

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Wednesday, 4 June, 1980

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING
AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report same and asks leave to sit again. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: I am just practising, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad that you remember my name.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I had questions for the Minister of Health, but I will pose a question to the First Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Health, who I assume is delayed due to his meeting with the health care workers subsequent to the demonstration this morning.

A question to the First Minister: can the First Minister advise whether or not he will be taking any position to the conference dealing with constitutional changes to be held this upcoming Monday in Ottawa, on behalf of the province?

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I believe I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition last week that the meeting which has been called by the Prime Minister for Monday next is by way of a preliminary meeting, at which I expect one of the main topics will be to devise a schedule for forthcoming meetings as well, possibly, as some discussion on general principles. I, of course, will be taking to that meeting the traditional stands that are well known to my honourable friend and to others who have followed these negotiations over the years, which have been echoed not only by this government but by previous governments as well.

We will, of course, endeavour at this preliminary meeting to do those things that will be best attuned to the interests of Canada, first of all, and best attuned to the long-term interests of the people of Manitoba as well. Beyond that, I think it would be premature to be too detailed about any particular positions, because I expect that this will be a meeting dealing with general principles.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, if I may, I neglected to introduce — we have 40 visitors of Grade 5 Standing from Alexander School under the direction of Ms Morgan. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. And we have 25 students of Grade 5 Standing from La Verendrye School. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS (cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister to whom Manitoba Hydro reports. I would like to know whether it is the case that the Brandon Thermal Plant, available for standby power, is now operating and has been operating for the last two weeks at least on a 24-hour continuous basis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm all of those details, although I know there was a statement by Manitoba Hydro two or three weeks ago, that both the Brandon and Selkirk plants were going to be brought into service. Whether or not it is on a 24-hour continuous basis, I can take that part of the question as notice.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would we be correct in assuming that all of the power installations, water installations, that were put into place in terms of the Nelson River Development since 1966 are therefore presently needed for domestic power in the province of Manitoba?

MR. CRAIK: No, not necessarily, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister says, not necessarily. Can he tell us which one of the plants would be unnecessary to provide domestic needs at the present time to the province of Manitoba, because his answer, not necessarily, indicates to me that there is some question in his mind with respect to that?

Wednesday, 4 June, 1980

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to the member one case, the Jenpeg Plant in particular, where 8,000 cfs is being spilled without being able to generate any energy from it, mainly because the system is designed such that it didn't take into account the low tail waters that have been encountered. So, Mr. Speaker, we are not able to, in fact, use 8,000 cfs of spilled water without putting it through any generation as a result of it.

Mr. Speaker, the Winnipeg River has been cut down substantially. The last I saw was that it was running at less than one-quarter of normal flow, because of the low levels of water in the Lake of the Woods system, and there is water being ponded wherever possible for future use this winter.

Mr. Speaker, it probably means, Mr. Speaker, that there is a large amount of unused capacity throughout the system in an attempt to pond as much water as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister in charge of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Is the Minister prepared yet to tell us on what dates he or his department replied to the group of independent and voluntary grocery retailers; and secondly, on what date he replied, or his department replied to the local developer, who presented the two proposals that the Minister said yesterday had been received.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):

Mr. Speaker, my answer to the honourable member the other day was they were contacted and we weren't contacted back. —(Interjection)— We'll look it up. Mr. Speaker, August 3rd, Mr. Dubowitz, the Secretary of MHRC received a proposal from Codville Distributors, which is IGA, a submission was made by our research department on August 17th, and that submission of the analysis of the proposal, a submission was made on August 17th —(Interjection)— August 17th, the Codville proposal was, and it was presented to the board, the proposal and the analysis of it on August 22nd. The board made a decision that there would be nothing on that property unless it included housing. Two days after the board meeting, Mr. Horta of Control Planning Limited contacted the Chairman of the Board and said he was representing Codville's and had another proposal to make.

On September 14th, a letter was sent to Nikos Skoulas of Codville Distributors, which basically said, Mr. Speaker, that we would assume that his proposal was being withdrawn because he had other representatives. We received a letter on September 25th from Mr. Skoulas who did not say that the two gentlemen were representing him, but he did say, Mr. Speaker, that he regarded them very highly and recommended them, and if, however, for some reason we would recommend acceptance of their proposal and would be prepared to withdraw our initial one in its favour.

Mr. Speaker, on October 2nd, the Chairman of the Board, and Mr. Schubert, the Director of Research, met with Mr. Baker and Mr. Horta on October 2nd at the Carlton Club with the development control people. They met also with an architect at the time from Cooper Rankin. At that time, Cooper Rankin, or the people presented them this, and only this, some drawings. No proposal, no nothing, when you'd start, how much the building would cost, nothing was there.

The Chairman of the Board informed them of the board decision that it must be housing on the property. And, Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Board also informed them that there would be no subsidy, because the proposal from Codville's would have meant a 64,000 a year subsidy by the government to Codville's. And we didn't accept that. So Mr. Speaker, it was left with Mr. Baker and Mr. Horta to contact the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation with a brand new proposal, and giving us the outline of what they intended to do. They never did contact us.

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday, so we would clear it up, the Chairman of the Board of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation contacted Mr. Baker to ask why he hadn't been in touch, and his words were, we looked over the figures, we didn't think it was viable, and dropped the whole situation. Mr. Speaker, they didn't tell us that and we had no intention of going ahead with anybody that was not making a proposal showing us what the costs were, what they intended to do at any time. Mr. Speaker, I gave the honourable member an answer the other day. She obviously went out and phoned some friends and got some misleading information. She wasn't able to get the information that I have got here and, Mr. Speaker, I would request an apology for saying that I mislead this House.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Honourable Minister would tell us how much we are paying a year to CMHC for this property on which he has just given us a report. Also, did the letter from Mr. Skoulas of Codville not say that if the proposal by Mr. Horta and the lawyer, Mr. Baker, I think his name is, was not accepted, they would appreciate their original proposal being considered, still staying alive in other words? Mr. Speaker, would the Minister advise the House why his assistant general manager is making public statements to the effect that this property on which we are paying money with no return would not be of interest because there isn't that big a market there? Why would his assistant general manager be making statements on policy in this particular area? Is this where he gets his advice on economic development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I read the comments of the assistant manager, and they're nothing. Her interpretation of them, as far as I'm concerned, is all wrong. The manager said that nobody was probably building there because it isn't viable for a grocery store. There used to be a bus run around the district picking people up and taking them to River Avenue, and they had to stop the bus because there wasn't anybody riding on it, Mr. Speaker, which gives indication that there is not that much desire for a store. Yes, Mr. Skoulas does say,

if, for, however, for some reason you reject their proposal, our original one of August 3rd, 1979, still stands, a proposal which cost the government, Mr. Speaker, 64,000 a year subsidy to IGA, and we don't intend to do that.

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

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, would it be too much to ask the Minister to reply to my question of how much we pay to CMHC for this property per year? Mr. Speaker, I was actually reading from the quote, and my interpretation wasn't involved: Due to a probable lack of interest on the basis that there isn't that big a market there — those were the words that the assistant general manager is quoted as saying. So, you know, when we are talking about a policy, lets be realistic . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The question period is a period to seek information, not to debate. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. In view of the meeting which the Minister of Health has just completed with the representatives of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, I ask the Minister whether he can advise the House as to whether or not there have been any concrete developments flow from the meeting which he's just completed with CUPE?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, the only concrete development that I could point to at this juncture, would be a successful establishment and understanding of the respective positions involved. We did not discuss negotiations; it was not a bargaining session. It is my understanding that bargaining is to be resumed at the Health Sciences Centre this afternoon, at the call of the conciliation officer.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his response, but ask the Minister why he informed those that were present at the Legislature that there had been no request for him to meet with CUPE, when in fact the Opposition has been requesting again and again, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister meet with CUPE, as well as all the other parties involved in the dispute. Why has the Minister misled the public of Manitoba that there have been no requests for him to meet with CUPE up to now?

MR. SHERMAN: CUPE has never said to me, Mr. Speaker, that their surrogates are represented directly in the Opposition benches in this Legislature.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, then more precisely, to the Minister, why did he suggest to the public that he had received no invitation to meet with the union, when in the letter which was forwarded to the Minister on May 27, there is a request for him to become directly involved, from his Health ministry, in order to resolve the present impasse? Why did the Minister then inform the public that in fact he had received no such invitation?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I might ask rhetorically why the Leader of the Opposition didn't stay for the whole meeting on the front steps of the Legislative Building, or for my entire remarks? I made the point very clearly that I had been asked by the leader, or the representative of CUPE, Mr. Kostyre, to involve myself at the bargaining table. I made that point very clear, that I had been asked to come in and enter the bargaining. I had not been asked for a meeting of the nature that we held today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a fourth question.

MR. PAWLEY: If the Minister could answer the question, in view of the letter which was submitted to him on May 27 in which it points out that only direct intervention from the Health ministry can help the parties reach a settlement, did the Minister not consider that an invitation for his becoming directly involved with the parties, at the invitation of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, in order to resolve the present impasse involving the work stoppage in the province of Manitoba?

MR. SHERMAN: If he would read the letter, Mr. Speaker, if it's the letter that I think it is, it asks me for direct intervention in the bargaining process, to participate at the bargaining table. It does not ask for a meeting between CUPE representatives and me in my office, which is the invitation that was extended to them today and which they accepted.

MR. PAWLEY: I would ask the Minister of Health when he would be prepared to undertake some leadership on his part, rather than await invitations or requests in a formal manner? When is the Minister of Health going to be prepared to provide some leadership and become involved in attempting to resolve the present work stoppage in the province of Manitoba affecting health care in Manitoba, rather than awaiting formal or technical requests?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that my colleagues and I in government are addressing ourselves, and have been addressing ourselves to this situation very conscientiously and very assiduously for the past two weeks, and we believe that the free collective bargaining process is going to resolve this dispute and we believe that that is in the best interests of all Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a sixth question.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's answer then is the Minister prepared to announce that he is now lifting the budgetary restrictions that have provided the present impasse within the province of Manitoba? Is he prepared to, at this point, lift the restraint process which he has conducted for the past three years, which has created the present situation in the province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the position of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is entirely insupportable. His reference is, no doubt, to the budgetary increase provided hospitals of 8 percent. Since he full well knows that there is more than 10 percent on the table right now in the form of an offer from the Health Sciences Centre, it hardly supports the fiction that he is attempting to foist on the House and the public.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I have become so emotional I might not be able to . . . Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Has not the Minister reported here during the session that he had met with the medical profession while their fees were being negotiated and reported good progress, during the course of last session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely would have to check on that. I meet with the medical profession regularly, with the President and his senior officers, but the negotiations with respect to the fee schedule were not conducted by me and I was not a party to them at any stage.

It may well have been that in one of the regular meetings with the MMA President the question was raised as to how the negotiations on the fee schedule were going, but I can't answer that without checking the record.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I guess we have to take the Minister's word; that doesn't mean that we believe that. The Minister reported in the House — Doesn't he remember? — that they had had meetings and that things were progressing. Mr. Speaker, does the Minister not consider that a confrontation is not something that should be done with any type, and if he meets regularly with all the people that he has been telling us these two years, why didn't he take it upon himself to meet once with CUPE for the betterment of the Health Services in Manitoba?

Another question, while I have the floor, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister explain to this House and to the people of Manitoba the rationale for saying that the budget, insisting that the budget of the hospital should be increased only by 8 percent when there is from 65 to 70 percent of that budget is for wages and not making such a — still in a period of restraint — not making any such decision when it comes to Medicare, when it is all wages?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, on the first question, to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, if he is asking me whether I was kept apprised by my officials from my office and the Manitoba Health Services Commission with respect to progress on the new fee schedule with the MMA, absolutely, I most certainly was, and I certainly reported to the House that it was reported to me that progress was being made and the new fee schedule agreement was being arrived at as quickly as possible and very

successfully. Certainly I made those reports, because I was receiving those reports.

On question number two, I have met with CUPE representatives. I have in fact met with the same representatives for CUPE that I met with today, on two previous occasions, Mr. Speaker, not with respect to this particular dispute, but on two previous occasions.

On the third question, Mr. Speaker, I simply put it to the Member for St. Boniface, when we are looking at the Health Care spectrum of services that Manitobans can support, that offers that have been made and accepted across the field generally in recent months have been pretty competitive with those that are being discussed at the present time with CUPE.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister chooses to beat around the bush as usual, and we are getting a little fed up with that; he hasn't answered any questions at all.

My question was: Why is the Medicare not held down to the same percentage as hospitals when it deal with wages, and that the hospital programs deals with up to 70 percent of the wages? The Minister said, and I ask the Minister if he feels this is the same thing, the Minister answered my Leader saying that he knows it is not 8 percent, it is 10 percent. But, Mr. Speaker, doesn't the Minister remember that for two or three times in the days . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The question period is to seek information, not to debate.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface proceed with his question.

MR. DESJARDINS: Can the Minister remember — I want some information — does the Minister remember — now I have forgotten what I was going to say — that I asked him repeatedly if they were going to tell the people that were negotiating that they wouldn't be held to this 8 percent? Doesn't the Minister remember that he would not give us this assurance? In other words, if there is 10 percent on the table now, that means that the services of the hospital will be reduced that much more, because there is only 8 percent in all.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the record in Hansard will show that I have answered that question in varying forms, but essentially the same question, on frequent occasions in the past two weeks in this House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, again that is not true. It is not —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. One of the fundamentals of the parliamentary system is that it is incumbent on members to accept the statement from a Minister as being fact. If it can be proven to be wrong, then the member has a right to raise a matter of privilege.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, when we get some information, as you did yesterday, saying that you read it and that you closed the books, which I

don't quite agree with that either, that is something else. But, Mr. Speaker, my statement — I am not going to say that I lie more than the Minister, and this is what you are asking me to do, and I don't intend to. That is not the case, the Minister is not answering the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KENNETH MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Logan asked about some rides that were being set up at Unicity yesterday and whether in fact they had been inspected. I am not sure whether, in fact, he wanted to know what the findings were, but I have got that information. They have been set up; they are not operational, they are still not operational. They were found to be more than mechanically sound, in very good shape, but there are some electrical defects that have to be corrected before they will be operational. I don't expect, in fact, they will be operational today.

I noticed that the Leader of the Opposition has been quoted as saying that there is something wrong with these being set up without permits. I would like to make him aware of the fact that they don't need the permits to set them up, they need the permits before they can operate them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. In view of the fact that he has made a statement in the Legislature to the effect that the offer by the Health Sciences Centre to CUPE employees support staff is fair and in light of the fact that this offer is substantially below the offer made by the government of Manitoba to the medical doctors of the province, can the Minister indicate if it is the policy of this government to pay support staff at the lower end of the income scale less than it is to pay those at the higher end of the income scale within the Health Services field?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, of course, Mr. Speaker, there is no such policy.

MR. PARASIUK: I would like the Minister then, to ask him he would reconsider his statements here in the Legislature that the offer by the Health Sciences Centre to those at the lower end of the income scale in the health care area, which is lower than that given by this government to medical doctors, is a fair offer? Would he reconsider that position in the light of his statement that it is not the policy of the government to force the people at the lower end of the income scale to accept lower pay settlements than medical doctors in the health care field?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have responded to the Honourable Member for Transcona by assuring him that is not a policy or the policy of government. I have met with the representatives of the CUPE today to exchange our mutual concerns as Manitobans and I think no usual purpose, Mr. Speaker, would be

served by commenting further with respect to negotiations and bargaining that is under way at the present time. I have said what I felt was necessary to be said, I have said what I felt was reasonable and I am not commenting further on it, Mr. Speaker. The two sides are resuming negotiations and hopefully there will be some reasonably early solution.

MR. PARASIUK: In view of the fact that the government of Manitoba negotiated the settlement, the fairly generous settlement with the medical doctors, and in view of the fact that the hospitals have said that their hands are tied with respect to budgetary allocations provided it by the government of Manitoba and thus cannot really proceed with negotiations with CUPE, is it the intention of the government then to lift the arbitrary 8 percent ceiling that they have put on government allocations to hospitals in order to allow the collective bargaining process to continue in good faith?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Could the Honourable Minister relate to the House what was the outcome of the Grain Handling and Transportation Meeting held yesterday in Victoria, which was held between the western provinces and the Federal Transport Minister Jean-Luc Pepin?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, the meeting held yesterday was a meeting between the Federal Minister of Transport and Senator Hazen Argue, who is responsible for the Wheat Board, along with the other western provinces, and a continuation of meetings that have been held since the first meeting set up in Winnipeg by the First Minister, Premier Sterling Lyon, on the grain handling and transportation.

It was a general update to pinpoint and to acknowledge some of the accomplishments, through the process of provincial and federal meetings such as have been held over the past year and one-half, such things as the development of Prince Rupert and the continued commitment by the federal government to support the infrastructure costs, an update on the availability of rolling stock, the rail line rehabilitation program that the federal government are carrying out. Some of the other discussions that took place were in relationship to the further developments, or the meetings that would be required between the federal and provincial governments, and I must add that although there weren't a lot of decisions made at this particular meeting it was, in fact, a good opportunity to make the point to the federal Minister that the process had accomplished a lot and we, as provinces, would like to see the continuation of those meetings in the future.

MR. HYDE: A supplementary question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Citing the importance of such

meetings, will there be a continuation of federal and provincial meetings on interrelating issues?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the transportation policies and responsibilities fall within federal jurisdiction, I think that the indications that we have received from the federal Minister were promising; that the fact that provinces such as ourselves had invested some 2 million in the leasing of hopper cars; that the other provinces had participated in funding of moneys for the port of Prince Rupert and the other governments supporting investment in hopper cars, that he indicated that in fact it was useful and looked forward to a further process such as we were involved in yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask a couple of questions of the Minister of Education in view of some serious allegations about a deterioration at the universities because of the government's restraint program. I would ask him whether he has any information on the allegations that Law and Engineering are once more in danger of losing their accreditation?

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I have no information in regard to Law at all. I have had some indication as late as a year or so ago that Engineering had some problems. I understand these are being dealt with.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, just on that first question, I assume that the Minister has had a report on the problems with the Law Faculty for a number of months, a report that was made public. Maybe he hasn't read it yet or maybe he hasn't had time to read it. I ask him as well whether it is true, as indicated, that the university is now receiving less money in actual terms than it did four or five years ago?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice, to check back through those particular statistics.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the Minister whether it is true that first year Science students in chemistry and biology do not have laboratories at the University of Manitoba, which would obviously seriously impair their ability to study? Is this so?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, without checking I find that particular allegation a bit hard to understand. There have been laboratories at the university for years, however, I will take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. My question relates, I think, to a very important matter.

The branch lines in the province of Manitoba that were placed under the permanent network to the year 2000 by the previous Conservative Government under the leadership of Don Mazankowski, my question to the Minister is: When he was in Victoria, did he get assurances from the Honourable Mr. Pepin that commitment was going to be honoured and that those branch lines in Manitoba will be maintained in the network until the year 2000?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, that is one of the items that was discussed at the meeting. I am not satisfied at this particular time of the response that I got from the federal Minister. There seems to be some question in his mind of the process that was in place to determine whether or not those particular communities would receive that kind of service, or that those rail lines would remain in the permanent network until the year 2000. I assured him, Mr. Speaker, as did the Minister from Saskatchewan, that if in fact there were any change in that particular status of those lines that they would be in for somewhat of a political storm; that those communities should not be put through the process of justifying whether they needed those railroads. It is our government's position that decision has been made by a federal government; we supported that position; we support the fact that decision has been made and would not expect any reversal on that kind of a decision on those lines that have been put in the permanent network.

MR. EINARSON: A supplementary question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the answer that I have just heard from the Minister of Agriculture, it concerns me a great deal and I am wondering if the Minister, if he did not already do so, if he would be prepared to remind the Honourable Mr. Pepin of a commitment that the Prime Minister had made in the last election campaign and after having the results, that we would have to give more consideration than we have in the past to Western Canada. I would ask him, under those bases, would he pursue this matter very strongly with the Honourable Mr. Pepin to assure the farmers of Manitoba, and Western Canada, that those rail lines that were committed by the previous Conservative Government will in fact be maintained?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to indicate at this time that I feel good in the fact that the federal Minister did find time to come out and meet with the provinces on the issues that we talked about. I think that in itself indicates that he is interested and concerned about the grain handling and transportation industry; that he was prepared to sit down and discuss openly with the provinces many issues; and his presence at that meeting was a good, clear indication of his desire to see the industry develop.

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

Wednesday, 4 June, 1980

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope the Minister of Agriculture is willing to issue a statement in the future with respect to those meetings.

Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources and ask him whether any agreements have been signed with the LGD of Armstrong pertaining to the transfer of Crown lands that were under the — LGD Crown lands — that were administered by the province and if there has been an agreement, could the Minister indicate what type of an agreement; and is the Minister prepared to protect, as he has stated in the past, leaseholder's rights — I brought this matter to the his attention, or his office's attention, on Monday — if he could report on this?

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable Member for St. George for bringing this issue to my attention earlier and advising me that he would be raising a question. The question is somewhat different than the one that was raised with my office but, to the best of my knowledge, there was no agreement signed with the LGD. He, I believe, was referring to a program whereby lands held in trust by the government since 1964 are being returned to the LGDs that request to have those lands put back into their own control. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, we have been returning land to LGDs. It was a concern of ours that the interests of leaseholders be protected, just as we are protecting the interests of leaseholders in our Crown Land Sale Program.

The specific situation which the Honourable Member for St. George is basing his question on involved a situation where the individual did not have a long-term lease but rather had a permit. I think the honourable member would be aware that a permit is the type of land holding that can be cancelled on a yearly basis and therefore there is no long-term continuing interest.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, is the Minister aware that the lands that were taken over, even though on a one-year permit, were the same lands that were leased to the farmer who sold the homestead ownings immediately adjacent to the leased land, and the lessee relinquished the right to the new owner of his original farmstead? Is the Minister aware of those facts?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with all of the details and I'm not sure that, if the situation is as the member described, it is possible to actually happen that way, because to my knowledge there has not been a situation where the transfer of leases or the assignment of leases could take place. This is the sort of issue that the honourable members had debated in the estimates and were opposed to that type of transfer. What we have been looking at, both within the government and the LGDs have been looking at, is the basis of making land available to the highest bidder, Mr. Speaker, and in this case it is my understanding the individual in question only had a year-to-year permit and therefore and no long-term continuing interest in the land.

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

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister consider having these lands withdrawn until further investigation would be undertaken by his office to prevent the sales of the nature that he is now saying that we fought against when both he and the Minister of Agriculture indicated that leaseholders rights would be protected in cases of sales of this nature, and they are not now being protected?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member doesn't seem to understand the facts as they were explained. A lease is a long-term right to the land and we have been concerned that right be protected when the land was transferred back to the LGDs. There was no long-term lease in place in this situation, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, the land was held in trust by the province for the LGDs and when the LGDs request that land be placed back into their hands then that is a responsibility that the government has, to turn it back to them, and the LGD must be responsible for the actions that they take with respect to people who have permits or leases.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Time for question period having expired we'll proceed with Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge on a point of privilege.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very disturbed and I'm sorry to have to do this but I must inform you and the House that the Minister responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, in my opinion, has again mislead the House in his statement today. May I continue, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Just on a point of order, Mr. Mr. Speaker, the member for Fort Rouge — (Interjections)— Are you finished? Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable —(Interjections)— order please. Order please.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I merely want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The honourable member is raising a point of privilege. I don't know if it is the same point of privilege she raised the other day or not. I am prepared to hear her argument.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister stated that the bus service that was being provided was cancelled because it was not being used. I think his exact words were, stopped the bus because nobody was riding on it, as I was able to write them down. Mr. Speaker, I have checked with the project officer and his immediate superior, the co-ordinator for community home services, and they tell me that the target project of six months had expired and the bus was stopped because they ran out of funding, not

because it was not being used; that the actual ridership over the period of six months averaged 33 percent right up to the very end. Some days the bus was full, some days it was perhaps a quarter full, but the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that it was not cancelled because it was not being used.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the first point I want to make is relative to the first sentence or two from the Member for Fort Rouge who stated that the Minister responsible for MHRC had again mislead the House. You ruled yesterday, Mr. Speaker, on her question of privilege, that the Minister for MHRC had not mislead the House, so I ask her, through you, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw that particular comment. Her first suggestion a few days that the Minister for MHRC had mislead the House was ruled on by you against the suggestion of the Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I believe I did add the words, in my opinion, and I think the point is well taken. But I did add the words, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker. Would you tell me if I was incorrect? If I was incorrect I'll withdraw that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, you might point out to the Member for Fort Rouge that if she added in the words, in her opinion, that she was commenting on a ruling from the Chair, and that's entirely inappropriate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. George on a point of privilege.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege stemming from the remarks and the answers that were given to me by the Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. We can only deal with one point of privilege at a time. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has raised a point of what she considers to be House privilege. May I point out to the honourable member that the Minister did not mislead the House. The Honourable Minister did indicate to the House that the bus service did stop; the member has agreed that the bus service did stop. The reason given is a matter of opinion of people and is not misleading of fact. The fact is the bus did stop, therefore the honourable member did not have a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, today upon questioning the Minister with respect to governmental policy dealing with Crown lands, I asked the Minister whether an agreement was signed with the LGD of Armstrong, in particular, dealing with the disposition of Crown lands that were held in trust

by the province. Mr. Speaker, the Minister, in a letter to a constituent of the Minister of Education in February of 1979, wrote — and I will read the entire letter, Mr. Speaker, just to show you that even though the Minister has indicated that the circumstances somehow are now different, he is now relinquishing and going back on the policy that both he and the Minister of Agriculture gave an undertaking and indicated that there was a protection of leaseholders' rights under their new policy of sale of Crown lands.

The letter is dated February 22, 1979, signed by A. Brian Ransom, Minister. This is in reply to your query of February 6, 1979, in Gimli, concerning your grazing permit on SW 20-19-3E. In 1964 many acres of LGD lands were transferred, in trust, to the provincial government for administration and control. SW 20-19-3E is a parcel of land owned by the LGD and administered by the province. Representations have been received from the LGDs to return or exchange these lands. Negotiations are presently taking place. The province is concerned that the right of the present lessee be protected. Agriculture Crown lands has recently written to the LGD to ascertain what its policy would be toward present lease or permit holders upon the return of these lands. Since the land is actually owned by the LGD, the province is awaiting clarification of the desires of the LGDs in this matter, and further negotiations between the LGDs and the province will be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, in that letter in 1979 the Minister gave an undertaking that the leaseholder's rights would be protected. Further, the Minister of Agriculture of this province indicated that even if an interested party wished to purchase Crown lands he was not obliged to do so upon having those Crown lands evaluated. If he decided not to purchase them he would continue his lease. Mr. Speaker, those lands were under long-term lease to the previous owner of the original farm, and the farm was sold to this new owner, and the lease was renegotiated through Crown lands to be taken up by this new owner. However, it was stopped, Mr. Speaker, and now the Minister is not prepared to involve himself in defending the leaseholders' rights of the province, he is now waffling on this issue, and he really is abandoning the provincial policy that they have enunciated, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. George is making many accusations which do not constitute a point of privilege. The honourable member has given no visible proof of any breach by the Minister, and I would ask the honourable member to apologize to the House for abusing the time of the House with facetious points of privilege.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a case of backtracking of policy . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I await the apology of the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, before I apologize to this House and to you, Sir, I would ask you to tell me on what basis, on what accusations that I have made

Wednesday, 4 June, 1980

that are contrary and misappropriating or mismanaging the affairs of this House, Mr. Speaker. I ask you to clarify what you want me to apologize for. I don't intend to apologize to both the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Natural Resources for the mismanagement of the Crown lands of this province, Mr. Speaker; absolutely not.

MR. SPEAKER: I have asked the honourable member to apologize for raising a facetious point of privilege, and using the time of the House. The time of this Chamber is valuable to all members. I would hope that the honourable member would use the Rules of the House wisely. He has opportunity to raise the matter in other avenues, but to use a point of privilege, when a point of privilege does not exist, is abuse of the privileges of this House.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to indicate to you that each member who feels aggrieved, in respect to the work he is doing as an MLA, may raise as a matter of privilege, when he has been misinformed or misled. Now, it may not constitute a matter of privilege in the opinion of the Chair, but nevertheless, it is a matter of privilege for the member because he feels he cannot do his work if he does not have a correct or fair answer, and I do not see where that becomes facetious. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do believe you have to give the Honourable Member for St. George an opportunity to explain why he thought it was a matter of privilege.

I believe he has indicated that there has been some misleading in respect to policies of the government, in respect to Crown leasehold lands, and that is a matter of privilege that he wants to discuss.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, when the severe economic impact is placed on an agriculture producer in the province of Manitoba by the very changes in policy of the provincial government, certainly, Mr. Speaker, it must be a matter of privilege when the operations of a producer, an agriculture producer in the province of Manitoba, are threatened by the loss of Crown land that he had leased from the province . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has stood up on a matter of privilege to indicate that the Minister misled the House. The honourable member has given me no proof that the member has misled the House. Therefore, I tell the honourable member he has no point of privilege at this point. If the honourable member has proof, has visible proof, let him bring it forward and I will examine it.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Northern Affairs Department, having been concluded last evening, Municipal Affairs will follow in Room 254 in

Committee of Supply. By way of notice, next week it would be our intention to call Public Utilities Committee on Tuesday and Thursday morning at 10:00 o'clock and Friday at 2:00 p.m., if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, would you call Second Reading on Bills No. 39 and 50, then adjourned debates on Second Reading on the bills as they appear in the Order Paper?

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the government House Leader a question following his last announcement, and ask him who will be appearing before Public Utilities Committee next week?

MR. MERCIER: Manitoba Hydro.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, also, as a matter of procedure, I wonder if the House Leader could give us an indication of how many more bills are to come before this House? If he hasn't got the answer, whether he could take that as notice.

MR. MERCIER: It's a significant number, Mr. Speaker, but in order to be accurate I'll attempt to advise the Honourable Opposition House Leader in more detail tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I have been accused, by the Member for St. George, of misleading the House. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you ruled that there should be an apology for that, and that has not been forthcoming. So be it, Mr. Speaker, I simply must point out that for anyone who will examine the letter which the Honourable Member for St. George has read into the record, they will see that letter is entirely consistent with the answers which I gave in the House today. The letter refers to a permit held by the individual; it refers to a concern for long-term lessees. The Member for St. George simply does not understand the difference, and I cannot be responsible for his ignorance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think that you have requested an apology to the House from the Member for St. George, and I think that should be carried through. I think that there's no way that when he makes those kind of statements he should be made to apologize to you if requested.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I distinctly heard you, Mr. Speaker, say that you thought the member should apologize and you were

awaiting apology, not because he had maligned any person, not because he had said anything about somebody which he shouldn't have said, but because you felt he used time which he shouldn't have used. Mr. Speaker, I think that is something that is done by honourable members quite often in this House. A person raises what he thinks is a point of privilege, you rule against it, and that's it. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that is the conclusion that you came to, that you told the honourable member that he used the House time, which he shouldn't have, which is the ruling that is made with respect to other honourable members. But at no time, Mr. Speaker, did you rule that he has to apologize to either the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: Order of the Day. We will proceed with second reading of Bill No. 39.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Before Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to introduce a change on Public Utilities and substitute the name of Mr. Steen for Mr. McKenzie.

MR. SPEAKER: Are those changes agreeable? (Agreed)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SECOND READING — GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: We will proceed with Bill No. 39. The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

BILL NO. 39 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE SOCIAL ALLOWANCES ACT

HON. GEORGE MINAKER presented Bill No. 39, An Act to amend The Social Allowances Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments in the bill are primarily of a housekeeping nature, there be no substantive changes being introduced in this bill. For instance, the definition of the Executive Director has been expanded to include persons authorized to act on behalf of the Director and those approved by the Minister. This will clearly authorize the day-to-day decisions made by the directors in the district offices in the administration of the Social Allowances Program.

There is also an amendment to deal with the definition of financial resources, and it clarifies the various benefits that constitute financial resources for the purpose of the Social Allowances Program.

There is also: The categories of eligibility for social allowances under the proposed amendment are extended to include the mother who is separated

from her husband. Under the present practice, the separated wife and mother with dependant children is provided with assistance when she is a person in need. The proposed amendment will authorize present practice.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there is a section, or a principle, that deals with actions to be taken by the director on behalf of a recipient after the person has been in receipt of assistance for three months. The proposed amendment deletes the three-month requirement and will permit action to be taken as soon as is necessary after a person comes on the Social Allowance Program.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there are amendments which deal with appeal procedures and in more clear and precise terms they detail and make it more explicit what is meant in the present Act and in accordance with current practices which are presently satisfactory to the appellant.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend to the House the approval of the bill. In the overall, the proposed amendments primarily clarify existing definitions under the Act and more clearly authorize the administrative process that is presently carried out in the daily operation of the Social Allowances Program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that some of the honourable members should take close note of what is in this legislation, not because much of it is new, but because of some of the comments that are made from time to time as to the character, and usually, Mr. Speaker, it is in rather derogatory language, about people who are to receive social assistance from the State, and the complete negative kind of attitude towards some of these people and, Mr. Speaker, the contradiction that takes place when other people receive money from the State.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, it is true that from time to time rural people will receive money from the State. I think that 40 million was paid to beef producers from the State and, Mr. Speaker, none of those beef producers had to show that they had no real or personal property before they could receive money from the State. They could have two sections, or three sections, or four sections of clear title, Mr. Speaker, and receive —(Interjection)— Yes, they could own five sections of land and still get State money, Mr. Speaker.

They cannot, Mr. Speaker, have any personal property, and I'm not suggesting that a person on social assistance cannot have anything, but anything that they have has to be listed, Mr. Speaker, in order to make sure that before they receive money from the State they haven't got more than a person should have. A recipient, Mr. Speaker, cannot receive any income; they cannot receive allowances, pensions, insurance benefits, and income from business or farming or any other source. Now, I'm not suggesting they cannot, but all of the amounts are taken check of and their social assistance is reduced accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, it is the next section that I am concerned with, and I don't know whether this is new, if it's housekeeping, if it's new, if it has been

Wednesday, 4 June, 1980

part of the usual, Mr. Speaker, difficulties that are involved in dealing with social allowances, such as, if a woman is on social allowance and lives with someone she becomes a dependant of that person and, Mr. Speaker, spies, social allowance spies of various kinds, are sent to find out whether the night was spent with some man or whether a man continues to live there, or vice versa, if a man is on social allowance, whether a woman is there.

But it's the next section that I'm worried about. There was a case, and I can't even recall the details of it, of a woman who received a gift from somebody — what was it, a gift of 500.00 or something? Mr. Speaker, somebody gave her a gift to take a trip, that's right, to take a trip. Let us assume that there is a relative, Mr. Speaker, who says, This person is on social assistance. I would like them to have a once in a lifetime trip to Florida. Gave the person the gift, the person's gift was deducted from their social assistance and they couldn't do it; or they were later penalized for having received that gift; or came under some scrutiny of the Social Assistance. So an uncle, Mr. Speaker, cannot buy the children clothes, I suppose, unless the mother reports that, that was a gift that I received, and it has to be deducted from social assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I am being very technical. I would hope that the manner in which these things are administered, and I really do not have any answer as to how to make them less objectionable than what they are. That, Mr. Speaker, is really why I indicated to this House when the Conservatives presented their Budget with the so-called poverty directed program, how terrible these programs can affect the people and how the people suddenly become a part of a social assistance syndrome, Mr. Speaker, which affects the giver, who suddenly takes on a feeling of superiority, just as badly as it affects the receiver, who is made to feel a dependant and made to feel a drone, and has to have their gifts analyzed.

I don't know whether this section is to undo what was said, because I think the Court of Appeal — and I am not certain, Mr. Speaker, but I think the Court of Appeal — said that that gift was something that they couldn't take away from the woman or couldn't use to deduct from her social assistance. If this is intended to change that, Mr. Speaker, if this is not mere housekeeping but is intended to change what the Court of Appeal said with regard to that particular gift, then I want the Minister to tell us that. I don't want him to say that this is housekeeping and it is merely administrative practices, I want him to tell us that, and I want to make my decision on this question based on that knowledge.

There are many other such things in here, Mr. Speaker, and I will confess that I don't know how to deal with them except to slowly deliberately try, as best as I can, as best we all can, to reduce with the hope of elimination — but that never comes — the institution of poverty, and not to put more and more people under this type of scrutiny. That is what the Conservatives say they are going to do, Mr. Speaker, because once you go to this means test family allowance that they are talking about, the means test will be these types of tests. It will be the state coming in and saying, what have you got? I mean turn your pockets inside out, cross your heart and

spit, and say that you haven't got any money, or else you are not eligible for these programs.

I am not going to condemn the Conservative government for doing these things. I have indicated that social assistance and the difficulties that go with it are something that we cannot eliminate, but we shouldn't perpetuate it and we shouldn't feel proud of ourselves, Mr. Speaker, on the basis that we are doing more of it, rather than giving people the dignity to live a life which is independent of this type of thing.

I will relate, Mr. Speaker, probably the most striking example that affected me as a human being, and I can remember it vividly, because it was done in a movie which I would urge all members to look at. I would urge the Minister to look at it if it ever comes back on the late movies on television. The movie was called *Body and Soul*, it was with John Garfield and Lily Palmer, and the story is worth telling, Mr. Speaker, because it deals with the things that are in this Minister's bill. It dealt with a very poor family in the lower east side of New York, where the mother wanted the son to get an education. It was during the Depression, and he had a great talent for boxing, and he wanted to be a boxer, but his mother insisted that he not box because this was a bad thing, this was fighting, and despite the fact that he could make a lot of money, she would forego the money rather than have her son engaged in boxing. The son had his friend over to the house and they were having dinner, and they were interrupted by a knock on the door, and the knock on the door was by a social worker, a very well-meaning nice social worker, and she asked John Garfield, who was the son, to excuse the mother and herself because she had some discussion to have with the mother, and the mother was very happy to have the discussion.

They went into the next room and the camera focuses on the discussion. She said, when did your husband die, what did he leave you, do you have that this, do you have that? In the middle of the interrogation, which is necessary under these rules, in the middle of the interrogation, the son who wants to be the fighter walks in, and says, what is going on here? She says, we have to ask our clients these questions, and the mother says, please, let me answer the questions, etc. Finally, after asking a few of these questions, she says, do you have any jewellery? The mother says, no, I have no jewellery, and the son says, she has a wedding ring. Because by this time he is very bitter about what is taking place. He says, she has a wedding ring — which would be included, Mr. Speaker — and the social worker says, we don't ask our clients to give up their wedding rings.

John Garfield, who plays the son, gets very angry and, despite the protests of his mother, physically throws the social worker out of the home and then he says to his friend, who wants him to be a fighter, he says, get me a fight, I am going to be a fighter, I want money. His mother said, no, better get a gun and shoot yourself, and he says, you need money to buy a gun.

The scene, Mr. Speaker, is a reflection and a commentary on all of these provisions and what has to go on to enforce them and how it affects the people who are affected by them.

When I read about this gift, Mr. Speaker, and it was in the newspaper, about this woman who had a gift and as a result of having this gift, the state suddenly put all its forces on whether or not she could receive this gift, and it went to the Court of Appeal as to whether a person can receive a present from a relative, which is a human emotion which we all say is a wonderful thing, but if it is to somebody on social assistance, Mr. Speaker, it becomes a feature of our bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that I don't like any of this and I am not blaming the Minister for it. I administered for some four and one-half months social allowances and raised them, and indicated, Mr. Speaker, that when I raised the social allowances I did not say it was one of the proudest days of my life, it was one of the days where I realized that society has failed certain people, because we have not provided an avenue, or a proper avenue, whereby they could make an individual contribution both to themselves and to society, and that is why we put in our bill last year, which talked about the right to work and about the right for people to live in dignity and not through social assistance.

I am not pretending that you can eliminate it, but I think every time something like this comes up, we should look at it and reflect on it, and apply ourselves to ways of making it possible for people not to have to go through these indignities, because, Mr. Speaker, the one thing that they will ask you is the value of free shelter, free board, somebody is supplying meals, free lodging, received by an applicant, etc. And the one that was drawn to my attention was the question of gifts. If that is in any way related to the case that came up in the Court of Appeal last year, I would like the Minister to so inform us so that we can see whether there is an attempt to make this gift illegal, rather than what the Court of Appeal said, that it was something that the woman was entitled to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 50 — THE MANITOBA-SASKATCHEWAN BOUNDARY ACT (1980)

MR. RANSOM presented Bill No. 50, The Manitoba-Saskatchewan Boundary Act (1980), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, prior federal Acts define the boundary between the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and the centre of the road allowance between the 29th and 30th ranges of townships, lying west of the first principal meridian in

the system of Dominion Land surveys, and from the international boundary to its intersection with the second meridian, the north boundary of township 78, and thence is the second meridian to the 60th degree of north latitude. The original surveys which defined this road allowance required survey monuments to be placed on the west limit of the road allowances. This could not provide a legal monumented survey of the actual boundary. These original township surveys were made between 1879 and 1900, and many of the old wooden survey posts have disappeared with time, making the location of the provincial boundary very difficult.

A ground survey of the actual boundary was recommended and a boundary commission designated and authorized to undertake a survey. The boundary line was adjusted on this new survey to allow a relatively straight boundary rather than holding the exact centre line at the road allowance through all its varying deflections every half mile. The British North America Act, 1871, provides that the Parliament of Canada may, with the consent of the Legislature of any province, increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of that province. The Parliament of Canada will confirm the survey boundary as soon as both provinces have consented. The province of Saskatchewan gave their assent in the 1978 session of their Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 9 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LIMITATION OF ACTIONS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have examined this new proposal. It would appear, to begin with, there are some changes with which we agree. Under the old Act, under the Limitation of Actions Act, the matter of disability was one which was fairly narrowly defined, first of all in that the disability must have occurred at the time the cause of action arose. Under the proposed Act, time stops running, even if a disability arises after an accident, and we are in general agreement with that proposal. Under the old Act, disability itself was more narrowly defined to only include infancy and mental incapacity. The new Act widens the definition of disability to include a physical disability, which is of such a nature as to make an individual incapable

of managing his own affairs, and during such a period of incapability, the time period doesn't run, excepting of course, for the 30 years, and excepting where notice is given.

That's a new provision, one which we did not have under the old Act, that is, if an infant was injured in an accident, for instance, or injured by some other tortfeasor, that person would have the right at age 18 to commence action. Under the provisions of the proposed legislation as I read them, my understanding is that that right will be abridged somewhat in the case of a possible defendant who feels that there may be a cause of action against him. Under this new proposed legislation, such a defendant would be entitled to provide a notice to the infant, or to the disabled person, ordering that individual to commence proceedings, and from the time of such notice, time would run as in the ordinary course. So in effect, in certain instances, this proposed legislation takes away from the rights of disabled persons. The old Limitations of Actions Act, Section 9, had no limitation of 30 years, which has been proposed in this legislation. I would expect that we will have some questions with respect to these matters. At this point in time, we are ready to allow the bill to go to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 12, The Law Fees Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (stand)

BILL NO. 13 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE DEFAMATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to make several remarks on this bill because it has been greeted with general acceptance and yet I have some problems with it, and I'm really trying to determine whether my problems are real or just apprehended and without basis for their apprehension. Most of the members who have spoken said that this is an extension of free speech, and that one can't say anything bad about free speech and therefore the bill has to go ahead.

I, certainly, Mr. Speaker, have tried to be a defender of free speech. I believe that in many cases I have gone as far or further — I'm not intending to try to detail it — in my defense of the right of people to say what they wished to, whether I agree with it or not, than the average person, Mr. Speaker, indeed, than the average person who has gone into public life, because it has been an issue which I have been directly related to, maybe by that accident alone. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I was certainly one of the people who worked very hard to see to it that the censorship of films was discontinued in the province of Manitoba on the basis that people should not be told what they could see, hear, or read, and I certainly was one who was instrumental in seeing to it that people could walk down the street carrying signs, which they used to be enjoined by judges from doing.

So I find myself in a difficult position in getting up and not entirely agreeing with some who say that this bill provides free speech, because I never, Mr. Speaker, ever indicated that although a person is entitled to freedom of speech, that if he wrongfully harms another person by virtue of the exercise of that right that that other person should not have a right to claim damages. If a newspaper or — not a newspaper, if an individual makes a slanderous statement or a libelous statement within our Acts of defamation — and they are not too restrictive, Mr. Speaker, as I know them — then the person who is maligned and who has had his reputation destroyed has the right of action.

Under this particular piece of legislation, the attempt is being made to grant a newspaper immunity on the basis of them publishing a letter to the editor, which is a vicarious right to publish a defamatory statement which the newspaper can then say it has no responsibility for. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with that. Let us assume that somebody says that the Attorney-General, Gerry Mercier — and I use that expression merely as a means of making the case — Gerry Mercier is a Nazi. Is that, Mr. Speaker, a question of fact, or is it a question of opinion? You, yourself had to deal with that issue a few moments ago when you said that the question that was asked related to a question of opinion and not a question of fact. Now, if somebody writes a letter to the editor and says, Gerry Mercier is a Nazi, in my view, Mr. Speaker, it would make it no more acceptable for him to write, in my opinion, Gerry Mercier is a Nazi. It doesn't change anything. Yet the paper could publish that letter, and as long as it could show that it did not know whether the person writing it held that opinion or not, and as long as it could say that a person could hold that opinion, Mr. Mercier would have no right of action.

Now, I'm not certain, Mr. Speaker, that I want to give a newspaper the right to say that, which I think if they said it themselves, they could be sued for. This permits them to incorporate, by way of letter to the editor, some completely irresponsible remark, and have it published to 70,000 people throughout the province of Manitoba — (Interjection) — The Member for Ste. Rose is right, the letters to the editor, we should know from the experience of British Columbia that you can, under the guise of letters to the editor, pretend that you are saying things that you are not saying at all.

Now, is the newspaper, who gets a letter from Joe Smith in Glenella, Manitoba, or if we want to deal with any other name, are they to check whether there is such a person, are they to check whether he has that opinion or does not have the opinion, and are they to form an opinion as to whether he could hold that opinion? Or should not the general law of libel apply to what they print in their newspaper? And if they are going to print a libelous or slanderous statement that they should be held responsible for it, and they should not be able to say that the newspaper didn't know that that person didn't actually hold that opinion, and it is possible for such a person to hold this opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I envisage, and I tell the Minister this in an attempt to be constructive, I envisage problems with this legislation. I envisage problems because, first of all, it doesn't distinguish between saying an

Wednesday, 4 June, 1980

outright, non-factual statement which a person could then say, I was of the opinion that that was correct. I will give you another example. They could say that Mr. Lyon said that all negroes are shiftless, and could send a letter to the editor. Now this is suggesting that Mr. Lyon has a racial prejudice against coloured people. I believe that is a defamatory statement. But the paper could say: The fellow who sent us the letter believed it. And it is possible for him to believe it, a person could honestly hold that opinion. Why should the paper be able to print the letter if they couldn't print the statement themselves? And, Mr. Speaker, it helps sometimes to be personally involved. A lot of the people sitting here; a bill comes in, they look at it. In print it's cold; it's an extension of free speech. Fine, it looks like it could not hurt anybody. Now, Mr. Speaker, what would the Minister say if the Winnipeg Free Press — we'll be selective — printed the following letter: Let us say that there was in Letters to the Editor, a headline, Does Sterling Lyon Speak For The Progressive Conservatives, and then it said: I recently attended a seminar which was addressed by Sterling Lyon. Sterling Lyon came out with the astounding proposal that zionism and racism are identical and that Israel is a racist state. Mr. Lyon appears to ignore the fact that Israel was established only as a result of racism being practised against its people and that its nationalism is only a counterpart to the many nationalisms under which it has resided for many years. Now Mr. Lyon has insulted all of its people by calling them racist. Does Sterling Lyon speak for the government of Manitoba?

Now let's assume that letter was published in the Winnipeg Free Press. Now let's assume that Sterling Lyon never made any such statement, never made any such statement. Is this libelous of Sterling Lyon, and can the paper get out of it by saying, Mr. Speaker, well the guy who sent us the letter, he believed that Lyon said that? He believed it and it is possible for a person to believe it. Is that what the Minister intends?

Mr. Speaker, I am not talking hypothetically. I am only leading into the discussion hypothetically because the Attorney-General and I both have personal knowledge of the next situation I am going to describe. The Attorney-General and I were at a seminar at United College and we were talking about Quebec nationalism. There was a group there calling themselves, Mr. Speaker, the Revolutionary Workers Party. I believed that they regard themselves as being the modern day perpetrators of the doctrines of Leon Trotzky. If Trotzky were alive he would regard these people as his worst enemies, from what I know about Trotzky. But they said, Mr. Speaker, that Quebec has to become a separate state; that it has to realize its national aspirations; and that it has to have an ethnic national French state combined with socialism. That was their position, Mr. Speaker. I got up and I said that I believed, and the Minister was there, the Attorney-General was there, I said that I strongly believed in the need to fulfil the aspirations of the people of the province of Quebec; that I believe that we need the French language in Canada as part of our country; that if Quebec goes, and we lose that flavour of our country, we will lose something which is dear to us all and, therefore, I

want to maintain French as being a fact in Canada. And to those people who say that Quebec must become an ethnic, nationalist state and then be a socialist state, I want to remind them that when you have combined in the past nationalism and socialism, you get national socialism, and that is what has happened, Mr. Speaker. And then I said that after you have this so-called French ethnic state in the province of Quebec, which they were talking about, how would they stop the premier of that state, or the president or the dictator or whatever you call him, from saying we cannot stand idly by while our compatriots in the province of New Brunswick are being unfairly treated by the English? Does that sound familiar, Mr. Speaker? Des it sound familiar, because that's what Hitler said? He said, how can we stand idly by while our brothers in the Sudeten land are being unfairly treated by the Czechs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Letters to the Editor of the Winnipeg Tribune the following letter: Does Sid Green speak for the NDP? Well I guess he has his answer now. This fellow is very happy, you see, because I am no longer speaking for the NDP. I hope he is not speaking for the NDP or it will give a lot of people reason not to want to vote for the NDP.

One of the events during, Exposure 1979, held at the University of Winnipeg, was a panel discussion with representatives of the various political parties on the theme, 'Manitoba and the Crisis of Confederation'. I was appalled and shocked to hear Sid Green of the NDP characterize the national aspirations of the French Canadians in Quebec as racist, leaning to the same national socialism as in Germany under Hitler.

Now the Attorney-General was at the meeting, he knows I didn't say that. What's more, Mr. Speaker, I have proof that I didn't say it. The meeting was covered by the electronic media; it was covered by the Winnipeg Tribune; it was covered by the Winnipeg Free Press. Can you imagine that there would be a Winnipeg Tribune reporter or a Winnipeg Free Press reporter at a meeting where I said that the national aspirations of French Canadians in Canada are racist and will lead to national socialism as in Germany under Hitler? Can you imagine any reporters being in a room where I said this, that it would have to wait for a Letter to the Editor — Does Sid Green Speak for the NDP? Is it credible?

So the Tribune, several days later gets this letter, prints it — Does Sid Green Speak For The NDP? Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a slanderous letter. It is a defamatory letter. The Tribune would not print this material on its front page. Indeed, they wouldn't print it on page 21, because it is false and defamatory and I would sue them for it. But they say they want to put it in as a letter from Ken Biddle, I'm not reading the right name, it's like Ted Stupidly. The name is different but it is available to anybody who wants it. Ken Biddle can't understand English — some of us members will say that the reporters sometimes don't understand English. But no reporter would print anything like this in their newspaper; but the Tribune puts it in as a Letter to the Editor; puts on its headline, Does Sid — usually a politician doesn't mind being in the headlines, usually we are very happy. But here it says, and it was the only letter of that day — I mean I got terrific coverage. Sometimes

I work very hard, Mr. Speaker. I do a little tap dance or I do all kinds of things to try —(Interjection)— That's right, wear a pink shirt; nice loud tie. But I didn't do anything. I got, on the opposite side of the editorial page, the only letter from the Editor; headlines — Does Sid Green Speak For The NDP? What did he say — I was appalled and shocked to hear Sid Green of the NDP characterize the national aspirations of the French Canadian in Quebec as racist, leading to the same national socialism as in Germany under Hitler.

Now I did say that about the Revolutionary Workers Party, that the kind of thing that they were advocating, that an ethnic state in the province of Quebec, combined with socialism, is what lead to national socialism in Germany, where at least a large block of Hitler's followers pretended or thought they were socialists, which shows you who can think they are socialists. And Mussolini was one of the strongest socialists in Italy and decided to combine it with ethnic Italian nationalism and became a fascist. And I said that about these people but I never said that the aspirations, the national aspirations of the French Canadians in Quebec, which I indicated, Mr. Speaker, were mine, and at the meeting and the member was there. The fortunate thing is that the Attorney-General was there, he heard what I said and he knows that this is a defamatory, slanderous, libelous letter. And under this Act all the Tribune has to say is that Jim Siddle believed that — not believed it but believed that I said it — excuse me Tim Biddle. Do any of you guys know Jim Siddle, who is this man? All they have to know is that he believes it and that a person could believe it, an idiot could honestly hold such an opinion; it says, a person could honestly hold such an opinion. Well a person could be an idiot and he could hold any opinion, and we are going to say that the newspapers are entitled to put this in the paper and that the person who is defamed, and I named him, Mr. Speaker, Sterling Lyon, and why not have Saul Cherniack, Gerry Mercier, anybody, will have no recourse on the basis of the fact that it's a Letter to the Editor. All of a sudden it becomes a glorified way of disseminating defamation.

Mr. Speaker, I don't mind the law that Jim Siddle could put this on a pamphlet and distribute it by himself to everybody else and I have a right to sue him. But why do we say that if he could only get it into one of the columns of the paper, who print all kinds of letters to the editor, that once that has occurred the person who is defamed cannot sue?

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister is going to have to look at this bill and tell me whether a person can make a misstatement, whether innocently or otherwise, which would ordinarily be defamatory and that misstatement of fact cannot be the subject of a defamation action if the newspaper did not know that the person expressing the opinion did not hold that opinion, which is an impossibility, or that a person could honestly hold the opinion, because people can honestly hold erroneous opinions.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party is an example of that and they will say, to be fair, that we are an example of the contrary, or that the New Democrats are an example of the contrary. I mean, you believe these people to be honest. They believe you to be honest but you do believe that their opinions are

wrong and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, what kind of defence is this if the letter is defamatory?

Now I say if the letter is defamatory and the paper is going to print it, why can't they accept responsibility for it? That's freedom of speech. Is that a denial of freedom of speech? A person wants to take the risk of making a defamatory statement which hurts somebody else; and not only that but they can disseminate it to 50,000-70,000 people throughout the province; and they do so under the guise that it's their responsibility to print Letters to the Editor which are defamatory. I don't know whether the Minister wants that, and fortunately I tell the Minister, you were there, I was there, you heard what was said. The reporters were there. No reporter would have reported this tripe which is defamatory, that I said that the national aspirations of the people of the province of Quebec are racist and would lead to national socialism as in Germany under Hitler.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said that of the views of the Revolutionary Workers Party and what they were advocating, which was a separate ethnic state of Quebec combined with socialism, so-called. — (Interjection)— Yes, I'll repeat it. I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister look at this. Under no circumstances, in my view, should the paper be able to reprint a statement of fact which is incorrect and which defames somebody. If it's a statement of opinion, it should be a statement of philosophical opinion of some kind. It cannot be a statement of opinion with regard to the character, conduct of a particular person who is defamed thereby, unless the paper is prepared to stand up behind it and say: If we are sued and we published this thing, that we can't, we have the same defences, it's still a fair comment, it's still a person in public life whom you can say things about. And I don't detract from that one iota.

But why these additional defences where the defendant published alleged defamatory matter, that is, an opinion expressed by another person. And the question of opinion is very difficult. It could be an opinion as to a state of fact. A defence of fair comment shall not fail, for the reason only that the defendant did not hold the opinion — in other words, the newspaper did not hold the opinion — if the defendant did not know that the person expressing the opinion did not hold the opinion.

So the newspaper says: We did not know what opinions he held or did not hold. Furthermore, a person could honestly hold the opinion. Well, persons can honestly hold very defamatory opinions. And you're going to say that a paper can print those because it's possible for Tim Diddle to hold such an opinion and if he holds it and we don't know that he doesn't hold it, then it's fair comment.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I wouldn't have been concerned if I didn't have an actual situation, but I have an actual situation. It happened. It's not something that I dreamt up, it happened.

Now, I'm not saying that I would . . . Maybe I could have sued the paper if I felt it was defamatory at that time but, you know, you don't run around suing the paper. I don't feel that this is a credible statement. I don't want to make it more credible by pursuing the matter, but shall we permit this type of thing to go by and say that the member who is defamed hasn't got the usual action. Don't forget,

they can say things about people in public life that they cannot say about other individuals. They can say that the Minister is dishonest. The papers can say that he is misleading the people of Manitoba. They might not be able to say that about somebody, a lawyer, a doctor, but they can say it so they have got considerable latitude and we are subjected to considerably more adverse comment than the ordinary person. That's the law, is it not?

We accept that. It's part of our vanity. If we want to be in the public eye, the public eye has got to see all the spots, even those that do not exist, and that's fair. I have never argued about it. But now they want to get out of responsibility because it's a letter to the editor. Why? You know, those letters to the editor are read and, in this particular case, I say the newspaper appropriated that letter to the editor. I mean, they say that Sid Green is speaking for the NDP so they implied that I said this. They didn't say, Did Sid Green say this? They say, Does Sid Green speak for the NDP?

Mr. Speaker, I believe in freedom of speech. I also believe that people who are defamed should have the right to sue for damages from those who have been responsible for the defamation. I am by no means sure that this thing has been thought out. I am by no means sure. If it is, if my fears or apprehensions are such that they are wrongly based, I would be happy for the Minister to explain it to me, but I had the situation and I see it happening, and I see more of it happening. I see the newspaper who wishes now to have said something, you know, if such a wonderful, highly-placed person as Bill Bennett could, say, write a whole bunch of letters to the editor saying crazy things about the New Democrats, why can't a publisher of a newspaper say that to somebody? Or a malicious reporter? There are such things. They're mostly all nice people but it could happen and I don't know why they should be able to get away with it because it happens to be a letter to the editor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 19, The Education Administration Act. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to deal with Bills 26 and 33. I wonder if we could have leave of the House to deal with Bill No. 33 at this time. The Honourable Member for Elmwood will be in just a moment.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable? (Agreed)

BILL NO. 33 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 33, an Act to amend The Public Libraries Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned debate on Bill No. 33 for the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, we followed with some interest the remarks of the Minister of Cultural Affairs when she introduced this bill on May 30 and indicated that the basis of the legislation being introduced was a study of library funding, which was reported last May, and the recommendations of the resulting report which the government is now attempting to implement. I might add that the government, prior to the introduction of this legislation, has in fact already been acting on the particular report.

The main recommendation of that report was to highlight a disparity in the library services between Winnipeg and the rural areas. The recommendation which is being implemented in this bill is that library grants for the rural areas will be enhanced some 50 percent in 1980. The Minister wound up her remarks by saying that the bill indicated her department's commitment to enhance the cultural life of Manitoba and that that life was enriched by public libraries.

Mr. Speaker, in principle we have no objection to any of the recommendations contained in the bill and we consequently support them. I must, however, in registering support for Bill 33, make a few points. I say, for the benefit of the Minister that she will not be surprised to learn that we support the principle of the bill and her concern and her government's concern for the fact that rural libraries do not appear to have been adequately funded.

I want to say, by way of illustration, I take some interest and pride in one particular rural library, and that is the Portage Library. I had the honour to attend, with the MLA for Portage, the opening of that particular facility, which I think is the kind of library that we want throughout Manitoba wherever it is financially possible. That's a bright, cheery, well-equipped library. It's more than a place where you can only obtain books. There are records, among other things; there are magazines, paperbacks and, I suppose, maybe other things. Perhaps the Minister can comment. I'm not familiar with whether we are into the stage of videotapes, but I suspect that it won't be long before people will be going to the library to loan movies or documentaries, video recordings, maybe even tapes of the Manitoba Legislative Question Period, which I watch quite faithfully. Sometimes it gives you a different perspective on what occurs in the Chamber, or one of my colleagues unkindly suggests sometimes it gives a person indigestion, so it's often best to watch it before or after meals, take one, but not during.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, the Portage Library, to me, is a model of the kind of library that should be existent in the province, particularly in the larger centres. I have some personal connection with that library in that it was during our government's term in office that we sold the old Manitoba Government

Building to the city of Portage for the purpose of developing a library and they did a splendid job.

Mr. Speaker, what concerns me in the bill is not what has been said or what is being done through the bill, which is all laudible, but the fact that I suspect that although funding throughout Manitoba in the rural areas is going to be enhanced by a 50 percent increase, that there doesn't appear to be any similar enrichment in the Winnipeg area. That is an area that I would ask the Minister to address herself, whether she feels that by bringing up the rural libraries to a higher standard, she should also have attempted to enrich the Winnipeg libraries, in particular, and she will in fact make a remark on that. Because I suspect that the urban libraries need further enrichment and that the rural libraries, even with this measure, may still have some distance to go because, you know, Mr. Speaker, it is a great temptation for all governments to push the cultural and the learning that can go on through libraries, and so on, aside. It is very easy to straight-arm money spent on cultural affairs because of the greater importance of the economy or other areas that are politically more exciting. When you enrich libraries, you don't score that many points and when you don't enrich them, you also don't lose that many points, so politicians are very good at calculating political support and they know that it's all too easy to hold aside what should be part of their responsibilities and part of their priorities.

I also wanted to ask the Minister whether she could comment on her relationship with the Minister of Education, as to whether there is any dovetailing, whether there is any coordination or complimentary action. —(Interjection)— I didn't hear that, but I am afraid to ask what was said. Mr. Speaker, I know that to this day a lot of libraries in the educational system are inadequate, and I can recall the kind of libraries that we used to have in Manitoba in some of the smaller rural centres and in some of the schools. I recall back in Emerson, and the MLA for Emerson might be interested, I remember the school library at that high school, which consisted of donations from people in the community. Now that was good, spirited citizens gave their old books to the local library and to the local school. The only problem was when you take a student, say, someone in the 1960s, and I am thinking now to the year 1960 specifically, and give them a 1923 edition of a Tarzan book, they may or may not be thrilled by the ape man, they may or may not be thrilled by the reading habits of somebody who no longer finds books useful but thinks that younger students might. I am also not going to get into the field of censorship, which might be a temptation at this particular time. So, Mr. Speaker, I would be interested to know whether the Minister works hand in hand with the Minister of Education in terms of trying to do something about the educational needs and the educational libraries.

I want to mention to her a couple of points, in particular, and she may wash her hands of this entirely, but it was simply indicated today, in a major news story in the Winnipeg Tribune that the U of M Library has been ranked 23rd out of 24 libraries in Canada. That is a sorry commentary — (Interjection)— The University of Manitoba Library. That's a sorry commentary on our library at the University. I mean most of us who went there or who

have visited there, I think, think that is one of the better libraries around and to find out that we are at the tailend of university libraries, it is shocking indeed; and that professors out there, as an example, because they cannot obtain books from the library, the library doesn't have the funds to buy books that they require, are xeroxing or photostating books. Now, you can imagine if you —(Interjection)— My colleague asks whether it is cheaper. If you have a 300 page book and it costs 8 cents or 10 cents a page to copy —(Interjection)— A penny a page, I don't where you can copy for that, not here. The MLA for Rossmere has a photocopying operation at which he only charges a penny a page, that is the cheapest I have ever heard. Please don't mention non-union printers in the Chamber. But in the most cases I think it costs 6 or 8 cents, maybe even more to photostat. Whatever it is, it certainly cannot be as cheap as purchasing a book. So I am just saying, in that particular case, Mr. Speaker, we are superficially saving money by choking off a grant in one area and then the money is spent to a greater degree in another.

I also want to ask the Minister this. It was indicated a year and one-half ago, again I may be leaning over into Education, but I ask the Minister whether she has responsibility or she coordinates or she provides any funding for school libraries? In public education, I was told a year and one-half ago that there is still about one-third of the schools that don't have a centralized library, and that because government grants are tied to enrolment that they are continuing to decline? Maybe the Minister could comment on that point about the extent to which her grants are tied to population, whether they are on a per capita basis, or whether they also can get around that?

The other point I made when the Minister wasn't here, I gather that she has been acting along the lines of the recommendations already, because I have a press release here from February 15th, entitled Library Support Funding Widened, and it seems as if this is already being done, so this is really putting into legislation what was obviously a government policy at the time.

I am concerned about the fact that Winnipeg, which has been ahead of the rural municipalities, that now the RMs are being brought up to Winnipeg, but I am asking whether Winnipeg is really at a sufficient standard, first of all, on its own, or whether it is in line with other cities of comparable size?

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the Minister indicated that libraries are an important part of the cultural life of Manitoba, and that in enriching the libraries she is enriching the cultural life. I encourage her in that direction and in that pursuit, but I have to say that there is much to be done in terms of the cultural life of Manitoba and the government, I think, has still not grappled with that problem. I don't know how the Minister fares in Cabinet, but in terms of actually enriching the cultural life of Manitoba the Progressive Conservative Government, I think, leaves a lot to be desired. We have promises from the Minister, we have the Cultural Policy Review Committee, and we have the annual reports and so on, but I think it is still true that the arts in Manitoba are still suffering, and that this is a priceless heritage that we have and we must

Wednesday, 4 June, 1980

nurture it, and we must support it with public moneys. Because although some of my friends opposite are not too sympathetic to government subsidies and government grants, they have to recognize that nowhere, including the mighty cities of New York and the free enterprise giant of the United States, that nowhere are the arts really making a profit, they all run with public support and public encouragement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say a few brief words with regard to this particular Bill, having been close to the library in my constituency in my home town. I really welcome this particular bill, it will mean a real boost for many of the rural libraries such as the one we have in Steinbach. It will mean a substantial increase in funding and I think will, to a large extent — well I know it will — be really welcomed by the many volunteers who over the years have donated, not only time, but have donated books and money to the upgrading and establishment of the Steinbach Library.

One of the problems we had with the old regional concept, Mr. Speaker, was that if one municipality couldn't get another municipality to enter into an agreement with it, then the support forthcoming from the province was very little, and this is one of the problems that we had out in our area. There was a referendum held and a regional library, because of the referendum in the one municipality not agreeing with the wishes of the other municipality, that regional library could not be formed.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that I am really happy to see is that this particular item will infuse some 50 percent additional funds into the existing system. It is needed and I know that I speak on behalf of the people that have, as I mentioned before, worked hard to develop a library in my home town and I know it will go quite far to do two things. Number one, to encourage the establishment of a better facility and the upgrading of the facility and it will also go a long way to alleviate the disparity that was being created between the level of funding of the municipality and the province. That disparity has been growing over the last number of years to the point where the part that the province was putting in, with relationship to what it was costing the town of Steinbach, was completely out of kilter.

Mr. Speaker, I say that, because I feel that this bill will in a large measure help to offset some of the costs that were borne by the local people, will help upgrade the library system, make it a better library in rural Manitoba, and I know in particular in this instance is well appreciated by the area residents of the Steinbach area who will be using that particular library.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

HON. NORMA PRICE (Assiniboia): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A great deal of thought has gone into changing the amending of this bill for the public libraries after a very thorough study was done

last May, and I am very pleased to note that the Member for Elmwood is in accordance with the amendments to this Act.

I can't comment on the news item that he was referring to in today's paper because I have neither seen the paper nor have I seen the source or the data of it. I only know that in Monday's Free Press there was some pretty disparaging remarks made about the Archives. When we looked into it we notice that it is 1977 data that they have used when, in essence, since 1977 we have increased the funding for the Archives some 87 percent, and it was 60 percent this year alone, so I can't take as God's word what you read in the newspapers — (Interjection)— or whatever, as gospel truth then, how about that for the Member for St. Johns?

I would like to tell the Member for Elmwood that — he was concerned about the Winnipeg Library — there was 250,000 given to them a few months ago for the upgrading of their book collection. They have been kept ahead much better than rural libraries have and it was time that they be brought up to strength with the Winnipeg libraries. There has been a total of 1 million extra has been given from the government in this past year for the libraries in Manitoba. I am really pleased with the comments that I have had from the Member for Elmwood and my colleagues, and some of the other people, and I look forward to an early passing of this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 26 — THE SUITOR'S MONEY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: We will now go back to Bill No. 26 — the Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really don't think I have ten minutes worth of contribution to make on this bill. It is a very straightforward matter of providing, first of all, interest on moneys paid into County Courts and Surrogate Courts in this province. I understand that interest is already paid in the Court of Queen's Bench. The intent of the bill is admirable. We see no objections to that aspect of it, and we also approve of the other aspect of providing notice to individuals who have, in fact, paid moneys into courts, and the parties to the law suits involved. The bill would provide notice to people two years after the money as been paid in, to possibly remind them, in case they've forgotten, that the law suit is still going on, and if nothing happens, there will be another reminder sent out five years after the money is paid in, and at a certain point in time the money would wind up simply in the consolidated fund, but even after that, even after the lapse of some years, providing a party could prove he was entitled to it, he would receive the funds out of the consolidated fund anyway, and therefore we would recommend approval of this bill.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 31.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, we are not prepared to deal with any of the remaining bills on the Order Paper at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is agreement to call it 4:30 and proceed with Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 4:30, we are now under Private Members' Hour. Wednesdays, we deal with Address for Papers, Orders for Return, of which we don't have any. So we will proceed with Resolutions.

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — ELIMINATION OF GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED LOTTERIES

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 1 and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Springfield. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface has three minutes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I don't need three minutes. We covered that in the estimates; I think I had a chance to make two speeches on this. I think the position I took exception to what the member read at the time, I thought it was very unfair and I felt that he owed me an apology and I still think he does. I think this is not the way to act in this House, especially when things have been settled or have been explained, not accepted later on, but I'm certainly not going to press this anymore. I've made the explanation. I can tell the member that I certainly have no guilty conscience on any of the things that he mentioned and if he bothers to read the transcript of the meeting, he will see that many of the things he said were out of context also.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise and address a few remarks in support of the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Springfield. In going through the records of Hansard the other day, I note that I have spoken on many occasions regarding lotteries in the province. I expressed certain concerns in 1969 when a private bill was brought into this House, a private member introducing the lottery system on a once over basis, as it was considered in those days, to provide lottery funds for our centennial.

Mr. Speaker, then in 1971, the government of the day saw fit, through the medium of the Attorney-General, to bring a bill under the government label, and again I expressed my concerns at that time. In fact I begged the former First Minister of the province, I begged the Minister of Finance, the Honourable Member for St. Johns, I recall begging the Honourable Member for Inkster and the former

Minister of Labour to express their sentiments which I knew were something similar to which I had. When lotteries first came into the province we were concerned, but nevertheless, the government of the day proceeded and then in 1974 we had the debates again on this matter when they phased out the Manitoba Golden Lottery system, and I was rather unhappy to see that event take place.

Mr. Speaker, I should say that over the years it has been an issue that not all members in this House agreed with, but I am somewhat concerned for the Member for Inkster bringing this bill in, this resolution. In fact, he was part and parcel of the government that moved from the lottery system into being part of government and the phasing out of the lottery system. But nevertheless, I think we have provided a vehicle now, and a medium, whereby the honourable member and members opposite can support the amendment and all will proceed without any problems in resolving this matter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in October 1977, the present government inherited a lottery structure and a lotteries philosophy from the previous government, which, as we all know, certainly there were problems, there were some concerns in the province, but nevertheless it was operating reasonably well. There was the report of this government brought in by Graeme Haig, QC, the Lotteries Review Commissioner, and that's well documented today, and I think Mr. Haig has done a very remarkable job in setting up a plan whereby we could proceed with the lottery system in our province. I know maybe the Honourable Member for St. Boniface doesn't agree with all the things that were submitted and offered by Mr. Haig, but I think he said it didn't tell him anything, but nevertheless, I think it has set up a structure whereby we can proceed in the province with a lottery system.

I'm also pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister in charge of the lotteries has grasped the Haig report and put it into perspective and we can see now that it likely is going to be handled as is pointed out in the amendment, that the government will pursue its policies, sure that the administration and the marketing systems for the provincially sponsored or licensed lotteries are effective and efficient. I basically don't see what else we can do under the circumstances, except to proceed under those, so I do rise and support the amendment. I think it's an excellent amendment and adds considerable structure to the resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. I think the members opposite will support it and we pursue the policies of this Minister; it is proceeding at the present time that the lotteries will be well handled in the future.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few comments to make. I gather the Member for Roblin is not too enthused about the lotteries, in any event, and he did point out that there are people on both sides of the House who have not shown that enthusiasm in favour of it. He sort of supports the fact that some of us could get up and say we don't agree with the principle of

lotteries without inviting calumny on our heads, and without inviting abuse and attack.

I must tell the Honourable Member for Springfield, whose speech I just read — I was not present when he spoke — two things: Firstly, I'm going to take this Hansard home to my wife to read, and the reason I want him to know that is that she has said to him, in my presence, that she thought he was one of the most mild-mannered, gentlemanly persons she had met from the Tory side of the House, and she is now going to have to change her mind, I think. The only thing I have to say is that I will point out to her the comments made by the Member for St. Boniface, who not once but several times, referred to the fact that the Member for Springfield was reading his speech, and excused some of what he said on the basis that someone else had used the kind of suggestions, the inferences, and the outright accusations that the Member for Springfield had made at that time, and that then, I will point out to my wife, is an excuse that in some way alleviates the reaction that she would otherwise have, I am sure, when she reads the speech from the Member for Springfield. Enough said about that, Mr. Speaker.

Not very much to comment on what the Member for Roblin said, he said, the government inherited a philosophy which was pretty well set out and was running reasonably well, in lotteries. I'm a little amused by that because the present government is the one which attacked Autopac and which said, we want government out of these things. It is a government which is inviting review of the Liquor Board's operations and there have been suggestions from that side of the House that the sale of liquor, or at least of beer, could be opened up and turned over to the private sector. A government which is so committed to support of the private sector is one which I am surprised at bringing in the amendment that it did, which the Member for Roblin says is excellent, an excellent one. In other words, a continuation of government sponsorship of lotteries.

Just a comment, Mr. Speaker, I do like that portion of Graeme Haig's report where he describes the role of the volunteer, and it is quoted by the Member for Springfield. It's a good statement; it's a correct statement. I think that we should recognize the value in society and in communities of the role of the volunteer as an interested party in living together within a community. By coincidence only, I was able to speak the same way when I spoke on it yesterday, it was on the Bethesda Foundation, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't quite recognize that the attitude to the role of involvement by the individual in communal affairs is that highly recognized by members opposite.

In any event, that's not important. What I do question, however, is the intention to continue to use the revenues from government sponsored lotteries, and I'm now quoting from the amendment, to enhance community activities in culture, recreation and athletics. Mr. Speaker, I believe that part of the volunteer's role in community activities in culture, recreation and athletics, is not only participation, not only in fund raising, but also being personally involved. And I don't believe that that kind of involvement should relieve him of the necessity to help raise the finances, the funding of the operations. In that regard, I would think that if there is a lottery

sponsored by the organization itself, the members go out and sell tickets for it, or if they have field days involved, or if they have any sort of function which is of a fund raising nature for that particular organization, I think that's fine.

I was brought up, just to take us away for a moment, Mr. Speaker, at a time when there was very little government funding of any kind for various kinds of cultural organizations, and a great part of the efforts of the membership were devoted to actually raising the funds necessary. There was something healthy and cohesive about that, although I do believe that it should be government's responsibility to finance, through taxation, the activities that are considered to be worthwhile and necessary. Nevertheless, failing the government's doing that, I believe that individuals should get together and do it.

But what I don't believe is that the government should be sponsoring lotteries on the general scale, raising funds from outsiders of the supporters of these various organizations in these various communities, and then turning over the money raised to these organizations. That is a method by which government gets out of its own responsibilities, I believe, in working for the organization and assisting the community organizations in their activities directly and indirectly. Therefore, it sponsors lotteries and I don't accept that.

I'm not at all interested in continuing the debate of where were you when we voted on something or other. That to me is academic and self-defeating and I won't participate in that. There have been many opportunities, when we've discussed the history, and history is not to me germane at this point.

Mr. Speaker, if the amendment spoke about government control, government regulated, government licenced, I could understand it. I don't like lotteries of any kind, Mr. Speaker, but if they are going to be there and they are going to be there, the fact that I don't like them will not remove them from the public participation in them. Therefore once that is done, then I do believe that government must play a role in seeing to it that they are properly run, but government controlled and government licensed and government regulated is not government sponsored, and it is clear that this government by its amendment, by the speeches made, especially by the Member for Roblin just now, clearly intends to sponsor, which means to operate lotteries and to promote them, and there is my biggest objection, Mr. Speaker. It is the promotion of lotteries. It is the involvement of government's patronage of the operation of — I use that term patronage in the sense of sponsorship and in the sense of supporting the role of lotteries — to enable the people who run the lotteries to give us the advertising they do, which I consider absolutely unacceptable. The fact that lotteries are there and the people are going to see to it that either under the table or over the table or in some way they are going to participate in it with their sense and their desire to gamble, I accept that. But to push it, Mr. Speaker, I do not accept, and when I see an advertisement, as I often do on TV and I think in printed form, saying you're going to get rich, you're going to have the great benefits of a sudden windfall of money tax free, that to me is unacceptable. I don't think that government should

Wednesday, 4 June, 1980

be sponsoring an operation which pushes, and may I say, Mr. Speaker, I always agree that government should not be involved in advertising the sale of alcohol, as another example.

So that, Mr. Speaker, I object violently to government's participation in the pushing and promotion of lotteries. This morning by sheer coincidence I was in the local hardware store where a person of means — I have no way of knowing his means; he certainly did not seem to be affluent — made some purchases for seven dollars and some pennies. He put down 10 and said, Just give me the small change and keep 2.00, and took up a couple of tickets and said, Maybe this will be worth 50 to me. He looked at me and said it to me and I said, Buddy, you're a sucker. You're a sucker because the odds are completely against you and your money of this kind is dribbling away in little bits and pieces and you don't really notice it.

Mr. Speaker, if people who were buying lotteries as a matter of course would total up in the year the amount of money they spend on them and start to assess what percentage that is of their available moneys, I think they would be in for a rude shock. On the other hand, if they said it is worth it to me to have those dreams of satisfaction, those speculative moments when I can think of suddenly having the windfall of 100,000 what I would do with it, well that's a form of recreation that apparently suits some people. Some people go to a movie and hope that a couple of hours of watching a movie will take their minds off the bitterness of life, as it may be to them, that's one form. To others it may be the dreams involved in winning lotteries, that's another thing. But I do not agree with the government sponsoring the lotteries, and that is a word that I key in on when I object to what is being proposed before us and why I agree with the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks with respect to this bill and in doing so I am unable to adopt the same position that the Member for St. Johns has with regard to the history because the Member for Roblin appears to be making a suggestion that how can I get up to make this resolution when I participated in the government that brought forward the legislation. Is that right?

Mr. Speaker, I invite the honourable members to go back to 1969 and 1970 and I am going back, Mr. Speaker. Here's where you've got me. I'm going back without looking and going to tell you what I said both years. And it's there in Hansard so if I am wrong, and after 11 years you can show, well, Mr. Green, you have not said what you said you said.

In 1969 I said, Mr. Speaker, I spoke on the bill, and I said that this will not be a one time effort. It was brought in by a private member and it was suggested that it was going to be one happy party, and I said that it would not be, that it was going to be a means whereby the public thinks that they can get some easy money and therefore do it in a painless way. And there is no painless way and if there is, the painlessness of collecting public revenues is itself a bad thing because people should know that public revenues are something that have

to be collected and have to be contributed to. And that is what I said in 1969 and you can go and check Hansard to see whether I am now misrepresenting what I said.

In 1970, Mr. Speaker, the government brought in a bill. Mr. Speaker, I got up in my place — I was sitting where the Member for Lakeside is — and I said that I do not approve what is in this bill, and I said, Mr. Speaker, that the government has decided on this question. I believe I mentioned that the government thought — you know they don't think so any more; they've become a little bit more mature in their older age — that this was passed at a New Democratic Party convention and therefore there was some type of policy that had to be implemented. They don't say that no more about hiring people when there are workers on strike. You don't hear the New Democratic Party saying: We have a policy, we're going to hire people; we're not going to permit the hiring of people when people are on strike. They've abandoned that, Mr. Speaker. They've abandoned that. The people who told the labour movement that they're going to do that are people who told them something that I would never tell them and I stand very secure in myself that I would not make that type of representation.

But I got up in my seat in 1970. I said I don't agree with this. It is something that the government has decided upon. They feel bound to it and I have no choice but to stand up in favour of this legislation or to resign and, Mr. Speaker, I said I am not going to resign from this administration for what amounts to the collection of 1/20 of 1 percent of sales tax. I think it is silly but I am not going to step out of an administration, which I believe can do a great deal of good, because of that.

Mr. Speaker, what did I show at that time? I showed, Mr. Speaker, a great willingness to compromise. I was very flexible. I was willing to — (Interjection)— Absolutely, as I always have been. I indicated, Mr. Speaker, I indicated at the time that there may come issues when I will not be able to stay with the government. But people are saying that we want lotteries and this is an absolute necessity. Well, Mr. Speaker, it showed my willingness not to get my way, as against people who have an obsession with getting their own way and must get their own way. I didn't say that, Mr. Speaker. I've never said that it must be my way. I voted for that bill and I voted for it with great misgivings and predicted that this will not be a proper way of collecting public revenue.

Mr. Speaker, something else occurred with regard to the member who has made this amendment. The member who made this amendment said in effect what the motion says. He said that the public doesn't want revenues from lotteries, that the only revenues that are from lotteries go to the people who are conducting the lotteries. Now, before I moved this motion, on the day that I moved it, I went to the Department of Finance and I said how much money from the lotteries does not go to the organizations but is taken in and used by departments of government for expenditures? I went in and got that information, Mr. Speaker, and gave that information to the members in this House. I can't remember the exact figure, but it's something like 3 million a year. I don't ask that my memory be relied on in that

respect, but I went over to the Department of Finance on the day that it was debated and found out that that amount of money comes into public revenue.

Now, you don't agree with that. You say it shouldn't be and, as a matter of fact, you said that. There is nothing in the motion that the member who spoke doesn't agree with. Why did he make an amendment? Revenues required for public purposes should be raised by means which are administratively efficient and which affect the citizen in relation to his ability to pay. You agree with that, don't you? He's nodding. Whereas government sponsored lotteries offend against these principles in that the costs of raising revenues are inordinately high, the methods are cumbersome, and there is no attempt to insure that there is ability to pay. So you don't want governments to raise public revenues by lottery, you said that. Whereas in utilizing lotteries for collection of public revenue, the government engages in processes which are destructive in that it inspires false hopes and 'get rich quick with no effort' ideals. Well, you don't believe that people think that they should get rich quick. You believe in the work ethic, don't you? I mean, I believe in it too. You don't believe that the government should be advertising throughout the country that there is an easy way, that you can live an easy life.

Mr. Speaker, I know why my friend the Member for Morden is not a socialist because he thinks socialism is something which it isn't. If he finds out what it is, he will become a socialist.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go on the record that I offered to go to my honourable friend's constituency and to the Member for Lakeside's constituency and go there and speak on the programs of the New Democratic Party, on the basis that he believes that if these programs are disseminated to his people it will get him votes. Why don't they call me, Mr. Speaker? I've offered them on several occasions. I've offered to get them votes, but they won't have me, Mr. Speaker. I'm even willing to give . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Perhaps if the remarks were addressed to the Chair it might remove some of the interaction in the Chamber.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's the Member for Pembina, he's right here; he's very close and his words reach my ear, and they invite response.

Whereas worthwhile public activities such as theatre, sports, the arts and cultural endeavours should not have to depend for their existence on such a negative form of public support. You agree with that. Sure he agrees with it, Mr. Speaker. How can you not agree with that? That's like motherhood. Therefore, and this is where the member has indicated, he said, when we came in, the government was taking so much money from lotteries and we're doing away with it, and we're having nothing to do with them, only controlling them, which I will agree has to happen.

What does the resolve say? Be it resolved that the government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of spearheading the elimination of government sponsored lotteries as a means of raising public revenues. Not for any other, just that they, Mr. Speaker, be in the forefront. It doesn't say

that they eliminate it today; it says that they have as their objective the elimination of government sponsored lotteries as a means of raising public revenues, only for that reason.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member in his speech said he agreed with all of these things. He blamed us for getting us into them. And I'm not going to deny that, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to deny that the New Democratic Party was instrumental in getting us into this situation. Okay. After we have said that, do you agree that the Conservative Party wants to get us out of it? You said yes. Mr. Speaker, that was the basis of his speech. Then what is there that requires an amendment? Be it resolved that the government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of spearheading the elimination of government-sponsored revenue as a means of raising public revenue.

Now, the Member for Springfield said that we are doing that. If you are doing it, why not push for it, and I will accept what the member says. I will say that, hopefully, and the Minister has said that they are no longer involved in collecting public revenues by means of lotteries, it's merely for the groups that have sponsored them; they run them, we control them. Isn't that right?

But, Mr. Speaker, I went to the Department of Finance the day that I introduced this resolution. — (Interjection)— Well, I'm telling you that I went there and I got the figures, Mr. Speaker, that there is — (Interjection)— Some people had more difficulty understanding them, so I have to repeat. I got the figures and the figures show that we are continuing to do it. If we don't want to do it, and I think that we don't, I think that we are of one mind, then we should say so, Mr. Speaker, and we don't need the amendment, the motion says so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Having spoken on the resolution and not on the amended resolution, I just want to say a few words on the amendment. First of all, I guess I find myself in somewhat the same position as the Member for Inkster did. Mr. Speaker, the only different is that we're a little further down the line with regard to government-sponsored lotteries than we were when the original bills were made. One thing that I have learned as a member of the opposition and now as a member of the Treasury Bench is that there is one luxury when you are sitting in the Opposition that is not afford to you when you are in government, and that is that you can make certain statements with regard to things happening and put forward certain suggestions, knowing that the final crunch with regard to that and the final implementation of those will not be your responsibility but will be somebody else's.

I suggest to you today, Mr. Speaker, that the member realizes that it is easy to put forward the thought that we are going to do away with the government-sponsored lotteries but I suggest to him that I find myself somewhat in the same position of not being wholeheartedly, Mr. Speaker, in agreement with all aspects that we are involved with. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have said time and

time again that I'm not for increased gaming in the province of Manitoba and I guess, as elected representatives, when you deal with responsibilities that are given to you, I think that all members will agree, that the best way to effect change and to have your own thoughts emulated in the different policies that are projected, the best thing to do is roll up your sleeves and get involved in it and try and change it and bring it into a direction in which you think it should be going.

Mr. Speaker, to that end, I have also stated that one of the basic reasons we are in this is for the public protection aspect as well as the accountability. If you look at the evolution, if I can use that word, of the lottery systems, and I'm talking about the Manitoba government-sponsored lottery systems, they slowly evolved until 1974, I believe, when the then Minister, the Member for St. Boniface, put together very much the situation that we have right now. We, Mr. Speaker, are trying to get more local groups, community groups and non-profit groups involved in this scheme but, Mr. Speaker, that is a difficult thing to do. There are substantial amounts of money involved and if we are to control the expenditures to make sure that these moneys are spent in the best interests of the public, it is a process which is moving ahead slowly.

I indicated when I spoke on the main resolution that we are moving in that direction and there have been some positive moves in the last year and a half. We hope to, Mr. Speaker, with the involvement of the total community involvement group, involve many of the small non-profit groups who, up until this point in time, have not had a share or been able to share in the revenues of the lotteries. This will mean a decreasing position as far as the province is concerned but, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the one thread that has come through the whole debate we have had here is that there is no such thing as a one-time-only grant. Mr. Speaker, as we slowly vacate that field and give up the funds that we are collecting we will have to find alternate sources of revenue from the provincial purse.

Mr. Speaker, that also adds, if you want to put it down in factual terms, adds to the taxes that other people have. As the members who have been in government before realize, that means that smaller departments, such as myself, have to go for pretty substantial increases for funding levels, for programs, Mr. Speaker, that have traditionally in the last five or six years been funded from lotteries.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the members would care to see what has happened. Just in my department I was able to, Mr. Speaker, this year, because we have given up some of the lottery funds and some of the things that we were funding, the grants that we were making to organizations like the Manitoba Sports Federation, I have been able to roll some more of the programs which traditionally were funded by lotteries, maybe a year or two ago, into my appropriation. So, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying to you is that I would hope, over the next period of years, as the whole system develops, I will be able to roll more and more of my funding and my programming that has been developed into my appropriation. Mr. Speaker, to that end we are working. However, I point out to the members that in many of the instances, when either this

government or the previous government makes a grant to any individual group, whether it be 5,000 or 10,000, I think, without exception you will read on almost every Order-in-Council that has been passed in the last six or seven years, it says, a one time only grant. Mr. Speaker, that group is back the next year, and one of the problems we had is that as you go you are keeping on building and you are becoming more and more reliant on these funds.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that some aspects that have been brought up in this debate — the Member for St. Johns mentions the sort of hard-sell approach of the advertising that is involved — I have that same concern. I have had concerns from my constituents who present that concern to me and I think the direction of that should be changed and I can assure the members here we will be moving in that direction. If the product is going to be on the market and is going to be marketed by a group such as we have right now, which is comprised of the United Way, Arts Council, Sports Federation, and Total Community Involvement, they will, of course, want to advertise their product. Now, how do you advertise it? Of course there are different ways of selling your product and I believe that can be brought into a proper perspective so it is more palatable to the people.

But I say to you that we are in a position where we have moved along the path. I believe we have in the last number of years, not expanded that particular path, we have tried to keep it a certain — we shouldn't maybe use the expression keep it on the straight and narrow and, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to work to that end.

It is a slow process but we have no visions of expanding the Lotteries, excepting, I guess I have to bring the one exception into it, and that was the takeover of Loto Canada by the provinces which, Mr. Speaker, I might add, has reduced the duplication of administration, has reduced the advertising costs, and has really tightened up the whole situation and put the whole jurisdiction of lotteries under one umbrella, namely, under the provinces.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted those few things left on the record. It is a matter of trying to protect the public, make people accountable and at the same time go ahead and provide the continued funding for the people who have come to rely on it. Whether we will be able to achieve the full rollover into appropriations is something that I cannot say here today, but that would be my goal, as well as my colleague's goal, the Minister in charge of Cultural Affairs.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I hope that there is no misunderstanding with regard to the direction we are taking. I don't minimize the problems that we will encounter, and there will be problems from time to time, but we believe we are going in the right path.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Inkster acknowledged that the former New Democratic Party Government brought this in, it reminds me that 11 years ago, in entering politics, I was perhaps naive and stupid. I don't think I am naive anymore. Because I was sucked into this thing,

because I wasn't going to vote for it, and I was prevailed upon. It was a one-shot effort, it was a Centennial year and this was a big . . . If you read Hansard you will see what I said at that time. I really don't believe in these kind of things. I don't believe in politicians pretending they can solve all problems. In advertising, you know, you take my product or buy it and you're in a perpetual state of euphoria; I don't subscribe to that.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks are going to be brief, because I was encouraged by what the Minister just said and I would ask that perhaps in this false advertising that the government is getting away with, but these, you know, 5.00 and you become a millionaire, and all the rest of them. If a private organization did that, the Consumer Affairs would be after them left, right and centre.

I think that they should be required, when they print those winning numbers, I think they should be required to put in, This number wasn't even in the hat, you know, when that occurs. And the reason that they have these additional bonuses is because your actuaries figure out how much money is building up and so many numbers aren't even in the hat. —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon, they sell lottery tickets up to today for the draw which comes today — today is Winsday — and the numbers aren't in the hat.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Fitness.

MR. BANMAN: On a point of clarification. Mr. Speaker, all the tickets, unless they are returned by a certain date, are in the hat, and this is precisely one of the factors that led the Member for St. Boniface to move into this field, because there is a difference between a bearer and a non-bearer ticket.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is getting into a debate here now, I think.

The Honourable Member for Inkster on a . . .

MR. BOYCE: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, maybe I'm using the wrong term and maybe the Minister is technically correct. They are all in the hat, you're right, they are all in the hat, whether they are sold or not. I am using the wrong term, thank you very much for pointing that out to me, because what is important, they print these numbers as if somebody had purchased that ticket, and that is not necessarily so. In fact, I think right today they have advertised that there are additional 50,000 prizes available, and the reason this is so is they establish actuarially a level of prizes, if all the tickets are sold, to give your piece of the pie to everybody along the line and give out the prizes, then you have got to have so much. As that builds up then they throw in, to sweeten the kitty, some bonuses.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point I am making, and I'll direct my remarks to the Chair, as you admonished somebody earlier, but the fact is that all of the tickets are in the hat, whether they are sold or not. There may be a million tickets in the hat and they only sell 10 tickets. But I think it is false advertising to suggest that the people are having a chance of their ticket winning, actuarially related to those number

of tickets which are sold, which is not correct, and this has been going on in perpetuity.

All I am suggesting is that there be some way built into the system, and I imagine it would be pretty costly, that those things would have to be run through, and I really don't understand how it could be done. But nevertheless, there should be something required that all of the tickets are in the hat, and these ads that they take out. They can take all of the tickets which are printed, the number of tickets which are printed, but there should be some way of building into the system, reporting to the public how many tickets were sold, so that people would know the odds. We pass laws in this House where they have to reveal true interest rates.

So in my judgement, Mr. Speaker, it's false advertising to hold out this cookie, this brass ring in front of people, 5.00 can make you a millionaire, or anything else. But nevertheless, perhaps in this winding it down, the Minister that is responsible for this could insist that the Crown organization include in their winning numbers, or any other advertising that they put in the media, the admonition or the warning that all tickets are in the hat and you're competing with those people who have bought tickets and those people who haven't bought tickets.

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

MR. LEN DOMINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just like every member of this House, I'm a gambler to some extent, I don't buy a lot of lottery tickets, I don't go to the races often but every little while, in the last two and a half years at least, I entered what I consider to be a major gamble, I offered myself to the people of St. Matthews constituency. The price of that particular ticket was pretty high in my opinion, in terms of personal expense, in terms of time, in terms of the ego that's involved in running for election and I think running for election is a gamble. There are some members of this House who advertise they're sure that it's not a gamble that they'll be returned but there are so many factors involved that I think that's a gamble and I think we all gamble in that sense.

My study of human nature, my understanding of it is that most people like to gamble in one way or another and they don't all run for public office, they don't all seek excitement that way but many people do like to buy lottery tickets and things of this sort. I'm not about to try and justify lotteries, to be exact I agree with all that's been said concerning the fact that they are inefficient, that it costs Loto Canada, for instance, 50 cents to raise one dollar. It certainly is regressive taxation, not fair taxation and I agree. In a perfect world there wouldn't be any lotteries and if we had a perfect world in the situation where the Manitoba government could control everything, we could outlaw lotteries in Manitoba and I'd be in favour of it. If I was sure that by outlawing lotteries or doing away with lotteries, there would be no lottery tickets sold or bought in Manitoba, I'd vote for it. But I'm a realist, I know what would happen if we were to disband all the lotteries or forbid the sale in Manitoba, people have a desire to purchase these tickets, they would go out and they would buy them.

Wednesday, 4 June, 1980

—(Interjection)— Let me get to it, I'll get to the Resolution.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I see the government's role with lotteries as accepting human nature, accepting the fact that we're going to have people buying lotteries, we're going to have people who want to purchase them. Our role should be to ensure that the lottery procedure in this province is regulated, which it is; that it's fair; that we minimize the abuse wherever we can. The previous government, to their credit, there was a progression from the time that they first introduced lotteries, it was a natural progression right through to right now, in which I think the lotteries have become fair and we've regulated them better and we are attempting to use the revenues that are generated for socially useful purposes. I certainly have no arguments with the United Way or Sports Federation or the Arts Council, I think they need funding; I'm not sure this is a proper way to fund them.

However, getting back to regulating and the fairness of lotteries. One thing that bothers me continually with lotteries is that I don't believe that this government or the Western Canada Lottery Foundation or any of the governments in Canada that run lotteries are as open and as fair — certainly they are not open enough about the way in which they run the system. They don't disclose enough information to people. The Member for Winnipeg Centre was suggesting that they print some kind of a warning. I suggest they print a warning too. Every lottery ticket sold and every lottery package sold and every time they run an advertisement on a billboard or on television, should carry a warning and that warning should say, it should read off the exact odds, Your chance of winning a prize in one in four million, for instance, because that's your odds of winning a million dollars if you put five dollars into the provincial lottery. You've got one chance in four million because they print four million tickets. I'm sure that if they were required to print that, as we require cigarette companies to print a warning similar to that, it would affect some people and they would notice it and there would be less lottery tickets sold and there would certainly be a lot less abuse, or a little less abuse anyway. Because the people who run the lotteries aren't, in my opinion, open enough, crazy things happen. Just yesterday two different people called me to say they had discovered within the provincial lottery a foolproof way of knowing whether you're going to win in advance or not. Of course I was a fool like everyone else, I ran out, checked a bunch of tickets, tried to find the winning ticket, spent half an hour at the local drugstore checking into it. Later on this afternoon when I got a chance I spoke to Mr. Simonis, the Manager of the Western Canada Lotteries Foundation, and he managed to convince me to my satisfaction that there was no foolproof way of determining in advance which tickets would be the winning tickets. However, right after that phone call another constituent called me to tell me the same story. As long as we are going to have lotteries, and I think we're stuck with them, we're going to have them, there's no way to outlaw lotteries because the lotteries will come in from outside the province and they won't be as well run or as well regulated. We're going to have lotteries as long as

we're here, there's no way of going back on it now in my opinion. I think we should run them in an open way, we should disclose as much information as we can because as long as the United Way and the Sports Federation and other people depend on that money, and as long as we put them in a situation where they have now originated programs and initiatives that require the money they receive from lotteries, this government and its employees are responsible for making sure that the lotteries run smoothly and efficiently. What we have right now in Winnipeg, I suggest to you, is that there's a lot of people out there on the streets who think there is an easy way to win money, or there's an easy way to check to see if you're going to win money, with the provincial lottery and they're all going to be checking, the rumour is spreading throughout Winnipeg right now, they're all going to be checking through the lottery tickets. None of them are going to find this supposed trick, this easy way to win and the sales of provincial lottery tickets in this province are going to drop drastically. I was told that the same thing happened several months ago, or a month ago in British Columbia, where someone thought they had figured out the code and sure enough sales started to drop everywhere. The people who are going to suffer because the sales are dropping won't be this government particularly. The Member for Inkster has already outlined that very little money goes to the provincial coffers; it will be the Sports Federation, it'll be the United Way and others. So I've suggested to Mr. Simonis, and I hope he takes up my suggestion, is that he call a press conference right away and explain the exact details of how the lottery tickets are printed; why the numbering system works the way it does; what that numbering system means to the Lottery Corporation; what checks and balances they have on it. Because if he doesn't do that, what's going to happen is no one is going to buy a provincial lottery ticket in Winnipeg next week and, as I said earlier, I'm not in favour of encouraging the purchase of these ticket particularly. But if we're going to do away with them, we've got to do it in a rational way and we've got to make an intelligent decision about it, we can't allow rumours to affect the sales of tickets.

So, I hope that what comes of this debate, and it's been a long debate, I've listened to, I don't know how many speeches and I don't want to prolong it too much more, is that we in this government realize that we've opened up, or the previous government and we've continued to do it, we've opened up a big problem and we have a responsibility to insist that these corporations like the Western Canada Lottery Corporation which operate at arm's length from the government, that these corporations (1) explain to people how they operate, so that there are not myths and rumours floating around about their operations and (2) that they explain to people in detail the very very slim chances that you have of winning. So that when a person does go and put down his five dollars he realizes, in effect, that his chances are almost nil and that what he is doing is engaging in voluntary taxation and in exchange maybe he'll receive a little bit of pleasure when he watches the show which draws the winning tickets and that maybe some daydreams will be fostered, maybe a bit of pleasure will be gotten but certainly his chances of actually

Wednesday, 4 June, 1980

winning a million dollars are very very slight. It's our responsibility to point that out to people. If we don't do it then the abuses that come from the lottery system, and there are many, will rest on our shoulders.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to support the amendment, I'm sure that's no secret, but I really don't find a whole lot of fault with what was said by the Member for Inkster. I think that many things that were said here were very rational and reasonable and that if we could I would do away with lotteries, but we can't. So, in the meantime, let's make sure people know what the real odds are, let's make sure people understand exactly how they operate and hopefully we will, over a period of time, educate people so that they will realize that there is no easy way to make a million dollars.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Springfield has already spoken on this. Are you ready for the question? The question before the House is the Amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Springfield:

THAT the Motion be amended by deleting all of the words after the word efficient in the first WHEREAS and by substituting thereafter:

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

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

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

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

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

QUESTION put on the Amendment, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like Yeas and Nays on the Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member support? Call in the members. The question before the House is the Amendment to Resolution No. 1. All those in favour of the Motion please rise.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

ANDERSON	BANMAN
BLAKE	BOSTROM
BROWN	CRAIK
DOMINO	DOWNEY
DRIEDGER	EINARSON
FERGUSON	GALBRAITH
GOURLAY	HYDE
JOHNSTON	JORGENSON
LYON	MacMASTER
McGILL	McKENZIE
MALINOWSKI	MERCIER
MILLER	MINAKER
ORCHARD	PAWLEY
PRICE	RANSOM
SHERMAN	STEEN
WESTBURY	WILSON

NAYS

BARROW	BOYCE
ENNS	FOX
GREEN	JENKINS
SCHROEDER	

MR. CLERK: Yeas 32, Nays 7.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment carried.

QUESTION put on the Motion as amended; MOTION carried.

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