



Second Session — Thirty-Third Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)

36 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Myrna A. Phillips
Speaker*



VOL. XXXV No. 73 - 10:00 a.m., FRIDAY, 19 JUNE, 1987.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Third Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BAKER, Clarence	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
BIRT, Charles T.	Fort Garry	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	LIBERAL
CONNERY, Edward J.	Portage la Prairie	PC
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
CUMMINGS, J. Glen	Ste. Rose	PC
DERKACH, Len	Roblin-Russell	PC
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DOER, Hon. Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOLIN, Marty	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry	Riel	PC
ENNS, Harry J.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen M.	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Hon. Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARAPIAK, Hon. Leonard E.	Swan River	NDP
HARPER, Hon. Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McCRAE, James C.	Brandon West	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.M.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte L.	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald W.	Pembina	PC
PANKRATZ, Helmut	La Verendrye	PC
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Hon. Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
ROCAN, C. Denis	Turtle Mountain	PC
ROCH, Gilles (Gil)	Springfield	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Q.C., Hon. Victor	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SMITH, Harvey	Ellice	NDP
SMITH, Hon. Murie!	Osborne	NDP
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Hon. Judy	St. Johns	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 19 June, 1987.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your Committee met on Thursday, June 11, 1987 in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider Bills referred.

Your Committee heard representations on Bills as follows:

No. 4 - The Re-enacted Statutes of Manitoba, 1987 Act

Mr. Alan McInness, Manitoba Catholic School Trustee Association

Ms. Linda Simpson, Sooter Studios

Mr. Ed. Lepieszko, Private Citizen

Bill No. 21 - The Family Law Amendment Act

Mr. Norman Rosenbaum, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties

No. 27 - The Real Property Act and Various Other Acts Amendment Act

Mr. Frank Cvitkovitch, Legal Counsel for the Mortgage Loans Association of Manitoba

No. 34 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act

Mr. Frank Cvitkovitch, Legal Counsel for the Mortgage Loans Association of Manitoba.

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 10 - An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act;

Bill No. 27 - The Real Property Act and Various Other Acts Amendment Act;

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your Committee also considered:

Bill No. 4 - The Re-enacted Statutes of Manitoba, 1987 Act;

Bill No. 5 - An Act to repeat Certain Statutes relating to Education and Other Matters;

Bill No. 19 - An Act to amend The Limitation of Actions Act and The Highway Traffic Act and to repeal The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act;

Bill No. 20 - The Crime Prevention Foundation Act;

Bill No. 21 - The Family Law Amendment Act;

Bill No. 33 - An Act to amend The Registry Act;

Bill No. 34 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act;

Bill No. 63 - An Act to repeal Certain Statutes relating to Hospitals, Hospital Districts and Nursing Unit Districts and other matters;

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Thompson, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I wish to table the Report of the Special Audit of the Reinsurance Operations of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Madam Speaker, I would like to table the response from the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation to the recommendations found in the Provincial Auditor's Report.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Archives.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Madam Speaker, I would like to table my response, as Minister responsible for the Archives, to the Auditor's Report.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have 20 students from Grade 6 from the North Memorial School under the direction of Mr. Ron Miechkota. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to the Legislature this morning.

Also, before moving to Oral Questions, I have a brief statement.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

MADAM SPEAKER: As members know, a Legislative Internship Program has been in operation in this Legislative Assembly since 1985. Each year six interns are selected, three to work for the government caucus

and three for the Opposition caucus. The term of employment in the past has been 10 months but has now been increased to 12 months. During their term interns perform a variety of research and other tasks for private members, as distinct from Ministers; participate in a series of academic seminars on the political process in Manitoba; and prepare an in-depth research paper on some aspect of the legislative process.

Successful applicants for the program are chosen on the basis of their academic achievement and potential, personal qualities, such as, maturity, responsibility, judgment, tact and discretion, and a demonstrated interest in the legislative process.

I would like to take this opportunity to express to the 1986-87 interns, most of whom will soon complete their assignments on behalf of the many members whom they assisted, the sincere thanks of this Legislative Assembly and best wishes for their future endeavours.

My main purpose today is to announce that six young people have been selected to serve as Manitoba's 1987-88 Legislative Interns and that they will begin their assignments in September. Working with the government caucus will be Ms. Lesley McKenzie from the University of Winnipeg; Miss. Gabriela Sparling from the University of Winnipeg; and Mr. Paul Vincent from the Universities of Manitoba and Winnipeg. Working with the caucus of the Official Opposition will be Mr. Darryl Balasko from the University of Manitoba; Mr. Real Cloutier from the Universities of Manitoba and Winnipeg; and Ms. Kathy Parker from the University of Manitoba.

Brief biographies of the newly appointed interns and an information sheet on the program are attached to my statement, copies of which will be distributed to all members. I know that you will join me in welcoming the new interns when they take up their appointments.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Workers Compensation Board - deficit reduction plan - tabling of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board.

Yesterday in committee the Minister agreed to table the computer-produced financial analysis of the rate increases that would be required to eliminate the accumulated deficit, as he phrased it, of \$84 million or \$184 million, whichever it is, over a ten-year period, the plan, produced by the computer, to reduce that deficit down to zero over a 10-year period. Will he table that plan today, please?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Workers Compensation.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, yes, I did agree to table that information at the next committee sitting.

Wm. Mercier Actuaries Report - tabling of

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Madam Speaker, it would be very helpful if we could have time to study that plan prior to the next committee meeting and I see no reason why he shouldn't do that or want us to have that information to prepare for the committee.

Madam Speaker, further to that, he agreed to table the report that was done by William Mercer Actuaries in 1984 that confirmed the financial obligations and projections of the Workers Compensation Board at that time. Would he table that as well today so that we can have proper information to prepare for the next committee meeting?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I do not have that with me at this time, but I will be giving it to members of the Opposition in plenty of time so they can prepare for the next committee meeting.

Workers Compensation Board - stop political and union interference

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my further question is for the Premier.

Yesterday the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board gave committee the absolute assurance that neither he, nor his predecessor, ever intervened with the Workers Compensation Board on behalf of the case of any injured worker.

He said, as well - and repeated it three times - that the Ministerial Liaison Officer, Mr. Ken Carrol never, repeat, never attended meetings of the Workers Compensation Board.

Madam Speaker, both answers proved to be false because I have a copy of a letter sent by the Minister to the Vice-President of CAIMAW indicating that he would ask his liaison officer to attend the forthcoming meeting of the Board of Commissioners to deal with a particular item.

Madam Speaker, given that, will the Premier now recognize the serious problems that the Workers Compensation Board is in, with political interference, with interference by unions, on behalf of individual claimants, will he now recognize that and intervene to stop the political and union interference, and to make that board arm's length, working on behalf of injured workers, as it used to be before.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, very clearly the Leader of the Opposition did have a letter which said that the Minister would ask his liaison officer to attend a meeting. I guess they were faced with a particular problem at that time, it was very grave and, in his enthusiasm to resolve the problem, he responded very quickly and said the liaison officer would attend the meeting.

He did not attend the meeting; he never has attended a meeting, and there is no political interference. What we are witnessing here is a desperate leader looking for an issue to pick up his profile.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Minister is lying through his teeth. Sonny Arrojado told you that he was there, didn't she? Now you're lying.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the Minister is reading from old material that's been prepared for him. He's forgotten to cull his files and get some of that old material out.

Madam Speaker, after I revealed that yesterday, the Minister turned to the Chairperson of the Workers Compensation Board who quietly said to him - and I was close enough to hear, "Well, he did attend sometime."

Madam Speaker, I don't want to accuse this Minister of lying because I know it's unparliamentary to do so, but will he come clean and acknowledge that not only his predecessor, but indeed Ministers of this Government, responsible for Workers Compensation Board, through the liaison officer and through their union connections, are interfering with the work of the board and that's what's causing the problems we've got, and that's why we've got a \$184 million deficit.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition didn't want to accuse me of lying, and I don't want to accuse him of lying, but he's got bad hearing.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, the Chairman of the Workers Compensation told me very clearly that Ken Carrol has never attended a board meeting.

Board of Commissioners meeting - did liaison officer attend

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, given that, in writing, the previous Minister responsible for WCB assured the vice-president of CAIMAW that his liaison officer would attend the next meeting of the Board of Commissioners, did that liaison officer disobey the Minister? Did he refuse to do it, or why did he not attend the meeting?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, the meeting did not take place.

Bill No. 61 - will Minister withdraw

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour.

Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that combined with first contract legislation, the final offer selection legislation of this Minister . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West has the floor.

MR. J. McCRAE: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

In view of the fact that first contract legislation, combined with final offer selection, in fact, will amount to total state control over labour relations in this

province; and in view of the fact that is a very negative signal to send to potential investors in our province, will the Minister now reconsider his stand on this issue and withdraw Bill 61 before it wastes anymore time in this House?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I won't question the member's right to make silly and non-sensical questions because that he can do, but in the past we've heard the same kind of representation to every legislative initiative that we have taken, and I'm not surprised at the continuing negativism of the honourable member's question. But the fact is that a growing number of people in Canada recognize that governments have an obligation to seek ways, innovative ways, to provide a labour relations environment that is one of greater harmony, and to be experimental and to innovate where as necessary, and we have done that with success in the past and we believe that this legislation is good legislation and will lead to more harmony in the workplace.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, the Minister refers to harmony in the workplace and has often spoken of the fact that he claims there are few labour work stoppages due to strikes in this province; that is also true in the Soviet Union, there are very few work stoppages there.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, this Minister and this government have destabilized labour relations in this province enough already. We now have the CLC attempting to strong-arm the Winnipeg Labour Council, attempting to silence opposition to the final offer selection bill of this government.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. J. McCRAE: Will the Minister take into account the fact that he is tearing the labour union movement apart in this province, and do the right thing and withdraw this bill? If he will not do that, will he resign?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Madam Speaker, I hear again the very nonsensical type of question, he refers to the Soviet Union. One of the first organizations that was destroyed by the Nazis was the trade union movement in Germany because it was progressive, and because it defended the rights of the common people.

Madam Speaker, the honourable member can use whatever questions he wants to try to undermine our very deliberate effort to produce an environment in which there is greater harmony in the workplace. I know that there are doubts and concerns whenever a government innovates, but we believe that the legislation which we passed in previous Sessions has confirmed the direction this government has taken to provide a fairer place, a fairer set of circumstances for

workers and management to operate; we believe that's working.

We have grave misgivings about the fact that today, nationally, we have work stoppages, and we still have problems in Manitoba as well. Our government is determined to provide greater fairness in the workplace, and we're not afraid to innovate because that, we think, is in the public interest.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Amalgamation of MHSC and Dept. of Health - supplementary funds

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health.

Madam Speaker, yesterday the Minister was questioned about the process of amalgamating the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Department of Health. Treasury Board is in the process of considering a proposal by the Minister for that amalgamation. In questioning the Minister of Finance, in his Estimates yesterday, the Minister of Finance was unable to indicate, as chairman of Treasury Board, whether the amalgamation process required additional funds.

Can the Minister of Health indicate whether this amalgamation of the Manitoba Health Services Commission with the Department of Health will require supplementary funding and additional funds to be provided to the department?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, this is quite unusual to discuss something with the members of the Opposition that hasn't been discussed in Treasury yet, but in a spirit of cooperation, to help them out, to equalize things a bit, I'd like to give that information.

Yesterday, first of all, you were talking about a report from Decter that had nothing to do with that at all. It was talking about should you keep the Commission or shouldn't you keep the Commission.

One of the reasons that we have things go to the Treasury Board is exactly to find out what the cost will be, what the implications will be. As far as I'm concerned, we're not talking about news -(Interjection)- That's not the reason?

MR. D. ORCHARD: You should know that before you go there, it's your department that's doing it.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, what makes you think I don't know? I like to keep you in suspense. I like to hear you yap.

But, Madam Speaker, the point is still correct, that's why you go to the Treasury Board, to find out what the implication is, and Treasury Board is looking at that; there's no decision made.

Now to help my honourable friend, I want to say that we're not talking about any extra staff. We haven't

asked for any staff at all. I would think that all in all it will be working much better. Of course, I'm behind the recommendation that I made and we're not talking about staff. It's amalgamating, if anything, it could be a savings, but I've learned in the many years that I've been there, when you talk about savings they don't always happen. But at least I say that no, if it is, it'll be next to nothing, but I think it probably will be a bit of savings, but it'll improve things. It will coordinate things and not go through duplication in the same department, that's one of the reasons why we're doing that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, I think the Minister indicated there was no additional request for monies in that answer, and, of course, we'll await the Treasury Board decision and the announcement by the Minister to see whether that in fact is a correct answer the Minister's given this morning.

Closure of beds - permanent closure to reduce deficit

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, another question to the Minister.

Has the Minister and the Health Services Commission received plans for deficit reduction by the Winnipeg hospitals, including plans by many of them to permanently close beds? Have those plans been received by the Minister of Health and the Health Services Commission?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The first observation, Madam Speaker, for once, my honourable friend thinks right. Yes, I did say that I didn't think it would cost any more money.

Now he's so anxious to find out about that second question. They ask the same question three or four times a week and I enjoy speaking, because I think we have to educate these people to start with, and the public to what we're doing. The better they understand what we're doing, the easier it will be. It won't be easy, but the easier it will be to bring in those necessary reforms.-(Interjection)- Yes, yes, my dear friend. We are not going to keep on with the habit or custom of allowing deficits in the hospitals. In fact, I think that what's finally made us realize that is all of you saying you shouldn't have any deficit, and so on. You know, "you can't manage a peanut stand," so we try to rectify that to change and to be good -(Interjection)- No, this is getting better, Madam Speaker. The situation is . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: May I remind the Honourable Minister that answers to questions should be as brief as possible.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, Madam Speaker, when they ask me the same question, day after day after day, I'm trying and trying, in the spirit of cooperation to make sure they understand. Sometimes, with these people, it takes a hell - I mean it takes a long time. All right.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The answers to questions should still be brief.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, the arrogance of the government to clap and laugh at an issue of bed cutbacks and cutbacks in the hospitals by the NDP is absolutely disgraceful!

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, my question was very direct to this Minister of Health and he consistently refuses to answer, which is his right.

My question was: Have plans been received by himself and the Health Services Commission from hospitals . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: That question has . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . involving bed cutbacks and he refuses to answer that and laughs at bed cutbacks . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The question is repetitious.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I've answered that repeatedly.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.
The question is out of order, it's repetitious.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Would you care to rephrase that question?

Knox Day Care Centre - insurance day care dollars spent on day care

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services.

The other night, Madam Speaker, before City Council, the Knox Day Care Centre asked for a grant of \$3,000 in order to be able to provide a washer and dryer for the day care centre, and in the documentation that was presented, under a heading called, "Administrative Costs," it became obvious that 46 percent of those administrative costs were being returned to the Provincial Government through the payroll tax, \$4,100 out of \$9,000.00.

Madam Speaker, will the Minister tell the House today what action she is taking to make sure that day care dollars are, in fact, spent on child care and are not returned to the Minister of Finance to do with as he pleases?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, the revenue sources of day cares come partly from government grants, partly from parent fees, and partly from subsidies to parents based on the need, so that the total revenue of a day

care is the figure that any increased amount due to a government tax should be weighed against.

I'd like to draw the attention of the member opposite to the salary enhancement grants that have been given by the government and a variety of other grants, so again, I think the question as put is quite misleading.

Day care centres - number to benefit from 625 spaces

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Madam Speaker, with a supplementary question to the same Minister.

Will the Minister table in the House the list of day care centres who will benefit from the 625 spaces that the Minister announced some weeks ago?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I'm happy to make that information available.

Day care centres - removal of payroll tax

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Madam Speaker, a final question to the Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Finance, last evening, was critical of some of the tax changes which were introduced in that he said there was still great inequity among the distribution of income and I agree with many of those comments.

When will this Minister, therefore, announce in this House the removal of the payroll tax from day care centres, hospitals and educational institutions, which would also distribute income more fairly in this province?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

What the member fails to recognize is that, overall, Manitoba has a fair and balanced tax system that raises revenues in order to provide essential services in our province.

The fact that we have the best day care system in the country, Madam Speaker, the best funded, the best system - not the perfect system - but the best system amongst all the provinces is an indication of the overall balanced policy that this government has with respect to the raising of revenues on one hand and the use of those revenues on behalf of taxpayers in Manitoba to provide needed services to Manitobans.

Postal strike - measures to be taken to prevent violence

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the Attorney-General.

Madam Speaker, I believe all Manitobans and all Canadians are appalled at the level of violence that is

taking place across Canada with respect to the postal strike. I would ask the Attorney-General if he can tell this House what action he is taking to avoid such violence when the series of rotating strikes hit Winnipeg?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Madam Speaker, it's clear to me, as I think it is to most fair-minded Canadians, that there would be no violence at all if the Canadian Post Office wasn't attempting to shepherd strikebreakers through the picket lines. It's regrettable, of course, that there is any violence at all.

One can understand that when peoples' jobs are being threatened and there is someone there taking advantage of a lawful strike to attempt to take their jobs, that they become angry. This is no excuse; it's no defence in law; one must understand the context.

One would hope that the Canadian Post Office, or those responsible for it - particularly the Minister, Hon. Harvie Andre - would do much more than has been done to create a climate for settling. The insistence by the Canadian Post Office on retrograde steps, asking the Canadian postal workers to make backward steps, is perpetuating this unfortunate strike and costing all Canadians.

With respect to law enforcement, law enforcement is something that, in the first instance, is the responsibility of police forces having the jurisdiction. I have no doubt that if in fact there is a picketing that takes place in Manitoba, whether it's at SuperValu or should it happen at the Canadian Post Office, that the affected police department, in this case the Winnipeg Police Department, will be supervising and I hope that they're able to maintain law and order, of course.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I suppose I should have expected that the Attorney-General would not have recognized if the Canadian economy in small business requires the mail to be delivered on a regular basis.

Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the Attorney-General does have a law enforcement department under him, and he meets regularly with the RCMP and the Chief of the City of Winnipeg Police, as he's told the House before, would he meet with them and request that there are sufficient police personnel available to avoid the violence that is taking place in other jurisdictions in this country?

HON. R. PENNER: The Member for St. Norbert is doing a disservice, it seems to me, to the cause of industrial peace by anticipating something in the nature of violence which has not occurred in this jurisdiction, and I don't expect that it will. I meet regularly with the police forces, both the RCMP and the Winnipeg Police Department, and, in fact, have scheduled meetings with them. Should there be any occasion to review that particular situation, it will be on the agenda.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I don't think it's unreasonable to anticipate some violence taking place when it's taking place in every other jurisdiction across the country so far as the rotating strikes have occurred across the country.

Madam Speaker, I would ask him if he would meet with his Minister of Labour, in view of Mr. Christophe's

comments that he did not rule out picketers carrying bats or other weapons to fend off people. I want to be completely fair about it. There should be no violence either from the labour side or from the management side relative to strikes.

But would he request the Minister of Labour to consult with Mr. Christophe about this statement, because that is only going to encourage more violence on the picket line?

HON. R. PENNER: Firstly, I'm unaware of that statement by Mr. Christophe. Secondly, Mr. Christophe's union is not the affected union in this strike and, therefore, it has no relevance to the conduct of that strike by the Canadian Postal Workers' Union or the Letter Carriers' Union. So I place no stock on it.

The Honourable Minister of Labour and I meet three to four times a day. Seventy-five percent of those occasions are very productive. I have no doubt that should the occasion arise, we'll meet. Do you want to see me at about 12:30, Al? -(Interjection)- Okay.

MR. G. MERCIER: It is absolutely incredible, Madam Speaker, that the Attorney-General would attempt to make this a laughing matter.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. MERCIER: Violence is occurring across this country and a union leader in Manitoba is suggesting . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I'm having problems with this whole line of questioning in terms of both jurisdictional and hypothetical, and I would hope that both parties . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

So far the questions have been just inside the area of being within the Minister's jurisdiction. However, he can choose to answer it in any manner he cares to.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert with a question.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Labour then if the Attorney-General doesn't want to treat this matter seriously, Madam Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: Madam Speaker, I ask that that statement be withdrawn. I treat the matter very, very seriously. There has been no violence in Winnipeg; I don't expect that there will be violence in Winnipeg.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. R. PENNER: There can be violence . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Would the Honourable Attorney-General please come to order. A dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert with a question.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The record will show that the Attorney-General did not take the question seriously.

Madam Speaker, my question to the Minister of Labour is: In view of the statements of Mr. Christophe that he will not rule out picketers carrying bats or other weapons, would he convene a meeting of both union and management officials in order that some steps can be taken or the parties can be encouraged to avoid any violence on the picket line?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I think that the people of Manitoba expect this government to show leadership in trying to encourage a harmonious labour relations environment. We're doing that. When the parties call for assistance from the Department of Labour, we offer that. There has been a member of my staff in the Labour Department available to the parties. We have continued to assist where required and any way in which we can help. We have indicated we'll do that. If that involves further meetings with the conciliator, with parties, certainly that is appropriate and we want to do that.

We do not condone violence anywhere and I think it's indicative of our concern that there ought to be other ways to resolve disputes rather than the confrontation that strikes and lockouts engender, that we are launching the initiative called final offer selection.

It won't prevent strikes. It won't prevent lockouts, but I think the people of Manitoba, the people of Canada, want governments to be looking at innovative ways to provide greater labour relations harmony.

AIDS - protection to health care workers

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'd like to thank the Minister of Health for the information he provided for us last week on guidelines for Aids Prevention and Management in institutions and in the community. But I have some very serious concerns about some of the articles contained in the guidelines.

My first question to the Minister of Health is: It states under the Correction and Detention Facilities, and I quote: "Persons who work and reside in correction/detention facilities have a right to be protected from acquiring an AIDS virus infection in that facility." My question, Madam Speaker, is: When will the Minister afford the same protection to those working in the health care institutions?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, my understanding is that we have, that a set of regulations and guidelines were given and if that is not finalized, they have been directed to work with the hospitals to have a minimum of guidelines to protect the people working in those facilities.

AIDS - surgery schedule for those who have symptoms

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question to the same Minister.

It states also in the guidelines, under "Surgical Procedures," that "if possible, surgical procedures on infected or high-risk patients should be scheduled at the end of the day to allow for sterilization overnight."

My question to the Minister is: How can the hospitals properly schedule for surgery those infected with the AIDS antibody which have no symptoms, if they are not tested and diagnosed?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Obviously, my honourable friend is back at the policy that she'd like to see and that we are not buying, that there will be compulsory testing on everybody in Manitoba. We don't intend to do that.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Madam Speaker, the Minister is obviously not terribly concerned about those working in the health care institutions with that type of . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: My final supplementary to the Minister, Madam Speaker, is: In the Summary of Changes in the HIB Testing Protocol and Physicians' Information package it says that for the methods of recording those that are antibody positive it is quite different from those that are asymptomatic or those that have no symptoms. The method of recording on patients' charts is different from those with symptoms. Those with symptoms, Madam Speaker, it's recorded on their chart that they have AIDS or are carrying the virus, but those without symptoms, it is not placed on the chart; it is placed in another place.

My question is: Who is the Minister protecting with this difference in policy, and are those with no symptoms not as infectious as those who do have symptoms?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I think I showed that I wanted to cooperate and give as much information as possible.

I also stated that question would be better answered by the experts in the department. I've also said that, periodically, as we did just a couple of weeks ago, we would make these people available to answer any questions that were asked of them, if they could. And if not, if they could finally get the answer, and also that we'd give any documents or anything we have; so I'll have to take that as notice and see if I can get the answer or get the honourable member in touch with members of our staff.

Provincial parks - questionnaires re paying for programs

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

We have had the Minister of Energy and Mines of late beating his breast and indicating how he's going to put \$150 back into the pockets of gas users in Winnipeg . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. ERNST: . . . but will we see, Madam Speaker, the applause when the Minister of Finance takes \$500 out of the pockets of the people in Winnipeg?

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. J. ERNST: But the Minister of Finance is not alone. The Minister of Natural Resources also has his hand in the pockets of Manitobans.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. J. ERNST: My question to the Minister of Natural Resources is: In proposing new programs now and self-paying provincial parks, will he now be advancing questionnaires asking people if they're prepared to pay for the programs that he proposes?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

In communicating to people our approach to having the services provided for within the parks, we indicated that there is a recovery of some 40 percent, 45 percent perhaps in terms of the cost of providing services to the users of parks and the fees recovered.

The users of the parks have indicated to us that there's a high level of satisfaction in terms of park services, some 75 percent of the respondents indicated satisfaction. And in order to maintain that level of service, we've indicated that we will be pursuing the question, where there are selective services, that those who are requesting those selective services, that there should be a high level of recovery for the cost of those services.

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, the Minister earlier indicated that it was their intention, by a certain date in the future, to try and recover 100 percent of costs, as I understand it.

Madam Speaker, in calculating the revenue and expenses of those parks, will each park, Madam Speaker, be cost-benefited on its own or will the entire park system be utilized as one, with one or two major well-utilized parks expected to carry the balance of the system?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I think it's important to set the record straight, when we look at the percentage of costs recovered.

If people were to look at the level of recovery of cost, let's say in 1960, there was a cost recovery in parks of some 80 percent. Now there was an expansion of services in the parks through the Sixties and the Seventies and the level of recovery did not keep pace with that. But if members opposite are alarmed by the level of recovery at some 45 percent, they should look back to the history of the cost recovery into that period through the Fifties and early Sixties, when cost recovery was as high as 80 percent in some areas. We will be looking, Madam Speaker, at the parks as a system. I will not put forward a proposal which will suggest that we will fragment our park system so that there will be exclusive services provided in some areas, no services provided in other areas. We have a park system and we will treat it as a system.

Provincial parks - will all parks be calculated together

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question, almost the same question because the Minister refused to answer.

He gave us a diatribe, Madam Speaker, about what happened in the Fifties and Sixties, but did not answer, are they going to calculate all of the parks together and expect Birds Hill Park and the Whiteshell to subsidize the entire system?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

As the honourable member knows, he can't determine whether a Minister answers a question or not, and a question that is the same, with slight variations, is still repetitive.

The Honourable Member for Charleswood to rephrase his question.

MR. J. ERNST: Is it the policy of the government, Madam Speaker, to require Birds Hill Park and the Whiteshell Provincial Park to subsidize the balance of the provincial park system?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, when we address that question, I don't think we should deal with it only as a parks issue. We should look at what happens in other areas of providing services to people within the Province of Manitoba. When we look, Madam Speaker, at what happens in terms of our public utilities, do we price the provision of telephone services to remote communities, strictly in terms of the cost of delivering to that community, or do we look at a system?

What would happen, Madam Speaker, with the delivery of hydro-electric utility to the people in the remote regions of the province if we looked only at the cost of providing to those communities? Surely, we should treat our park system in the same way, and I would challenge the Member for Charleswood to prove that, in fact, the parks that he refers to are subsidizing other parks. Some of the most highly utilized parks, the parks in which we have the greatest level of recovery are not the parks to which he refers.

Provincial parks - will user fees be included in the calculation

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, I gather the answer is yes.

Madam Speaker, in determination of the calculation for cost versus revenue, will the user fees or rental fees paid by cottage-lot leasees be included in the calculation of those revenues and expenses?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: The Member for Charleswood has finally zeroed-in on the point that is perhaps of particular interest to him. Let me point out, Madam Speaker, that in terms of charges to cottage-lot holders, there is a rental charge of 2 percent of the assessed value of the property. I think most people would suggest that that is a very reasonable charge.

Over and above that, Madam Speaker, there is a charge for services. Those fees have increased by \$45 in this year. The level of the fee will vary depending on the level of service, but that fee, yes, we do attempt to fully recover the cost of providing fees to cottagers and, Madam Speaker, I will not apologize for that.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: May I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 students from Grades 1 to 9 from the Glenway Colony School, under the direction of Mrs. Lorna Lamont. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to the Legislature this morning.

ORDERS OF THE DAY HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Madam Speaker, before calling bills for debate on Second Reading, I'd like to indicate through consultation with the Opposition House Leader that it's been agreed that the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources will meet on Tuesday, 10:00 a.m., June 23 to continue its consideration of the report of McKenzie Seeds, and that the same Standing Committee will meet on June 25 at 10:00 a.m., Thursday, to continue its consideration of the report of MPIC.

Madam Speaker, would you please call Second Reading on Bill No. 70, An Act to Amend the Public Schools Act and following that will you please call adjourned debate on Bill No. 61, An Act to Amend The Labour Relations Act.

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 70 - THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

HON. J. STORIE presented Bill No. 70, An Act to Amend The Public Schools Act, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Before I begin my remarks, I have some spread sheets that I would like to have delivered to the Opposition Education critic and the deputy critic. I had made an undertaking to provide the spread sheets so that members opposite would have easy reference to both the present provisions of The Public Schools Act, the changes that we were proposing and the intent of the proposed changes.

I should acknowledge as well, Madam Speaker, that the printing and Second Reading of this particular bill were somewhat delayed because of the delays in translation. I will acknowledge the cooperation of the Opposition House Leader and the Opposition Education critic in facilitating the introduction and moving of this particular amendment. I did provide the Opposition Education critic with a draft copy in advance last week, so that he might have time to review the act prior to Second Reading.

It is a pleasure nonetheless, Madam Speaker, to be introducing Second Reading on Bill No. 70. The amendments that are being introduced today reflect a number of concerns that have been raised with me over the past several months, I think the most noteworthy of the changes involved in this particular legislation involve the clarification of the conflict-of-interest provisions of The Public Schools Act.

Questions raised during the most recent trustee elections reveal the need for more specific definitions of pecuniary interest and disclosure requirements for school trustees. The Manitoba Association of School Trustees requested this clarification and the wording of this amendment, Madam Speaker, was developed in consultation with the Manitoba Association of School Trustees and their representatives.

The amendments proposed to The Public Schools Act will result in application to school trustees of the same procedures that currently apply to municipal councillors under The Municipal Conflict of Interest Act. The major provisions define direct and indirect pecuniary interest; requirements for disclosure of assets of trustees and certain dependants; and procedures to be followed in the event the trustee fails to disclose conflict of interest.

The adoption of this legislation should enable school trustees to identify situations involving potential conflicts of interest and comply with accepted procedures to follow when such situations arise by providing clear guidelines for trustees to follow. In avoiding even the appearance of conflict of interest, this amendment will assist school boards in the smooth efficient conduct of business at the school division level.

A second amendment introduced by Bill 70 clarifies the requirements concerning residency in a school division. This amendment is also intended to clear up confusion that has arisen concerning who is responsible for the education of treaty Indian children who are being dealt with under The Child and Family Services Act for The Young Offenders Act.

In the past, while the Federal Government is clearly responsible for the cost of educating these children, there has been an assumption that school divisions

will take financial responsibility for these children while they're in the care of provincial agencies. The education of Canada's Native people is constitutionally a federal responsibility and, while the province's public schools are only too happy to provide services to Native peoples when it is mutually agreeable, this does not relieve the Federal Government of its constitutional obligations. This amendment, by clearly restating the definition of resident, returns the responsibility for costs of educating treaty Indians back where it belongs to the Federal Government.

A third change removes the requirement, Madam Speaker, that bilingual, heritage language programs be offered on a pilot basis with the approval of the Minister of Education. This change is being made in recognition of the fact that programs now being offered have proven their worth.

Bilingual programs in Ukrainian, German and Hebrew have been offered for many years and have become an accepted part of the curriculum. They were introduced originally at the division level in response to local needs and requests from various groups in our community and proven to be desired educational programs. We expect these programs to continue and perhaps to expand in response to requests from community groups.

Now that we have a model and, if the model has been established over these many years, these programs should no longer be considered experimental. Decisions regarding the introduction and continuation of heritage language bilingual programs should become the responsibility of individual school divisions and their respective constituents.

All other changes contained in this bill, Madam Speaker, are designed to clarify the intent of the sections of The Public Schools Act in order to assist all those affected in complying with the legislation.

Madam Speaker, I can say parenthetically that the majority of the changes, particularly those dealing with conflict of interest, have also been vetted with the Manitoba Teachers' Society. They are aware of the underlying intent behind the legislation and I believe that the amendments that are being introduced here will serve to improve the interests of education in the Province of Manitoba generally and help us deal with some specific problems that have arisen over the past couple of years.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Madam Speaker, I thank the Minister for his statement and his cooperation in this matter. I move, seconded by the Member for Niakwa, that debate on this bill be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

**ADJOURNED DEBATE
ON SECOND READING
BILL NO. 61 - THE
LABOUR RELATIONS ACT**

MADAM SPEAKER: Debate on Second Reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of

Labour, Bill No. 61, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: I think, as I understand the ruling made recently by yourself, that bills standing in the name of another honourable member can still be spoken to.

MADAM SPEAKER: Can be spoken to, not necessarily left standing in that member's name, unless there's leave of the House.

Is there leave to leave it standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain?

MR. J. McRAE: Madam Speaker, I wish to speak.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is there leave, first of all? (Agreed)
The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, it is with regret that I have to rise today to oppose the motion for Second Reading of Bill No. 61. It is unfortunate the bill is before this House. The bill represents another blow to the principle of free collective bargaining in our province. It's surprising to me, Madam Speaker, coming from a government which so often repeats its dedication and rededication to the principle of free collective bargaining, when at every turn the moves the government makes in its Labour Relations Act are moves that would tend in a very real way to stifle truly free collective bargaining and replace it with state control.

As I said a little while ago in question period, it is true that in the Soviet Union we hear very little about labour strife or work stoppages due to strikes, and no doubt there's some politician - not unlike the Minister of Labour - in the Soviet Union who says, "We have harmonious labour relations in our country. Look, we don't have strikes." Well, aside from the fact, Madam Speaker, that my contention is that Bill 61 and the provisions contained in it will promote strike action in the future, aside from that the bill is indeed a direct blow to free collective bargaining in our province. Coming from this government it should be surprising, but as recent and not-so-recent events have unfolded and demonstrated, this government's commitment to free collective bargaining is questionable at best and it amounts to a sham, Madam Speaker, because honourable members opposite with their labour legislation have done almost everything they can to thwart free collective bargaining.

I also said earlier in the question period, Madam Speaker, that combined with first contract legislation, the final offer selection legislation being introduced in this House, will have the effect of making labour relations state controlled from beginning to end.

I invite Your Honour to put yourself in the position of a potential investor coming to the Province of Manitoba. No. 1, he or she faces the prospect of having the first collective agreement, so-called, imposed on his company or her company through the first contract provisions of the labour law.

So up until now, Madam Speaker, I suppose we could say - or some have made the point - that the first

contract legislation helps set the base for negotiations for a second contract and third contract and subsequent contracts. But now, Madam Speaker, with final offer selection, the attainment of a second contract is now in the hands of the government. And that is wrong. That is why I am on my feet today, because that potential investor who wants to come to Manitoba will have his labour relations climate in his plant or her plant governed by provisions such as the first contract legislation and the final offer selection legislation.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, C. Santos, in the Chair.)

Now, the Minister in his remarks at Second Reading referred to fairness - he often does in his answers in this House - fairness in labour relations in this province. There is no fairness in regard to final offer selection. There can be no fairness when one side has to win and one side has to lose. What we have before us is perhaps a final instalment on the payment required to the Manitoba Federation of Labour for its assistance in helping to get this government elected and re-elected.

This is an outstanding item on the agenda of the Manitoba Federation of Labour and certainly we know, if taken to its logical conclusion, this legislation could also be used, as it stands now, in a labour dispute that is ongoing now, which would be totally unfair to the parties in that situation at the Westfair strike between the Westfair Foods and the Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers' Union. The rules are being changed in the middle of the game. Whichever party should oppose the final offer selection process, this is blatantly unfair and the Minister knows it. The Minister has not yet denied it, but it is obviously blatantly unfair to either one or the other party in that particular dispute.

The legislation is unfair certainly to the employer's side of the equation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the final analysis is that it's the workers at a plant who will decide whether a dispute is taken to a selector for a final offer selection. The employer has no veto but the employees do. So that there's certainly no fairness involved there.

Final offer selection has been used by mutual agreement in this province. You can't argue that wouldn't be fair, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but final offer selection imposed by one party on the other can never be described as fair.

So in that situation, you're going to end up with a winner and a loser. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in labour relations there should, as you'll often find at the end of a strike or at the end of negotiations, both sides approach the cameras and they say, we won this one. The other side says we won this one and the debate goes. Everyone appears to be happy because what we've had as a negotiated settlement either as a result of lengthy negotiations, brief negotiations or a strike or lockout. In any event, the parties have made the decisions themselves and they will have to live with that agreement, which is a very important principle in carrying out the terms of a collective agreement, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

When a contract is imposed on one, we already know that, in the case of first contracts, under the first contract legislation, there's bad blood on both sides after the imposition of a first contract by the government. Mr. Christophe would be the first to tell

you that if he were being honest with you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

In the case of the T. Eaton Company in Brandon, the first contract imposed on that particular operation resulted in the decertification of Mr. Christophe's union at Eaton's. So secretly, I think, Mr. Christophe has a bad taste in his mouth in that particular dispute.

But we know that labour negotiations involve an extremely - it's an extremely sensitive type of situation, where both sides sit down together, they talk, they hammer away at each other and they work very hard to come up with an agreement that's, while not necessarily totally acceptable, something that either of them or both of them agree to live with.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's a certain emotional attachment to an agreement like that, something that has been worked out through tough bargaining and sometimes over an extended period of time. That type of an agreement is something that is pretty important to our labour relations in Manitoba. It's pretty important because both sides have that emotional attachment, that commitment to an agreement that they have worked so hard to achieve.

In this case, it's a win-lose situation. It's the flip of a coin. If I were charged with the responsibility of carrying out the terms of a contract that I had no part in negotiating, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder how good my faith would be in carrying out the terms of that, whether I be the employer or the union representative.

So it's contrary to the natural kinds of human relationships that develop, Mr. Deputy Speaker, between employers and bargaining agents, in carrying out the terms of a contract. I can see all kinds of unfair labour practice charges and grievances being filed. We'll probably see more of those than we've ever seen before as a result of contracts decided by final offer selection just because of that important principle that one side is a winner and one side is a loser. At least in a negotiated settlement, Mr. Deputy Speaker, both sides can claim victories in some areas.

There's a problem with the choice of the selector, in my mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As I said a little while ago, final offer selection has been used in the past by mutual agreement, and that's as it should be. That's available to parties in a labour dispute. But when you start imposing that type of so-called final solution to the problems of employers and their employees, when you start imposing that, then the atmosphere becomes poisoned and the future is pretty bleak in terms of the term of a contract.

As I said, it has been done by mutual agreement, but we have reason to be nervous about the future if the government is going to continue to choose selectors. Obviously, both sides, if they're not able to agree on a selector, then the question is put to the Labour Board to decide who the selector should be.

Well, in view of recent events, we know of certain circumstances occurring at the Labour Board which call into question the impartiality, certainly, of the Labour Board and obviously of this Minister - as I'll point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

A year ago, and here again it was Westfair Foods and Mr. Christophe's union, the Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers' Union, who were attempting to settle their difficulties by means of a mutually agreed upon process of final offer selection. They needed a

selector, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and they called upon the Minister to choose that selector for them. The result of that was that the Minister and the Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers' Union became defendants in a lawsuit as a result of this Minister's choice of a selector.

The selector in that case was one Bob Mayer, who is well-known to honourable members opposite. Mr. Bob Mayer is a Thompson lawyer. I know him myself. I've actually worked in the same courts as he has in the past. I knew him then - that was a long time ago - to be a strong supporter of the New Democratic Party. Can you imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a labour negotiator for Westfair Foods, being told that the selector in the case of your dispute is Bob Mayer? That was the choice made by the Minister.

Mr. Mayer, the gentleman who has been a member of the executive of the New Democratic Party continuously from 1977, is a very good and old friend of Brooke Sundin, who is employed full time by the Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers' Union as an organizer and as a representative. Mr. Mayer is a close, personal friend of Wilf Hudson and Dick Martin. Mr. Mayer, at one time, in 1981, had been the lawyer for the Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers' Union, and he owns and he wears two jackets bearing the name and symbol of that union - a man with no previous experience as an interest arbitrator, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the man that the Minister of Labour chooses to decide in a dispute between Westfair Foods and the Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers' Union.

So what does the future hold in terms of the appointment of selectors in labour disputes? And don't forget, it's not something that one side can back away from, certainly one side being the employer, because there's no veto. The Canadian Union of Public Employees resents this part of the legislation, and they say the legislation alters the strike lockout equation and therefore constitutes a serious threat to free collective bargaining both in the present and in the future.

The Canadian Union of Public Employees also resents this legislation because they refer to it as Russian roulette arbitration; and this is a fine way to settle important industrial disputes in this province isn't it, just by the throw of a dice or perhaps by the selection of a person whose impartiality is certainly in question?

There's reason to be very, very nervous about that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I think the employers across this province should be very nervous about it too. We are told quite often that we are the ones who are politicizing labour relations in this province. Well, I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the appointment of Mr. Bob Mayer to be a selector in a matter of dispute between Westfair Foods and the Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers Union is the most blatant example of impartial selection of a selector that one could ever imagine.

Now we see it in legislation, that we're going to be choosing selectors in this kind of way through the Labour Board. There will be one selector only and that selector will choose between one and the other. Now, it's very, very important to consider who that selector will be and, if this is the kind of track record in labour relations of this government, I say the employers in this province have a lot to be concerned about - and

ultimately the employees. Because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this type of legislation doesn't have a beneficial effect on the economy of our province.

So, I'm very, very concerned about whether we can trust this government to carry out the terms of this legislation properly. Even if I liked this legislation, I would have with that. But I don't like the legislation, so we've got a double problem.

The other point that concerns me is that usually, in collective bargaining, the two sides hammer out an agreement after some considerable discussion and then the matter is put to the workers for ratification. Is there a ratification of a final offer selection? What right do the workers have in that case? Do the workers have the right to say, well, no, that's not what they want as it has been done in the past?

There's a real problem in respect to strikes. The Minister claims to be proud of the strike record in this province. Well, in the last couple of weeks the strike record in this province is getting worse and worse, and I'm telling you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there will be strikes as a result of this legislation, more strikes than ever before because a union can resort to the strike weapon, safe in the knowledge that within 60 days they can have the whole matter settled so that there's no risk in sending your workers out on picket lines. There's no risk whatsoever because, within 60 days, the matter can be referred to a selector and, regardless of which way it goes, there will be an end to the strike.

This is not what freedom is all about, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As one person said that there's a gun to the head of the employer and the finger of the union is on the trigger and that doesn't strike me as any kind of fairness at all, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

What about innovative or complicated issues? In a progressive society, employers and bargaining agents get together and they discuss all kinds of new and exciting ideas for the workplace. Do they really want to put those types of issues on a piece of paper and hand it to a selector to decide which way it should go? Mr. Deputy Speaker, things are really going to be standing still. Both sides are going to awfully careful about what they put in that final proposal and they're going to leave out a lot of important things that are important to a lot of workers in this province. That should be a very big concern.

Another problem, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the legislation assumes that there's a dispute before the previous collective agreement terminates and allows for final offer selection before the previous agreement has even terminated. Now, if that isn't a confrontational style of legislation, I don't know what is. Why would anyone want to go to a selector before the previous agreement has expired? I can't figure that one out and I don't know why the Minister has put that in there, but it certainly assumes there's already a dispute before the good faith bargaining has even begun, which brings me to the point of good faith bargaining. Why should any irresponsible union leader - let's face it, there are a few of those around and there are a few irresponsible employers around, too - but why should such people bargain in good faith, certainly on the union side, when they know this weapon is available to them?

MR. G. DUCHARME: Tries to go through the motions.

Friday, 19 June, 1987

MR. J. McCRAE: It is a matter of going through the motions, as my colleague from Riel points out, going through the motions. I think that we're seeing certain going through the motions right now in a very important labour dispute in the food industry in this province. Earlier, we saw on television the two sides slamming their briefcases down on the table to begin discussions, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I can tell you, there's a lot of posturing going on and I have a very strong suspicion that there's a waiting going on, a waiting for those 59 days to go by, so that an application can be made for final offer selection.

Now we're talking about Westfair Foods here again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I wonder who the selector will be this time. Will it be Bob Mayer again? Will it be someone like Bob Mayer? You know, the Minister seems to assume that the NDP Government will be in office forever. Well, it's just not going to happen, I can tell him that, because I wouldn't want to see this kind of legislation in the hands of any government but, least of all, this government.

We've heard precious little from the government opposite about the labour situation in B.C. The reason for that is that there are so many opinions on all sides about that legislation, and a similar kind of situation exists in Manitoba, where we now have the MFL lined up on one side, against all kinds of union people on the other side and management people.

Let me just go through the list, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This Minister claims to be a consultative kind of person, or the kind of person who listens so carefully and acts so fairly. Well, I'll just tell him that the City of Winnipeg, which employs over 11,000 workers, represented by some seven bargaining agents, is against this legislation. The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce - dare I say it again? Should I ever refer to a Chamber of Commerce? I suppose not. The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are totally opposed to this legislation.

The Canadian Association of Industrial and Mechanical and Allied Workers are opposed to this legislation; the Canadian Union of Public Employees, comprising 16,000 workers, is opposed to this legislation; MONA, 10,000 employees, opposed to this legislation. The Winnipeg Labour Council, which represents unions representing 36,000 workers in this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, opposed to this legislation and now they're being sat on by the Canada Labour Congress and we're not going to be hearing much from them, at least until June 30, and maybe then we'll never hear from them again, because the Canadian Labour Congress has strong-armed them into silence over this.

I received calls from - the Minister of Natural Resources would be interested to know - the Town of Swan River is very concerned about this legislation and we may be seeing a resolution from that council in the near future. We may not, but I certainly know what my telephone calls are telling me.

I attended yesterday a Union of Manitoba Municipalities meeting in my community, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There's a lot of concern among the elected representatives of the municipalities of this province about this final offer selection legislation and what it means to them in the future. And, of course, the City of Brandon, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think we'll be hearing

from them very soon. We have an interesting situation there too. We have three socialist members on City Council, Ross Martin is the president of the Local Brandon District Labour Council. Of course, Wayne Smith is a representative for CUPE, and he's another member of our council. Those two, though, I expect they'll be squaring off at next Monday's council meeting.

Of course, Alderman Grambo, my opponent at the time of the election, I'm not just sure where he stands, but I imagine after he's weighed it out and weighed both sides, he'll come down firmly on the side of the Minister of Labour, and I think I can fairly accurately predict that unless, as I'm told, there's as much acrimony over this issue and dissension over this issue in the New Democratic Party Caucus opposite. I understand there is, I understand the Minister of Finance for one is not very happy about this legislation, and he's not very happy that his colleagues are shoving this down his union's throat either.

Of course, we know where the Manitoba Federation of Labour stands, but of course we know the Manitoba Federation of Labour has been bought and paid for by this government through grants to the Manitoba Labour Education Centre, for instance. - (Interjection) - The Member for Thompson suggests that statement is sick. I suggest the Honourable Member for Thompson get on over there to the Manitoba Labour Education Centre and find out what is being done with taxpayers' money there in the name of the Manitoba Federation of Labour.

I've never been able to find out from the Minister of Labour just what happened to that gentleman who was charged with theft and convicted of theft in the matter of a break-in at the Manitoba Labour Education Centre. I wonder why it is the Minister hasn't made that information available to me. How long does it take to find out how much the taxpayers of this province are out as a result of the criminal activities of certain people, and supported wholeheartedly by this government through grants to the Manitoba Labour Education Centre and through Jobs Fund grants to the tune of \$250,000 in 1985 to employ three people to train 40 people over six to eight months - \$250,000.00. That works out to about \$6,200 per person trained. That's a pretty expensive training program and, I suggest, a very blatant misuse of taxpayers' dollars and a very telling statement in terms of the fealty that this Minister feels to the Manitoba Federation of Labour.

The Winnipeg Free Press dealt with that in an editorial. Honourable members opposite are anxious and always willing to hold up for my attention editorials that might mention my name. Well, I'd just like to hold one up for honourable members opposite, and it has to do with an offer they can refuse dealing with Bill 61.

I won't read it all, but I will read the last paragraph, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's pretty hard to say you've got a misprint or a mistake, because this is an editorial here. It says: "It is evident that Labour Minister Al Mackling introduced his legislation as an act of fealty to the Manitoba Federation of Labour. It was clear from the beginning that it would not serve the interests of labour peace in Manitoba. It is clear now that it will not even serve to ingratiate Manitoba's NDP Government with organized labour. Mr. Mackling should read the writing on the wall and withdraw this silly bill." That's what it amounts to. It's silly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but it's a dangerous bill too.

The Minister of Labour, we already know, is nothing more than a punching bag when it comes to issues in this province. We know that he's punch-drunk from what he took over the MTX scandal. He still sits opposite, and the fact that he does sit opposite tells me that he sits there as an automaton doing nothing but carrying out the wishes of the labour movement in this province.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. McCRAE: And this is the Minister, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: Alvin the - what was that name again?

MR. J. McCRAE: Alvin the automaton.

A MEMBER: That was the name, Alvin the automaton.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's plenty of evidence for that statement. That is not a silly statement.

The fact that this Minister has, in every speech, every time he rises to his feet - he's similar to the Minister in charge of the Workers Compensation Board. He's got his lines memorized. He stands up for the working people of Manitoba. Well, we know who he stands up for. We know from Springhill and we know from Sooter's, we know from Eaton's, and we know from Westfair. We know from all those disputes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this Minister knows nothing about the needs and the wishes and the aspirations of the average working Manitoban.

But we do know where he stands with Bernard Christophe. He's toe to toe, knee to knee, belly to belly, jowl to jowl, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with Bernard Christophe, Wilf Hudson.

I'm telling you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister's loyalties are misplaced. If he pretends, if he really wishes to stand up for all Manitobans he would be withdrawing this bill, but instead he stands foursquare with and beside Bernard Christophe, Bruno Zimmer, Wilf Hudson, against the interests of organized and unorganized workers all across this province.

This is one of the things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which will be the undoing of this government. The undoing of the government has begun already with other issues but this is certainly going a long way towards the defeat and the demise of the NDP. We see the NDP self destructing now on this issue. We know that the labour movement is in a crisis over this issue. They're tearing each other apart and the object of all their anger is going to be the honourable members opposite, who are tearing each other apart as well.

I have to ask why there's a sunset clause in this legislation after five years. I really don't know. The Minister is telling us that this is a useful tool. He tells us that it's something that is needed, something that enhances our labour relations in this province. He says all those things and I just hope he will not improperly attribute to me again the assertion that I'm saying those things because I certainly am not and I'll make the record very clear right now, labour relations in this province are a sham. They're state controlled and I'm

very concerned about the future of the rights of workers in this province.

We know that through this legislation and other legislation the government of this province has absolutely no respect for the constitutional rights of workers in this province, which should be a very big concern, and I think we'll find out how big a concern it is after the next election. But the government has added another weapon in the arsenal of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, a weapon that so many other union people don't want. They see it as dangerous and a serious erosion of the free collective bargaining imperative in this province, something that we must have in order to attract business investment to our province. We must have freedom, Mr. Deputy Speaker, freedom in everything we do including labour relations and for the Minister to say that this legislation is fair is strictly a misstatement of the facts.

So I am sure that in view of the fact that the Minister will agree that the rules of any dispute, the rules of any proceedings should never be changed in the middle of the game to the disadvantage of one party or the other, I am sure the Minister will agree at committee to amend this legislation, to exclude any pending dispute so that the parties to any pending disputes in Manitoba right now will be able to proceed with the rules as they are now.

I know the Minister will consider this matter very seriously, although I have strong suspicions as to why the legislation was brought in in the first place - I believe it was brought in to deal with one specific strike and to put an end to that strike and to save the face of one union leader in this province - but I believe the Minister and his colleagues will see the wisdom in being fair and doing the right thing and amending the legislation so that its provisions would exclude pending disputes.

One honourable member asks me if I will then support the legislation. Of course not, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This legislation is wrong. It's wrong from the beginning, it's not used anywhere else, this is the first time this type of legislation that I know of is used to end private sector disputes.

In his comments the Minister referred to other jurisdictions where final offer selection is in effect. Well of course in those jurisdictions we're talking about the public sector and in many cases in sectors where the right to strike is not enjoyed by the workers there, so they had to come up with some method in those jurisdiction.

But in this jurisdiction, this is the first, as far as I know, where final offer selection has been imposed on the private sector, as well. Mr. Deputy Speaker, to impose it on parties to a dispute that is pending right now, is absolutely cowardly and shameless behaviour on the part of the government. I know honourable members opposite, certainly the Minister of Finance, will see the wisdom of amending the legislation, bad legislation, as it is, but amending it to exclude any pending disputes, so that Mr. Christophe and the people on the employer side in the present dispute can be satisfied and can know the rules of the game.

I remind the Minister that in labour negotiations and labour relations, plans are made, strategies are set and, when a government comes along on the side of one party or the other and changes the rules in the

middle of the game, it kind of throws the whole thing out of kilter.

It may be that this is a tactic on the part of the government to destabilize the food industry, as they have attempted to destabilize other industries in the past. Whatever their intentions are, I don't know.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan suggests that there's some paranoia out there. I suggest that he talk to representatives from CUPE, representatives from CAIMAW, representatives of the City of Winnipeg, representatives of MONA, representatives of a host of others who are opposed to this legislation to find out what the paranoia is all about. Take the blinkers off and find out what the facts are before you make silly statements in this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with those comments I will sit down, but I do remind the Minister that we are expecting him to be bringing in an amendment to exclude any pending disputes when the time comes. But that in no way will alter my opposition to this bad, dangerous legislation which goes against the concepts of freedom and certainly against the concepts of free collective bargaining.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It doesn't give me a great deal of pleasure to follow an act like that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had planned in a rational way to discuss the bill, to talk about the clauses in the bill, what I felt was good about it, what my concerns were. But the Honourable Member for Brandon West, in his usual style, talked about facts.

Let me quote from March 6, 1987 Hansard, the Honourable Member for Brandon West. Facts. "The Minister of Labour, Madam Speaker, tells about the wonderful example set in Minnesota. How would you like to be a nurse in Minnesota because, in Minnesota, you make 20 percent less than an electrician makes? Madam Speaker, if you were a nurse, you'd want to go to Wisconsin, where nurses get 50 percent more than electricians get. So where is the fairness? How do you think the electrician in Wisconsin feels, and how does the nurse in Minnesota feel? Do they feel they're being treated fairly? I say no."

This is on pay equity. Let me tell you some facts, because the Honourable Member for Brandon West, stating about pay police, as he referred to it, in Minnesota, talking about facts.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thought about that, and I thought carefully and I said, my goodness, I don't know any place in the entire world where I know a nurse who makes more than an electrician. The Honourable Member for Brandon West is suggesting that is the case in Wisconsin. I said that's fascinating, so what I will do, contrary to what the Member for Brandon West did - and I will table these documents - I wrote to the State of Wisconsin, and I wrote to the State of Minnesota.

I have the collective bargaining . . .

A MEMBER: Either speak to the bill or sit down.

MR. M. DOLIN: I am speaking to the bill.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Brandon West will please state his point of order.

MR. J. McCRAE: Well, I now have two, so I'll state the first one first, and I'll remind you of your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the fact that the time taken for points of order are not deducted from member's speeches, and that they form part of that member's speech. Of course, your ruling is not in accord with Madam Speaker's, but be that as it may.

The point of order is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there are rules of relevance here. We're talking about final offer selection in this debate, not pay equity.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: On the point of order.

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

HON. J. COWAN: On the same point of order, I would ask the Member for Brandon West if he was reflecting upon a ruling either of the Deputy Speaker or a ruling of the Speaker in his point of order?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: The Government House Leader can take my comments for whatever he likes, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

HON. J. COWAN: In that case, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will take them as a reflection on the Chair and ask the Member for Brandon West to withdraw.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the Member for Brandon West is reflecting on the ruling of the Chair, I would ask the Member for Brandon West to withdraw.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would ask that you deal with my point of order which is the one on the floor.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, with all due respect to the Government House Leader, it is not up to him to decide if a comment reflects on the Chair. Sir, that is your responsibility. Surely you're not accepting directions from the Government House Leader. It is your responsibility to determine that, not the Government House Leader.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the same point of order, Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

You will know, as the Opposition House Leader knows full well, that it is the duty and the responsibility of any member of this House and I'm surprised he didn't stand when his member on his side indicated that he may have been reflecting on the ruling of the Chair and, if in fact he didn't, then let him state that clearly and, if in fact he did, then let him withdraw it. The Opposition House Leader should know that it is his responsibility as well as mine to bring those sorts of abuses of the rules of this House to your attention and to the attention of the House.

So, let him not suggest, or the Member for Pembina, or any of the others on their points of order, that anything out of the extraordinary took place when it was suggested that if there is a reflection on the Chair, that reflection should be withdrawn and let them have the honour to do so.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Pembina. Is that on the same point of order?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Government House Leader who is prone to try to fix up the situation when his colleagues get into trouble, and it happens quite regularly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government House Leader had no point of order because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will recall quite clearly, the confusion caused by your ruling the other day . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the Member for Pembina reflecting on the past ruling of the Chair?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you would listen, I will explain to you what I'm trying to - instead of listening to the jackals over there. I mean, there's a legitimate point of order here, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other day when I was speaking, I believe it was Friday of last week, I was interrupted on a number of occasions by members opposite on points of order. You, Sir, were in the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm sorry. I have to stop all this reflection of the past ruling of this Chair.

MR. D. ORCHARD: It is not reflecting, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am stating the facts of what happened, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The ruling of the Speaker has been given. That settles the matter.

MR. D. ORCHARD: But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point is, the ruling made by the Speaker appeared to contradict your ruling in that there are times when it can be decided by the Speaker. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we're trying to determine here today, No. 1 is, did the Government House Leader have a point of order? I submit to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he had no point of order because no reflection was made on you. But the "fixer," pardon me, the Government House Leader in attempting to fix messes caused by speakers on his side of the House has created a phony point of order. There was no point of order.

Would you please rule on the Government House Leader, as to whether he had a point of order?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is settled that no point of order can be imposed upon another point of order.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's right.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: So that's clear.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Right.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In other words, a point of order cannot be made a basis for another point of order.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So then he had no point of order. So he had no point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The original point of order was raised by the Member for Brandon West. He is asking whether or not the substantive content of the speech of the Member for Kildonan is relevant or not. That is a matter for the Chair to determine.

A MEMBER: That's right, and we're waiting for your determination.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may assist you . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not asking for assistance. Would the Member for Pembina please come to order.

Whether or not the Member for Brandon West is reflecting upon the past ruling of the Chair resides only in the recesses of his inner mind, which no one can determine, except as manifested by his external behaviour.

HON. J. COWAN: On another point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a new point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm not recognizing anyone. I'd like to ask the Member for Brandon West pointedly now whether or not he is reflecting on the past ruling of the Chair?

MR. J. McCRAE: I would never do that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Only he can say so.

MR. J. McCRAE: I would never reflect on the quality . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Then say it.

MR. J. McCRAE: . . . of your ruling. I would ask you, though, if you would please rule on my point of order respecting the relevance of the comments of the Member for Kildonan. That's what the whole thing is about.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . out of order; he had no point of order.

MR. M. DOLIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to continue with my address. I have not made the points

I was making, so how does the member determine whether they're relevant or not? I have not stated what I was going to state yet. I had just begun to speak. If the member is a little uptight about what I might say to prove that his facts are controvertible, that may be of concern to him.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the members of the House will have a little patience, maybe if we know the contents of the statement, we will be able to determine whether or not the facts as stated by the Member for Kildonan are relevant or not.

A point of order being raised by the Government House Leader?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would ask you to take this under advisement. I believe I heard the Member for Pembina in his comments refer to messes caused by speakers in this House.

I would ask the Chair to take that under advisement as to whether or not and, after having reviewed Hansard and reviewed those specific comments, to determine whether or not that is a reflection on the Chair and a reflection on the rulings of this House, and to report back to the House accordingly.

I'm suggesting that matter at this point in time be taken under advisement and be brought back to the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd be very pleased if you would take that under advisement. When I said that speakers in this House have caused messes, because the Member for Kildonan is the speaker in this House right now and has caused the mess that it's got us into right now.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the best course of action for this House to take is to review the Hansard. The Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Perhaps without interruption, I will explain for the edification of the Member for Brandon West the reason for quoting him from Hansard and the reason for my writing to Wisconsin and Minnesota.

He stated in his address just a few minutes ago about facts. When he stated that pay equity has made the lot of nurses in Minnesota worse and, in Wisconsin, where they have no pay equity legislation, better, I questioned that and went to the exact sources.

Well, I would like to tell you, and for the record, his idea of facts are something that I would consider fiction. As a matter of fact, I would go so far as to call it mythology because there are no facts here. He makes them up as he goes along it appears, because here are the facts. In Minnesota, a nurse, the monthly median is 2,170 a month. An electrician, the range is 2,171-2,911. In Wisconsin, a nurse is 1,988. In Wisconsin an electrician is 2,218 - a differential of 30 percent in Wisconsin in almost exact parity.

I will table this information for the honourable member if he wishes to read it, because perhaps he might wish

to correct some of his statements or perhaps he might wish to be informed instead of just quoting quasi-facts.

Let me tell you another one from the Honourable Member for Brandon West. What I'm doing here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is particularly relevant to Bill No. 61, because we are establishing the credibility of the statements made by the Member for Brandon West when he suggests there are facts.

On April 16, the Member for Brandon West stood up in response to the Member for Thompson and said, the Member for Thompson had accused the Member for Brandon West of, "vicious personal attacks," which I heard again, "which have no place in this Legislature." The Member for Brandon West stood up and said, "The Honourable Member is saying things that aren't true. I made no personal attacks. I named no names, Madam Speaker." So I looked at his speech and I will run through the speech quickly.

His speech begins on page 1067 of Hansard and, on page 1068, I see the names Wilf Hudson, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Hudson, Ross Martin, Arnold Grambo, Bernard Christophe, Bernard Christophe, Bernard Christophe, Bernard Christophe. On page 1069, I see Wilf Hudson, Bruno Zimmer, just a couple on that page. He names no names, he said. On page 1070, Dr. David Stewart, Dr. David Stewart, Wilf Hudson, Shirley Carr - a new one. Hey, that's not bad. Oh, further on the page, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Zimmer. On page 1071, Colin Trigwill, another new one that he did not mention, by his own statement. Mr. Zimmer, Mr. Hudson. On page 1072, Wilf Hudson, Bruno Zimmer. On page 1073, Wilf Hudson, Bruno Zimmer. This is the man who stated, "I named no names."

I suggest to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that as much credibility should be given to his statements that he just made on Bill No. 61.

He talks about Russia, a blow to free collective bargaining. He talks about state control. He talks about impartiality of the Labour Board and questions the impartiality of somebody - and he names names again - of Bob Mayer. Bob Mayer is a lawyer from Thompson. Bob Mayer has served, to my knowledge, on many arbitration boards. People with all sorts of party tickets in their pocket, Mr. Deputy Speaker, serve on arbitration boards. The member conveniently forgets something that I'm sure that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition remembers - who was chair of the Labour Board when this government first came into being and what was his previous position? It was one Obie Baizley, a former Conservative Cabinet Minister, and by the comments of Minister of Labour, he didn't do a bad job because we were concerned about getting a job done and if he carries a Tory party ticket or he was a former Tory Cabinet Minister, that does not deny the possibility he may do a good job.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West denies that anybody who could carry an NDP card in his pocket could possibly be a good labour lawyer or a good arbitrator, or a selector or a member of the Labour Board. I say from his previous statements of "fact," this mythology presented and promulgated continuously by the Member for Brandon West, which I find particularly and personally offensive, to stand up in this House, with saccharine voice, to claim, with his crocodile tears, how he cares for the working people of this province.

He cares, he bleeds for the workers of this province. My goodness, he bleeds for the workers of this province. Sure he does, I believe that. I believe he bleeds for the workers, the workers who work in the board rooms of Great-West Life and Investors Syndicate, I believe he bleeds for them. He will bleed when we get to the bill on Inter-City Gas, for the board of directors of Inter-City. We will see that blood. I see no stigmata for the workers of this province on his hands, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I would also like to point out that one of the things he has neglected to do, which I would like to do now, is actually deal with the bill - aside from the hyperbole about personalities and reading Bob Mayer's curriculum vitae into the record. I know Bob Mayer; I've known Bob Mayer for a long time; he was president of the New Democratic Party. He's a good fellow. If you met him, you might like him. I also think he is probably impartial in certain cases, because he is a lawyer, and as far as I am concerned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, lawyers are hired guns - no offence to some of my legal colleagues on both side of the House, lawyers are paid to do a job for a client.

When lawyers are put to do an impartial job, as chairman of an arbitration board, they usually do an impartial job. One of the reasons they do is because they'd like to be reappointed again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and they get paid very well for doing it. So if you're not impartial, you usually don't get reappointed. I think it's as simple as that, and I think most lawyers, and I'm sure the Honourable Opposition House Leader understands that, that there is a certain mechanism and a certain incentive to be impartial when you're appointed as a chairman of a quasi-judicial board. I think Bob Mayer would be impartial; I think the Honourable Opposition House Leader would be impartial; the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, should he get some appointment as a legal person. So I wish the Member for Brandon West would get off personalities and start talking about the bill.

It's interesting, the Member for Brandon West has now become a friend of CUPE. He's become a friend of the communication workers. He's become a friend of the ILGWU. I expect to hear him stand up in this House and heap praise on Leslie Spillett. I did not see her name mentioned here, to say what a wonderful job she's doing, and how she represents the workers in a fair and honest manner, and I expect to see him marching on the next ILGWU picket line in front of our friends on Inkster Boulevard, who moved - their head office is Toronto, because of this government. Of course, they had planned to move two years before, but I expect to see him in a picket line. I'm sure Leslie would greet you, she's a very nice person. She's a little further left than some of us on this side. Maybe you're finding a kindred spirit, maybe the Leader of the Opposition should worry that somewhere underneath all this hyperbole and rhetoric, there lurks another Leslie Spillett, in drag. That could be dangerous.

Let me point out what this bill does. Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us deal with the bill and what it actually does and let us judge the bill on its merits or lack thereof.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

Final offer selection. Final offer selection is another mechanism to add to those already contained in The Manitoba Relations Act, to assist the parties in successfully concluding contract negotiations, and a fair and reasonable agreement. When you think about that, that's not so horrible. There is nothing in this act - and I'll run you through step by step, so obviously the Member for Brandon West hasn't read the bill. It becomes increasingly obvious that he doesn't know the contents of the bill; he doesn't know the import of the bill, and the more I hear of him in Labour Estimates and places like this, I don't think he knows doodley-squat about labour legislation. Is that parliamentary, Madam Speaker? If it's not, I withdraw it.

Final offer selection very simply as is first contract is designed to be pro-settlement and it's not pro-union or pro-management. Basically what we are saying is that here is another mechanism to attempt to avoid strikes and lockouts that union members and working people, the people who the Member for Brandon West cares so much about, can actually vote and make a decision on some way of not causing public disruption, not causing the loss of their incomes. The Member for Brandon West ignores that fact.

Another thing that the Member for Brandon West talks about is where has it been done before? He mentions it in his speech, in his usual accurate statement of facts, that this has never been done anywhere before. Well, I say that is just absolutely untrue and, if the Member for Brandon West did a little research, he would find it has been done in other places. It's been done in many places. As a matter of fact, it's done in some places where it would seem rather bizarre, but it seems to be working, one of which is in baseball. Free agency in baseball is settled by final offer selection and has been done reasonably effectively. We, who are ball fans, really don't want any more ball strikes and I think one of the ways of dealing with this has kept baseball from going out on strike is by final offer selection and free agency. It has certainly helped. It certainly helps people to get to the bargaining table before they take the risk on a selector.

The Member for Brandon West comments, "labour wizard." I find that very interesting, because I had been a management person negotiating with a CUPE local for over a seven-year period. On the other side of the table, I had been appointed as the union representative on arbitration boards by that same CUPE union. The fact is, I have been on both sides of the table, I should suggest to the Member for Brandon West, and the union has continually asked me back to be their representative, the impartial representative, as their appointee on the Labour Board. I did that for many years.

So I would suggest to the Member for Brandon West that perhaps I do know a little bit from whence I speak. I would perhaps suggest to him, if he doesn't know from first-hand experience, perhaps he should read something, like maybe start with the bill, maybe start with The Labour Act which he has obviously not done.

For the edification of members opposite and the Member for Brandon West, let's walk through the bill and see what it actually does. There's an interesting little chart that was attached to the press release. The way it works is, any time between 60 to 30 days before the expiry of a collective agreement, either party may

apply to the board for a vote. The vote being held by the workers, the very workers that the members express so much concern about. Not the labour bosses as has been referred to the other side, not the management stockholders, but the workers whose investment and equity in their jobs is affected by the contract and by any potential lockout or strike.

What happens then? The members vote on the question. The question is, do you wish to resolve the labour dispute by final offer selection process? If the members vote yes, the disputed items go to a selector. If they vote no, the bargaining process continues in an attempt to resolve the outstanding items. Let's assume they say, yes, that they want it resolved by final offer selection at that point. The selection process begins. If a strike or lockout is in progress, it shall be terminated forthwith. If a strike or lockout is in progress, one shall not be entered into or caused.

One of the things that I find interesting in the questions from members opposite and statements in the public that people forget is they have been talking about the labour unions and they keep mentioning individuals' names. They mention Bernie Christophe; they mention Bruno Zimmer; they mention other people's names and then they mention the Chamber of Commerce, Madam Speaker, and other people. I would suggest to members opposite, we are and they desire to be, the government of this province.

This bill is trying to establish a balance between labour and management, and for what reason? We are the government of all the people of this province. The people of this province, who are neither union nor management or chambers of commerce, are affected in one way or another and usually negatively by strikes and lockouts, Madam Speaker. We are attempting to provide alternatives to that process. I don't think anybody is happy on the SuperValu picket line. I don't think the management is happy. I don't think the union is happy. I don't think the workers are happy.

If there is another mechanism that could be made available to management and labour, Madam Speaker, to avoid that kind of situation and the kind of situation we're seeing in the post office, we, as a government, are going to attempt to provide that alternative. The workers themselves will choose whether they wish to accept that alternative. If they do not, then we go back to the strike, back to the lockout, back to the bargaining table hopefully. But this is another way of trying to keep labour, peace and fairness and not to interfere with the public interests in this province.

Let us go further. Okay, if they say, yes, a selector is appointed by the board. Where the parties agree on a selector, that person will be appointed. That's a fact that is conveniently forgotten. Most arbitration boards I have been on, Madam Speaker, is the party appointed by management, the party appointed by labour, usually sit down and get together and agree on who is going to chair the arbitration board, who they both agree is impartial, that same process, in effect.

There have been suggestions on the other side of the House, Madam Speaker, that somehow the Minister of Labour is going to appoint Bob Mayer, the Member for Brandon West suggests. I say balderdash, Madam Speaker. What will happen is management and labour will sit down and look at people who they think are fair and will present the list and they will agree on one

or the other. They will choose themselves who is going to be the selector. That is the normal process that arbitration boards work. I see no reason why this should work any differently, Madam Speaker.

Where the parties do not agree, then the board shall appoint - the board being the Labour Board. That same Labour Board chaired formerly by O.B. Baizley would be making this decision. I have heard and I find it extremely offensive from the Member for Brandon West that somehow the Labour Board is biased.

Madam Speaker, I find that suggestion offensive. I find it extremely offensive because, when the Conservatives were government, when we were government, a previous administration, now we are government, won attempts to get agreement on people for the Labour Board who are going to be fair and impartial so they do a fair and impartial job, so the government is not tarred by any brush of non-impartiality, Madam Speaker.

What is happening here is suggesting that the Labour Board, chaired now by John Korpesho, who was the secretary to the previous Labour Board, under the chairmanship of O.B. Baizley, that somehow John Korpesho is biased. I find that an offensive remark, Madam Speaker. I find that an offensive implication. I heard nobody when that same John Korpesho was appointed, I think it was 1982, from either business or labour condemn that appointment.

They all said, this is the best and fairest man for the job. The attempt by the Member for Brandon West to discredit the Labour Board and John Korpesho and his colleagues on the board by somehow suggesting bias, I find offensive, I think it is insulting and I also think that he is using his freedoms in this House to say such things as licence, Madam Speaker. If he said that outside of this House, I would suggest that the members of the Labour Board might have legitimate libel action possible and open to them.

I would suggest that he should tone down his remarks as other members opposite for the very simple reason that they are not true, they have not been validated and, in my opinion, Madam Speaker, they are libelous and defamatory.

What happens then, Madam Speaker, if a selector fixes the dates for filing the documents in a preliminary hearing? Then a selector holds a hearing to determine which terms and conditions are in dispute, and to fix a date for selection hearing. The selector may adjourn this hearing if, in his opinion, the parties can resolve the issues. I would like to point out that one of the major reasons for this legislation being put in at this time, Madam Speaker, is the fact that this legislation is there as a tool, but it is also as a tool and a prod to get people back to the bargaining table in order that they resolve the issues themselves.

The same intent was there with first contract, Madam Speaker, and I would suggest to all members of this House and the public, first contract has worked because it has not been invoked very often, I think the Minister suggested 14 times since it has been in, which is about four years.

What that means to me, Madam Speaker, is the existence of first contract legislation and the existence of final offer selection will encourage people to bargain in good faith, to get back to the bargaining table, to resolve the issues between them, rather than taking

the risk of having a selection imposed upon them on a final offer of which they have no choice.

We now see that the selector attempts to get them back to the bargaining table. The selector then holds hearings to allow each party to submit evidence and arguments in support of the final offer submitted to them. The hearing may be waived by agreement of the parties. They may just submit the offer. Within 48 hours at a hearing, the parties may agree to remove any items from the selector and shall so notify the selector.

The purpose of this, Madam Speaker, is they are continually being encouraged even while the selection process is going on to get back to the bargaining table and to come to an agreement themselves and that selection should only bring on the outstanding issues and the selector will continue to encourage them, as will conciliators and people from the Department of Labour, to make their own deal.

Final offer selection is very simply, like first contract, a way of allowing for settlement of dispute only in extremes, only in circumstances where the parties themselves cannot come to an agreement and only on those issues.

Then there is a timetable set out within 7 to 14 days of the hearing referred to. The selector shall select the whole of the final offer of the bargaining agent or the employer on the items still in dispute and so notify the person in writing. Upon receiving the selector's decision, the parties shall file with the board the terms and conditions which have been agreed to by the parties and a whole of final offer selected by the selector. This becomes a collective agreement.

This whole process can be repeated at another point in time. When a strike or lockout has lasted between 60 to 70 days, either party may apply to the board for a vote and then the vote is in the same wording, do you wish to resolve this labour dispute by final offer selection? The same choosing of the selectors takes place etc., should that be the case.

Madam Speaker, this is not the state control, and I quote the Member for Brandon West, of labour relations that one would have you think. If you read, Madam Speaker, the legislation, you look at the process. This is in no way state control. As a matter of fact, the thing that frightens the Member for Brandon West and his colleagues is the fact that this is actually to some extent worker control, and it's not worker control of the workplace and it is not taking over, but it is worker control of bargaining in good faith and making a choice whether or not they wish to stay on strike or be victims of a lockout, or whether or not they wish to go to ask an impartial body to provide them with final offer selection or, in the case of a first contract, with first contract.

Now what is happening in this situation, Madam Speaker, that I find somewhat a little annoying is the knee-jerk reaction from the Chamber of Commerce. I don't even know, Madam Speaker, why I should bother dealing with it. The Chamber of Commerce attacking final offer selection, obviously not having read the bill, or any of the background material, Madam Speaker, attacks in the same breath our taking over of the distribution facilities of Inter-City Gas which will benefit business people if we lower their gas prices. Basically, the Chamber of Commerce has a knee-jerk reaction to anything coming out of government and I would say,

Madam Speaker, from my own part, I dismiss any criticisms of the Chamber of Commerce out of hand because it is a knee-jerk reaction. It is not responsible criticism. They are not dealing with the particulars of the bill and its effects on It's a knee-jerk reaction to something coming from this government, Madam Speaker.

One of the things that is of more concern to me, Madam Speaker, is the unions who have come out in opposition to what they think is in the bill and what they think is done by final offer selection.

I refer to CUPE, I refer to ILGW, UCWC. The basic principles of the unions involved is that somehow this erodes, or prohibits, or takes away, or denies right to strike which has basically, for over a hundred years, been the major weapon of the labour movement. Well, I have sympathy with their concerns and we discussed this at caucus and when I read this bill I wanted to make sure that this did nothing of the kind.

I am assured, as are members of this caucus assured, that notice does not take away the right to strike, nor does it take away a company's right to lockout. What it does, Madam Speaker, it provides the workers - not the union reps who are negotiating the contract - but the workers on the shop floor, at the grass roots with an option of whether they want to use this tool when a strike situation is either impending or has taken place and has been in process for at least 60 days.

Now, Madam Speaker, this is not wrong; this is not unfair. I find it interesting, the City of Winnipeg is saying we, the city councillors, as management, are against this bill. A little more knee-jerk reaction, orchestrated by my friends opposite, who seem to fill their back benches with former city councillors of the Tory stripe from the City of Winnipeg. It was nicely orchestrated.

I watched last night. The Honourable Member for Charleswood is an excellent example of an upwardly mobile city councillor. I watched the debate and I noticed the Conservative members, and I'm sure most of them are card-carrying members on City Council opposing the bill, and opposing the bill for any reason they could see, whether or not it was rational or irrational. I heard one city councillor say the entire labour movement is opposed to this bill.

Well, that's not true. Even members opposite are aware not the entire labour movement, not even the majority of the labour movement. I saw other people opposing it because they are, all of a sudden, the City of Winnipeg - and I find this fascinating and wonderful. The Honourable Member from Charleswood, I'm sure, has a good memory of some of the labour disputes that have taken place in the city. They're concerned about the CUPE members. They want to make sure that CUPE gets the best deal possible from the Provincial Government.

Well, Madam Speaker, I have looked back on CUPE disputes and Transit worker disputes in the City of Winnipeg and I never noticed that attitude before. I never noticed this great love for CUPE. Ed Blackburn - I never saw him welcomed to all the bashes. I never saw Eugene Kostyra, when he was a member of that local, invited to go on junkets to Israel, Monaco, wherever else the city councillors went. But all of a sudden they are expressing this great love for CUPE and concerned about "the workers" and whether or not their right to strike - I love this one - is going to be eroded by this iniquitous legislation.

Friday, 19 June, 1987

The City Council of Winnipeg is concerned that CUPE should have the right to strike. Well, God bless them, Madam Speaker, I think that's wonderful. I just hope the next time a CUPE contract comes up for negotiation and there's a dispute in the City of Winnipeg, I hope to hear echoes of that. I hope to hear echoes of their concern for the workers.

But the fact is one of the concerns that CUPE has, and I think, as I mentioned, there is a certain legitimate concern, is whether or not this does erode their right to strike. Well, Madam Speaker, I am convinced, and I think one of the difficulties we have had is because of the media and because of the misstatements from members of the Opposition - and today we heard some beauties from the Member for Brandon West - is that people who are in a union movement, who have used the strike weapon as their final big gun in any labour dispute which is none that any working person in his right mind ever wants to use - I have been on picket lines in my time. Nobody on a picket line likes being on a picket line, not when it's 30 degrees outside Celsius, not when they're losing their pay packets, not when they're having to live on strike funds and pay their mortgages. I don't know of anybody who wants to be on strike. It is the ultimate weapon of labour to withdraw their labour. They only do it as their final weapon, and it is a huge risk because when you lose a strike you're out there, you lose pay, you lose income, your family is disrupted, you work hard; and if you lose a strike, Madam Speaker, and you are beaten you have lost all of that and gained nothing. That is an enormous risk. It is equivalently the risk of management to lock out and face the same situation where your company can go bankrupt in that kind of a situation.

It is also unfortunate in this province that we do not have anti-scab legislation to prevent third party intervention in strikes and lockouts is where we do not prevent management - where there is a dispute between two parties that somehow a third party, like security people, or hired scabs which the post office is hiring now, Madam Speaker, which I find absolutely reprehensible for a Crown corporation to be advertising and hiring scabs across this country, I think it's appalling. Madam Speaker, this should not be allowed but that's another issue which hopefully at a future Session of this Legislature we may be interested in debating. I am sure the City Council will be concerned about the poor scabs. They will not be concerned about the CUPE workers then. We will see what City Council does.

Madam Speaker, labour and management do not as members opposite and as some people in the media have - what drives me crazy, this term that constantly is being used by the Opposition - a level playing field. There is not a level playing field in labour management relations and you, Madam Speaker, I am sure are well aware there has never been a level playing field. Where management controls the pay packets, controls the hours of work, controls the working conditions of workers, Madam Speaker. There is never an equal situation; there is never a level playing field, Madam Speaker.

Workers individually and I would like to suggest that members opposite, particularly the Member for Brandon West, read the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights. He keeps talking about human rights. Section

22 of the Declaration, and I will quote it to him: "Everyone shall have the right to freedom of association with others, including the right to form and join trade unions for the protection of his interests." This is the United Nations, Madam Speaker, to which Canada is a signatory to that and we have been a signatory since 1948.

The fact is people join trade unions because they realize individually they do not have the power, and a playing field is not level unless they work collectively. The song "Solidarity Forever," which is a mainstay and almost an anthem of the union movement, Madam Speaker, is not taken lightly by the union movement. Because the fact is the playing field is not level. The playing field will never be level as long as companies can move, as Peter Pocklington has done with Gainers, from one place to another, to exploit labour in one area; and when they organize to oppose the exploitation as is their right under the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, when they oppose it, he moves his plant to someplace else.

The facts of life, Madam Speaker, is what we are doing is trying to level the playing field - and God I hate that expression - I hear it so often. Look, the level playing field members opposite talk about are the level playing fields I used to play on as a kid in the South Bronx where you had boulders for third base and where you had rocks and gullies and fences in the middle of it and garbage. That's the kind of level playing field of members opposite. What we're talking about is equity and fairness.

The employer has equity in capital equipment, his investment, his life, his time, in the business that he has. The worker has, Madam Speaker, equivalent equity and investment in the time he has put in, in that job; the investment of his sweat, her sweat, and toil in that particular job. They have as much rights as somebody who was 20 years at a particular job to protect their investment as the employer does to 20 years of owning a company.

Madam Speaker, what we are talking about is equality. What we are talking about is the ability of workers and management to sit down as reasonable adult human beings and come to reasonable agreements for the benefit of both sides, Madam Speaker.

One of the interesting things since I came to this country - and members opposite are constantly offended that I came to this country, but I'm here and I have a great intention of staying here. I will continue to stay here as long as I continue to be baited by members opposite that somehow immigrants shouldn't have come here and I, being an immigrant, have no right to be here.

But, Madam Speaker, in the United States, which is my home country, there is a different impression of the word "compromise," and I think this is one of the problems the U.S. has in international relations. Compromise, in the United States, is viewed as a dirty word. Compromise is giving in, is that somehow you are giving up something that you came to the bargaining table with. Be it the U.S. at Helsinki or be it labour or management at the bargaining table, the compromise is to give in and show weakness.

Well, let me tell you one of the great differences I have noticed in Canada, Madam Speaker, is compromise in Canada is seen as a meeting of minds

between two people who have a disputed condition around the same interest, and where they sit down and they work out and say, I'll give a little, you give a little and we work something out. Madam Speaker, the Canadian way is a better way, the Canadian way is a more reasonable way. The Canadian way, to me, Madam Speaker, is the right way. Compromise is not giving in, compromise is not the wrong thing to do.

We do not live in Canada in a macho society toting six guns like Lyndon Johnson or Ronald Reagan. We live in a society of reasonable people, where we have pride and, in fact, we have a Prime Minister who has won a Nobel Peace Prize. That's wonderful. Why? Because we have been willing to take the responsibility to sit down and negotiate and work out compromises where nobody gets everything they want, but people get the best possible deal, where both sides can walk away from a bargaining table, Madam Speaker, and feel that we have had some justice here and we can shake hands at the end of an agreement.

Madam Speaker, that is the intent of this legislation. The intent is very simple. The intent of first contract, which I have heard no qualms from the labour movement, wants to get people to get back to bargain, no American stand-offs, compromise is a good thing. Let's get them to work it out and compromise.

What you have in final offer selection is exactly the same intent, and to have the public interest protected is, where there can be no compromise reached, that a compromise is reached on who is trusted enough to actually make a decision which will satisfy both sides. That is the intent of this bill. Yes, it is innovative, this is innovative legislation, Madam Speaker, something that a party that calls itself Conservative would be opposed to just on a matter of principle because they're Conservatives. They are not innovators.

Madam Speaker, I commend this bill to the House. I praise the Minister of Labour and my colleagues for having brought it in. I urge honourable members to read the bill, to look at what is happening in New Zealand and in other places where this legislation has been used and to see it will have a beneficial effect. And also, Madam Speaker, is where the parties don't want to use it, the workers themselves will decide that they don't have to use it. It provides another tool to try and protect the public against unwanted strikes and lockouts, and protect both management and labour from the kind of escalating disputes we are seeing in the last few days, which we feel in this province is against the public interest.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for allowing me this time, and I commend this bill to the House.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: May I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have 26 Grade 5 students from the Hamiota Elementary School, under the direction of Mrs. Lynda Irwin. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Virden.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to the Legislature this morning.

Is it the will of the House to call at 12:30 p.m.?
(Agreed)

The bill will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

The hour being 12:30 p.m., the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned till 1:30 p.m. on Monday next.