

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 29 April, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital):** Presenting Petitions . . .

## READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**MR. CLERK, Jack Reeves:** The Petition of the Winnipeg Humane Society, Praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate The Winnipeg Humane Society Foundation.

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

**MR. DON SCOTT (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report on the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

**MR. CLERK, Jack Reeves:** Your Standing Committee on Economic Development beg leave to present the following as their Second Report:

Your Committee met on Thursday, April 29, 1982, to consider the Annual Reports of Moose Lake Loggers Ltd., Channel Area Loggers Ltd., and the Communities Economic Development Fund.

Mr. John Christensen, President and Chairman, Mr. R.J. Kivisto, General Manager and Mr. G.P. Trithart, Secretary-Treasurer of Moose Lake Loggers Ltd. and Channel Area Loggers Ltd., provided such information as was required by members of the Committee with respect to the Companies.

Information with respect to all matters pertaining to the operations of the Communities Economic Development Fund was provided by Mr. James E. Goodman, Chairman, and Mr. Hugh J. Jones, General Manager of the Fund. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired.

The Annual Statements of Moose Lake Loggers Ltd., Channel Area Loggers Ltd., and the Communities Economic Development Fund, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981, were adopted.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

**MR. SCOTT:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wolseley that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, as members are aware, the Throne Speech provided for the establishment of a task force to examine the structure and policies of Manitoba's Provincial and Municipal Social Assistance Programs. I'm pleased to announce the task force has been appointed under the Chairmanship of Dr. Joe Ryant, Professor of the School of Social Work at the University of Manitoba.

Other task force members are: Ms. Sheila Rogers, a Legal Aid Manitoba lawyer; Ms. Florence Flynn, director of the Outreach Program of the Churchill Health Centre; Mr. Campbell Connor, an administrator at Brandon University; Ms. Janet Spence-Fontaine, a Cree Indian author and a former member of the Welfare Advisory Committee; and Mr. Ken Murdock, a senior planning associate with the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg.

A detailed outline of the task force's terms of reference are attached to the copies of the statements for the information of members.

I'm confident, Mr. Speaker, that the task force deliberations and report will be of considerable value to the government in updating the Social Assistance legislation which has not been changed since 1960. Thank you.

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

**HON. STERLING LYON (Charleswood):** We would wish to thank the Minister for his brief announcement relative to the task force and to the terms of reference which he has appended to the announcement. One or two observations I think would be in order.

No. 1 — The major renewal or review of social assistance in Manitoba, which he says is the first to take place since 1960, calls to mind of course that Manitoba did, in the period of the Roblin Government, pioneer the Social Assistance legislation in this province which was the first of its kind in Canada, with the cost-sharing undertaken of course, by the Federal Government and that program through four different administrations, now into the fifth administration, I think has served its purpose quite well. It is timely, of course, that a review should take place from time to time because any program should not remain immutable; any program should become and be susceptible to the changes that occur within the society that it is meant to serve.

A second comment about the membership of the task force without in any way impugning any of the members who have been appointed, many of whom are unknown to me. I would suggest that there seems to be an overemphasis on people who are engaged in services to those who might be regarded as being on social assistance and I fail to see anyone amongst the group mentioned who would be representative of municipal governments who are responsible in many instances for the administration of social assistance. I fail to see anybody from the general business community who could bring some viewpoint that would be fresh, I'm sure, to the deliberations which this impor-

tant task force will have to make and generally it seems to be rather an inbred group rather than an expansive group representing the total community. I would hope that the Minister in perhaps reconsidering the size of the task force might ensure that there would be broader representation of the total citizenry of Manitoba rather than just those who happen to labour in this difficult field.

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

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 students of Grade IX standing from the Dauphin McKenzie Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. McCallum and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dauphin.

There are also 25 students of Grade 5 standing of the Oakville School under the direction of Mrs. Pat Williams. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris.

There are 23 students of Grade IX standing of the Morden Collegiate School. These students are under the direction of Mr. John Einarson and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina. On behalf of all of the honourable members I welcome you here this afternoon.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. GARY FILMON (Tuxedo):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the government has now been in office for over five months and the expansion of the Critical Home Repair Home Program was announced over three months ago, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to us how much of the \$3 million which the government has allocated to the plan has now been paid out under the program?

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

**HON. AL MACKLING (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I know that the department has been very busy in connection with applications and works. I couldn't give the exact numbers. I'm happy to take that as notice.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, again in view of the fact that the government has now been in office over five months and that some three months ago it announced the Emergency Interest Rate Relief Program, I wonder if the Minister could indicate just how much of the money allocated to the homeowners portion for the mortgage interest rate relief has been spent to this point in time?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, similarly I believe there has been intense activity, but the actual numbers

I cannot give. I will be happy again to take that question as notice.

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

**MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism.

In view of the fact the government has been in business for five months and, in view of the fact, the government said there would be instant relief of high interest rates for small business, can the Minister inform the House how much cash has flowed to small business through the Small Business Interest Rate Relief Program?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. MURIEL SMITH (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to respond to the question. I don't have the actual amount of the monies that have flowed out, but I do, following on the first meeting of the Board, have a report of the number of projects that have been approved. Twenty-two items were on the agenda, Mr. Speaker, of which 14 were dealt with, 8 were approved, 5 were deferred and 1 was rejected. I can obtain the numerical figure of dollars that have been approved for payment at a later date.

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

**MR. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister of Agriculture, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture could indicate to the House how many farmers have received interest rate relief under their Emergency Interest Rate Relief Program that was pledged during the election campaign?

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

**HON. BILL URUSKI (Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, I can advise the honourable member, not in dollar terms but in numbers terms, there are approximately 200 applications that have been recommended for processing from the field.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the Honourable Member for Arthur have a supplementary?

**MR. DOWNEY:** A supplementary, maybe the Minister could further clarify, is that 200 people that have received assistance out of the 30,000 farmers in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I can advise the honourable member there have been over 2,000 enquiries to the program. Approximately 200 have already gone through the application stage, have been processed and have been put forward to MACC for processing for payment.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Has anyone received any support in actual cash dollars, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I believe some letters of acceptance have gone out, the exact number I don't know. I could take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER (Emerson):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Immediate relief was promised in the election by the Premier for the beef farmers. In view of the Premier's promise that the Beef Assistance Program would not drag out for weeks or months and, in view of the fact, that the government has been in power for almost six months, could the Minister indicate how much money has been paid out for the relief of the beef farmers in Manitoba?

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the member should read his statements and his material. Mr. Speaker, what was pledged that we would sit down immediately with producers to discuss ways and means of assisting the livestock industry. The honourable member well knows and should well know that a program has been announced. There are now committees in the process of recommending details of the plan to the government. At this point in time, obviously, there has been no money paid out.

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

**MR. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In view of your government's stated policy initiative through the Main Street Manitoba Program, I wonder if the Minister can tell the House how much money has flowed through that program to date.

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

**HON. A.R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose):** The program is almost completed and ready to be announced within the next week and no funds have been disbursed. I would ask the honourable member when my Estimates come up for review that he helps me get them through as fast as possible so that we can get this program on the way.

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

**MR. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the First Minister. In view of the fact that the First Minister has cited the \$29.5 million interest-free loan to the credit unions as an economic initiative of his government, could the First Minister inform us as to how many new jobs have been created as a result of that economic initiative?

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

**HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I say to the Member for Pembina, I suspect it's helped in sustaining 1,200 jobs in the Province of Manitoba.

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

**MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. In light of the fact that hardly a day goes by without another business declaring bankruptcy in the province, and in view of the fact that unemployment is escalating rapidly, and in light of the fact that the First Minister made promises during the election to farmers, to small businesses, to homeowners, to those who were unemployed, to those who were threatened with unemployment, will the First Minister advise the House when he's going to stop issuing press releases; when he's going to stop talking; when he's going to stop shuffling paper and when he's going to take some action to fulfill the promises that were made and to deal with the economic situation that exists in this province?

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to have the opportunity to speak to the very general question that the Member for Turtle Mountain has posed toward me.

Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain had been absorbing what has been said in the last few minutes in response to questions from honourable members across the way, he would have noted indeed there has been definitive action that has been taken in regard to interest rate relief on behalf of the farmers, on behalf of the small business community in the Province of Manitoba, on behalf of homeowners in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, there has been definitive action taken in the first four or five months, that it will indeed, it's true, cost Manitobans considerable sums of monies, but monies that are geared in order to ensure that the existing economic structure in the Province of Manitoba is sustained during this very very difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, contrast that to the total inaction that took place during the four preceding years, an uncaring attitude, a remote attitude from the public of the Province of Manitoba by the previous government and I must admit that I am somewhat puzzled by the audacity of members across the way to express such righteous concern about what has or has not been done in the first four or five months.

Mr. Speaker, furthermore, in view of the question by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, I sense that he will be pleased to join with us in supporting the resolution that is being debated at the present time by the Honourable Member for Thompson, that so well places the responsibility where the responsibility belongs, the responsibility that belongs insofar as those that maintain Reaganomic policies, Conservative fiscal policies throughout Canada. Mr. Speaker, Canadians are fed up with those fiscal policies; Canadians are demonstrating their opposition to those kind of fiscal policies.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the promises made by the First Minister and his Party during the election last November are well-known. There were promises to farmers that no farm would be lost; to businesses that no business would be lost; to homeowners that no home would be lost as a consequence of high interest rates.

In view of the fact that that government has been in power for over five months — and they cannot assure us that one nickel has been paid out to deal with the emergency situation which they said existed last October and November, Mr. Speaker — in view of the fact that he now blames the Reagan economics on the problems, the First Minister last December said that we are facing in the immediate term, hard economic times. The Federal Government is responsible for dealing with this overall, so we will be developing an economic position in relation to the Federal Government. Having said that, we will not sit back as a province and say there is little we can do.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member's one-sentence preamble does seem to be of considerable length. I was also having some difficulty in hearing the honourable member's question, if he has completed it.

The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would turn to you to ask whether or not I respond to a statement I'm quite happy to do so and I would like to but am I, indeed, breaching the Rules of the House, Sir, as, indeed, the questioner has already done?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Because of the noise in the Chamber I have difficulty in deciding whether the honourable member had completed his question.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. RANSOM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I simply would like to complete the preamble to my question and when I was interrupted, Sir, I was quoting as preamble the statement made by the First Minister last December 11, when he said: "But having said that we will not sit back as a province and say that there is little we can do."

In view of the promises and in view of the fact that he's prepared to take action, when will he implement his strategy for economic recovery? When will they be the payouts of money? When can Manitobans expect some relief and some action from this government?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would think I would have equal time or more, by way of response to the statement by the Member for Turtle Mountain. Mr. Speaker, I would, indeed, remind you that it is not the members on this side of the House that supported high interest rate policies. It was not, indeed, the Minister of Finance that sits on this side of the House that defended the Ottawa-inspired high interest rate policies last May in this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, it was the previous Minister of Finance, the Member for Turtle Mountain that now sits in this Chamber that told us that there was no alternative to the monetary policies that were being pursued by the Federal Government

in Ottawa.

Let me refresh, Mr. Speaker, the memory of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. So, Mr. Speaker, let us first deal with basics; first the monetary policies that have been misguided and misplaced and have been pursued since 1975 in Canada must, indeed, come to an end if we're to enjoy the economic recovery that Canadians deserve. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I heard the honourable member talk about this government not doing anything. Mr. Speaker, I looked at the honourable members across the way as they were posing questions to the Minister of Economic Development, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Housing, and as they posed those questions they had some sort of glee in their eyes. That glee turned to disappointment, Mr. Speaker, when they discovered that, indeed, this government's Ministers were indicating to the members across the way in concrete figures, in concrete numbers, that this government is providing interest rate relief to hundreds of farmers, hundreds of business people and hundreds of homeowners in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I know that information which the honourable members across the way did not expect this afternoon bothers them. I can sense that they are quite disturbed, Mr. Speaker, and they ought to be disturbed after four years of neglect in the Province of Manitoba to now see a government that is, indeed, performing.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from a school of parliamentary debate which believes fervently that raising one's voice does not mean one is answering the question, may I quietly reiterate the question to the First Minister and ask that he settle himself down and really not scream and rant and rave, and keep his feathers dry, and so on. Would he mind telling the house and the people of Manitoba about this great economic program that he promised to the people of Manitoba in his election campaign promises last year on which we have seen not one whit of movement in terms of getting money into the hands of people who need it while people are going bankrupt day by day. Jobs are being lost by the hundreds day by day while this government sits and fiddles and fusses about Saskatchewan elections.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I didn't know I made any reference to the Saskatchewan election; obviously, it's very much on the mind of the Leader of the Opposition. I know it's the first bit of good news that the Leader of the Opposition has had in five months and I understand, indeed, why that to be the case, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to carry on a rather fruitless debate because what is demonstrated best is action and deeds. What Manitobans, indeed, Mr. Speaker, are witnessing is a government that is undertaking concrete economic measures, whether it be interest rate relief, whether it be other programs; programs to assist and ensure that the economic base of this province is maintained. Mr. Speaker, it is a diffi-

cult role but I'm pleased to report that Manitobans as a whole support the efforts that are being undertaken by this government. It is made more difficult by the fact that we've had four years of neglect by the previous administration; we have monetary policies that are in need for change at the federal level, but despite this, unlike the previous government in the Province of Manitoba we are indicating, Mr. Speaker, it's not adequate to do nothing, we must carry on in our limited way to undertake those actions within the provincial context that can best help men and women and families that are the hardest hit by the present economic direction that is taking place in Canada.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a very simple question following upon my honourable friends's pronouncements about his feeling of great support on behalf of the people of Manitoba: if he is so confident of that would he consider calling an election tomorrow?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, Manitobans would properly condemn a government that calls an election five months after receiving a mandate because, Mr. Speaker, what Manitobans are looking for . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.

**MR. PAWLEY:** . . . what Manitobans are looking for is a responsible government that will carry out its mandate of five years, that will undertake to fulfill the commitments that it made during that five-year period so that, Mr. Speaker, Manitobans will be able to judge that government on the basis of what it has done during a five-year period. Mr. Speaker, they will judge us on the same basis they judged the Conservatives on November 17. They will judge either to support us or to defeat us on the basis of how we performed during our term in office. Mr. Speaker, my intent and the intent of all my colleagues is to measure up to the task much better during our five-year term —(Interjection)— yes, we may go in four years, Mr. Speaker, five years. But it is our intent to live up to our responsibilities so we win re-election, because I do not intend to be the second government that has been defeated after one term in government since 1913. We don't intend to follow the record of the previous administration.

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

**MR. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Labour and would ask him if he could confirm that his statements that the Youth Employment Program which he announced several weeks ago will create approximately 2,000 jobs and cost roughly \$3 million?

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

**HON. VIC SCHROEDER (Rossmere):** Yes, I believe that is approximately correct. I don't have a copy of the statement with me. I made the statement to the House; the member has access to Hansard. I'm sure he could very easily find the statement that I made and he would get an exact number. If he expects that I'm

going to keep all of those numbers specifically at my fingertips at all times, I trust that he should realize that would be somewhat difficult to do.

**MR. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Having assured us that those are the figures that he has been quoting, I wonder if he could inform the House whether or not in the month of March there were some 17,000 Manitobans unemployed and those Manitobans were between the ages of 15 and 24?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Well, again, Mr. Speaker, I don't have the unemployment statistics in front of me so, I'll take the question as notice.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that many university students and students and people that are unemployed are looking for summer jobs, and in light of the fact that his department in their Annual Report indicated that last year's Student Employment Program employed some 5,000 students for a total cost of \$2.9 million, and his program's going to employ 2,000 students for the same type of money, would he inform the House as to why the almost two-and-a-half times increased cost in producing one job and why there is going to be a reduction of 3,000 student jobs created under his program for the same kind of money as the previous government put into it?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the numbers that the member gave me without checking them with my department but I should say that the program that we are entering into is a different type of program altogether, number one. Number two, as the member probably knows there was an input-output study done by the Department of Labour for last year's numbers which came back with the conclusion that there was no evidence that those numbers of jobs they said were created were, in fact, created as a result of the program that they are numbering. That is, most of those jobs would have been there; in fact, there was no evidence to indicate that all of them would not have been there without that very program.

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the figures which I quote come out of the department that he is responsible for - out of their Annual Report - in which they state that the numbers of employees hired in '81 was 5,009 employees. I would ask the Minister with regards to that particular program if he could inform the House since many business people and many students are now looking at their job opportunities and job openings for the coming season, I wonder if he could give us a definite date today when the application forms and the guidelines will be released because if that doesn't happen very shortly the students who are coming out will not be able to apply for these jobs? An employer does not decide overnight whether that job is required or not. I'd like to ask the Minister to give us a date when this will happen.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the date of the application coming out, I believe the member has a very good point. It should be done quickly. I had hoped it would be ready yesterday and it may be that it will be ready today and certainly, if it is

we will be moving ahead.

I should say that there have been a large number of enquiries. There is no doubt that the concern raised yesterday from members opposite that there wouldn't be take-up is not going to be a problem. There's plenty of people out there who are very anxious to get into the program. I should also mention — although my department is working on a fuller answer to a question asked, I believe, by the Member for St. Norbert with respect to the number of employers last year who had less than 10 employees — the answer to that question is that about 87 percent of the students hired last year were hired by employers who had less than 10 employees.

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

**MR. G.W.J. (Gerry) MERCIER (St. Norbert):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In view, Mr. Speaker, of his stated desire to achieve co-operative federalism, and in view of the fact that apparently the Federal Minister of Immigration wrote to the Provincial Government this past February seeking the involvement of the Provincial Government in a temporary employment program for laid-off workers, and in view of the fact that the hundreds of workers at ManFor are due to lose their jobs or be laid off within a very short period of time, could the First Minister endeavour to get the two Ministers involved, the federal-provincial Ministers to set aside their differences and cause some action to be taken to provide some support for the workers at ManFor?

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member in his overeagerness to interpret is off base again. I would ask the Honourable Member for Energy that's been dealing with this particular subject with the workers in The Pas, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona):** I'd be delighted. The Provincial Government did receive some information in February indicating that a federal-provincial agreement had been signed between Ontario and the Federal Government, and we then responded by saying that rather than raise a whole set of false expectations by signing general agreements and not having any projects come forward as had happened in the past if you can recall, Mr. Speaker, the previous government used to recycle its press releases over and over and over again about the certain joint agreements that hadn't, in fact, led to any particular projects, we decided we'd take the approach of working out specific concrete projects which is what we are doing. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is a proposal for Moose Lake Loggers before the Treasury Board apparatus right now. It is being processed, Mr. Speaker, and I would expect that if it does go through and the negotiations and discussions with the workers lead to them accepting that particular program pro-

ject, that there could be a specific project under way which I think probably would take up more people than have taken up the program in entirety in Ontario to date.

We also raised the whole concept of this supposed program with the workers at ManFor through the Manpower Advisory Committee, and there were detailed discussions held when the management and workers and government people were looking at all the options, and at that stage, Mr. Speaker, the workers themselves said that the program as proposed by the Federal Government, gave them some very grave concerns as it applied to people who would be laid off at the saw mill because what it forced them to do, was to go out into the woods for, I think, an extra \$60 or \$80 above their UIC.

They had to live away from home; they had to then buy clothing, boots, etc. and they had expressed concern at that time, Mr. Speaker, but they are laid off. Their perspective on this may change. These projects are developed through a process of consultation. To date, the people at The Pas have said that they would hope to try and improve the program or get a better type of program. We are working with them, Mr. Speaker, to see if we can develop any particular project possibilities in this respect. We hope we can because our intention in this regard is to try and keep the people there, employed and staying in The Pas as long as possible and we're dealing with the problem, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the question was not answered by the First Minister. I have a supplementary question to him.

In view of the fact that in March of this year city statistics show that building permits have declined 62 percent from March, 1981, and one of the significant reasons cited by the president of the Manitoba Home Builders Association is interest rates; and in view of the fact that the Premier in his election document, signed by him and guaranteed by him, promised to take steps to relieve the interest burden facing families buying a home — not only renewing a mortgage — buying a home, Mr. Speaker, is the First Minister prepared to take any steps to amend his Interest Rate Relief Program to provide assistance to home buyers, not only to help them to buy a home, Mr. Speaker, to renew some hope in young people to buy a home, but to provide some work for construction workers in the home building industry?

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this is a recycling of some earlier questions but I'm quite pleased, in fact I'm delighted, to have the opportunity to deal with same subject matter again.

Firstly, the honourable member has made some reference to not answering his question. I think the Minister of Energy did an excellent job of answering his question, that's why he's a bit sore.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the Honourable Member for St. Norbert to join with us then, if he has such concern

about the interest rates and what the interest rates are doing insofar as young couples are concerned, purchasing homes. I would be delighted to see the Honourable Member for St. Norbert and the Honourable Member for Pembina, the Honourable Member for Morris, the Leader of the Opposition join with us, Mr. Speaker, and for once take exception to the monetary policies that have been pursued in Ottawa since 1975. I invite the Honourable Member for St. Norbert to join with us in supporting the resolution by the Member for Thompson, calling for a reduction in interest rates, opposing high interest rates. I invite all members, Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber to join together unanimously in placing responsibility where responsibility belongs for high interest rates in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, what I do say — and I don't apologize, Mr. Speaker — I find that indeed Manitobans accept, and we speak to Manitobans as a whole, that Manitobans as a whole appreciate the fact that this is a government that is trying to do something within its limited finances, limited jurisdictions, by way of the Interest Rate Relief Program.

Mr. Speaker, we would have been able to do more if indeed we had been fortunate as Premier-elect Devine is in the Province of Saskatchewan and if the previous administration in the Province of Manitoba had left us with a balanced budget, had left us with a \$1 billion Heritage Fund, we would be able to do more. Yes, we would be able to do more.

Mr. Speaker, to satisfy the repeated demands that we hear day after day by honourable members across the way asking us why we don't spend scores of millions of dollars more, we can't spend scores of millions of dollars more . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.  
The Honourable the First Minister.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, if I could proceed. We can't spend scores of millions of dollars more because we took office, despite the demands by honourable members across the way that we do so, because we have inherited a cupboard which has been left bare by a negligent previous administration in Manitoba.

**MR. MERCIER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, when he signed this statement last fall, was in possession of fully up-to-date material about the economic situation in Manitoba, and therefore can't compare the situation in Manitoba to any other province or government; in view of the fact that he was fully aware of that information and can't use that as an excuse, Mr. Speaker; in view of the fact there's no mention of Reaganomics or any other government program, this is a clear promise to provide relief to home buyers buying a home, relief interest for people buying a home. This question hasn't been asked before.

The construction industry is plummeting. People are out of work in that industry. Young people no longer have an opportunity to buy a home. This is his promise. Is he not going to live up to it or is he going to be like the Minister of Labour who said yesterday in Estimates on the Committee of Labour, that their promise to provide job security to people as a result of shutdowns or layoffs is not a priority? Is it the same

way with the First Minister? Is this not a priority for him?

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I ask you indeed whether that was a question or a statement. I would ask for a ruling from you prior to my entering into an answer. I'm prepared to answer but was that a question?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question was of some length but I do believe there was a question buried in there somewhere.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I wasn't able to hear for the noise across the way but I'm anxious, Mr. Speaker then to provide a statement by response to the rather inaccurate commentary by the Member for St. Norbert.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert said something about being aware of the economic situation in the Province of Manitoba in November of 1981. I would mention to the Honourable Member for St. Norbert and to the Leader of the Opposition that it is rather interesting that there were commitments that were made by the previous administration in the final week, two weeks of the campaign that would have totalled between \$275 million to \$300 million of expenditure for the Province of Manitoba, in contrast to commitments that were made by the party that I represent, which were much much less, in fact, Mr. Speaker, that represent only 3 percent of the expenditures in this year's Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how the honourable members across the way would have honoured the commitment that they gave to the public of Manitoba to spend between \$275 million and \$300 million of the public taxpayers' monies if they had been re-elected in November 17th of last year.

Mr. Speaker, I'm quite confident and I know my colleagues are quite confident, that Manitobans understand very well the situation the new government is confronted with. They are quite conscious of the fact that we have inherited an empty cupboard. They are quite conscious of the fact that this province, as well as other provinces in Canada, is confronted with economic difficulties and I sense amongst Manitobans, a desire to join together, to work together to overcome these problems, rather than a lot of continued nit-picking that appears to be the case from time to time from honourable members across the way.

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

**HON. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. My colleague, the Minister responsible for Environmental Management and myself, have heard from our Deputy Ministers and I'm sorry to say that the news from Grandview is not as good as we'd like it to be.

Apparently this morning, six children were sick, complaining of stomach cramps and are a little flush. They were taken to the Grandview Hospital where four of them were released and two are still being checked over by the local physician, a Dr. Carlton. Dr. Carlton will be in touch with our part-time Medical

Officer, Dr. Sigurdson, and we'll hear what the latest is.

It could be just a coincidence. The flu is suspected at this time, but because of the situation that has been happening, we're still monitoring that. The two departments are staying very close. There is a man there monitoring the air but so far nothing has been discovered and if there's anything new, I certainly will inform the House.

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

**MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin-Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for his note. I'm satisfied that the best staff that we have in this province with his department and the environmental people are on the site and I hope, at the earliest possible date, that the problem can be cleared up.

Thank you kindly.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to two questions I took as notice by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye and the Honourable Member for Morris, this past week in connection with school taxes in the two constituencies involved.

Mr. Speaker, I have received information I would now like to relate to the two members and to the House as a whole pertaining to those questions.

In respect to the Morris-MacDonald School Division, there can be few better examples that can better illustrate the weaknesses and inadequacies of the Education Support Program that was passed last year by the previous administration in Manitoba.

In the first year of that program, Morris-MacDonald School Division had a deficit of almost \$50,000.00. This year, enrollment has decreased by 5.1 percent which means an increase of only 9.6 percent in operating money under the Education Support Program. There can be no clear evidence of why this party, Mr. Speaker, no better evidence of why this party responded to the patched, put-together-hastily program, that the former administration put together last year by announcement of a one-year review of the education finances system in the Province of Manitoba. It's a patched-up system, hastily put together. Maybe you could do a scrap book, glued-together kind of approach rather than any comprehensive, well-thought-out program, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)—

I regret if the honourable members don't like the information. The facts are facts. Honourable members may not like the facts but the facts are here.

The situation in the Town of Steinbach —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Health on a point of order.

### POINT OF ORDER

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think you must have heard it as well as anybody else. When the Leader of the Opposition called the Premier of this Province a liar, and he's challenged; if that's

parliamentary he says: "No, but it's true," I think that it's high time that something would be done and I would urge you to act. There's a limited use of control in the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I would thank the Honourable Minister of Health for bringing that to my attention, although I did not hear the remark.

The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, these words were certainly stated and the members certainly heard it and I think that this should be withdrawn.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think exchanges that take place between two members from their seat are hardly questions for points of order in the House.

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, this is certainly not an excuse. It's quite obvious and it's clear that you don't call people "liars" in this House and get away with it. That was yelled at; it's not the first time. It's being done nearly every day and then, especially this time, he was challenged and asked if that was parliamentary. He admitted, "No, but it's true," and I think it's time that something should be done or, Mr. Speaker, if you don't do something you're going to lose complete control of this House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I hope the last comment was not meant as a threat from the Honourable Minister.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, the last comment is something that I believe, I've seen it happen. If something isn't done, if people are allowed to act like animals or without respect, that's exactly what happened. It's not a threat, it will be a fact.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. If the remark complained of was, in fact, made by the honourable member and was clearly heard by other members of the House. I believe the honourable member has a duty to the House to make a withdrawal of the fact.

**MR. LYON:** Quite so, Mr. Speaker. The use of the word, lie or liar, is unparliamentary and I withdraw it without hesitation.

I merely say to you, Sir, on the record, that the statements being made by the First Minister with respect to the previous Education Finance Program being patched together and other statements of that sort which impugn the Civil Service, and which were not true, were statements that do not deserve the time of this House. His statements and the truth do not coincide in that respect.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I thank the honourable member for those remarks. The time rapidly running out for Oral Question period, the Honourable First Minister.



**MR. PAWLEY:** To complete the answers? Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I can't get clear indication. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the town of Steinbach which was one of enrollment that had not increased or decreased, the Education Support Program approved by the Cabinet to which the Honourable Member of La Verendrye belonged, would have provided an increase of 12.6 percent operating support for that particular school division. The supplementary support provided by the Government of the Province of Manitoba provided an additional \$274,275 beyond that which would have otherwise been provided. This represents a 10.8 mill decrease for the division as a whole, although, I should point out and note that the difference between balanced assessment and actual assessment causes a substantial difference in mill rates among the various municipalities in the school division affected. What is clear, however, is that the program which is introduced by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye and his colleagues would have resulted in a much higher special levy in the town of Steinbach than the one he is now talking about. Here, as in every other school division in the province, this government has acted responsibly to deal with the property tax burden.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for Oral Question period having expired, the Honourable Government House Leader.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### ADJOURNED DEBATE — CROW RATE

**HON. ROLAND PENNER (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Transport standing in the name of the Member for The Pas?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Government Services, the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. HARRY M. HARAPIAK (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, before I begin with my remarks I would like to say a few words about yesterday's comments. I guess we were doubly blessed that we found out what the positions of the Official Opposition was. They claim ours is a do-nothing position. I believe theirs is a do-nothing position. I guess they're happy with the results of the Saskatchewan election so they have given blessings to another ag rep, but he has been chosen as their official spokesman, or official Leader for this issue as well. I am surprised that an agricultural economist like himself wouldn't have looked across the border before he made his statements and found that once the railroad rates were allowed to increase in the States the grain still did not move. It did not improve at all and I'm surprised he wouldn't have looked across there before he found out — if he figures that's all it hinges on that if the Crow disappears, then the grain will be moving and we'll still be left with as big an inventory as we presently are.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be speaking on this subject, it's a very important subject and I'm going to be

speaking with a great deal of mixed emotions because I am a railroader and I recognize the railroads require large amounts of money to upgrade their rail beds and also to maintain their equipment. But I also recognize that increased production would give many of my brothers who are out of work at this time jobs because that sector of the industry is affected by the downturn economy as well as many of the other industries are.

I also speak as a person who was born and raised on a farm and I presently own half a section of land. I know the honourable members across the way believe the only one that can speak for the agricultural community is someone that's involved in the tilling of the land or possibly their heart's on the side of their chest. But I want to assure them that there are probably more members on this side of the House who recognize that agriculture is still the backbone of our economy and our hearts, although on the left where they're supposed to be, we are firmly supporting the family farm and supporting the agricultural community.

Mr. Speaker, western Canada is unique in its dependence on rail transportation. In the U. S. there are vast inland waterways maintained at public expense which provide a keen competition for the highways and the railways in America. Eastern Canada has the St. Lawrence Seaway, again maintained at public expense, which provides an alternative and, more importantly, it provides competition for the railways. Eastern Canada is too far removed from our problem that their politicians cannot understand our problem in order to understand the real issue of the Crow.

In 1976, Canada West Foundation, a non-partisan research organization, whose main objectives were to initiate and conduct a research program regarding the economic and social characteristics and potentials of the west and the north; and a second was to initiate and conduct informational educational programs to encourage and appreciate our Canada-West heritage and a future within Canada. It is interesting to note that Dr. Gilson was, the same Dr. Gilson who's commissioned by Mr. Pepin to study the effects of the removal of the Crow rate, was a part of that committee. He was one of the eight people assigned to that task force. In the report, they go over again about the need for a good railroad transportation system for grain movement because of our unique dependence on land transportation.

They point out that in the 1970s prairie farmers were not able to take full advantage of the strong market for grain. The record shipment of two and a half million bushels or two and a half million tonnes in 1972/73 has not been equaled since, mainly because the railways have not been able to meet the delivery demands. It is generally agreed that railroads hesitate to invest in rolling stock because of the low returns for moving grain. The government has recognized the railways problems and have purchased 8,000 cars; they are presently leasing 2,000 and they have also shared the cost of repairing several thousand cars. The Canadian Wheat Board has purchased 2,000 cars and the Province of Alberta and Saskatchewan have also purchased 1,000 cars. Manitoba made a contribution by leasing 650 cars. This year there should be 14,000 cars in grain service. However, by 1985-86 there'll be at least a requirement of 10,000 more cars to move the

grain that is projected to be here in that year. The CPR has refused the estimated \$500-million investment that is necessary unless they receive adequate pay for moving their grain.

I believe that the railroads entered into a legitimate agreement and have a responsibility to provide the service that is necessary to move the grain in the prairie provinces. In Manitoba, if the railroads are given the right to set the preferential rate, there are areas like Swan River who, if there's a preferential rate given to Swan River that'll be the beginning of the end for the community surrounding Swan River — (Interjection) — that's right. Swan would do a best for a short period of time because Benito and Minitonas and those small communities would be killed off because the people would drive to Swan River. Eventually, Dauphin would be given a preferential rate; then Swan River would die off as well. I think that our rural population is too important a part of this province to be killed in that way.

The recent report which stated that Manitoba's gross agricultural product would decrease this year by 16 percent; Saskatchewan's would decrease by 22 percent. Can the farmers afford this loss? If this is compounded by the removal of the Crow rate, I'm sure that many of your friends and my friends would be joining the ranks of the bankrupt. There are people who say there'll be a great advantage aimed in the area of oil seed and livestock production. I have not seen any figures which farmers could use or was shown to gain anywhere near the loss they would have if the Crow didn't come.

It is interesting to note that in the conclusion of the task force of which Mr. Gilson was a part, they reached two basic conclusions. The first was, as a result of the Crowsnest Agreement the transport of grain to ports is heavily subsidized. It is a large part of the railroad companies. As a result of inflation, rates which until 1960 covered all or nearly all of the cost of transporting grain, by 1990 may cover less than 15 percent of the costs. These rates will be the sorting the grain-animal industry mix and disadvantage some grain-processing industries in Western Canada.

The second one was that the nature of Canada's present railroad system forces grain producers into a captive market. It cannot be claimed with any confidence whatsoever that the removal of the statutory rate would provide grain producers with either adequate movement to a port or transportation rates that are equitable. The task force recommends that a Crown corporation be established; that we own the infrastructure of the two major railroad companies including the railroad beds and yards lying west of Thunder Bay. The corporation would be empowered to operate and maintain the facilities and to grant licenses to companies to operate on their specific terms. That's Gilson's recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, it is recognized that Mr. Gilson has an impossible task. We know that Mr. Pepin is willing to put a limited number of dollars into the transportation stabilization. We also accept that inflation will go up by at least 10 percent. Some projects say that inflation will go up as high as 15. So, the railroads are faced with the costs along with a legitimate responsibility of providing the service. The government is faced with the sacred responsibility of protecting the

grain producers.

So, that is why the suggestion of the Honourable Member for River East made on the 21st of April — if the honourable member said we weren't making any responsible suggestions, I wish he would have listened — the honourable member made the suggestion. He recognized two types of resources, grain, which is not in a position to set its rates; the Wheat Pool can negotiate a couple of cents per bushel. But, then they must take whatever the world market will allow.

Then, there are the other set of resource producers: the coal, the potash and the sulphur producers who are in a position to set their prices. This type of subsidization could take us out of our dilemma. This type of cost subsidization would work in this situation. When the Member for Morris proclaims we did not make any positive recommendation I would challenge him to read the Hansard of the 21st of April and see who has had the more positive input, him or the Member for River East. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that Alberta and Saskatchewan get most of the benefits if the Crow is removed, because of the increased construction that would take place. But, I also realize that Alberta would be faced with most of the cost because they would have to build between 80 and 100 overpasses and underpasses across their highways. I also realize that as a northern representative there might be a great advantage to the Port of Churchill; therefore, it would be a great increase to the rail business to many of my constituents. The Pas at one time was an active railroad centre but now it has decreased to a very low point.

I also worry that the Federal Government nor the CNR are willing to spend any dollars to upgrade the railbed in Northern Manitoba. So, I believe that maybe the part of the Manitoba contribution could be the manufacturing of a low centre of gravity car which could be handled on the northern route and could also be built in the plant at The Pas, the ManForPlant, and it would create a great amount of employment at this time. The ManFor Plant has the necessary equipment to manufacture these cars at this time.

It should also be noted that Dome Petroleum at this time is building a class 6 icebreaker which would make the Port of Churchill possibly viable to be used as a port all year round. So, again, this would make it more profitable. Mr. Speaker, there may be some benefits to some Manitobans if the Crow is abolished, but there are many people who feel that the west has always been at the short end of any agreement that we have entered into and they are saying that this may be the straw that breaks the camel's back if the Crow rate is abolished.

So again I say, Mr. Speaker, I urge the members on the other side to stand up and join us and as Canadians to fight and stop the Crow from being abolished. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Virden):** I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Niakwa that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

### MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

**MR. JERRY T. STORIE (Flin Flon):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal grievance and I would like an opportunity at this time to make a few comments on several of the problems that have been developing over the last several months that I see, that reflect on us as individuals and certainly us as representatives of different constituencies.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain took the opportunity last week, I believe, to speak on a matter of grievance and in that speech he commented somewhat unfavourably on the government of the present day. During his speech he remarked several times about the fact that the government, in his view, was not living up to its commitments and was, in fact, not living up to the trust that the people of Manitoba had placed in it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that we have been in government five months and that we are proceeding with as much haste and yet with as much caution as we can given the difficult circumstances, but I'm not here to defend our record.

My point of grievance, Mr. Speaker, is that the Opposition it seems to me is not living up the trust that has been placed in them as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. The people on the opposite side of the House have a responsibility that is in some ways equal to or greater than the responsibility on the government side of the House.

The responsibility of the members of the Opposition — and the Member for Minnedosa is laughing because he doesn't feel he has any responsibility I suppose — the fact is, that they do have a responsibility and I know that it is a responsibility which many of them take seriously. However, Mr. Speaker, I think that in the pursuit of their duties and as I've said, they're important ones, I feel that quite often they overstep the bounds of the trust that has been placed in them.

It seems to me that more often than is necessary the debate which they participate in, which they incite, more often than not does not deal with the issues, those particular issues or the particular policies that the government is proposing. What happens is that the debate that they participate so willingly in seems to degenerate into name calling, into insults, into the sleazier side of politics.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the papers of the last several weeks, if you look at the information that is being placed in front of the public by members of the Opposition, I think you have to question the credibil-

ity of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and I would like to direct the attention of you, Mr. Speaker, and other members, to something in particular that concerns me.

Over the last several weeks members opposite have made specific comments with regard to matters that are of no direct concern to the issues and policies that should be debated.

My question is, Mr. Speaker, I understand that in the heat of debate things get exaggerated. I understand that in the heat of debate positions and issues tend to be fudged, that there can be no guarantee that what one says in a moment of passion, in a moment of debate, is going to be what you actually mean. There is no certainty that what you say is going to be your exact position. In the heat of the moment what you say becomes distorted, your thoughts aren't concretely put across. I recognize that that happens.

But, Mr. Speaker, when in the cool light of reason and not associated with this Chamber, when the members are outside of this Chamber, when the members are distributing information to the public and they are making those same accusations, when they are trying to impart the same kind of information to try to create an atmosphere of fear, to try and create an atmosphere of distrust which is in no way deserved, then I have to stand in my place and say, is this the way that we collectively should be operating?

I understand that it happens on our side and I understand that it happens in politics but my question is, Mr. Speaker, is this — and it's a question for the whole House to decide — is this the way that we want to proceed?

To my way of thinking there is no place for the kind of personal — and the word was used by a Free Press reporter, I believe — sleazy personal attacks on individuals and I would hope that I would not be accused of doing that. I may be. As I said in a moment of weakness, in a moment of unthinking comment, I might make those kind of comments but it does happen and as I've said, we could point out examples of it happening in the local press.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the report from the Legislature from the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain — (Interjection) — I'm not here to argue that point. What I am here to say, Mr. Speaker, is that in the text of his statement that he released to the paper and I quote, Mr. Speaker, he says: "But the most alarming revelation from the Minister of Agriculture is his belief that the system of land holding that exists in the Soviet Union will eventually come about in Manitoba."

I agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is in Hansard but I respect the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain enough to know that he was here when that was said; he understood what the Minister meant by that statement. If he would have quoted the statement in context we would have seen, and the people of Manitoba would have been allowed to see, what actually the Minister meant. He, in no way, has tied us to the method of land control that is used, say, in the Soviet Union, in fact, in the same statement, Mr. Speaker, in Hansard the Minister is also on record as supporting private land ownership, the private land ownership of farmers indicating that this government is 100 percent behind the private land ownership.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur says, "Why doesn't he say that?" I suggest the Member for Arthur read Hansard; it is clearly written in Hansard. Mr. Speaker, he has said that is the desirable system; private land ownership is the desirable system. What the Minister said was that because of the loss of farms in this province, because the continuing disappearance of the small family farm, we are in danger of ending up with a system where the farmland in this province is either owned and operated by very few corporate farmers, large farmers, whatever it is. That's what he said. He said we were losing the family farm.

However, I'm not here to defend the Minister of Agriculture, he does that very well for himself. I would go on record, Mr. Speaker, as saying that I admire and respect the Member for Turtle Mountain a considerable amount; I respect him as an individual. What I have questions about, Mr. Speaker, and serious questions, is that these kind of statements do not accurately reflect the position that these people occupy. To my way of thinking, and I hope to the Legislature as a whole, sees the position of Opposition as one that is responsible; one that is there to outline the difficulties, to outline the problems that are inherent in some of the programs that this government might bring forth. It's a responsible position; it is not to be lowered to the level of some ideological innuendo when there is no relationship to the actual statements of the Minister or to the actual intent.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the opportunity to peruse several of the reports from the Legislature from honourable members opposite. I have another one here from the April 1st edition, The Swan Valley Echo, in which the Honourable Member for Swan River has stated, in press release, "that during the last provincial election campaign and shortly afterwards the NDP candidate for the Swan River constituency complained about the way some of our party workers had indicated that a vote for the NDP was a vote for the Communists." Obviously, there may have been more truth than fiction if, in fact, this is what they were saying. Mr. Speaker, this is an old political ploy associating the New Democrats with Communists and the Soviet Union. I don't believe that it works. I don't believe that washes with the public, Mr. Speaker; I don't believe anybody buys it; I'm not disturbed that continues. Personally, I'm not disturbed that continues. The difficulty I have, Mr. Speaker, is that the comments that come out about the jackboots and several other personal comments in that vein stem from that ideology, stem from that overwhelming concern that some members have that there's somehow some plot being hatched, that somehow just because we do not perceive things identically with the Conservative Party that means automatically that there's some devious plot and something sinister going on.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this government has policies that are different from the former government's policies. Those policies deserve to be debated in this Chamber, Sir, in the most responsible manner. They deserve to be examined thoroughly; they deserve to be criticized and they have been criticized and justifiably so in many cases. That is their role, Mr. Speaker. But when that debate degenerates into the kind of mudslinging, name calling, putting of the debate into

some ideological mold, Mr. Speaker. I object to that and that's why I stand on this grievance.

I would like to say further, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to provide an example of the kind of ideological furor that can be created out of adopting a certain number of statements or taking words out of context. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to take this opportunity to single out an incident which occurred on Tuesday, April 27 in this Chamber. I do this with a certain amount of reluctance but, given the display that we have seen in this Chamber, Sir, on too many occasions, I feel that there is a message here that has to be brought forward. On Tuesday, April 27 in a speech being delivered by the Honourable Member for Morris he said: "Well, I think we can look at Argentina possibly to see what they mean by freedom; there's freedom in Argentina. Mr. Speaker, he did not say there is freedom in Argentina once. On Page 1903 he said: "that's a country that's free, but, is it really free in an economic sense?" Mr. Speaker, he said it a third time, he said, again: "I refer to free countries like Argentina."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make one thing perfectly clear concerning the Honourable Member for Morris. I believe that these statements were made carelessly. I do not believe for one minute that the Member for Morris can associate himself with the atrocities that are occurring in Argentina. I do not believe that, I know that he is an honourable member. What I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I could take these comments out of context, I could go down to the Mennonite communities of which there are many Mennonites in Argentina. There are many Mennonites in his community, but I could —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. I would hope the members would give the same amount of courtesy to the member who is speaking now that they expect when they are speaking.

The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. STORIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could continue. I know the Member for Morris did not mean to imply in those statements alone that there was any connection between the words that he was speaking and some of the atrocities that are being committed in Argentina, I know that. He was speaking in an economic sense and he was tying that into his economic argument and that's legitimate.

But what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is, that it is all too easy for members of this Chamber to go ahead and take statements out of context and tie them into some ideological boondoggle to confuse and distort and create mistrust in the public. There is no room for that in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, I could go on and outline for the Honourable Member for Morris and other members of this Chamber some of the atrocities that are being committed, some of the completely undemocratic, unthinkable, unspeakable kinds of goings-on that are occurring in Argentina.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a document from the United Nations Economic and Social Council and it's a submission on human rights and it deals with the question of human rights of all persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment in Argentina and it deals with the question of missing and displaced persons and it says, it's talking about the

method of the political repression: "This method of political repression used in Argentina varies from one country to another but irrespective of the numbers involved which also vary in all of these countries including Argentina, it represents a violation of the most elementary human rights."

That is not freedom, Mr. Speaker. It continues: "Arrests or kidnapping of persons by state bodies, government bodies or others which carry out their actions with complete impunity subsequently the authorities refuse to acknowledge that persons affected have been detained, in some countries the corpses of missing persons are found bound generally with signs of torture, on others the fate of the prisoners remains unknown, unless a great cemetery is accidentally uncovered."

Mr. Speaker, just to reinforce what I'm saying, this body that made this presentation said that it would like to draw the attention of the United Nations Human Rights Commission to the inhumane fate of hundreds of persons, men, women and children, disappeared particularly in Argentina, Chile, Guatemala, Paraguay and Uruguay. Mr. Speaker, there is a long list of articles —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Does the Honourable Member for Morris have a point of order?

**MR. CLAYTON MANNES (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the honourable member would table the document from which he is reading either now or at the end of his presentation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** If the document is a public document it is not necessary to table it. If it is otherwise, the member has a responsibility to table such a document.

**MR. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I have no problems with tabling the document. Yes, they are also public documents, I obtained them from the library. They are a United Nations document and if the Honourable Member for Morris would care to have them from me I certainly would be more than willing to let him have those.

Mr. Speaker, I have another document that is a report presented to the United Nations in January of 1980. It talks about another country where there is very little freedom and that is Chile. I won't outline all of the things that this document says but it talks about the complete lack of human rights and the restrictions placed on the freedom of information, on the freedom of movement, on the freedom of liberty and we all know some of the activities of the right wing government that is presently in control in Chile.

Similar kinds of things are happening in Argentina. I have another document, Mr. Speaker, which comes from the Reader's Digest. The title is "Argentina's Appalling Reign of Terror." Now this is the crux of the matter, Mr. Speaker. In this article an Argentine general, part of which may represent the government given that the government is a military government, and it says: "A terrorist is not just someone with a gun or a bomb but also someone who spreads ideas contrary to Christian civilization." Mr. Speaker, that is a very dangerous notion and on that pretext the government of Argentina has undergone a campaign of

eliminating, of kidnapping, of murdering tens of thousands of people.

Mr. Speaker, "Thousands of victims," this article says, "Thousands of victims of a reign of terror that has tormented Argentina since the 1976 coup, the terror is all the more appalling because it is being carried out by an outlaw extremist group, by sinister squads of the government's own military and police. As a result, one of the biggest and most developed countries in the western hemisphere has come to be regarded as its worst violator of human rights. Estimates of the total number of kidnapped persons runs as high as 20,000 people. They are known as the disappeared ones."

On at least three occasions, Mr. Speaker, this document says, "Dozens of bodies have washed up on the shores of Argentine beaches with their heads chopped, with their bodies mutilated, their bodies burned, their heads or hands chopped off, making identification impossible."

Mr. Speaker, on the surface if you look at Buenos Aires as a capital city it looks peaceful, it looks serene, it looks wealthy and affluent, but underneath the Argentine society is sick, it is a sick society. It is a society full of death and destruction; it is a society of no freedom, contrary to the accidental remarks of the Member for Morris. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe they were deliberate. He was talking economic freedom and I agree with the Member for Morris.

My point is, Mr. Speaker, why, time after time after time, do we have to sit and listen to the ideological crap imputing motives to the members of the government without being able to respond? This was my opportunity to respond, Mr. Speaker, and I have taken it. —(Interjection)— It is a game. I recognize that politics is a game —(Interjection)— the Member for Arthur says that it is a very serious game. I'll rephrase that. The Member for Arthur said that it's a very serious business. I agree with that. Mr. Speaker, when I said it was a game, I meant in that things were said from a particular perspective sometimes. Sometimes those things were said from a particular perspective with the full knowledge — and I hope the Member for Arthur will recognize this and acknowledge it — sometimes things are said with the full knowledge that they're said only from a particular perspective. They do not represent the whole truth, but only represent that portion of the truth which we care to present. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur has been involved in this business a long time and it is a serious business. I want to assure with that members on this sidetake that business very seriously but, Mr. Speaker, any business has to be run by rules.

What I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, is that the rule of this Assembly accord individuals the respect that they deserve; that there not be allowed in this Chamber, Sir, the kind of individual attack that we have witnessed on too many occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the kind of jibes that go back and forth from members' seats is something that we're not going to prevent. It's something that happens in the heat of debate. I would not wish to stifle people venting their anger. Those incidences are most often, Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Tuxedo has indicated, are delivered in good clean fun — fun may not be the appropriate word — but they're

not delivered with a sense of menace and I know the Member for Tuxedo believes that because he often jibes at the present government. But, Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that — the point that I've been making is that — comments can be taken out of context.

The Member for Morris from his seat asked me a question. He asked me whether I supported the atrocities in Poland or in Afghanistan or in the Soviet Union, the lack of human rights. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the Member for Morris now, I will tell him on the record that I am in no way supportive of the limitation, or the elimination of human rights no matter where they occur. Whether they occur in right-wing dictatorships, in right-wing totalitarian governments, or whether they occur in left-wing totalitarian governments, it makes no difference. It makes no difference. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make that last issue.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I would like as well to say at this time that I apologize to the Member for Morris for using him as an example. I understand as well as the Member for Arthur has said, that I could be used as an example. The Member for Arthur correctly mentioned the fact that I was quoted in the Free Press as saying, "That I hoped that this Caucus would do away with the slaving dogs of capitalism and support the farmers on the Crow resolution." I said that with tongue in cheek. I said that with tongue in cheek. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, as a political . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. I know that members do not wish to infringe upon the 40 minutes allowed to the honourable member when they have an equal opportunity to get up and give their own points of view.

The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I recognize that I am a political neophyte as is the Member for Morris. I recognize that we are from time to time, going to say things which we do not mean, literally. I recognize as well, that is part of politics. I recognize that we have to live with the jibes that are forwarded our way because of those misstatements and I recognize that I am as liable to make those errors as anyone in this Chamber.

My final point is, that there are members in this Chamber with a great deal more experience who seem to be exercising a considerable lack of respect for the position which they occupy and for the job which they have been elected to do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### POINT OF ORDER

**MR. McKENZIE:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I feel sorry for the honourable member. The Deputy Speaker of this House, the Deputy Speaker of the parliamentary system in this province, standing up on a grievance motion? Can you believe it? Can you believe it that the Deputy Speaker of this Legislature stood in his place this day and attacked the sys-

tem that we're using this Legislature to make better legislation and to make sure this government tries and delivers the promises that it pledged to the people of this province?

I don't think in my time, Mr. Speaker, and I've only been here since '66, I have never heard, and I can go back and check Hansard, of a Deputy Speaker anytime ever standing in his place and attacking the opposition because they're trying to make the government deliver their programs.

Mr. Speaker, it's unbelievable, unbelievable. Now I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for St. Boniface has been here longer than I have and I just ask him to rise in his place after I sit down and tell me if, in his time, he has ever seen a Deputy Speaker of this Chamber stand up and attack the British parliamentary system which is so near and dear to our hearts like this member has this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. It's unbelievable.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon on a point of order.

**MR. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I will have to wait until the record is before me in the form of Hansard, but I believe that the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell is totally misinterpreting and misconstruing what I have said.

What I have said, Mr. Speaker, I believe is that this Chamber has a responsibility that has been carried out and I simply pointed out one aspect of it that I wish to bring to the attention of this Chamber, needs in my estimation, further consideration.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the Honourable Member for Minnedosa wish to speak to the same point of order?

**MR. BLAKE:** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. There was a good illustration of it just recently with the Mayor of Winnipeg's visit to Taiwan that stirred up a bit of a controversy because it was claimed, by some quarters, that he was going there as the Mayor, not as a private citizen, and therefore, it lent some credibility to that visit. If the Deputy Speaker now is criticizing the decorum and the conduct of this House he is casting aspersions on the Chair because his position as Deputy Speaker puts him in a far more responsible position than any ordinary member in this House. So, I'm just concerned, Mr. Speaker, that your reputation is being cast upon.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I thank the Honourable Member for Minnedosa for his explanation of that point.

The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** On a point of order before we leave this. It was very interesting but I would like you to rule to see if the last member who told us the story about the Mayor of Winnipeg if that was a point of order, to serve as guidelines in future debates.

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

**MR. McKENZIE:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not a sage of this parliamentary system nor can I tell you, Mr.

Speaker, that you and I know how this system works and how it should function, but I tell my learned friend, who has only been here a short time, if he can't stand the heat in this kitchen he better pack up his seat and leave. I would like him to tell me today, Mr. Speaker, what he's added to the British Parliamentary system and the conduct of this House and the way that you've been handling this House. Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied that you've been excellent the way you've handled this Legislature and I have no quarrels. Certainly the other day with the problem with the pigeon, and we've been through that and I've already apologized to you for that conduct. But, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that you've run this House excellently. I become very concerned when the Deputy Speaker of this House raises in his place and says that the questions that are being raised by the Opposition are not fair, they're not properly prepared or they're not dealing with the subject matter that we should be dealing with in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I only have to refer to one matter that's so near and dear to my heart and that's the problem of selling the cheese in Rossburn. Surely, Mr. Speaker, I stand in my place here day after day after day and ask this government, and all those members on the back bench, surely that somehow we can dispose of that surplus cheese. The Member for St. Johns, of course, he can't speak in this House because he's in conflict with the Attorney-General, we all know that, he's got to be very careful how he conducts himself. But, he and I talked in the halls the other day about disposing this cheese surplus to Poland. But, do you think any of these Ministers over there . . .

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable learned member sitting to my left here doesn't understand, they are the government over there; they are the treasury and they have the purse; they have all the power. Mr. Speaker, all that we have is you sitting in your Chair there and the right to speak and raise in our place. We don't have all the power that they have over there; we don't have the Treasury Benches; we don't have the purse. All we have is the right to stand up in this House and ask them. This member here says we can't do that and it's unacceptable to him and he doesn't like it and he's unhappy. I tell him to resign tomorrow and get out of this place. I tell him again if he can't stand the heat in this kitchen, pack up his books and go back where he came from and send somebody else in here because I can't stand more of that diatribe than I heard from the honourable member this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, the other concern that I have, and especially when a Deputy Speaker rises in his place, Mr. Speaker, you know and I know this is the weakest government that I've ever seen in my lifetime in this Legislature. This is the poorest, ill-conceived, ill-planned government, who have no answers. I'm going to go through this whole book page-by-page before I'm finished to just point out to the honourable members how bad they actually are. I daresay these comments that I'm raising this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, will likely go down in history as one of the more learned statements that this is in fact the weakest government this province has ever seen. I don't think anybody in this province today will dispute that.

He says, this learned member over here, this Dep-

uty Speaker of this House, Mr. Speaker — remember, he's the Deputy Speaker — he says we in the Opposition are wasting the time of the House. Is that what this learned member said when he seconded the Throne Speech. He said we'd see open, free government. This learned member is trying to muzzle us over here so we can't even ask a question. Is that fair, Mr. Speaker? Is that the British Parliamentary system that we've practiced for so long in this country. Mr. Speaker, it is not and I shall not accept the comments or the grievance that the honourable member raised this afternoon. I think that he's a disgrace to the parliamentary system; he's a disgrace to his constituency and he should not be allowed to sit as Deputy Speaker in this House after what he said this afternoon.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Harry Harapiak (The Pas):** The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a point of order.

**MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI (St. Johns):** Mr. Speaker, certainly, I would like to put on the record that the Honourable Member for Russell said that I have a conflict with the Attorney-General. It's not true. We are working together; we are from the same party and we don't have any conflict whatsoever. So, I would like to just clear this record, he was accusing me. This is beside the point, you know, I'm talking about something else. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member stood up to tell us the truth but, when he started to speak he is not giving us the truth, he's accusing us and he should apologize for it.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, the only evidence that I have is comments that were made by the honourable member when they were fighting that St. Johns election campaign. I have it in my file what the honourable member said about the Attorney-General and the House Leader about what he thought about his political background. I have that in my file. If he wants me to read it into the record, I'll read it into the record.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Same point of order.

**MR. STEVE ASHTON (Thompson):** On a different point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would note in Beauchesne there are a number of citations in regard to language similar to the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell used. In regard to the Member for Flin Flon, in particular on No. 320M, Disgracing the House, I think the statements used by the honourable member were of a similar nature and I would ask you to rule whether indeed these were parliamentary or actually unparliamentary language.

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that you wait until you have a chance to peruse Hansard to give your decision on this.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On the same point of order.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Did the Honourable MLA for St. Johns have a point of order?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will have to wait until I have had a chance to peruse the comments and I will make a ruling at that time.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, on a point of order. I thought it was going to continue for a while. The motion was already placed in front of the House.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Flin Flon in the Chair for the Department of Health; and the Honourable Member for The Pas in the Chair for the Department of Labour and Manpower.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

### SUPPLY — LABOUR AND MANPOWER

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas):** We'll call the Committee to order. We're in Labour and Manpower, 2.(d) Employment Standards: (1) Salaries. The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the recent increase in the minimum wage to some extent. The Minister has indicated that he and the Cabinet, I take it, took a political position and adopted the minority report of the Minimum Wage Board. I appreciate that this is a very difficult decision when you're faced with it because I don't think anyone in any political party really wants to see someone who is dependent on the minimum wage, particularly as a primary source of income, to fall behind the cost-of-living increases.

At the same time there are studies that have been done elsewhere, in other jurisdictions, that raise questions about whether or not such increases, and perhaps, increases the size of the most recent one in these kinds of economic times as to whether or not they have the effect of causing jobs to be lost for some segments of the job population.

Mr. Chairman, back in, I believe it was in 1978-79, the Minimum Wage Board was divided and part of the — I believe it was the management section, in fact — of the management representatives at that time suggested there should be a complete review of the minimum wage and raised — the Minister will have the full material — but they suggested there should be questions looked into and studies done by qualified people with respect to who receives the minimum wage, who pays the minimum wage, what effect would this have on employment opportunities, what effect would it have on new businesses commencing operation or old businesses expanding operations, what extent would it have on employment, the economic implications for the province, etc., and they did refer to some of the recent studies that were done in the United States and I believe one in Quebec which made a suggestion that the increase in minimum wage does

cause a loss of employment.

I don't think there is any unanimous conclusion that anyone has come to but I wonder if the Minister, now that he has authorized the recent increase, in view of the controversy that has taken place, in view of the conflicting studies that have been done, would he be prepared to undertake this kind of thorough review of minimum wage in Manitoba to attempt to answer some of these questions?

As I have indicated, I think everyone is sympathetic, particularly to those people who receive the minimum wage as a primary source of income, who are dependent upon that source of income, but nobody wants to see at the same time a loss of jobs. I just wonder, in view of this previous recommendation I don't think any action was taken on it, would the Minister in the light of having made a decision to increase the minimum wage in the way he has done and the controversy that has come from some quarters of society, would he be prepared to undertake a full review of the implications of raising the minimum wage, etc.?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**HON. VIC SCHROEDER (Rossmere):** Mr. Chairman, when we started thinking about raising the minimum wage, it was one of the first items on my agenda when I took office; I thought it was important. We had spoken about it often enough in Opposition and Cabinet decided that we would go by way of having the Minimum Wage Board hold meetings and come to a determination.

At the same time I asked the Department of Labour and the Department of Finance to come up with some indications as to the effects of minimum wage increases. As the member has indicated there is that report in Quebec; there are other reports. There are economists who argue on both sides of the issue, I don't think that it's a very clear issue.

We did check to determine what impact it might have in the area of the clothing industry, the garment manufacturing, which is an area where some people had expressed concern, not incidentally people from that industry but rather others who thought they were speaking in protection of that industry. We discovered that there were relatively few people in that industry who were on the minimum wage or very close to it.

The one area where we had a lot of people concerned was in the area of the hotel industry, the restaurant industry. I should say that there was, as the member knows, a differential put in a few years ago with respect to people handling alcoholic beverages and we did look at that. We checked to see how many — and these are troubled economic times — and we determined that there are no operations of that type going out of business that we can discover. There doesn't seem to be any real danger of the hotels in the province going bankrupt. They seem to be doing fairly well. So we decided that we, not because of that in itself although maybe we would have looked at it in a different light if there was some evidence that there was a real problem in that industry, but we didn't see that. We felt that it was important for the dignity of working men and women that there not be this group who somehow had a lesser wage than other people.



That was the same type of political decision that was made when the differential was put in.

With respect to a study, I think, that's a good suggestion. Both employers and employees in the past have occasionally suggested that the minimum wage be tied to some kind of a formula and I have occasionally been attracted to that kind of proposal but there are some problems with it. One of the biggest problems is, that we have to be looking at what other jurisdictions are doing, we can't go too far ahead of them nor be behind them and using some of the formulas that had been suggested in the Seventies I think that we could have gotten ourselves into some problems, although the formulas looked okay at the time.

We are looking to see whether there is any other way of doing it. I'm sure that if we could come up with something that would be fair to all and would put us in a position where we don't have to make these kinds of announcements, but rather they just sort of come because of the formula, we would feel as politicians, very good about that. But I have the feeling as well that within a few years we would have to make another political decision to eliminate that formula because it would either be paying too little or it would be paying too much and then we would be back with whoever of the two groups is in opposition, haranguing the government for that.

It's an area where, I suppose, in the final analysis you have to guess, you want to guess to ensure that you're not too low and you want to guess to ensure that you're not too high. In this particular case, the major areas of disagreement was a matter of 10 cents an hour. That is, the employer representatives suggested \$3.90 an hour, the employee representatives suggested \$4 an hour and as you can see, we chose the \$4.00. There were other areas where they didn't disagree where we came in the middle, I believe. There was a suggestion that student salaries, or people under age 18, have their wages go up to \$3.65 an hour and we ended up at \$3.55 an hour. When we did that we were also looking across the border to Saskatchewan where those very same people under age 18 are receiving \$4.25 an hour, so what we have got right now even with this increase, is a 70 cents an hour differential between students in Saskatchewan and students in Manitoba.

The question of a review is a good one. I would like to see another review done. I'm not completely optimistic that we're going to be able to come up with a solution that would be satisfactory for any lengthy period of time, in any event.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister has referred to having made a political judgment, perhaps having to make in the future a political judgment again in the event that certain occurrences took place, or having to make some guesses at what is appropriate.

He has adopted a minority report from the Minimum Wage Board rather than the majority report which he has every right to do but which would tend, I would think, to harm the quality of the report that he might receive in the future from the Minimum Wage Board. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that he would think seriously about undertaking a thorough review, as

was previously recommended, and certainly having involved in that review both employee and employer representatives and perhaps let's hope that they could come up with a full discussion of the implications of such increases that might make it easier for the Minister, and any future Minister, to deal with this very difficult subject in the future.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, that's something that I think we ought to do but I should say that the position right now out there is, as I understand it, that the employees are still looking for a specific formula type of solution and the employers, who at one time agreed with that position, are now of the view that it's unlikely that we'll be able to achieve a formula that will be useful to us for a long period of time. That doesn't mean we shouldn't try again and I think we will.

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

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate what percentage of those employed on the minimum wage in Manitoba are under 25 years of age.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, I don't have that number here. I'm not sure that we would have a specific number in any event. There are, in total, somewhere between 20,000 and 40,000 Manitobans on the minimum wage, that is the estimate. There is no real way of knowing exactly how many there are. We understand that over the years it has been in the range of 5 to 10 percent of the workforce.

**MR. FILMON:** Would the Minister's department estimate that the majority of that group is under 25 then or the minority?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, apparently there is a question of age but there is also a question of students, people who are working part-time generally are on the minimum wage and there is also a significant component of what we understand to be the people working on minimum wage are women, and I'm sure there are a lot of young people on the minimum wage as well.

**MR. FILMON:** Does the Minister not, and again acknowledging, as the Member for St. Norbert has, that none of us wish to place restrictions of income on people who have to live on the minimum wage, but combining it with, firstly, the strong representations of the food and beverage industry employers whose estimate, I believe, is that it could affect the loss of as many as 1,200 jobs in their industry and with the Minister's stated intention of wanting to promote additional jobs for students this summer and instituting a program expected to cost \$2.9 million or \$3 million, and so on, did the timing or the juxtaposition of the two decisions not seem to be rather strange to the Minister?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Well, it seemed to me that it would be appropriate to let people know that on top of

working in the summertime, there would be a reasonable minimum wage and the member refers to numbers by the restaurant association.

I want to tell the member that I met with that group on a number of occasions before the decision was made and I want to tell the member as well that they presented a brief to us which in no way supported any kind of a suggestion that the hotel and tourism industry had somehow hired more people as a result of the wage differential. In fact, we have since the hullabaloo started, looked up and down the country to determine what impacts there were in other provinces.

Just for example, in Saskatchewan, where young people under age 18 are getting 70 cents an hour more than in Manitoba and others are getting 25 cents an hour more than they will be in Manitoba. The restaurant and food industry employment figures grew significantly faster during the last several years than they did in Manitoba and that was the case almost without exception throughout Canada. There was no evidence that after the tip differential was set up that there was any significant increase in employment. In fact, I have to tell you that there was a decrease in employment in Manitoba as opposed to an increase in Canada in restaurants with more than 20 employees.

So if the honourable member has any information that would suggest that the numbers that the industry is projecting are accurate, I'd be interested in seeing it, but they didn't present any statistics to us other than, just for instance, they said that in Minnesota the minimum wage is \$3.25 an hour and therefore you are putting us in a position where our people have to compete with people who will be earning considerably less. The fact of the matter is though that when you take the dollar into account, the minimum wage in Minnesota is approximately \$4 an hour and for a Canadian going to Minnesota, he or she will pay with Canadian dollars which are worth, if you pay \$3.25, basically it works out to approximately \$4 that you pay. The same thing applies to Minnesotans coming to Manitoba, so a lot of the arguments that were provided were on examination not valid in our opinion.

Again, they didn't show in any way that there had been an increase in employment as a result of the differential, nor did they show that there would be a decrease as a result of the removal of the differential.

**MR. FILMON:** Is the Minister saying that there isn't such a thing in the United States as a federal minimum wage which is less than the normal minimum wage for those who are in the food and beverage industry and likely to be in receipt of tips?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, there is a federal minimum wage in the United States as there is a federal minimum wage in Canada. I don't have the exact number of it at my fingertips, but it is lower than the \$3.25 per hour that — no, I'm sorry, as of January 1st, 1981, the minimum wage federally was \$3.35 per hour in the United States, which would work out to more than the \$4 per hour that we have here.

Now I think you're right though that there is possibly a federal minimum wage differential for hotel and restaurant employees, but it is my understanding that does not apply in Minnesota where a state law would be the law that would govern, by far, the majority of

hotel and restaurant employees other than, if their laws are similar to ours, other than railway restaurants.

**MR. FILMON:** Yes, for the Minister's information, it's \$2.01 versus the \$3.35 in terms of the federal legislation in the United States and the differential is utilized in many of the states in the United States for food and beverage workers, acknowledging the fact that a significant portion of their income often is from tips.

Is the Minister saying that he doesn't believe that a significant portion of income for food and beverage workers is from tips in Manitoba?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I don't believe that it ought to be government policy to encourage or discourage relations between employees and customers. I believe that it is the responsibility of government to have minimum wage rates that will neither detract from tipping nor encourage tipping. It is my view that by having a tip differential you are inviting the public to provide a tip, providing of course that the employee smiles properly at you as the service is given.

**MR. FILMON:** Does the Minister then believe that by removing this differential he is suggesting or inviting the person being served not to tip?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** No, by removing the differential we are being neutral on that issue. Our relationship — (Interjection) — Well, the member says we can't have it both ways. I suggest that we can have it neutrally. What we can do is say that there is a minimum amount that must be paid for an hour's work in the Province of Manitoba. That amount will be paid by all employers to their employees. Our rule is to deal with employment standards between employers and employees and not to govern any relationships between employees and third parties. That is none of our business. We do not encourage nor discourage the giving of tips. It is our view that if we had the minimum wage at a lower level for those employees than for others, then we would be encouraging the giving of tips.

**MR. FILMON:** But, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister says that by permitting a differential to exist. They are inviting people to make up the difference through tips and he must, by deduction, logically say that by eliminating the differential they are inviting people not to tip. I don't think he can have it both ways; it's one or the other. If that's his position then that's fine, then the public should know that they're been invited not to tip as much because the Minister is saying that legislatively he's going to make up the differential and has done so.

Again, to the point of the adoption of the Minimum Wage Board Report, in the House the Minister indicated that he believed that public hearings were deemed not necessary by previous governments and therefore that view was accepted by his government because there is broad representation on the Board. People from both sides of the issue and presumably some in the middle are represented on the Board and therefore it was not necessary to undertake public hearings.

On the other hand, he has chosen not to accept the

majority report of the Board, so therefore he is not saying that the board is representative of all the views of the public if he's only going to select one viewpoint, the minority viewpoint, I might add, from the Board. Again, I don't find that very defensible.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, dealing with the second point first, then I'm sure the former Minister of Consumer Affairs must have felt embarrassed when his government didn't follow the report of the majority. The Board was made up of the identical people. I should say that in some areas we disagreed with both majority and minority. We have to make the final decision and we don't apologize for that. As far as not having it both ways is concerned, I really don't understand the honourable member's argument.

As of July 1st, 1982, there will only be two provinces in this country that have this kind of a tip differential. All of the others say that an employer pays so much to an employee minimum per hour. If what the honourable member is suggesting is that in all the other provinces including Manitoba is then the position of the government therefore, that they are opposed to tipping; I suggest that is simply not a proposition that he can logically argue. I think he could make that argument if we said we would demand a minimum wage of \$4.50 an hour for hotel and restaurant employees and \$4 for everyone else. Then you could say: "Well, those people are earning more money per hour, why should we tip them?" You could make the same argument if you say: "They will be at \$3.50 an hour while everybody else is at \$4 an hour." That is the reverse argument; here the government encouraging to tip.

We are taking the middle of the road, we're taking the same position that all of the provinces to the west of us are taking, that we will not get involved in that issue.

**MR. FILMON:** Does the Minister, or does the Minister not believe that people who are working in service areas in the food and beverage industry do get a significant portion of their income through tips?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** That is between them and their tax person. I should say that when the tip differential was instituted it was instituted without any such recommendation from either the majority or the minority of the Minimum Wage Board.

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I think my real concern is whether or not there will be a loss of jobs. Does the Minister have a mechanism in place that can somehow determine specifically whether or not jobs will be lost as a result of the increase in the manner in which it is being done?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, it's a very inexact science. During the next year I'm sure that there will be restaurants going out of business as there did last year and five years ago. In each case you can contribute fault to different areas, including the management

skills of the management group; the type of food they were selling; the particular area they were in, maybe they didn't have enough of a customer area; the kind of capital investment, and; certainly, paying \$4 an hour instead of \$3.35 an hour for an employee will add to the cost of the owner. At the same time I remind the member that the tip differential only applied to people who were serving alcoholic beverages so that this didn't apply anyway to the people working in the back of the shop. They had to be paid the regular minimum wage in any event, so I would suggest that the difference isn't quite as severe as some might have thought in the first place.

I would say as well that an argument could be made that if you have 20,000 or 40,000 people earning 45 cents an hour more than they were in the past, that they will be spending more money and that there, in fact, will be some jobs created. They may not be the same jobs in the food and restaurant business, they may be elsewhere. I'm sure the member would agree with me that when a person is receiving \$160 a week that he or she will be spending practically all of that money very quickly because they just can't afford not to.

**MR. MERCIER:** Just in the few moments left, Mr. Chairman, and I think that the Minister's answer that the mechanism that he has through his department is a very inexact science further justifies the suggestion that there should be a full and thorough review with the opportunities for input from all sectors of society into this question so that these decisions in the future can be based on a thorough study and on some provable facts.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour being 4:30, I'm interrupting proceedings for Private Members' Hour. The Committee will reconvene at 8 o'clock

## SUPPLY — HEALTH

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon):** The Health Estimates, the Personal Care Home Program, I believe.

The Honourable Member for Virten. Order please. The Honourable Member for Virten was on his feet, please.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Unless the honourable member has some information that may be valuable in debate.

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, everything I say is valuable in debate, but I have a statement of correction or to make sure that there's no misunderstanding in the statement that I've made. So if you could take note, I wish to clarify that the Adolescent Psychiatric Unit proposed for central Winnipeg in addition to outpatient and day space will include 25 inpatient beds. I think I had mentioned 20. It's 25.

Also, there was one that was left from one of the schedules, the St. Boniface Hospital laundry. While the cost for the upgrading of the St. Boniface Hospital laundry to provide improved and reasonable service is included for construction during this fiscal year,

this specific project was omitted from my earlier statement. It doesn't change the amount of the funds. It was just omitted but the total amount stays the same.

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

**MR. GRAHAM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the five-year Capital Program that the Honourable Minister delivered to us the other day had some omissions that certainly caused me some concerns, especially when the hospital facilities at Virden were not in the first five-year plan, although he does include them later on as programs that are under consideration.

I would ask the Honourable Minister to seriously consider the condition of the present hospital in Virden and the attempts that are being made by the Hospital Board there to have an entirely new structure to replace it as the old one is, in the opinion of many, beyond repair. I hope that plans can go ahead as quickly as possible so that hospital facility can be brought forward as quickly as possible.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I realize the concern of my honourable friend and the people in the area and this is why I've instructed the Health Sciences Centre to develop functional programs for the people in the area. Now, I'll try to explain. When we talk about long-range planning or a five-year program, it is not the \$143 million that was announced and authorized at this time. It is going to be much more than that during the next five years. We're talking about now we have to sort many of these things that have been approved under the former government but we have the responsibility of continuing or deciding if we should freeze, if we should change or if we should go ahead and certainly to provide the funds and to make the decision that they will go on at this time and then the people of Manitoba will have to make sure to provide the dollars for the operating cost of these things.

Now, the situation is there are two groups. Let's say that some are approved to start building as fast as possible or as soon as possible; some of them are being constructed now. Others have been directed to go to tenders immediately and others as they come along we'll go it and, as I tried to explain, because we're not going to plan in a fish bowl. We're working with other departments. We're looking at the economy of the province. We're looking at the state of the building trade and so on and it is possible that will be modified some. Well, all right, all I can say is I'm not going to go ahead and announce something and approve something that's going to be started or that we've had no functional program, that we don't know exactly what we're going to approve. I'm not going to start approving that or the government is not going to approve that in three or four years from now. I've approved what we're ready to go.

Then, I've also given you another schedule that this year we are approving funds to start the architectural design. Now that should be at least an indication. It should be if you want to take it. You could practically take it and, stretching things a bit, say it's approved in principle because there is no way that we are going to approve funds. We haven't got that much money to

throw away with no intention of ever going to construction. Now, in that schedule there's approximately \$88 million, and I want everybody to be very familiar, to understand what I'm saying.

Now, this year all the government has approved is funds for planning. Next year, either they will ask for more planning — that will have to be approved because planning is not done in one year; more money — that will have to be approved. We'll have to make another decision but it's not approved ahead of time, or most of them will be finished and we'll say okay, we're ready to go; it is the intention in general now. I don't want you to come back next year and say you promised all this was approved. It is not what I am saying. I am saying it is certainly the intention after that to follow through, take this package, go to the Cabinet and the Government and say, now I want approval for this. That would go in the mainstream of a five-year program. That is where it starts. Some of them, we might say no. Some of them, we might modify, but in general, and I am confident because we are following the guidelines that we have. Now, I want flexibility to say fine, we're ready to go; we'll wait another year; we've got too much this year or the private enterprise is busy with a lot of construction, let's spread this around a bit; that is a possibility. Of course, we look at needs and priorities; these are some of the things that will have to be looked at and, who knows, we're going to work very hard. As the official Health critic for the members of the Opposition and myself and certainly the members of our staff, we agreed that we're going to keep on looking to see if we could bring in better and cheaper ways of serving the people in providing the health care. It might be that then the guidelines will change.

Ten years ago not too many people heard of home care the way we have it now and that is something that has cost a lot of money but it saved an awful lot more money and brought the good life to a lot of people. So you see, I want that flexibility also; I don't want to necessarily keep on and I'd been chastised by the Health critic of the Conservative Party if I do that. If I just say, well, that's the establishment, this way, we're going to keep on forever.

Furthermore, we have certain things that must be done right away; you can't just wait and say, well, we're planning. At that hospital my honourable friend mentioned, I think, there's some recommendation from the Fire Commissioner and this will be looked at immediately. I don't think those are named but I there are funds there to do these things. We will look at the immediate thing that has to be done now, and that will be done, then I've instructed the Commission to go back to these people and to say, fine, let's work on some programs. I announced it, if you noticed, everything was an announcement of Cabinet where this last one was an announcement of the Minister, the prerogative of the Minister who instructed the Commission, here, go ahead. To give you exactly that, an idea of what the five-year plan would be or should be in general. Again, I repeat, I'm going to be held for everything exactly the way it is now, but in general this is the direction we're going. I will come back to Cabinet, they will look at the economy, they will look at everything and they will either approve the whole thing as I recommend it or make some modification. I

would say that for all intent and purpose you could consider that, if we're talking about planning and programs development with that hospital, is part of the five-year program.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, I will accept the Minister's explanation. I would maybe find it a little difficult to sell it in the community when the recommendations of the Fire Commissioner are such that the building is almost unsafe to operate in. However, I'm more concerned about the community itself, the medical staff and the hospital board who are doing everything they can, they look at this program and they find that they're not even being considered for Architectural Planning for this year. The five-year capital program has been prepared and they find that they're on a further program to continue to work with communities in determining and refining the functional program. I don't know how much longer you can continue to work with the communities in owning the functional program to the point — I suppose you can carry on for quite some time — but when does the community throw up their hands and lose interest?

They expect to see some progress made and it isn't just yesterday that they started work on a new hospital and then to go down further and find out the Shoal Lake renovation and expansion of the hospital which has been in the Architectural Planning is now taken out of it and is now put back into determining and refining the functional program. I'm sure the people in the Shoal Lake area are going to be very appreciative of that backward step because it does little to instill confidence in these volunteer people and remember they are volunteers who work conscientiously and very dedicated in attempting to provide a good health care facility in a community.

I warn the Minister, if you rebuff your volunteers too long, you can be in serious trouble with them and they may lose interest and the health care of the community can then deteriorate. So I ask the Minister to consider carefully the progress with which programs once started should continue. In the past we have seen programs stalled, but eventually they do get carried through to fruition; I would hope that these two projects carry on in that way as well so the people can have faith and hope that something will be done in the foreseeable future.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, this debate, I'm sure will be somewhat like a Throne Speech debate, and I don't say this as a way of criticizing the members of the House and I expect that maybe a few from my side will take me task. This is something that people put on record that they're fighting for their constituency and I accept that, but I'm not going to rise at the bait of every single one. I'll give the proper information, I'll talk in general, I'll give the information that I have and I'd like to give you some more information to the member that just spoke.

First of all, he mentioned Shoal Lake and Virден, it's exactly in the same schedule, except that I have here, Virден Hospital, possible replacement of the existing 32 bed hospital, where Shoal Lake is talking only about renovation and expansion of the hospital. Anybody can make a point here that you're favouring one to the other, but I'll accept those questions as valid

and I'll try to make my case. If we're going to talk honestly and if we'll put everything on the table — (Interjection)— Beg your pardon?

**MR. GRAHAM:** I said that Shoal Lake was in Architectural Design and is now being pushed back.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** . . . no, it's not pushed back at all, Mr. Chairman, the thing is, it's in the same schedule.

Now, let me say this, that if we're going to put all our cards on the table that's exactly what we'll do. The Board of the hospital of Virден have been resisting at this time any renovation and any work ordered by the Fire Chief. I'm not going to criticize them too harshly for that, because they want to start their new hospital immediately. We're going to get, by many of the Conservatives who are talking about these people throwing money around, they're going to all say, do it, like it was said before, but not in my constituency. Give me what I want and then, dammit, start saving. We are going to have that by a lot of them. Okay, I'm not going to accept that because we're going to look at the whole thing together. We looked at the needs; we will look at the priorities. There's some that will come in that are not even in the five-year program, nothing at all and they'll have criticism. I'm not saying this to say that I question the sincerity of the members, I'm not saying that at all, because you're there to represent a constituency and that's your role. You have to be militant and you have to say, well, all right, as far as I'm concerned that's the one that should go first, but I'll have 56 people saying, that should go first. We've got so much money and we're going to spread it out and we're going to try to do it in a question of priority, do it in an orderly way, looking at our finances, looking at the economy of the province. I think that's all I can give the member at this time, the assurance that a functional program will be looked at in view of the priority. I think that there's a guideline or a direction to the Commission that they'll have to insist to bring some of the repairs while this is done, some of the concerns of the Fire Commissioner certainly will have to be taken into consideration.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Minister would expect me to stand up and plead the case of the hospitals in Virден and Shoal Lake as they are within my constituency. The only thing I'm pointing out is that it appears as though we are going backwards rather than ahead, and when you go from architectural design back to the functional program, in my limited experience in hospitals — I was a member of a board. In fact, I was chairman of the building committee. — I think that is a backward step and not a forward step. The Minister has to have some very valid reasons for moving things backwards. So far, he hasn't told us what the reasons are.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, maybe I should give more information to my honourable friend. He chose to make a comparison between Shoal Lake. He's talking about his hospital going backwards. There's no such a thing. Until they start building, in their mind it might be that this is what they want. I wasn't going to give this as an example, but this is done with the same government and changes of

government. Shoal Lake, not my example, the honourable member's example, was ready to go in '77. It was frozen. It was frozen. Why? Because they weren't too sure if they wanted the doctors in the hospital or not. They finally came in with a decision in 1980. So you see there's always a reason. I would hope that people are not going to start pointing at another one because you're going to be in trouble if you do that.

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

**MR. BLAKE:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to put on the record, as the Minister said, we're going to be a little Throne Speech debating and I'm talking about constituency problems, but there have been delegations in here to see the former Minister, and I'm sure this Minister has had correspondence and he'll likely have a delegation here before long from the Medical Nursing Unit at Erickson. There was some correspondence and some encouragement given to that group. They have a small 10-bed hospital there and the plan was to add a few more beds and take some beds from the hospital and turn it into a sort of a care home with maybe four acute care beds in it, something of that nature.

One of the main concerns there with the people is having a facility there that'll enable them to maintain the doctor, and having a doctor in that particular point is extremely important due to the close proximity to Riding Mountain National Park where there are some 60,000 to 100,000 visitors over the summer months and there are no medical facilities maintained in the park now. They used to be maintained by the Federal Government, but there are no doctors maintained in the park now. It puts a heavy load on the doctor in that community with minor scratches and bruises as happens to children in recreational areas, as well as vehicle accidents and whatnot. The doctor there is very very well liked and very capable, Dr. Khandelwal, and enjoys the support of the Minnedosa area.

There was some considerable encouragement, in a way, given to the local group that in the foreseeable future that they could maybe expect some plans to get under way to help bring their plans to a successful conclusion, to the point where the committee — there is a local committee set up — became very encouraged and even got to the point where they started to collect money for furnishings, televisions or whatever is supplied for the addition to their hospital, which would become virtually a care home when it was finished, knowing full well that they weren't looking for immediate construction in a year; they were looking for some planning in a few years down the road.

I notice in the Minister's five-year capital project that Erickson is not mentioned there. I know that the committee and the community are going to be very very disappointed. I would like the Minister to provide me with any information that he may have to indicate why the decision was made not to include that in some further planning stage at this time. So if the Minister could let me have some information that will allow for a logical explanation to those people, so that they may be encouraged to keep planning and to keep that project going, and maybe some light at the end of the tunnel as to when they may expect that facility to

be completed.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, all I can say, and I'm aware of the project they have there, it's a well worth project, but it's certainly not a priority. The reason is that even Erickson as such is overbedded right now. We go by guidelines by regions and that might be enriched later on, but we have to be careful, we can't just build all in one area, although they want it very much, and have certain areas in the province underbedded. Now that causes problems the way you've started, and I think this isn't going to improve the planning, that you might have a region that is overbedded, but all in one community and the other people are not too happy.

Then you have the thing that we tried. I'll always remember the Member for Sturgeon Creek; I'll always remember one concern that he had, when I was in my previous term as Minister, he felt there shouldn't be any regimentation, that we should try to appeal and try to help people stay within their culture and their religion and so on, especially these old people. I assured him that's exactly what I wanted. We want to improve that. It can't be the only factor, but if we can help them — of course, we have rules also that we don't want small freestanding personal care homes which are not viable. That is the reason. So we're following the guidelines very very seriously.

Now my honourable friend talks about a problem for so many months when there are still areas that have the same problem; that are more because they're under bedded and they have nothing. So we're going to start with that. That's why I can't say it's on the list. This is why even the direction wasn't given to the Commission to start your functional programs on that.

I might say, though, that Erickson itself is over bed, even the town itself, whereas Minnedosa is probably under bedded if you looked at the town but not the region. Now, another thing on that is there is a small hospital there for these people and then there's a 40-bed personal care home at Sandy Lake which is only about 15 miles away.

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

**MR. BLAKE:** I appreciate the Minister's remarks but it doesn't alter the fact that the people who have to leave Erickson to go to a personal care home either have to go to Minnedosa or to Erickson and there are some that have even gone further away, whatever they can get them placed in, in an available situation.

The Sandy Lake Nursing Home, I suppose, is an extremely good operation. It has an ethnic flavour to it that is not found in too many rural areas and that in itself has been a very big plus. The Minister indicated that I had left the impression that Erickson was really pressured in the summer months. It's pressured all the time with only one doctor in the community because it's very, very difficult for him to get time off and to book relief, but the summer months puts an extremely heavy pressure on the doctor and the small facility there, and it was an enriched unit that they were looking for. It was some small addition that would provide some care beds as well as some acute hospital beds and allow the doctor maybe some addi-

tional facilities such as blood testing and things of that nature. They had been encouraged by their discussions with the MHSC to proceed and maybe their hopes were raised a little prematurely or artificially, I don't know, but it's going to be extremely disappointing to them to find out that this has not been a priority item with the Minister.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** There's no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that it will be disappointing. It will be disappointing to a lot of people but I can't give much more information than I have. It is not a priority. Let's give the members of the committee an idea what the potential of the spending of this 5-year program is and look at the economy and look at the problems that we have.

This year, some of these, of course most of them approved or planned by the former government, but the money that will have to be raised will be \$153.4 million that will start it. I don't say it will all be spent this year but it will be started this year or finished this year. Then there's another \$3.4 million for planning a potential project totalling \$88 million. Now, anywhere from \$1 to \$88 million and probably when we're looking at those dollars two years from now, I would imagine that we'll be lucky to get away with it for \$88 million. So that's after your 3.4 and your 153, and then the other programs that I'm talking about, those that are looking at the functional program, the potential is another \$112.2 million.

So, you know, even with all the remarks and all the disappointment, I am sure that the member is responsible enough to know the difficulty that we have and what we're doing to try to spread it out and that we can't give them any encouragement at all. I'm not knocking the program at all. I think it's a good program but, unfortunately, if you're going to say well, the different priorities, it doesn't warrant being placed on the same priority list as the others announced in the House so far.

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

**MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to discuss a couple of items if I can with the Minister.

On the top of page 2, I noticed that you have the "Winkler Salem Home — Replacement of the 1956 section of the home." And down at the bottom of that particular page it says: "These projects will be submitted to Cabinet in subsequent years for consideration and if approved will become part of the M.H.S.C. 5-year capital program."

Now, the particular building has been questioned by the Fire Commissioner's Office for many, many years and I believe at one time or other has been condemned and they made a few changes in there, but are they going to be able to get it into the condition where the Department of Labour and the Fire Commissioner's Office would say that this is a building which would be safe against fire.

The Board had been trying to get an appointment with the Minister. They wrote a letter asking for an appointment with the Minister and the Minister wrote back to them that he didn't have time to see them at this time. This is a couple of months ago and since then they also have received no word from the Minis-

ter and they are wondering, will they ever be able to get to see the Minister or will they not be able to discuss this question with him.

I would appreciate it if the Minister could let me know that he would meet with these people and if he can't do it this month, then can he do it next month or give them some kind of date so that they don't have to come to me and say, how can we possibly meet this Minister. I would think that if the Minister could give them some kind of date anyhow in which they could come and discuss this problem with the Minister, it would be very helpful.

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** All I can say to the honourable member is that we conformed to all the recommendations of the Fire Commissioner as far as that particular project is concerned. There could be a good argument to replace that building. That is why I've instructed the Commission to keep on with the functional program in that area.

As far as the appointment with the Minister, I don't think I've refused to see anybody but there's no way that I can see everybody that's been in touch with me since there was a change of government. Let me say again that in this area, I've purposely stayed a bit of a distance because I wanted to get the recommendation of the Commission in a nonpartisan way and I was aware — everyone like that, I figured, fine, I'll meet with them but in my book it wasn't a priority. It might have disappointed people. It wasn't refusing to see them but there were others where I had to pick and choose. That wasn't necessarily the first priority because the Commission was very much aware, and that is why you have a Commission. If you understand the Manitoba Health Service Commission still exists, and although I'm the Minister responsible, it has certain responsibilities and certain independence and I want it to preserve that. You can just imagine if everybody that wants a personal care home, a hospital or any of these facilities would come in to see the Minister, we'd have a lot of people with no work to do at the Commission and the Minister would have a hell of a lot of trouble keeping up with all these appointments.

You know, I start now anytime from 6 o'clock; the former Minister will tell you too. If I come after 8 o'clock, I feel guilty that I'm late and you people want to keep us here and I can't see anybody while I'm defending my Estimates. I'm not criticizing but you have to realize there are only so many things you can do in a day. First of all, we had to go to the Estimates; we're working on the Budget as a Cabinet, and you can't do it all. I'll be very honest with you. It wasn't my first priority because I knew that somebody was looking at it and they had been in discussion with the former Minister and the Commission and they were bringing in recommendations. It's not that I don't want to see them, and you are not the only one in that book. I spend more time, when I have a chance, to talk with these different problems in the department proper, the medical problems. I spent an awful lot of time with the MMA problem, that is another thing that I couldn't get away from. I'd like to see everybody that wants an appointment; it's not humanly possible and, fine, at a later date when this is finished if they still

want a discussion, but I think the announcement I did today will answer some of these things that I did yesterday.

Now they know where they stand and that's what they wanted to hear from me, and I wouldn't have told them at the time. Even my colleagues didn't know till Cabinet approved it just last week and I wasn't in any position. To be a good politician, I could go and listen to them, but I couldn't give them any more information that the Commission was ready to give them. The Commission was much more knowledgeable and I left the Commission alone to give their recommendation without any partisan or any favouritism at all and that's the way I received it.

**MR. BROWN:** I realize that the Minister has a lot of problem areas and I recognize this, but there comes a time when people have been working for something and when they are continuously bombarded every day, hey, when is my mother going to be able to get into a facility, or my father, or whatever or my aunt, it gets a little difficult for these people to say, well, you'll have to wait a little longer until somebody dies because that's the only replacements, really, the space that we ever get is if somebody dies. Now, we have a long waiting list, and the people are wondering, well, is there anything that we can have that's going to relieve this situation within the near future, within the next year, or two years, or whatever. People want to know these things.

There is another area that I'd like to discuss with the Minister and this is the hospital at Altona. Surely, that must be one of the oldest hospitals in existence at the present time. The Altona Hospital is really far below the standards of, I would say, at least 95 percent maybe of all the hospitals in Manitoba. It's an old hospital; somebody should take a look at it. I know that they have requested replacement of the hospital and I hope that we'll be able to get under way with that shortly.

Then we have a situation at St. Jean where they have no personal care home at all. The older people, everybody in that community along the Red River over there, they have to leave their community once they get old — Letellier, the St. Jean community. They're placed all over Manitoba. You have some of them in St. Boniface, you have some of them in St. Pierre, some in Ste. Anne, some in Morris. They're all over creation and it's causing a big problem over there. The people would like to spend the rest of their days when they get old among people that they know. They don't want to spend them among strangers. They would like to have the priest from the church, who has been seeing them and they've been going to, attend them and this is not possible under the present situation. There is a problem there and I hope that the Minister is going to address himself to some of these problems.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Rest assured and I hope you will be here at 8 o'clock because I certainly wish to answer the comments that you made now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The time being 4:30 and time for Private Members' Hour, I am interrupting proceedings of the Committee and we'll return at the

call of the House. Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, Private Members' Hour. The first item on Thursdays is private members' resolutions.

#### RES. 5 — 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Roblin-Russell, that

WHEREAS on July 14, 1932, the International Peace Garden was dedicated with the words "TO GOD IN HIS GLORY . . . WE TWO NATIONS DEDICATE THIS GARDEN AND PLEDGE OURSELVES THAT AS LONG AS MEN SHALL LIVE WE WILL NOT TAKE UP ARMS AGAINST ONE ANOTHER";

AND WHEREAS Canada and the United States of America continue to enjoy the longest undefended boundary in the world;

AND WHEREAS Canada and the United States of America have together made great sacrifices in the cause of international peace and freedom;

AND WHEREAS the International Peace Garden has developed into an internationally renowned site to continually remind the people of the close bonds between Canada and the United States of America;

AND WHEREAS the International Peace Garden has become an important centre for cultural and athletic activities for young people;

AND WHEREAS International Peace Garden is commemorating its 50th Anniversary in July, 1982;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, extend congratulations and best wishes to all people who have worked to fulfill and expand the original concept of the International Peace Garden;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be printed, engrossed by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, and forwarded to the President of the International Peace Garden.

#### MOTION presented.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to introduce this resolution in our Assembly. There is a great deal to be said about the Peace Garden and, no doubt, in my remarks I'm going to have to be very sketchy to try and keep within the time that's available.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk a bit about the idea of how the International Peace Garden was started. It was an idea that began in the mind of Henry J. Moore, a gentleman from Islington, Ontario, who was a graduate of the Kew Gardens in England and who was an extremely well-known gardener in



Canada and, indeed, in North America. Mr. Moore had the idea of establishing a garden dedicated to the peace that had existed at that time even for well over 100 years between Canada and the United States. He took the idea to the National Gardeners' Association meeting in Euclid, Ohio, in 1928, and the idea at that time was relatively well received by the people at that meeting. He again raised the idea at the National Gardeners' Association meeting in Toronto in 1929. The idea was largely accepted at that time as being one that was very worthy of pursuit. The process then became one of selecting the garden. It's my understanding that originally, Mr. Speaker, they had intended to locate the garden somewhere in central Canada, in Eastern Canada from our perspective, which was a reasonable thing given where the idea was generated. But, after looking at a number of sites they had decided that was not possible. A gentleman by the name of Mr. Parmley from South Dakota who was active in — it was then called the Sea to Sea Association — the Canada Canal Highway Association heard of the idea, contacted Mr. Udall from Boisevain and said let's get to work on this thing and see if we can get the International Peace Garden located in our area in the Turtle Mountains, astride the boundary of North Dakota and Manitoba. There were reasons, of course, for that because it was located within 35 miles of the geographic centre of North America and made sense from that point of view. The area, of course, is also very beautiful.

The gentlemen, who were involved at the time, were subsequently flown over the site in 1931 and agreed that was the place to locate it. It required an Act of the Manitoba Legislature, which I believe was passed in 1932, to set aside some 1,451 acres on the Manitoba side of the border. Mr. A. R. Welsh of Boissevain and Errick F. Willis, two of the former members of this Legislature were actively involved in seeing that Act was passed at the time. There were also were 888 acres set aside on the North Dakota side of the boundary.

The financing aspect of this is something that I find extremely interesting, Mr. Speaker, in looking back at the history of the establishment of the garden. One has to realize the times that existed when this garden was commenced. The way they went about it was to seek some donations from individual people who had the capacity to make a substantial and significant donation. But, they also appealed to all of the school children in North Dakota and in Manitoba to donate five cents towards the establishment of the International Peace Gardens. I guess in 1931-32 that perhaps was not that easy for a student to come up with five cents to donate toward the establishment of the Peace Gardens. But, that is how they went about raising some of their funds, Mr. Speaker, and I'm told that still today some of the people who donated those individual five cents as students in 1931-32 still donate to the garden today. They are still contributing to the financial support of the Peace Gardens.

So, it was established, Mr. Speaker, and the opening was held on July 14th, 1932. I find it very fascinating to examine the history of the events surrounding the opening of the Peace Gardens at that time. You must realize that this was perhaps while not in the depth of the Depression, it was very close to it in 1932.

The opening attracted somewhere between 50,000 and 75,000 people to come to the opening of that garden in 1932. Occasionally, one sees pictures crop up where the cars are stretched for miles down the road, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, not many months ago I was re-reading some letters that my uncle, who had served in the armed forces during the war, had written back home, and he was talking about a convoy of army vehicles moving on maneuvers through England and he described it in terms that he hadn't seen that many vehicles since the opening of the Peace Gardens in 1932. So, you can imagine the size of that gathering to get 50,000 to 75,000 people out in the midst of a wooded area, set in the prairies of North Dakota and Manitoba, in 1932. I guess part of the reason was because of the way they financed it; that so many people had contributed to the establishment of this garden.

In looking at one of the papers from the time — this happened to be the Turtle Mountain Star from Rolla, North Dakota — and to give you an idea of the difficulty of the times, other articles that appear on the same page as they report on the opening of the Peace Garden talk about state taxpayers plan more initiated acts. They talk, for instance, about "Six new initiated laws of the petitions soon to be circulated by the North Dakota Taxpayers Association are duly filed and accepted that the new measures will call for a reduction of 20 percent of state official salaries and salaries of state employees; reduction of salaries of district judges; reduction of salaries of judges of the Supreme Court; elimination of district tax supervisors; reduction of fees paid to newspapers and publication of legal notices, etc."

Another article on the same paper shows that there was a preliminary city tax levy was cut by 12 percent in Rolla, North Dakota because the people weren't able to sustain the tax burden that was being placed on them.

At the same time that this was happening we have this Peace Garden being opened and attracting 50,000 to 75,000 people from all over North America. They had interesting events, Mr. Speaker, at the time. They talk about six airplanes on the site doing a rushing business in giving rides. There was even a parachute drop and, of course, they had ball games. They had something like five bands from North Dakota and five bands from Manitoba. They had a male choir made up from various towns on the Canadian side, as well as from the towns on the U.S. side. The greetings that were sent to that opening, Mr. Speaker; there were more than 200 telegrams and letters of greeting and congratulations received on the grounds. Some of them were read from the platform. Greetings were read from President Hoover; from Lord Bessborough, the Governor-General of Canada; the Honourable R. B. Bennett, Canadian Premier; Hanford McNider, U.S. Ambassador to Canada; and so on through a list of dignitaries who had sent greetings to the opening. Of course, there was a long list of dignitaries who were there at the time.

They only began with a cairn at that time. That's all they did was establish a stone cairn with the plaque dedicating the garden. The development of it in the early years, Mr. Speaker, didn't proceed very rapidly, of course, because of the Depression and then sub-

sequently because of the Second World War. But, in a sense the Depression was responsible for some of the early development because the U.S. Conservation Corps, the CCC camps were being established at the time and one of those was established in the Peace Garden and was there for a number of years and established some of the early buildings; some of the log buildings, the lodge for instance, which is still there and one of the main buildings in the garden. They built some of the bridges and constructed some of the roads as well. That was largely the development that took place during the Depression and through to the end of the war years. Subsequent to that, of course, then further development commenced.

I'd like to mention some of the people who were involved and who were instrumental in the establishment of the Peace Garden. I've mentioned already Mr. Henry J. Moore who conceived of the idea of the garden. Whenever one talks about the history of it, of course, Henry J. Moore is the man who is spoken of. I mentioned Mr. Parmley from South Dakota; Mr. Udall from Boissevain, who were originally involved; and John Storeman, who was the original secretary and spent a great many years working to further the development of the garden and only passed away within the past year or so.

People from this Legislature have been very extensively involved in the development of the Peace Garden over the years. Some of the first were, as I mentioned, A. R. Welch from Boissevain; Errick F. Willis, who was a Vice-Premier of the province at one time and served in various cabinets and was subsequently the Lieutenant-Governor of the province and came from the area immediately to the north of the Peace Garden — Mr. Willis was extensively involved in the early years; Reg Lissiman, who represented Brandon for years, was also very actively involved with the Peace Garden and at one point donated his very extensive collection of carpentry tools to the garden, as well as donating a building to house them in; Ed Dow, who comes from Boissevain, still lives in Boissevain and represented the constituency of Turtle Mountain for a number of years, was also actively involved; and Earl McKellar, who was of course a long-time Member of the Legislature also was very extensively involved; more lately, our former colleague from Virden, Morris McGregor has recently become active and he's still active as an appointee of the Premier to serve on the Board of the Peace Garden. I know that Morris is doing an excellent job of representing the province's interest there and I hope that he'll be able to continue to do that.

Some of the superintendents who served the garden over the years were a Mr. Tinline for quite a few years. I remember working in the garden as a volunteer when I was about 15 years old when Mr. Tinline was the superintendent and working to help develop some of the early gardens there. Mr. McKenzie and more lately, Mr. Bert Howard, who was there for about 10 years — Mr. Howard still lives in Boissevain, that's very active. His son, Jack Howard, took over from him and stayed for a couple of years, and then the present superintendent, Dean Mortenson, took over.

Some of the people on the board: Oscar Solberg is the President. Oscar comes from Rolla, North Dakota; he's a Member of the House of Representatives of the

North Dakota Legislature. A Vice-President is Brinhill Hoglund from Minot, North Dakota; she also is a Member of the House of Representatives of North Dakota. Another Vice-President is Mr. Tom Wilkins from Killarney, and the Chairman of the Board is Don Hayes from Winnipeg. It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that there are two other members from the House of Representatives in North Dakota that are on the Board and are very active. One, is the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Jim Peterson and also Carolyn Hullman.

If I could speak for a few moments about the facilities, the present situation at the garden, Mr. Speaker. Time simply doesn't allow that I go into very much detail on it. There is a booklet that exists; it's available downstairs, for instance, in the information booth which talks about the various — I don't know what to call them exactly — the features of the Peace Garden that have been developed over the years in any case: the entrance gate, the floral clock, the carillon bell tower, the sunken gardens, the Peace Tower and Chapel, the amphitheatre, the lodge, the recently constructed Masonic Lodge, the Errick F. Willis Pavilion, and the aboretum. These are all facilities that have been developed over the years according to a plan as finances became available.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Manitoba has contributed significantly to the funding of the Peace Garden; presently gives \$50,000 a year to the operating funds and has contributed actually several hundred thousand dollars over the years to the establishment of an irrigation system in the Peace Garden. Just this last year the people of Manitoba; the Government of Manitoba made a donation of \$100,000, a capital grant coming from lottery funds to help the Peace Garden put facilities into place in commemoration of their 50th Anniversary.

Two other things, Mr. Speaker, about the Peace Garden at the moment; the International Music Camp, which is held in the Peace Garden, attracts approximately 2,200 young people on an annual basis and last year those 2,200 young people came from 17 different countries to that Music Camp at the Peace Garden. Every second year they select a band that tours North America and Europe as a goodwill gesture representing the Music Camp at the Peace Garden.

There also is an Athletic Camp there that is run by the Royal Canadian Legion, which has about 1,000 athletes every year that go through that camp. About 90 percent of them are Canadians and about 10 percent are Americans. It provides a tremendous opportunity for young people to learn of athletics, ranging from rhythmic gymnastics, to sailing, to football, to judo, to wilderness touring, to equestrian activities as well. It's a tremendous piece of work that the Legion has done in the development of that camp.

I might say it's also the facilities are leased for the entire winter by Winnipeg School Division and there are, I believe, some 50 students there every week during the winter taking advantage of the facilities that are there and being able to get outdoors for outdoor studies.

Mr. Speaker, the future of the garden, of course, depends on how much money they're able to raise from various sources and I know that they presently

are talking to the Tourism people here in the province about the possibility of getting some funds from Destination Manitoba, but they, of course, get funds from other areas as well; the North Dakota Government and indeed the Federal Government of the United States have been quite generous in their financial support of the garden over the years, as have private individuals and organizations and as the funds become available, the garden will continue in its development and will become even more of a showplace than it now is known to be.

Mr. Speaker, on the 17th of July this year, they will be celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the International Peace Garden and I would hope that as many members of the Legislature as possible would avail themselves of the opportunity to go down to those celebrations on the 17th of July and see the garden firsthand and help celebrate the 50th Anniversary. I don't think we're going to have the same sort of crowd as was there in 1932 but there's going to be a lot more there to see for the members who are able to go.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity of introducing this resolution.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. STORIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take this opportunity to heartily congratulate the Member for Turtle Mountain on this resolution. I think that it's a resolution that can be warmly supported by members on this side.

I personally have never attended a Legion Camp, the Athletic Camp that the member mentioned that occurs annually in the Peace Gardens but I have relatives and friends who, in the area where I grew up, attended on a regular basis. I have been through the Peace Gardens and I think we have to take this opportunity to recognize the International Peace Gardens on the occasion of its 50th Anniversary as an important symbol that exists between the United States of America and Canada. It is certainly a symbol of friendship that has existed since 1812, the occasion of our first and only war — (Interjection) — in '14 it was over; the first conflict was in 1812 — and as the motion indicates, it is the longest undefended boundary in the world. I think that is certainly something we can all be proud of as a nation and I'm sure Americans feel likewise. It's a record that we can be proud of.

I think, as well as a symbol of co-operation and friendship, it's a symbol for other countries in this oftentimes war-torn world that the possibility for peace exists between nations and that borders do not have to be manned by machine guns and barbed wire. Perhaps we can hold out some hope that other countries will recognize the symbol of the Peace Gardens and can take some steps in the future to find peaceful ways to settle the differences between their countries. No one can say that there haven't been differences between the United States and Canada; there certainly have been, but by and large, those differences have been settled peacefully and I believe with the interests of both countries at heart. Of course, there are still continuing problems but the mechanisms are in place to solve those problems.

So the Peace Gardens stands as an important sym-

bol that represents the co-operation, and as the Member for Turtle Mountain has mentioned, there are a good number of cultural and social activities that occur at the Peace Gardens every year which are an occasion to bring the people of the United States and Canada together. I'll just quote from an article here on the North Dakota history and I won't repeat a lot of the history of the Peace Gardens that the Member for Turtle Mountain has put on the record. I would only note that when the cairn was dedicated in 1932, one of the articles of incorporation for the International Peace Garden Incorporated stated that:

"The dedication of this cairn was in reference to the creation and maintenance of a garden, or gardens, approximately one-half of each which will be situated in the United States of America and the other approximate half of each which will be situated in the Dominion of Canada and contiguous thereto as a memorial to peace that has existed between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada.

"Its purpose, therefore, is to commemorate and perpetuate the longstanding friendship and the pleasant relationship between the peoples of Canada and the United States by the establishment, maintenance and development of a living garden of flowers, shrubs and trees on the longest unfortified border in the world."

I think the establishment of the Peace Gardens and the goal that it represents is something that everyone in this Chamber and everyone in this country recognizes, acknowledges and we can only pray that there is never need for us to break that trust that was dedicated in 1932.

The Peace Gardens is a site, as I've said, each year where thousands of young people in particular get together and I think the fact that young people have those occasions is particularly significant. As we know, the young people of today will be the leaders of tomorrow and if they can exercise, if they can meet in a spirit of co-operation, in a spirit of sportsmanship and in a situation of sharing of cultures, that bodes well for the future, that they will carry those feelings on with them when they return to their respective governments and when they return to their respective countries.

I would also share the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain's hope that when the official commemorative ceremony occurs on July 17th, that there will be as many people as were at the initial opening in 1932 when apparently 50,000 people from both countries met. It would be a joyous thing to see that many people there on this occasion to celebrate this event.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would only say that I personally and I believe that the present government supports the resolution and the principles and I hope that we can carry it through.

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

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to add a few comments to this very important historic resolution that we have before us this afternoon and express the support of veterans from all across Canada and especially the Royal Canadian Legion of this province and Northwestern Ontario who will be cele-

brating their 20th Anniversary of the Athletic Camp at the Peace Gardens this year as well. So very briefly, I do on behalf of veterans, their wives, their families and those who have gone on to their great reward with the most high, express their support for this very timely resolution as the Garden celebrates its 50th Anniversary.

Many of us in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, have been there on various occasions associated very closely with our American friends, enjoyed their hospitality and shake hands, the politicians, and it's always been a most rewarding experience for me to go there and enjoy the beauty and the lush greenery that we see in that place and see that border there unguarded where these two countries can get along so well.

So, very briefly, on behalf of the veterans — there are many in this Chamber and the Legion in this province, Northwestern Ontario, and veterans all across Canada — I'd like to associate those with this very important resolution and wish them every success for the future and I hope that the Legions' Athletic Camp will expand as much in the next decades and in the future as it has in the past. It's been a wonderful place for the Legion to spend some of their time and dollars to help develop the youth of this great province in Canada.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. LLOYD HYDE (Portage la Prairie):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I too wish to add my congratulations to the Member for Turtle Mountain in bringing forth this very important resolution, this being their 50th Anniversary of that wonderful site, the International Peace Garden, bordering the two nations. During the past 50 years, Mr. Speaker, it has grown immensely as I understand and I want to say how interesting it was to me to hear the honourable member bringing forward to many of us in this House, I'm sure, the early history of the International Peace Garden. I have had the occasion to gather there on more than one occasion and each time have enjoyed myself, but I'm sure the next time I have the opportunity to be present at the Peace Garden I will enjoy it that much more for realizing and knowing the early history that has been brought forth to this Assembly this afternoon.

First, before I proceed to speak on behalf of the Masonic Order of Manitoba and our neighbouring Masons of North Dakota, I want to congratulate and recognize the importance of the Legion Athletic Camp that the Member for Roblin-Russell spoke of. I know that my own Legion in Portage la Prairie do take an active part in sponsorship towards that camp and I certainly want to make it known to the House this afternoon that the Legionnaires of Canada have my full-hearted support in their movement on that program.

Of course, we are aware of the fact of the music camp that has been mentioned earlier. I know that there is a Portage man who is involved in that particular group interested in the music camp and he has given me some interesting facts of that part of the camp activities. The music camp became famous for its instruction sessions in every form of music, art, drama, ballet and modern dance, creative writing,

speech and debate, piping and drumming, twirling and drum majoring and cheerleading.

Mr. Speaker, any organization or organizations that gather in support of the growth of our young people of our country, we should be very very appreciative of what they're doing for the youth of our country. I understand in 1981 a record enrolment of 2,257 students from 17 nations took part in the programs. A staff of 125 teachers and internationally-noted conductors provided the instruction for the music camp in 1981. Mr. Speaker, I've mentioned now the Legion Athletic Clubs and the Music Camp, I would just like to make a few notations to the House in regard to the Masons of North Dakota and Manitoba, their work towards the betterment of the facilities that are now in place in the International Peace Garden.

Many times in former years, Mr. Speaker, the scheduled concerts that had to be cancelled by the inclement weather that turns up once in a while and when they found that the need for an auditorium was very evident, the Masons of North Dakota seeing the need launched a campaign to raise the necessary funds. As the project was too large for that body, the Masons of Manitoba were persuaded to join forces and combine strengths and both Grand Lodges proceeded to raise over \$750,000 without government support. The building was constructed in the form of a square, encompassed with the well-known symbols of Freemasonry, which has proven since to be a very wise choice because of the acoustic qualities of that designed building. Besides having space and chairs to seat 2,000 people, the 34,770 square foot building is equipped with a large stage and, of course, the necessary curtains and an organ was provided. On the south side of that particular building, eight large doors can be opened to permit the overflowing crowds to be seated on the grassed inclines adjoining that structure. On June 27, 1981, the building was dedicated and donated free and clear of all encumbrance to the International Peace Garden authority.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to stand here this afternoon in this Assembly and to be able to remark of the tremendous work that the Masonic Order has done towards the continuation and growing of the International Peace Garden bordering our two nations. I would urge those of us sitting here in this Assembly this afternoon, those of us who have not had the privilege to visit that part, I would urge them to make every effort to make that move this summer on July 17th when the anniversary of this opening will take place.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it's been a pleasure for me to be able to speak on this resolution at this time.

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

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with great pleasure to get up and participate in this debate and join with my friends opposite, as well as my own members on this side of the House, in supporting this resolution with respect to the International Peace Garden, the recognition and congratulations that are being extended to the people who have worked on the International Peace Garden concept. Indeed, I can recall from my limited experience the many many

groups and the virtual, that's not dozens, but hundreds of organizations, who have over the years participated in enhancing that facility by virtue of performing either music or providing some other kind of entertainment. There have been groups involved, not only on the entertainment side and on the side of the arts, but groups who have as other members have pointed out contributed of their time, energy and raised money to put facilities into place.

I think there's a long way to go yet in the development of the Peace Garden. Certainly, we've made great strides in the past 10 or 15 years in the way of improving infrastructure, water facilities and the like, but there are many many improvements I think that could still take place in the years ahead and I, indeed, trust that from time to time the Provincial Government will see fit to assist as it can in this process of gradual, but steady improvement of this centre. It is, indeed, a unique facility enabling two great countries to demonstrate to the world the friendship and the esteem that they hold for one another, two great peoples being able to come together in this way to celebrate peace, to celebrate friendship. It, indeed, is done on a regular basis and has been, of course, for many years — by "regular," I mean there is simply one group after another using the facility.

I do have a couple of regrets, well, one major regret; that is, it seems to me that the people of Manitoba have not been as aware of that facility as the people of North Dakota have. The State of North Dakota has seen fit to put Peace Garden State on the licence plates. I think that's an indication in itself of the importance with which the Government of North Dakota holds this facility, the importance that they place on this particular facility.

Also, I've had meetings, I've been at the Peace Garden at official meetings representing the government in the past. I've met with the Board of Governors years gone by and I know there's a great deal of dedication and interest. I sometimes feel that there is perhaps a bit more commitment on the North Dakota side than I see on the Manitoba side. That's to be regretted, but perhaps in the years ahead, this can be corrected. I'm not suggesting for one moment there haven't been many good, fine Manitoba groups who have participated as the Member for Roblin has pointed out and the Member for Portage. Many people have used the facility; many people have been engaged in building up the facility and certainly there has been fine contribution and I'm not criticizing. I'm just wishing we could be a little more collectively as Manitobans, a little more interested in the facility than perhaps we have been.

I've been there on a number of occasions, not as many as I'd like, but I must not forget the one occasion back a few years ago in 1976. I'm not sure whether other members made reference to it. I didn't hear all of the Honourable Member for Roblin's remarks, but perhaps he was there on that occasion. 1976 was the year of the American bicentennial. The American people were celebrating 200 years of independence as a nation and we had a very fine party, if you will, a very fine meeting and evening with the State Legislature of North Dakota. The entire Legislature from the Province of Manitoba — I think most of us were there — at least all were invited and the entire Legislature of

the State of North Dakota was certainly invited. They were there in full force and we, indeed, had a very fine time.

We exchanged information, ideas. — (Interjection) — Right, hands across the border in action; so, it was a very fine time. I'll never forget, I guess, one particular bit of entertainment that we had, thanks to the persuasive efforts of our former Lieutenant-Governor Jobin, in finding a violin for Governor Link on that occasion. Governor Link is quite a fine violinist or fiddle player, as some people would say, and unfortunately nobody knew I could play the accordion. At least, no one could find an accordion. So Governor Link — (Interjection) — some people knew that there was one there, but they didn't want to let anyone know. The accordion and the violin go very nicely together, I might add, and I say that from a lot of experience. Nevertheless, we were treated to several selections on the violin by Governor Link and we had a singsong I believe. Anyway, we had a very good time and that was a very very significant occasion and demonstrating, incidentally, one of the uses that can be made of that facility. I would hope that in the future at some appropriate time the Manitoba Legislature could go to the Peace Garden for a similar type of event, that is, a sociable event with the State Legislature of North Dakota on some appropriate occasion.

Regardless, Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by stating that we on this side wholeheartedly endorse the resolution put forward by the Member for Turtle Mountain. We do extend the congratulations and best wishes to all the people who have worked to expand the International Peace Garden and certainly we would like to see the resolution engrossed by the Clerk of the Assembly and forwarded to the President of the International Peace Garden. Thank you.

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

**MR. GRAHAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I listened with interest to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Brandon East and I'm sure those members that have been in this Chamber and were here in '76 recall very well the visit that was made to the International Peace Garden.

Mr. Speaker, we also recall a visit that was paid to this Assembly by Mr. Oscar Skoberg and I believe, if memory serves me correctly, he had the privilege of addressing this Assembly on the occasion of that visit. At that time the plans were being made for the expansion of the International Peace Garden and they were here seeking the support and the co-ordination of the Government of the Province of Manitoba. I think it's an excellent example of how states and provinces operating in a federal system can co-operate without the services of the Department of External Affairs. The Province of Manitoba was able to deal directly with the State of North Dakota and in a very amiable and cordial manner for the common good of both countries; progress was made and the plans for the expansion of the Peace Garden went forward. At that particular time the former Member for Souris-Lansdowne, I believe it was called at that time, was a very ardent supporter and I believe a member of the board and Mr. McKellar was well known for the work that he put in to forward the cause of the Interna-

tional Peace Gardens.

Mr. Speaker, it causes me a little bit of concern today. I believe it was just last weekend I heard reports of rallies and 30,000 people, I believe, meeting in the City of Vancouver; people who were very well intentioned, planning to protest the nuclear arms and things of that nature; people who are very concerned, I presume, with peace in this world. Here is an opportunity for people of that nature to make a valuable, personal contribution towards a living symbol of peace that exists between the nation of the United States and our nation of Canada. But, maybe it isn't quite so glamorous as marching in parades and waving flags and things of that nature. But, I think that there is a large element in society today that is concerned and would like to see peace and goodwill exemplified throughout the world. I appeal to those people now to join with the people in Manitoba and the people in North Dakota in making the International Peace Garden a living symbol of the goodwill that exists between these two nations and the symbol of the goodwill that can exist between other nations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity of taking part in this debate.

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

**MR. SCOTT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to give thanks. First, to preface my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give thanks to the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain for bringing forward this resolution. I think it is received wholeheartedly and given full support on both sides of the House. It's a symbol of rare unity in this House, one might add I suppose, but it's a symbol of the unity of the House can have.

With the Peace Gardens we are celebrating the 50th anniversary, but really we are celebrating not just 50 years but 168 years of peace between two of the greatest countries in the world. We have that record of peace across an undefended border, a border that is defended not by arms but a border that is defended with flowers, arboretums and wildlife; that is, trees and birds and what not in the area, where a person can come and feel the tranquility, feel the peace, instead of having armed guards, armed borders, tanks, barbed wire and whatever else that is so common in other countries.

We have seen the perpetuation of this in the efforts toward the enhancement of the Peace Gardens by men who had fought in wars, who have seen a fellow man die, who have seen their buddies killed beside them; the men of the Royal Canadian Legion and the men of the Legions in the United States of America in joining to promote peace instead of combat, can give an example not just to ourselves but to mankind the world over.

The Peace Gardens themselves are a tribute to the early settlers of Manitoba; to the foresight that men had at that point in time; to the foresight that people had in very tough times and as the Member for Turtle Mountain indicated, during the Depression it was not the best of times, and for the school children to give five cents toward building the Peace Gardens at that time, towards the construction costs of it, is probably more significant to a good many of those children who contributed than \$5 would be today because in a

good many homes in 1932 there was hardly a nickel to be found, let alone to be given towards a symbolic Peace Garden, which has proven to be far more than just symbolic.

Mr. Speaker, as I finish my remarks, in the last couple of minutes I would like to join the Member for Virden and his references towards disarmament as well. It is perhaps a sad thing that two countries, who have such a long record of peace between them, have also a record of very high armament sales to other countries and aids and in many cases, I would suggest, abets disruption in other parts of the world, assists in France, certainly, and in all nations who export arms, be they in North America, be they European nations, or be they Asiatic nations, the nations world over, that those who may preach peace within but prosper somewhat in some cases an awful large degree through the transmission and the sale of armaments which are sold for one purpose, and that is for killing.

We have demonstrated here in our countries of what peace can be and what flowers can do versus arms. I would suggest that as other countries come to accept their borders as being borders, that they accept their national wills as being national wills and that they respect the interests of those countries, that we will have far less conflict in the world and be able to move towards a world harmony similar to the harmony that we have between the United States of America and Canada.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MRS. GERRIE HAMMOND (Kirkfield Park):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am extremely pleased to support this resolution to honour the International Peace Gardens on the occasion of its 50th Anniversary. Part of the resolution states: "AND WHEREAS the International Peace Garden has become an important centre for cultural and athletic activities for young people."

I would like to say a few words about the International Music Camp. Of the over 800 Canadian students who took part in the music camp, close to 600 are from Manitoba and for the past 11 years, as was stated by the Member for Turtle Mountain, the Music Camp has sponsored an 80-piece symphonic band, newly formed each year, which has made a goodwill European tour. Out of the 86 students who were chosen by audition to make the tour, close to half are from Manitoba. We have students from Winnipeg, Carman, Somerset, Neepawa, Foxwarren, Birch River, Thompson, who are included in this band and it's an extremely important honour for these students to take part in this particular band concert and band tour. I'm happy to be able to say that two of the students are part of my Constituency of Kirkfield Park, Barbara MacIntosh who plays the French horn and Valerie Peters who plays the flute.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Arts Council gave a grant to the Prairie Winds Woodwind Quintet from the Winnipeg Symphony and they were artists in residence for two weeks during the Music Camp season and the members of the quintet presented recitals, coached small ensembles and taught private les-

sons and this is another example of, I think, hands across the border.

In St. James-Assiniboia, our school division has a music program second to none and they give bursaries to two students from each high school and junior high in each of the disciplines, choral and band, to go to the Peace Gardens in the Music Camp and it's based on skill and need. And I can only say from a personal standpoint where I did have children in my own family attend that it was a wonderful experience, both the Music and Athletic Camp, and I would like to very much congratulate the Member for Turtle Mountain for proposing this wonderful resolution.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 5:30 p.m., when we next reach this resolution the honourable member will have 17 minutes remaining.

The Acting Government House Leader.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I think the procedure has been, Mr. Speaker, that we adjourn the House with the understanding that Committee will continue tonight at 8 o'clock. I move that the House be now adjourned, seconded by the Member of Community Services.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. (Friday)