great need for shelters which assist women who are the victims of family violence and there's a need for ongoing funding for these shelters because at present ongoing funding doesn't exist. In Thompson, for example, the funding will run out as of the end of this year and the Crisis Centre is already trying to obtain funding for next year to continue its activities. So I think providing these shelters and providing ongoing funding for these shelters has to be a top priority.

I think beyond that, Mr. Speaker, we also have to get to the root of the problem itself rather than just treating the symptoms of the disease, if you want to call it that, the disease of family violence. In looking at those root causes and looking at the recommendations that are contained in the report in regard to attacking those root causes, I find it rather ironic, Mr. Speaker, that when this particular document was discussed in the House of Commons in Ottawa that, well, people laughed at it. People laughed at the problem; they laughed at the attention given to the problem in this particular report and they took the whole thing rather, you know, in jest. I say it's ironic, Mr. Speaker, because the report says that there's a great need for public education; a great need for changing the attitudes towards wife battering through this public education. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that if there's a place that needs it pretty badly, a place where they could start would be the House of Commons in Ottawa because I think the attitude shown by some of the members there at least was in very poor taste on an issue of this seriousness and this magnitude.

I must say, at the same time as I comment about the fact that it was not taken seriously in Ottawa, I would commend all my colleagues in this House for the seriousness with which this issue has been debated and the seriousness with which people have paid attention to the debate on this issue. I take from this that all members are concerned about this problem and I think that if we are to do anything on our part to

try and help solve it that we should support the motion put forward by the Honourable Member for Kildonan and support it unanimously, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're dealing in this resolution with a societal problem that arouses concern in all of us. Wife battering is a fact of life. Thousands of Canadian women are subject to violence inflicted upon them by their husbands. Slaps, beatings, threats of violence, humiliation and torture is the way of married life for these women. The problem of wife battering needs to be recognized, dealt with and eliminated. Wife battering is violence inflicted on a woman by her husband or common-law partner to which she does not consent and it takes three forms; physical abuse, mental abuse and emotional abuse.

Physical abuse, when we just talk about the term, we tend to sort of overlook what kind of feelings these women have to deal with every day. Being punched in the face, being kicked, burned, hit by thrown objects, shaken, being pushed into a wall, down a flight of stairs, being beaten unconscious, thrown out of moving cars, being strangled to the point of unconsciousness, being subjected to forced violent sex, these are the kinds of physical abuse that women have to deal with, one woman out of every 10 married women. Physical battering ranges from what could be considered an impulsive act such as throwing objects to more severe acts of torture and attempted murder. The physical abuse suffered by battered women is far from an occasional slap. The assaults result in bruises, broken bones, internal injuries, torn ligaments, dislocated joints, permanent disability and death.

But mental abuse is also a part of everyday life for these women and mental abuse often appears in the form of threats. These may include threats by the husband to leave his wife accompanied by a description of just how hard life would be for her and how difficult it would be for her to make it on her own. The home atmosphere is one of oppression and violence, it is as though things could erupt at any minute.

Emotional abuse most often takes the form of insults, criticisms and accusations and these go on daily and hourly. The husband may criticize the wife for the way she dresses and the way she behaves; he may unjustly accuse her of flirting with other men and thus subject her to a rehashing of every single social encounter. He may criticize her choice of friends and may even verbally humiliate her in front of friends, or he may direct criticism of her friends to their faces. Women are particularly vulnerable to such social embarrassments because they've been taught to be ladies and behave properly.

Furthermore, the husband may degrade the wife when it comes to discussions of her work in the home or the way she raises the children. He may criticize and devalue her job outside the home and he may criticize her sexual performance. So who are these abusers, these one out of every 10 married men in our society? Well, they are men who have a history of violence in their own families; they have a belief in discipline; they have a need to be in control and a need

to feel powerful especially when they feel powerless in other areas of their lives. They may have a propensity for alcohol as a method of coping with difficult or stressful times and they cope poorly with stress, anger, frustration. They usually, almost always, have a low opinion of women. They are personally insecure and they may be of any age, race, social class, occupation, education and religion, but they do have a belief in traditional marital roles.

Simply put, common attitudes have produced a situation where a marriage licence is implicitly viewed as a hitting licence. Violence between spouses has been looked on as a tolerable inevitability, something different than other sorts of assault. So where do we get this kind of attitude that violence within marriage is okay? A survey conducted, and the Member for Kildonan referred to it, a survey conducted by the National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence asked the question, whether people agreed or disagreed that there are circumstances in which it's permissible for a husband to hit his wife. One in four people interviewed, both male and female, one out of every four of us replied in the affirmative, that there are situations where that's acceptable.

This belief that relations within marriage should be governed by different rules than those outside marriage is reflected in our laws and legal conventions. For instance under Civil Law, in most provinces a woman cannot sue her husband, or a husband his wife, after divorce for an assault committed during marriage or for injuries received from beatings even if he or she was prevented from earning a living as a result of this assault. Well, I'm very pleased that our Attorney-General introduced amendments to rectify that injustice in Manitoba.

Another example is the fact that a wife cannot charge her husband with rape if he forcibly commits sexual intercourse with her. Again, what would be a crime amongst strangers or between strangers is permitted within marriage. Such incidents were frequently condoned and even encouraged by the church, popular writers and legal officials. For instance, I'd like to quote a writer from the 14th Century who relates a story of man's violence towards his wife and attaches the moral, and I quote: "Here is an example to every good woman that she suffer and endure patiently, nor strive with her husband, nor answer her husband before strangers, as did once a woman who did answer her husband before strangers with short words," she talked back, "and he smote her with his fist down to the earth and then with his foot he struck her in the visage and broke her nose and all her life after she had her nose crooked, the which so shent and disfigured her visage after that she might not for shame show her face, it was so foul-blemished and, therefore, the wife ought to suffer and let the husband have the words and to be master for that is her duty."

Throughout all such historical accounts we can trace four themes; that women were considered, and in a lot of social attitudes are still considered to own their wives; that women were expected to obey their husbands and to conform to an ideal of self-denial; that men had complete authority over their wives that was unquestioned in their home; and that women's place was in the home. By placing the wife under the authority of the husband within the home and by rem-

oving the home from the sphere of social justice, these beliefs nourish the growth of violence towards women in the family. The acceptance of these cultural norms and translation of them into common law is responsible in large part for the high incidence of violence in marital relationships.

Marriage becomes the perfect relationship for such violence. Consider the social norm that man should be head of his wife and household; man is assigned the authoritative role in marriage and the man, in taking this role, is given certain rights to control and dominate his wife.

If society accepts and promotes the right of men to control their wives, then it follows that society must also support and condone the methods men use to maintain that control. Men use the resources available to them, physical strength, economic power and social permission. Men, angry and humiliated and frustrated by their jobs and environment, over which they have little control, strive to gain control over some part of their lives, that being their wives and their children, and battering results.

There are many common misconceptions about wife abuse. One, that women like to be beaten or deserve it, and that women stay in abusive situations because of that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time for Private Members' Hour having arrived, when we next reach this resolution the honourable member will have 10 minutes remaining.

The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, before moving that the House adjourn, I'd like to inform the Committee that the Executive Council will continue outside of the House in Committee and General Salaries will be here this evening.

I move that the House be now adjourned.

**MR. SPEAKER:** With that agreement, it is moved by the Honourable Minister of Health and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines that the House do now adjourn. Is that agreed? Agreed and so ordered. The House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon (Tuesday)