

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 24, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 66 students of Grade 9 standing of the Isaac Newton School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Ferens and Mr. Lenzman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Burrows the Minister of Education.

We also have 52 students of Grades 8 to 12 standing of the Miami Collegiate hosting the students from St. Leonard d'Auston, Quebec. These students are under the direction of Mr. McMahon and Father Lamothe. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met for organization on Monday, April 23, 1973 and appointed Mr. Walding as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that, for the remainder of the Session, the quorum of this Committee shall consist of nine (9) members.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 14 - An Act to amend The Soldiers' Taxation Relief Act.

No. 27 - An Act to amend The Flin Flon Charter.

No. 29 - An Act respecting The Town of Steinbach.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bill No. 28 - An Act to amend The Brandon Charter (2), and has agreed to report the same with the following amendment:

THAT the proposed subsection 1.1 of Section 33A of The Brandon Charter as set out in section 1 of Bill 28 be amended by adding thereto, immediately after the word "conditions" in the fourth line thereof, the words "including, inter alia, earlier termination provisions".

All of which are respectfully submitted.

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

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

MOTION presented and passed.

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

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MATTERS OF URGENCY

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris that the House do now adjourn to consider a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely that since the partial withdrawal of guards service at Headingley Jail creates a dangerous situation for inmates, remaining guards, supervisory personnel and area residents alike, and since this situation was precipitated by provincial government action immediate consideration of possible provincial action is therefore warranted.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I entertain the motion our procedure calls that I hear representation in respect to urgency on the motion. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the urgency of debate comes as a result of the withdrawal of partial services by some of those correctional officers who have objected to the government's course of action with respect to the hiring of an ex convict and an ex inmate of the institution to work in the institution. Mr. Speaker, the urgency of debate is warranted because of the confusion that I think exists as to the exact functions that would be undertaken by the newly hired correctional officer.

## MATTERS OF URGENCY

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, the issue before us is not the question in principle of whether an ex convict should be hired or not -- (Interjection) -- No, it is not, Mr. Speaker, and I must indicate very clearly that that is not the issue before us. There is an acceptance I think on this side that in effect the rehabilitative process should in fact allow someone who has served his sentence to be put in the same position as everyone else. However, Mr. Speaker, the problem arises because of the objections that have been raised by the correctional officers to the hiring of someone who has just recently left the institution, criticized the institution, and who in their opinion would hurt -- would affect the actual proper operation of the institution.

Mr. Speaker, I gather that there have been meetings between the Department of Health and Social Development, that is the officials of the department, with representatives of the correctional officers. However, Mr. Speaker, there has not been to my knowledge a meeting between the Minister or between the First Minister and the correctional officers. We are dealing, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the honourable member that he address himself to the urgency of debate not to the subject matter of debate. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have here two letters, one dated March 22 which was first sent to the Director of Corrections by the Correctional Officers at Headingley Correctional Institution, dated March 22, 1973, the first letter, in which the statement is made: "The morale of the correctional officers has become a serious situation in the institution." I have in addition another letter which was sent to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, dated April 17, 1973, and I believe that the First Minister is in receipt, and the Minister of similar letters, in which the question of government policy is referred to in which the correctional officers state that government policy in the past have indicated clearly that if any officer becomes involved in a criminal offence he is subject to dismissal.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency of debate is the fact that the partial withdrawal of services can in fact damage life in the institution, can in fact damage life outside the institution, and that government action is warranted, and those people who have been involved in the correctional process as government employees are entitled to have the matter debated so that part of what may be referred to as the misinformation, and I suggest that there is misinformation on this, is clearly stated. I think there is reason to believe, Mr. Speaker, that if an emergency debate was allowed in this Legislature that the situation could in fact be clarified; and I would not move this motion, Mr. Speaker, if I did not believe that that emergency debate would in fact contribute to assisting in solving the problem and in fact bringing the degree of protection for the correctional officers and the inmates to the same position that it was before . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's five minutes is up. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, having participated myself, and through my party in the past, in bringing matters before you for urgent immediate public debate, and having seen all rejected on the grounds of the House rules, I recognize, Sir, that it is a very rare set of circumstances, and a special set of circumstances, which will compel you or cause you to rule in favor of such a debate, and I would urge you, Sir, that in this case, this situation does meet the criteria you so often have set out yourself in this House. And, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is quite correct in segregating the value judgment, or the policy judgment, of whether an ex inmate should be engaged as a correctional officer in the institution in which he served, which is not the issue which is urgent, and which is not the issue which is before us, but rather the fact that a series of Manitoba public servants who would serve a very sensitive function within our society have at least partially if not totally withdrawn their services and a deterioration of the situation is imminent or at least is indicated. Mr. Speaker, on that basis this becomes urgent.

One might normally go through the criteria which you, Sir, normally do and then determine that there is another appropriate moment at which it can be debated, and so on, as you so often have, Sir. But in this circumstance the Estimates for the Attorney-General have now been debated and there is no moment on the horizon foreseeably when we can debate this issue under the normal House rules and therefore for that purpose, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party supports the Leader of the Opposition in his request for an immediate urgent debate.

## MATTERS OF URGENCY

(MR. ASPER cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, the issue is not a policy decision of how one rehabilitates, and I'm positive that members opposite in the government will attempt to characterize the position that the Leader of the Opposition takes, and that I take, as being a barbaric attempt to restrain a person who has paid his debt to society from having the full civil right to work. But, Sir, in supporting it I make the Liberal Party's position very clear, that that is not at all our area of interest. Our area of interest is the fact that the government has through a very blunt set of instruments, a very unresponsive set of instruments, created an unacceptable situation. Not only is it unacceptable but it must be rectified immediately lest danger be incurred, damages be suffered by the people of this community or the other inmates of the institution involved.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would urge you in making your judgment to focus only on the question of: Is there a danger when a prison remains partially unguarded, or when there is a threat that a prison remains unguarded, is there a danger to society, and if there is that danger, and even if that danger is only one that lasts for hours, it is a proper case for immediate public debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon. Order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, as is often stated by me on occasions when we do have an attempt made to adjourn the House in order to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, the test that the Chair has to decide is not whether the subject matter is substantive and important but whether there is in fact urgency that there be debate on the subject matter. Now on this particular case I can only respond to the Leader of the Opposition; I cannot respond to the Leader of the Liberal Party since I couldn't follow the torchless path of his reasoning - the policy wasn't wrong but it was somehow unacceptable, that's what it seemed to come out to, so I leave his remarks alone and deal with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition when he's arguing that there's urgency of debate.

I have asked the Minister of Health and Social Development to indicate the advice that he is receiving within the department relative to the alleged problem. We are advised that there has been a meeting between certain representatives of correctional officers and the Deputy Minister of the department and other officials of the department. We are further advised that of the three shifts of security guards that out of each shift of approximately 40 persons that there are some 15 that have not reported for work.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I suggest to the Honourable First Minister that he too is discussing the subject matter not the urgency of the debate.

MR. SCHREYER: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm attempting to demonstrate that in quantifying the extent to which there is a problem that the quantification shows that it is only a problem of degree, it is not a problem of major degree, and therefore there is no problem of urgency of debate. No problem of urgency for that matter, let alone urgency of debate. We are advised that the problem is one of degree and therefore there is no reason to assume that there will be undue or unusual difficulty . . .

A MEMBER: We don't know.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . In the event that there is then the arrangement is that there will be immediate communication to those that have the responsibility of making decisions relative to this situation, and the appropriate kind of alternative arrangements will be made. In the meantime we are advised that there is no prospect, no concrete prospect or reasonable prospect of any undue difficulty, and accordingly I would suggest to you, Sir, that there is no (in that context) there is no urgency of debate. There is a disagreement being expressed on the part of a number and a relatively small number of that who have not reported out for work who disagree with a particular policy innovation, one which, and perhaps this is going into the substance of the matter, one which is in accordance with certain trends that have been well established in the course of the last decade with respect to the concept of rehabilitation of offenders, with respect to expungement of record, with respect to a second chance in society, etc. We cannot surrender that kind of policy decision-making to those who would want to usurp it because of their particular view of the structuring of society and the right way in which to run a penal institution. There are persons who are appointed with that responsibility. We take advice from them, Sir, and on the basis of advice we have it would seem that the problem is one of degree. Let there be no exaggeration of the degree.

## MATTERS OF URGENCY

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members for their contribution in respect to the urgency of the matter but I do believe that the Chair has very little latitude in this regard. In this instance Citation 100, subsection 3, indicates that urgency within this rule does not apply to the matter itself but it means urgency of debate, and the Chair is aware that there are a number of avenues open for debate on this subject matter. Although it was mentioned that the Attorney-General's Estimates have already been dealt with, this matter in my opinion comes under the Department of Health and Welfare in respect to corrections so therefore there is still ample opportunity, as well as a number of other procedures before this House. So therefore I rule the matter out of order.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

MOTION presented and passed.

MR. SPIVAK: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The motion before the House is: shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

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

YEAS

Adam	Mackling
Barrow	Malinowski
Burtniak	Miller
Cherniak	Paulley
Desjardins	Schreyer
Doern	Shafransky
Gottfried	Toupin
Green	Turnbull
Hanuschak	Uruski
Jenkins	Uskiw
Johannson	Walding
McBryde	

NAYS

Allard	Henderson
Asper	Gordon E. Johnston
Barkman	J. Frank Johnston
Bilton	Jorgenson
Blake	McGill
Borowski	McGregor
Craik	McKellar
Einarson	McKenzie
Enns	Moug
Ferguson	Spivak
Girard	Trueman
	Watt

MR. CLERK: Yeas 23, Nays, 23.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair having cast its vote once before casts it again in the affirmative sustaining myself. The motion is carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Member for Crescentwood. Had I voted I would have voted in the negative.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

## MATTERS OF URGENCY

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Had I voted I'd have voted in the negative.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether a representation has been made to him by the correctional officers suggesting that the ex inmate who is now to be used as a correctional officer should not be used on the floor of the jail?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I have received a brief from the correctional officers at Headingley and I would like to point out that the individual in question who was put on staff starting this morning is -- will be placed on staff as a term position for summer employment and will not be involved in the question of guarding inmates on the floor itself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . satisfied that the men understand this correctly, that that information has really been truly communicated to them.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied that this information has been related, and if additional information is needed on the part of the correctional officers at Headingley all information is available to them either directly from myself, my Deputy Minister, or the senior officials within the Department of Health and Social Development.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can assure the House that there is no danger to the correctional officers as a result of the partial withdrawal by some of their services?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm informed by my senior officials in Corrections that the walking out of 15 correctional officers involved with the guard of inmates on floors in the amount of 40 correctional officers, and keeping in mind the meeting that my Deputy Minister had with a council of residents at Headingley, that we are not in a point of danger at the Correctional Institution of Headingley.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether any of the wives of the correctional officers have made representation to the government with respect to the safety of their husbands?

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Speaker, not to myself. There could have been communications made to officials of the Department of Health and Social Development. But I can't really see why there would be at this stage additional jeopardy on the part of the remaining correctional officers at the jail at Headingley.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. In view of the conflicting reports as to his position on the Kierans Report, could he indicate whether it's the government's intention to request a speedup in the report of the task force the government has assigned to advise it on the viability of the Kierans Report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the task force will proceed expeditiously. It couldn't proceed more expeditiously; it wouldn't be able to fulfill its function.

MR. ASPER: Can the First Minister indicate why in response, or relating to his response yesterday, it should take the task force six months, I believe is what he said, to analyze a fairly brief report and advise the government?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe I said within six months. So hopefully it can be somewhat sooner.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the confusion that seems to exist as to the -- in the general community as to the Premier's position, could the Premier give an undertaking that prior to the termination of his term of office that he will make it clear to the people of Manitoba the government's policy vis-a-vis the Kierans Report?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will not accept the kind of implication in my honourable friend's questions. If he wants to become insulting I will only tell him that every time he opens his mouth he confuses people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Municipal

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . Affairs I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Can he indicate by what laws in accounting practice the government feels justified in burying about \$6 million in the Autopac operations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, certainly the Minister of Municipal Affairs who reports for Autopac would be in a position to respond to that question better than I, but there is no burying of any funds as such. I believe that the statement will show that there is an amount of approximately a million seven which has gone into what one might call contingency and rate stabilization reserves, and if one subtracts from that an amount approximately of a million dollars to meet claims incurred but not reported prior to the end of the fiscal year of the Corporation, it will see that the amount is even less than that. Certainly there is nowhere near \$6 million that has gone into any kind of reserve. It is -- in a sense I wish it were so, Mr. Speaker, but it isn't.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the First Minister if in fact the Autopac does not have outstanding to the Motor Vehicle Branch \$2, 539, 000 and has also shown as assets expenditures for start-up and it's shown as an asset as \$3, 480, 000.00?

MR. SCHREYER: No, Mr. Speaker, I would not agree to that. In any case I would point out, Sir, that questions having to do with the balance sheet can be taken up at the time that report will be taken up in the appropriate standing committee, which I hope can be arranged very soon. There are really a number of questions that deserve answers and that can't be done really in the question period as such.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a further question to the First Minister. In the government's announcement yesterday that the insurance rates were reduced by 15 percent, why did the government not include in the total cost of insurance to Manitobans those costs of supplementary insurance that are paid still to the private automobile companies or automobile insurance companies?

MR. SCHREYER: Well again, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of question that can be better dealt with when the report is taken up by the standing committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, my question would be to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CRAIK: . . . supplementary question I'd like to address to the First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Honourable Member for Riel have a supplementary?

MR. CRAIK: Yes I do, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the First Minister if in fact the figures given yesterday in the press release are not misstated and that in fact the total cost of automobile insurance . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I'm sure the honourable member is aware that during the question period verification of press statements is not permissible as part of our procedure. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa. -- (Interjection) -- The honourable member wish to rephrase the question?

MR. CRAIK: I would like to ask whether the costs of automobile insurance from 1970 to 1972 have not in fact the total dollars collected gone up by \$5 million?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, either in the standing committee, or in fact when the Minister of Municipal Affairs deals with his Estimates here in Committee of the Whole, detailed questions of that kind can be raised. I would say at this point in time to my honourable friend that if there has been an increase it would have largely to do with the kind of coverage, the percentage of the total motoring public that have full coverage, medical benefit coverage, etc., that all of these things have to be taken into account, and I believe that that was the gist of the press release that was issued yesterday. I did not peruse that press release personally so I'm not familiar with it. I have however seen the annual report as tabled yesterday by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Would he advise the House if the province is considering building and operating their own distillery in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I can advise in the negative.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him if he has reached agreement with the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Saskatchewan as to the tabling of the terms of reference of the Interprovincial Hog Marketing Agency?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I believe all of the information has already been made public. As I recall it the Orders-in-Council that had been passed have been filed -- I would think they have -- and that whatever information there is should be contained therein.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, the question was: has the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Saskatchewan has agreed in that House to table the terms of reference, and he said he would be consulting with the Minister of Agriculture here as to whether or not it would be an agreeable course of action. I am asking now if the Minister has had conversations with the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan with regards to the tabling of those terms of reference?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he could indicate to the House when the policy was instituted of hiring freshly released ex-prisoners into positions, sensitive positions, where security or public funds are involved?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I - as I'm sure my honourable friend will appreciate - I cannot recall that the matter as such arose in Cabinet and therefore that the matter was decided as a matter of government policy at the Executive Council level. My understanding of it is that this was a decision arrived at departmentally, based on the best advice available from senior officials of the department and in concert with developments elsewhere in this country, continent, and the free world, with respect to rehabilitation of prisoners, expungement of record, etc. I cannot swear to it but I'm quite certain that it was not arrived at as a matter of Executive Council decision; it just didn't reach that point.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, a further question to the Premier. I wonder if he would indicate to the House whether he is at all concerned that that type of policy could jeopardize the safety of all the citizens of Manitoba in view of the situation that there is several - half of the guards have walked out. Is he more concerned about one person, or is he more concerned about the rest of Manitobans?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been circumstances, incidents, and of course in the past decade within our memory where there have been incidents in penal institutions, and I think investigations have shown at times that, at times the fault lie on - with respect to those who were incarcerated, and at times the fault lay with those who were really responsible for security of the institution, and so it goes. I must say to my honourable friend that the concept, the concept that persons who have served their penalty to society upon release from incarceration they are as speedily as possible to be helped in rehabilitation and assimilation back into normal society, is one that I think we agree with, and as is the case I believe right across the country, and that I think is what has motivated the department to proceed the way they have in this case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson -- last supplementary.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder in view of the statements made by the Premier in answer to the question, could he indicate whether his own department has hired any ex-cons into his own department, or whether his Party has hired any ex-cons to work as

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . staff or part-time staff? Is he really sincere in what he just said?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I can't say that there are any such persons employed in the office of the Executive Council. On the other hand I am aware, Sir, that in the Parliament of Canada there is at least one person who was in a position of having served a penalty to society, and I believe that the same is true of legislations across the country from time to time, and I think it has to be determined on the basis of the actual job opening and the individual concerned, and common sense and good judgment must prevail at all times.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. Does the honourable member have another supplementary. He's had two.

MR. BOROWSKI: I'm not asking a supplementary, I just ask the Premier if he'd mind answering the question, does the Party employ any ex-convicts within the Party structure, the NDP Party structure?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is something which doesn't come under the administrative responsibility of the Crown; but if the question is, does the Crown hire such persons, the answer is obviously that from time to time in the past the Crown has, and this is merely one example of it. I certainly - if it's answering the question any more specifically I'd be glad to do so. Certainly that would not be one of the caveats of instruction that would be issued to anyone in hiring personnel that they must avoid at all cost the hiring of persons who were at some time incarcerated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and it relates to the answer he gave to the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. Did the government at any time during which he was the Minister of Industry, did it in fact commission a feasibility study to examine the feasibility of the Crown establishing a distillery in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, not while I have been Minister of Industry and Commerce. I don't recall any such study being commissioned. My friend the Honourable Minister of Labour reminds me that the Bracken Commission made some reference to such a facility and made some recommendations in this respect. I do know this, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Industry has helped many people in doing feasibility studies on distilleries, and some in the Minnedosa area which I know my honourable friend may be familiar with.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, then can we assume that reports that have been issued publicly, and discussed publicly in the media, to the effect that the government had been interested in establishing a Crown owned distillery are incorrect?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, this is something, you know, everyone has ideas but I can tell the honourable member quite categorically to the best of my knowledge no study has been conducted or commissioned in the Department of Industry and Commerce on this subject.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the other day the Honourable Member for Thompson asked whether any United States citizens were employed by the Planning and Priorities Committee and I have had that checked and I am advised that there are no U.S. citizens employed in that particular branch of operation of the Crown.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I understand his counterpart in Saskatchewan indicated to the Saskatchewan House that he was prepared to table or make public the contract having to deal with the sale of pork to Japan. Would the Minister now reconsider his earlier position in this regard and make public the contracts for the sale of pork to Japan here, as his colleague in Saskatchewan seemingly is prepared to do?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I know not of any contract that the Province of Saskatchewan has entered into with anyone in Japan. Therefore having not any knowledge in that regard and the nature of such a contract, I am not prepared to give my honourable friend that kind of a commitment.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Honourable Minister a supplementary question. Is



## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . he now prepared to tell us for what price Manitoba farmers are selling the pork to Japan for?

MR. USKIW: I would imagine, Mr. Speaker, one would have to take out the formula related to the recent price changes that did occur in this province to arrive at the price, and I have not done so. I am not aware at the price the product may be moving out today or tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside. Last supplementary.

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question. Can the Minister give us any reason why he is so secretive about the price arrangements that we're talking about?

MR. USKIW: If the honourable friend would read Hansard he would know why. We have had these same questions before, and I want to repeat for his benefit again that a contract entered into between two parties is one that is usually kept in confidence for the sake of both parties.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. At the meeting held with the City of Winnipeg yesterday, were there any decisions made re the province granting more financial aid to the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Urban Affairs) (Burrows): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture related to the question just asked by the Member for Lakeside. I'd like to ask the Minister, is the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan aware and know the details of the contractual arrangement between Manitoba, with Manitoba hogs and Japan?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware about the awareness of the Minister of Agriculture for Saskatchewan.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister then in the arrangements that have been made between Manitoba and Saskatchewan in establishing a board that would handle Manitoba and Saskatchewan hogs collectively, was there not any understanding between the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan and Manitoba as to contractual arrangements that had previously been made and now put under the jurisdiction of that board?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the contractual arrangements between the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board and the company purchasing pork in Japan is of no business or concern of the Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Could the Honourable Minister inform the House whether an agreement has been signed with the Federal Government for the takeover of Deer Lodge Military Hospital, or if not, is an agreement imminent in the future?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, we have not signed an agreement with the Federal Government pertaining to the purchase or the utilization of all or part of the Deer Lodge Hospital facility. We are negotiating with the Federal Government and hopefully that if this ever occurs it will occur as a benefit to those veterans concerned and to all citizens of the Province of Manitoba.

ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. TOUPIN: While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to an Order for Return No. 13 asked by the Honourable Member for Thompson.

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture, further to what my colleague from Lakeside had to ask about. Can the Minister indicate whether or not the hog producers of Manitoba are subsidizing the pork sales to Japan?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the Honourable Member for Rock Lake implies when he talks about subsidization because a question of subsidization, if that is the term to use, could be applied in both cases, whether or not the exports are subsidizing the domestic market or vice versa.

MR. EINARSON: A second question to the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister indicate whether the Municipality of Lorne have negotiated an agreement with the Water Services Board for the use of those facilities to towns in that municipality?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I have a vague recollection about such an incident. I think I should take the matter as notice though to be sure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare. In the present circumstances in Headingley, can the Minister assure the House that the discipline and security will be maintained both now and in the immediate future?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm assured by officials in my department that the security is well in hand at Headingley now, and so far as the future is concerned neither the Honourable Member for Swan River or myself can indicate what will happen in the future. Measures have been taken pertaining to additional staff, if need be, for additional protection, if need be -- but again I say that we've had meetings with correctional officers at Headingley; we've had meetings with the council of residents at Headingley, and based on those meetings I am quite assured that the security is well in hand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Urban Affairs. He indicated there's been no decisions made. Did the province make any offers for more financial aid to the City of Winnipeg at the meeting yesterday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asked me whether any decisions were made. The only decisions that were made were an agreement on matters requiring further discussion by the delegation from the City with its council, and that was the limit of the decisions that were made. And also a discussion of the expenditure of ways and means in which the City could make best use of the assistance provided by the province to it.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could outline the offer of assistance made to the City of Winnipeg by the province which he just referred to.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is contained in No. 1 in the Estimates, No. 2 in the Budget Speech.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: A last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, could the Minister inform the House if the financial help offered to the City of Winnipeg will be in the form of a grant, that the City of Winnipeg can decide how the money is used, or will the province designate how the money shall be used?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Both, Mr. Speaker, as the law provides.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has an article entitled: "Government Considering Building Distillery" in the Free Press of April 24th, today's date, has it been brought to the Minister's attention? Has he seen the article?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased that the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party raised the question because the article in question has just been brought to my attention. Previously I had been asked whether we had conducted a feasibility study related to a possible government-owned distillery and I indicated in the negative, and I was asked subsequent questions, and I indicated that feasibility studies as such had not been conducted. There has been a feasibility study conducted for another distillery in Manitoba, but this was in keeping with a request from a European firm that at one point a couple of years ago had thought it might wish to establish a distillery in Manitoba. Unfortunately not much progress has been made in this regard, but the feasibility study was done in connection with a request by a private European company that had some interest in going into this type of business in Manitoba.

MR. ASPER: Was it the intention of the Government of Manitoba to participate in

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. ASPER cont'd) . . . . ownership of the distillery, as the article reports?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the article, you know, implies as though it would be a Crown corporation, or where we would have majority ownership. Unfortunately the proposition didn't get to the point where particulars of finances were itemized in detail, so I can't report on that matter to the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Resources. Sometime ago I asked the Minister if he could advise me whether the Fairford Dam was closed because of the low runoff this year. I wonder if he has that information yet.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I don't have it at the moment, but I'll try to see why it's been delayed in coming.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he could advise the House if in view of the results of the feasibility study, if his department has assisted Canada's Manitoba distillery at Minnedosa in finding sales outlets for their produces, in view of the fact they had to close for some nine months last year due to lack of sales.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I can't suggest that we have assisted that particular company substantially in their sales efforts, but I do know historically that the Government of Manitoba has given great assistance through the Manitoba Development Corporation or the Manitoba Development Fund, and through the Department of Industry and Commerce, to the Minnedosa distillery.

MR. BLAKE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could he confirm that during their period of depressed sales, did the government receive an offer to purchase the distillery in Minnedosa from the principals?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't recall any such offer. I do know that we had discussions with that company to assist them in overcoming their particular prices, the fall-off of sales and so on, and we did the best we could to assist them at that time to get back into production. I can't take the time of the House to go into detail now. I'd be glad to discuss it with my honourable member privately if he so wishes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. I wonder if he could indicate whether he said a few moments ago that his department is hiring extra outside staff to look after the prisoners so there will be no escapes at Headingley, and I believe the other institutions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that. I said that there is a capacity at this stage based on recommendations that I had received, enough there at Headingley to actually care for the protection of inmates and of society and if additional staff is needed because of a prolonged walkout, additional staff is available within the Department of Health and Social Development, and if at one point in time there is a decision taken to hire new staff, this will be done.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister assure us that no scabs or strikebreakers will be hired by him to break the present deadlock?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, at this point there is no strike at Headingley, so as Minister of Health and Social Development I cannot make reference to scabs being brought in on the job to protect the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Can he advise the House whether the form of the tax statement for the City of Winnipeg has been approved by the Provincial Government yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is going to take the question as notice, would he advise the House as well if the government is in fact printing the tax statement form for the City of Winnipeg?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'll take that question as notice too, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Does the government intend to present -- as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, perhaps this should go to the First Minister as Minister of Finance, and may I add that I hope we will not have the gratuitous unparliamentary response that we had from his last answer to me. Does the government intend to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I do believe that the same applies in respect to Beausnesne Citation 171 in regards to members making their question that they should be brief and to the point. Gratuitous remarks are not necessary. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I raise the point because I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member place his question?

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Does the government intend to present a brief to the House of Commons Finance Committee on the question of foreign ownership, the bill presently before the House of Commons Finance Committee, restricting foreign investment in Canada, or does it have any intention of submitting its views directly or indirectly to the Federal Government on the proposed bill restricting foreign acquisitions of industries, which would apply to Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, we've had communication, government to government on this; there have been discussions involving former Ministers of the Federal Crown and the Province of Manitoba. Since that time the Federal Government has reintroduced revised legislation. The political parties in parliament have addressed themselves to the legislation and any dialogue we have will be government to government rather than through any committees of parliament.

MR. ASPER: Might I then ask, Mr. Speaker, if the Government of Manitoba has a position paper on the foreign ownership bill and if it does, when was it written?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, a position paper is presumably something different than a letter. We have been in communication with the federal authorities in this respect by way of letter and by way of meetings right here in this building approximately a year ago.

MR. ASPER: Would the First Minister indicate to the House what is the Government of Manitoba's position with respect to the bills currently before parliament, and on the question of how far it goes, and should it go any further, and so on. Would the Premier outline his position?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The question is out of order. It's asking for too large an area of explanation. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: May I rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Government of Manitoba intend at any time during this session to table either through Guidelines III, or in some other form, its position on the foreign investment issue so that we will have an opportunity to debate it?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, we regard the legislation or the bill that has been recently tabled in Ottawa to be an improvement over the initial bill that was tabled a year ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources. Is it the intention of the government to improve the airstrips in Northern Manitoba, the landing strips?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Yes, Mr. Speaker, money has been budgeted for further improvements on airstrips in Northern Manitoba, and further discussion of this could take place if my Estimates ever get before the House.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary. Will the same kind of moneys be made available for southern Manitoba for similar improvements?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the communities in southern Manitoba have highway access which is not true of many of the communities in northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. In view of the statement that they are hiring ex inmates in his department and in view of the fact . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. BOROWSKI: My question is that in view of the fact that there is discrimination against people over 40 in this province, will the Minister assure us that inmates or ex inmates or ex convicts over 40 will be eligible for being hired by his department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, there is certain allegations within the question posed by the Honourable Member for Thompson that I totally disagree. There are no discrimination in the Department of Health and Social Development pertaining to age, sex, creed, religion, you name it.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase my question. Can he assure the House that ex convicts over 40 years will be hired by his department the same as those that are under 40?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I can assure the Honourable Member for Thompson and yourself and all members of the House is that anyone below or over 40 years with experience and qualifications will certainly be considered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson, last supplementary.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, I have a question for the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Premier would indicate whether it's going to be now the government policy to give preferential treatment to ex criminals over 40 which is not given to people who have never committed a crime and are refused employment in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it is not apparent to me that there is any kind of preferential treatment either in one direction or in reverse. There is sometimes the problem of trying to follow a particular social policy to the extreme where one indulges in reverse discrimination, which is something which is not particularly advisable in the long run either. But in this particular case I doubt very much whether there is any indication that the number of persons who happen to have a previous term of incarceration in relation to the total employment at correctional institutions is in any way, in relation to total population of the province, in any way out of kilter, and therefore I don't think that there is any preferential treatment. In fact statistically I suppose that there is still discrimination perhaps. But I think that that is statistical nonsense either way.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. In view of his admission in the House that men over 40 are being discriminated, would he . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I suggest once more to the honourable member that he contain his opinions to himself, that he ask direct questions as our rules call for. He continually interjects with opinions which is contrary to our rules. Now I've been lax in allowing this to occur but I must insist that we get the Question Period over with. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I way with the greatest respect, Sir, it is not your business how long the Question Period lasts. If it's ten minutes or an hour, there are no rules in this House that say the Question Period must end at some particular time. If the members on this side wish to ask questions they have every right to do so, and I object to you telling us that we do not have the right to ask questions because we are prolonging it.

Secondly, other members of the House, including government members, have prefaced questions and it's necessary in some instances. If the question is to be understood by the Minister it is necessary at times to preface it, and I simply did that, not to abuse the rules but so the Attorney-General knows the question so he can answer it without me getting up and explaining it. The Attorney-General had last week admitted that there was discrimination in 40, and I'm asking him will he use the Human Rights Commission to look into the question of discrimination against people over 40 who have never committed a crime?

## ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated that there was common knowledge that people over 40 had difficulty if they had lost their employment in finding new employment, and that there were cases, obvious cases of hardship, that honourable members had heard about, and where there is that sort of thing obviously there is a problem, but I indicated that the Human Rights Commission was not charged with that responsibility. Some Human Rights Commissions do deal with that category of alleged discrimination but I indicated that this Human Rights Commission was not.

You know the question as to whether or not I am going to investigate person who allege discrimination because they have or have not a criminal record, I want the honourable member to know, and all members of this House to know, that pursuant to acts passed in the Parliament of Canada, people under certain circumstances can have their records expunged after only two years following their release from an institution. And I am not, for one, going to advocate that we do a super sleuthing job of investigating the background of every person that is hired, or every case that comes before us. Surely if people have a right to have their records expunged by the Parliament of Canada we should not dig beyond that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise a question of House privilege and it refers to the series of questions I asked earlier about Autopac. The questions I asked were taken from an official press statement by the government yesterday, and I understand from your ruling today that official government statements, such as that referred to, are not to be used or taken as official government policy. And I bring it up, Mr. Speaker, unless I'm mistaken, in your ruling today, but I did say that I was referring taking the questions from an official government press statement, and I ask you to clarify this because I have a feeling that perhaps you may have misunderstood what I said. But the question really is, and the privilege of the House, as to whether or not official statements, press statements, issued by the government do not in fact represent government policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair can only go by Beauchesne's Citations and the practices of this House and I understood the honourable member, which is again contrary to what our rules are, -- if the honourable member wishes to discuss it with me personally that is the proper way to do this, but not to raise it on the floor of the House as to decisions taken. But I will this one case, and it's not a precedent and I want to indicate that, indicate that I understood the honourable member to say "the press" and consequently I assumed that it was the press, not any other paper or anything else. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps to clarify it - the question raised is not a personal one, it's one that affects the whole House. I did say a "press statement" and this is a statement issued by the government to the press yesterday in a press release, and I think that for the record it would be worthwhile to clarify that press statements released by the government do in fact reflect government policy and therefore are open to question in the Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood have a question?

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Yes, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Resources. Has the Government of Manitoba accepted the recommendation of Flyer Coach to sell its Morris plant yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood. Sorry.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I shouldn't leave false inference. I'm not aware that such a recommendation has been made to the government at this point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources can indicate whether such an offer has been made to the Manitoba Development Corporation Board?

MR. GREEN: I did indicate, Mr. Speaker, last week that the Development Corporation was discussing such a proposition, and just so that again there is no inference that is incorrect, my understanding is that the Board of Western Flyer has made such a recommendation to the Board of the Manitoba Development Corporation. I am anticipating that the Development Corporation will deal with this matter by making a recommendation to the government.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister if he could advise the House as to whom the Development Corporation are negotiating with?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that we are this far in discussion of it. I really can't give that kind of information to the honourable member at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Mines Minister, and I preface my question by agreeing with him that matters under negotiation must be carefully handled.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister state his point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SCHREYER: Yes. Every question that starts with the preface begs an answer that has a preface, all of which is out of order. Prefacing is just simply out of order, Mr. Speaker, and I do wish that we take cognizance of that fact.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, raised by the First Minister, the questioning permitted and which is fully in order under our rules and under Beauchesne, permit the framing of a question in such a manner as to make it intelligible to the person to whom it's addressed. And that's the only point I make, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. ASPER: To the Mines Minister, could he indicate whether the sale or the offer that's been received would result in the closing of the Flyer Coach plant and its removal to Transcona from Morris, or would it involve the construction of a new plant in Morris for Flyer Coach?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the government -- I am unaware of any prospect that is now being considered by the Manitoba Development Corporation which would have any effect on reducing the activities in Morris, Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and it relates to the matter that is now before us. Without in any way dealing on any specifics, can he indicate though whether the Manitoba Development Corporation is reviewing an offer for shares or as an offer for assets?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, is it an offer for shares?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I previously answered the question and that's as far as I'm going.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I'll put another question to the Minister, he may or may not want to answer it. I wonder if he can indicate whether they are dealing with an offer for part of the assets as opposed to the total assets of the company?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the whole is the sum of its constituent parts, the answer is yes.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister could indicate if they're dealing only with the Morris plant.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated as much information on this question as I think that it is fair to indicate in a matter which is under negotiation.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether the government's received any feasibility report about the feasibility of the plant located in Transcona, a recent feasibility report concerning the feasibility of the plant in Transcona.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Development Corporation proceeded with the Transcona plant on the basis of certain projections as my honourable friend calls them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: To the same Minister. Has the Government of Manitoba instructed the Manitoba Development Corporation to cease negotiating to sell the Manitoba plant to an American corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 73 (a) -- passed -- the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make some remarks on the Estimates of the Minister of Labour. I heard most of his remarks when he introduced his Estimates the other evening and I was somewhat disappointed in the Minister's introduction. Almost on every other occasion he took some time and was able to give us more detail about the workings of his department, and I would have been most interested to hear how the new legislation, how the completely revised Labour Relations Act and the number of major amendments we passed in this House last session, how these were working, and were there any problems, and I was waiting for the Minister to tell us how the new legislation - what kind of attention it was receiving from the employees and the employers, and if there were any concerns. However, Mr. Chairman, we did not get that kind of an introduction from the Minister.

But the Minister did however on the other hand take the members of the Opposition, and I would assume he mentioned the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party and I was one of those included, that we weren't concerned about labour. And I was disappointed in the Minister in that respect, because surely the Minister knows quite well many of the issues that I have brought before this House, before the Legislature in the last ten some years now, Mr. Chairman, and in some areas I was able to bring these issues to this House and matters before anyone on the NDP side, when they were on this side of the House, would raise any of these matters themselves. Not only did I raise the matters but I also introduced them by way of resolution or amendment to the bill. And very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I introduced such matters as automation, how it would deal with technical changes; higher minimum wage in northern Manitoba, which my colleague has introduced I believe last year and has on the Order Paper again. I have continually introduced for at least four years in a row, before the Minister had enough courage last year to amend the bill in respect to statutory holidays, increasing the holidays and the employer would have to pay for statutory holidays. I know there's very very few abuses but there were times when maybe perhaps a couple of employers would not pay for statutory holidays, and naturally many employers would be tarnished, but in the majority I would say the employers would observe this type of - even it was unwritten law at that time until we put it on the statutes a year or so ago. I've brought in matters relating to vacation with pay, and I stated in this House even when the Conservative Government were in power, I stated at that time, and that's going back over four years, that after five years of service with one employer there should be three weeks holiday pay. And again the Minister of Labour had to be dragged and pushed for almost three years before he brought in the legislation, so he can't say that he was the very progressive Minister that he tries . . . us to believe when he lectures us on this side.

Mr. Chairman, there were other matters such as certification that we had real problems in this province and by placing under the jurisdiction of the Labour Board matters respecting the Labour Relations Act, and this was the recommendation that I brought in by a resolution form some seven years ago, and at that time I believe the government of the day did accept my recommendation and said they would look into it, and subsequently the Woods Committee reported and brought in the same recommendation and it was then put into legislation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I've talked about increasing the minimum wage; I've had a resolution on the Order Paper to repeal the government supervised strike vote; I've introduced a national building code resolution in this House, and many other things. We've asked for a joint management-labour research committee to be established, which it was. And so the Minister last night, or the other night, saying that the members on this side contribute very little as far as the Labour Estimates are concerned, and that's the reason why I'm putting these points on the record, Mr. Speaker, and I couldn't believe that that was the contribution of the Minister



## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . of Labour because really I have high regard for him and when I listened to him the other night I thought it was a very very shabby performance.

Now it may be true we could be complimentary to the Minister in some respects, and I hope when we are critical and don't extoll platitudes on the Minister that he doesn't get angry and cranky about it like some of the other Ministers do, and they still feel that now they're -- perhaps on this side. I know when the Minister was on this side he was able to get up and talk for 40 minutes at least sometimes three or four times a week. And the government of the day would have to listen to it. But nowadays if we're critical, and in a very mild manner critical, and we don't extoll platitudes on the Ministers they get very touchy about anything that we have to say, and I think it's very unfortunate, Mr. Chairman. And I want to be critical in some areas, Mr. Chairman.

According to the Report of the Minister of Labour he has told us that labour force and employment in the province expended in 1972 and the total labour force averaged 396,000 - this is in his report last year - which was an increase of 6,000 people, or 1.5 percent, over the year prior and the total employment climbed to an average of 378,000. My point is, Mr. Speaker, an increase of 6,000 jobs in this province is not enough. That means that at least five to six thousand people, young people that are graduating from universities and colleges and high schools have no work in the province; they have to go to some other areas or some other province. So even according to the Minister's own report the 1.5 percent increase in the labour force should not be something that he should be quite happy about and quite satisfied because, Mr. Chairman, I feel it's not good enough.

The second point that I wish to raise to this very progressive Minister of Labour who tells us on every occasion that he has an opportunity to get up, which I disagree at times, last year I was very critical as far as the workmen's compensation amendments were concerned, and I'm still not satisfied this year, and the Minister I believe took an undertaking last year that there would be a further study and perhaps further amendments as far as compensation to widows is concerned. At least I know that he said we'll have to take a very serious look at it and it's a year now and we have not had this look. Now my point is, Mr. Chairman, the most glaring injustice in the compensation what a wife receives with children she is better off when the husband is living than when he dies. The wife actually loses money when the husband dies. When the husband is around I believe even when he is incapacitated he can do small chores or he can even baby-sit while the wife can perhaps get a job and be able to do some work. But what did we do last year? Last year we increased the compensation from \$120.00 to 150. Now this wife when the husband dies she still has the same problems, she still has to pay rent, she has to pay fuel, she has to buy clothing for the children, she's got taxes to pay, and she's got all the same expenditures and then her allowance is out down by more than 75 percent to what it would have been if the husband would have been alive but totally disabled, totally disabled. My point is, and I wish to state it again to the Minister, that if the husband should die as a result of an industrial accident it is my opinion that the wife should be entitled to at least two-thirds of the husband's salary, to at least two-thirds. Surely increasing it from 120 to 150 dollars has not solved the problem, and this is the area that I can be critical of the Minister.

I know I've had many many replies - in fact there is a couple of letters on my desk now - into the same matter, and I guess the reason the letters came in today because they knew the Minister had his department before the House. And this was the point that was raised in the letters as well, that the \$150.00 is not sufficient to keep a household, to pay all the bills, and let's face it, when the husband was alive and totally disabled he may be receiving \$900.00 pension and the minute that say he died, this is reduced to \$150.00. I'm sure the Minister realizes it's pretty difficult to keep the household going on \$150.00, and this is the area that I think that he has to concern himself. I believe the widow we should realize was not responsible for the industrial accident. I know that some may say well she should go and get a job. She may be at the age that she may not be able to get a job; she may not have the proper training to get a job, and she'll also find it difficult to get a job. She might be not equipped to get a job that easy. So again I wish to say to the Minister this is one area that I think that he could be criticized, and justly criticized, and I feel that he should look into this area.

The other matter, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to bring to his attention, when he tells us how progressive he is we still have a 44-hour work week in this province. There are other provinces who have a 40-hour work week, and it is my information that even the large stores

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . like The Bay and Eatons they're operating under the 36 and 38-hour work week, and really I feel that it's not right because many of the collective agreements today specify one and one-half time for anything over the 40-hour work week, and still where there is no bargaining unit, when the employees are not in the unit, they still have to work the 44-hour week. I understand the 40-hour work week is in the federal legislation; it's in at least several of the other provinces, and really there's another area that the Minister is not as progressive as he would like us to believe.

Mr. Chairman, all we have to do is take a look at our chart on the civil service super-annuation pension plans and again we find some very very almost unbelievable points in this thing. For instance the averaging out of pensions, which is five years in most provinces, it's still ten in this province. This is an area that the Minister has not upgraded. Refunds of contribution - three percent. At one time we have no interest paid, we now have I believe three percent. I understand some of the other provinces are paid a current bank rate interest whatever it is, five or six percent. Anyhow it's higher than the three percent. So that's another area that I believe the Minister said - replied to me last year and said, we will take a look at it. We're a year later now and we haven't been able to find time, or whatever it was, that we never looked at this again. And I hope that we will.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, it's more often nowadays that there is a transfer of civil servants between governments, or between provinces, and again the pensions should be made portable. I think that it's time that we make it as easy as possible for people to be able to transfer from one job to another and this is an area that the Minister should make the pensions portable.

I would not have taken the opportunity to talk about this but during the question period I think there were some good points raised in respect to the problems and the walk out at Headingley Jail, and I wish to ask the government and the Minister at this time, has the government taken any action to insure that there will be no walk out or strike at the Headingley Jail? And I think this is very serious and very important and something that this Minister has to concern himself with. And if he hasn't taken any action I think that he has to be prepared to take some action if there is a walk out because I'm sure this is a very serious matter. I wonder what recommendations that the Minister or his colleague, the Minister of Health and Social Services, received from perhaps the correction officers in respect to this problem at the jail and this to some extent will fall under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour, and I would like to see - I would like to know what he does intend to do about this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the other area that the Minister has to give some action and concern himself, is in respect to finding some employment - not only keeping the employment down but trying to find some employment for the university students in respect to summer employment and the high school students. I do not know the program that the government has but perhaps one of the Ministers would tell us what the program is. How many students will each department of the government hire for the summer? I understand that this is what takes place in the Federal House and it's been practiced by the previous government and the present government that each department will hire so many students. Now I don't know what the program the present government has but surely I think the Minister should be concerned about the unemployment, and he may say to me that I should ask these questions of the Minister of Colleges and Universities but the Minister of Labour is still responsible for unemployment in this province, and I think that they do operate the student employment office now and it would be a good thing to know how many students have applied and made application to this office, and perhaps he can tell us how many were able to get placed or get jobs through this office last year, to see if the office has any responsibility or it's doing any justice or not. If he hasn't got the information perhaps he can get it from the Minister of Colleges and Universities, and I think it would be of interest to all members in this House. I think that this is an important point, because not only that the university students are finding difficulty in getting jobs but also the high school students.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to ask the Minister. Perhaps he can give some consideration about the establishment of an institute of industrial relations in Manitoba, which I believe is much overdue. This type of an institute is, you know, in existence in British Columbia, the University of Toronto, Queen's University and Dalhousie, and these are just the ones that I know that there is, I'm sure that there's more. I believe that there's a need to

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . conduct research in the field of labour management and industrial relations, Mr. Chairman, perhaps dealing with certain specific aspects of labour and management. The functions would be to provide a form of perhaps promoting better labour and management relations, to conduct research in the general area of industrial relations; and I know that the Minister didn't even mention anything about the four-day work week. I don't know how it's working, and I know there is one industrial plant, or several in this city, that have been on a four-hour work week. I understand that Manitoba Hydro is going into it for a four-month period this summer. Surely the Minister must have done some -- or four day -- I'm talking about four-day work week -- surely the Minister must have done some research and see how this has been working. Is the management for it; is the labour for it; and what are the problems connected with it? I know that the Minister will have to, not only when we go into a shorter work week, the governments will have to spend more money for leisure time, to give people certain leisure activity so they can be involved, because you just cannot leave them do nothing, and I'm sure the Minister knows this, but to the present time I . . . know of any research that has been done, and surely in talking to this progressive Minister of Labour, that tells us how progressive he is, and perhaps he's done some studies in this area but we've never been told about it. He did not tell us -- (Interjection) -- somebody says it's all talk; maybe it is all talk -- (interjection) -- and not much action, he said. But really this is an area that the Minister should give us and give the House some information.

I believe that the Women's Department of the Department of Labour at the present time -- it was established just a couple of years ago, which I called for years ago. It's working and it is concerned with certain public relations type of a role and not much more. But we also know that there are 40 percent of the women in the labour force at the present time, 40 percent. And surely I think that Women's Bureau should assume a very activist role in encouraging and facilitating the role of women in, not only in the labour force but in management, and so on. And what do we have today? Mr. Chairman, we haven't even got equal pay for women, and it applies to the government itself. I understand there's some 300 nurses who are not receiving equal pay, not receiving. And I believe that the Women's Bureau should be much more active than it is at the present time. We have 40 women, as I said, involved in the labour force of this province, and at the same time we still have not enforced the equal pay act for men and women. We haven't got many women in the ministerial or in the administrative positions, and this is another area that could be involved.

Mr. Chairman, the other day I believe the First Minister when he went up north and talked about, had some very encouraging remarks to say about day-care centres, and tell them what a great part they should play in the community, and I wish this would be the opinion of the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Health and Social Services, because he has not been paying the proper attention as he should be, because I think it should be our job to facilitate widows and working mothers. I know that in our own office we've had two girls been working for many years who have supported their children who have no husbands, their husbands -- either they were divorced or separated -- but because they were able to take care of their children through the Day-Care Centre program they were able to work and look after them and did a good job. Now, I don't believe that the Minister, the present Minister of Health and Social Services, is giving the type of attention as far as Day-Care Centres are concerned.

I've mentioned, Mr. Chairman, what I wanted as far as the Workmen's Compensation, and I certainly hope that we will hear something in respect to that area because I feel very strongly about it.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister, and I did not hear his speech when he took part in the resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson when he talked on strike in essential services, and perhaps the Minister can touch on it. I do believe we finally have a situation in respect to the jail strike, and not only do I feel this is a very serious matter but also I don't know if there's any action that the government has taken to the present time, or even have discussed it in case there is a walk out at Headingley Jail.

The Pension Act, Mr. Chairman, I feel should definitely be amended. I think that at the present time there is such a great mobility of people in employment, not only in private industry but as well in government employment between the provinces and between the Federal Government, so I feel that there should be change, there should be an amendment to our Pension Act. I believe at least at a minimum an employee shall have at least 50 percent vesting

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . rights after five years of service with any company or with a government. This is not the legislation at the present time, and this is an area that again the Minister has neglected and we could be critical of the Minister in this area. I feel that the vested portion of the employers' contribution, plus the employees' contribution, must be fully portable from one employer to another employer from, be it one province to another province, and I'm sure that we're probably the only province in Canada at the present time that haven't changed the legislation in this area. And again I'm talking to the very progressive Minister of Labour and I hoped that he would pay some attention in this area.

Mr. Chairman, the point that was raised by the Member for Thompson in connection — anyone over 40 or 45 -- I forget what he said; I believe it was 45 -- had difficulty in getting employment, and I think to some extent he is justified in his criticism, because the same criticism has come to my attention. There may be reason for it; I believe that once a person gets to that age, he has a great amount of experience, administrative experience in any job that he's doing, and naturally perhaps he justifies and warrants a higher wage or a higher salary than one that's 21 years of age or 19 years of age, and this is one reason that perhaps they have more difficulty. But I believe that — I don't feel that there should be ads placed even on the Wanted Ad sections only between 21 and 40 should apply. I don't know how prevalent this is but if it is to any extent, I don't think it should be allowed; because this has come to my attention last year and it has come to my attention this year. I know that I've had some correspondence in this area and perhaps the Minister has, if not the same correspondence but at least to the same extent, and if he has then I feel that he should do something about it, Mr. Chairman, in this area.

But I really do feel that in respect to the Equal Pay Act, the Minister must amend the loopholes in this legislation and it must be enforceable; it must be enforceable not only for employees in the private industry but it must be as well applied to the government departments. And I know that the Member for Portage la Prairie has, on many occasions, has asked the same question, and it has come to my attention and I don't know if this matter has been resolved or not. If it's not resolved, surely the Minister should tell us why it is not resolved.

These are some of the areas that I feel quite concerned, and again in closing I was somewhat disappointed that the Minister in the introduction of his Estimates -- I know on other occasions he's taken great pride in introducing his estimates and given us quite a proper inductory into what's happening in the department, and on this occasion he has not. He started right off with being critical of, he was criticizing the Opposition and the Parties and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. PATRICK: . . . I have two words, can I finish it, Mr. Chairman. I wish to extend my appreciation to the members of his staff and department which on any occasion that I have any time to call them for any help, I get excellent co-operation and good service, and I say that he's got a pretty good staff. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I just want to make a few brief remarks on the item before us. We on this side of the House would have liked very much to have had a meaningful discussion on the Estimates of the Department of Labour, because we feel that this is an important department affecting a good many people in this province. But the Minister's attitude last night; his refusal to outline even in the slightest detail the conduct of the department which he has the honour to head; his stewardship, the direction that the department is intending to go, has led us to the conclusion that the Minister is either crassly ignorant of what is going on within his department or so brutally arrogant that he refused to tell anybody what his stewardship consists of.

There were some very legitimate questions placed to him by the Member for Emerson last night and his response to those legitimate questions was a torrent of invective and abuse that was unwarranted, unjustified, and was below and beneath the dignity of a Minister of the Crown. Sir, he indulges in his favourite pastime of hurling invectives instead of replying to the questions, and instead of giving meaningful answers to the criticisms that were levelled at him. He expects that, as the Member for Assiniboia has pointed out, he expects that when you come to this Chamber that all that will happen is that we will sing paeans of praise for him; that is not the purpose of this place and that is not what we intend to do. There are legitimate criticisms that can be levelled at his department, and if there are legitimate answers

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . then we'd like to hear them, but we hear nothing but abuse.

The Minister was demoted as a House Leader in this House for a very good reason. It's not very often that I agree with the First Minister, but on this occasion this was a justifiable action on his part, because since he had been removed from that particular responsibility the affairs of this House have been conducted a lot better, except on those occasions when he is in the House. Sir, we feel that there is — it's a meaningless exercise to go through to attempt to get responsible answers from the Minister, to attempt to get a meaningful resume of his stewardship as a Minister, and I think it's unfortunate that the people that are suffering are the very good and loyal civil servants that he has in his department who, thank Heaven, unlike the Minister are able to give us the kind of co-operation and the kind of answers that we would like to have.

For that reason, Sir, we feel that it is pointless to carry on with the examination of this department and we would ask you, Sir, to call the numbers as quickly as you can and get it over with so that we don't have to listen to any more of that torrent of abuse from the other side of the House.

. . . . Continued on next page.

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to my friend from Morris and . . .

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised. The Honourable Member for Emerson,

MR. GIRARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to point out that the Member for Morris completed his speech by asking that the question be put, and I believe that that is not debatable and the question should be put.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour, on a point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, that is not what the Honourable Member for Morris said — he would suggest that the numbers be called in rotation. It was not a formal motion that the question be put. So I suggest to my honourable friend the Member for Emerson that he pay a little more attention because I've been criticized by the Member for Morris for not answering the questions that were posed last evening by the Member for Emerson, and I did. Every question he raised I answered because I jotted them down. But of course in my opinion there is no answer worthwhile giving to the Member for Morris because he carried on in his normal manner.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, may I point out that under our rules a Minister introducing his estimates only has a period of 30 minutes in order to introduce them and that was used and my time expired, and following that the Member for Emerson spoke. But I don't fault my honourable friend from Morris for what he said, Mr. Chairman; we're so used to that sort of a tirade from him that it just rubs off like water off of a duck's back.

Now my honourable friend from Assiniboia, and I want to compliment him . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. There was a question of order raised and I think I should make it quite clear here, and I would refer the Honourable Member for Emerson to Citation 196, on Page 166, "a motion for the previous question is not admitted in the Committee of the Whole or in any other committee." The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I was just saying, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, because he was constructive. I accept from him the criticisms that were directed toward me because in the four years that I have had the honour of being the Minister of Labour all of his desires and all of my desires have not been achieved.

My honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, did to some degree cover the waterfront in that he made reference to the Superannuation Act, made reference to the Civil Service Act and others which of course are separate items, but I presume, Mr. Chairman, that because the Minister of Labour happens to be the Minister responsible for the civil service functions then he was quite in order. My honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, waxed eloquently about the deficiencies of this Minister and this government in the treatment of our pensioners and provisions for the civil service in respect of pensions. I had to smile to myself as I listened to my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, because I was going to announce this afternoon a new deal for the civil service in the Province of Manitoba, a new deal unheard of four years ago. A new deal which will bring to fruition many of the propositions placed by myself when I was in Opposition and now we are in a position to do it. And the bill, formal bill will be introduced very shortly.

But I also want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that this is the second change in our Superannuation Act since we became government. My honourable friend made reference to the three percent refund on withdrawal of funds; it was unheard of under the previous Conservative Government. There were other aspects as well that we brought into effect, such as a cost of living bonus for the three years just past to increase the pensions of those who had retired from the civil service, and it was made applicable to all. Something unheard of by the great Conservative Party that had the reins of power for at least ten years.

But we don't stop there, Mr. Chairman, we may not do everything in a hurry or we may not do everything in a day but we are progressive, at least in some cases. And I want to tell my honourable friend, I want to tell my honourable friend and announce to the Assembly a few of the changes that are going to be introduced for the consideration of this Assembly and I challenge any member to vote against them for what they are, may criticize because they're not sufficient and I would accept that. -- (Interjection) -- You wouldn't understand.

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . .

For the first time in the history of the Province of Manitoba we are going to reduce the pension formula from ten to seven years. I agree with my honourable friend that many jurisdictions have five years but there are still a number that have the ten year formula. At least, Mr. Chairman, we're going to reduce the formula to the best seven out of the last twelve years, at the choice of the person who is retiring. And in addition to that, extend this increase to those who have already gone on pension. A survivor's pension will be equivalent to 60 percent of the formula pension to be provided for life to the spouse of an employee; or if there is no spouse a guaranteed pension for ten years to an eligible survivor if an employee dies after completing ten years of service. A vast improvement over what we have at the present time.

We are going to change the retirement age on a voluntary basis. At the present time all retirement is at age 65 with certain penalties for early retirement — I believe 1 1/2 percent per year for each year below 65. The new pension scheme for our well-deserving pensioners will provide voluntary retirement at the age of 60 on completion of ten years of service without any penalty.

We are going to provide in our new legislation for transferability of pensionable service between the Fund and any other reciprocating fund in the public sector of Canada following the completion of five years service immediately prior to the transfer — a point raised by my honourable friend of — is not done by this do-nothing government.

We are going to reduce the service requirement for disability pensions from 15 to 10 years. We are going to continue the cost of living adjustment for the year 1973, 74 and 75; and as I indicated, we are going to continue payment of interest on contributions at three percent for those years as well.

This, Mr. Chairman, I suggest is a new deal for the Civil Service in Manitoba, and from my observations and studies will be comparable with most favourable pension schemes in the Dominion of Canada and better than most provincially.

I could not, as I say, Mr. Chairman, give a more definitive answer to my honourable friend in reply to his criticisms in respect of the civil service pension, to indicate to him and to the House what will be the contents of the bill. My Honourable friend from Thompson said, well this is an election year; I could have taken advantage of it by announcing it outside of the House but I chose to announce the new provisions, the new deal for our pensioners inside of the House where it is proper so to do. So while we can be faulted for some of the things as I was and the government was from my friend from Assiniboia, I trust and hope that my reply to him regarding the pensions will be acceptable to him.

I also want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that insofar as the funding of the plan is concerned the present situation is that upon retirement the Government of the Province of Manitoba matches the accumulated benefits of the pensioner. There was a surplus, I believe I announced this some time ago, there was a surplus in the employees' pension portion of the fund as at December 31, 1971 of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$12 million. In order, Mr. Chairman, to provide for all of the benefits that I have announced today in respect to the Superannuation Fund it will require approximately \$18 million; and because of the fact that there is a triennial actuarial assessment of the fund, we have guaranteed to the pensioners of the province and to our present civil service that if the accumulation in the employees part of the fund does not reach that 18 million required for the employees share then the Government of Manitoba will pick up the balance so that there will be no increase in the next three years of the percentage requirement for contribution by our employees. If that isn't progress, Mr. Chairman, then I would like to hear from my honourable friends opposite.

My honourable friend made mention of a number of other points and I would like to mention them briefly. He made reference to some discussion that took place this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, regarding the plight of the 40-year old worker seeking employment. May I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to all concerned that there is a general guideline issued as far as the Civil Service of Manitoba is concerned that there shall be no discrimination because of age, creed, sex, religion, colour and what have you. As a matter of fact, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, there is a guideline, one guideline gone out to the employing authorities within the Civil Service to attempt to employ people who may have their hearing impaired or may be sightless. I requested all departments to make an assessment as to whether or not these people can be hired within the Civil Service. Another guideline is going out from my office

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . . that I'm sure will receive the hearty endorsement of the Member of Assiniboia, and that guideline is that paraplegics and handicaps should be given every consideration for employment within the government Civil Service. So I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that as far as we are concerned as employers that there can be any consideration of discrimination, and I would include that, the rights and opportunities of free citizens for employment after having served a penalty because of some misdemeanor. That is the basic principle that I have adopted as the Minister responsible for the Civil Service. I think it is a forward-looking policy and one that I'm sure will be accepted by any reasonable Manitoban.

My honourable friend mentioned, the Member for Assiniboia made reference to the situation regarding essential strikes in industry. I want to indicate, Mr. Chairman, a few of the settlements that have been arrived at already this year under the new Act which changed legislation pertaining to collective agreements, in the public sector:

The University of Manitoba which some consider as an essential service -- (Interjection) -- I said some, I included you, I said some consider it an essential service -- negotiated a collective agreement covering approximately 750 employees, a settlement which was reached on February 2 of this year and continues for a couple of years.

A settlement, an agreement in a public essential service, namely the City of Winnipeg Police Department covering 850 employees, reached an agreement since the new legislation without any hostilities.

The St. Boniface General Hospital with 600 employees reached a satisfactory agreement just recently without any strikes in the industry. This covers a considerable number of employees too.

The St. Vital Hospital entered into an agreement with its union for a term expiring on December 31, 1974 covering 250 people without any withdrawal of work.

Winnipeg General Hospital with 800 employees reached an agreement to last until January 5, 1974 covering a considerable number of employees -- 800 as I indicated. And if you want to take into account the Manitoba Teachers' Society, the Winnipeg Teachers' Association who are responsible for some 2,400 employees in what some people term an essential industry, they reached an agreement for a one year term without any withdrawal of services.

At the present time the Government of Manitoba is conducting negotiations with the Manitoba Government Employees' Association and I anticipate an agreement will be reached and that there will be a clause in the agreement reached that will provide for a binding arbitration on a voluntary basis.

This, Mr. Chairman, is just but a small record of what has happened since the new labour legislation has come into effect in Manitoba. As a matter of fact, if memory serves me correctly, outside of the strike that apparently started in the River East School Division this morning, I don't think we've had any indication in this general area of the public sector of any withdrawal of services.

Mention is made of Headingley and my friend from Assiniboia referred to it as a strike. I would suggest that it is not a strike, it may be a few fellows want a little bit of sick leave or something like that and they have -- (Interjection) -- I really didn't say they were sick but they wanted a little bit of sick leave possibly and they withdrew their services on a temporary basis I hope.

My friend from Assiniboia made mention of the Equal Pay Act. Unfortunately I am not in a position to expand insofar as the Nurses' Aids and the likes are concerned, Mr. Chairman, because the matter has been placed before a court and judgment is reserved at the present time as to whether or not the province may be guilty in some cases, or guilty insofar as the application of the Equal Pay Act in certain health institutions. So I'm sure my honourable friend would not expect me to comment further on that at this particular time. Indeed, I'm not able to.

He also mentioned the Women's Bureau which started operation last August, I believe it was. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, to all and sundry that Mrs. Mary Eady who is the Director of the Women's Bureau is doing an outstanding job at the present time, and I am sure she will continue to do a good job. I am sure also that many women appreciate the efforts that is going into the work of the Women's Bureau. It is not a placement agency, it is a counselling agency for women and Mrs. Eady is almost nightly addressing women's groups to let them



## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . know what their rights are and what their obligations happen to be and I want to say that provision is made in the Estimates for an increase in staff and a research person to assist in this department. So I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we shouldn't be really too hasty in criticizing a department that has just started up. And of course I'm sure my friend the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge will recall that when she introduced a resolution asking for a women's bureau or a women's department in the Department of Labour she was flabbergasted when we accepted the resolution and I trust and hope that she has had an opportunity of having some discussions with Mrs. Eady or others in the department to see how it is working out. I'm satisfied; I appreciate and realize that it's not all that is desired but nonetheless it's a foundation of a worthwhile project in the Department of Labour and I'm sure that the 40 percent of the work force who happen to be women will benefit greatly as a result.

The Member for Assiniboia also mentioned the compressed work week. He referred to Manitoba Hydro. At the present time there is an agreement for a four-day week for the summer arrived at through a methodology of banking hours in the wintertime so that the actual work week will be equalized over the year but the four-day will be in effect in the summer. As far as the general approach to the compressed work week -- and I would be glad to give my honourable friend the benefit of quite a number of documents that I have, I'd be pleased if he would be interested to forward copies of some of the documents at least to him -- the Canadian Labour Congress has gone on record as being opposed to a compressed work week unless it still involves an eight-hour day. They would have no objections to four days at 32 hours of work but they oppose the general increase in the number of hours per day over eight.

My friend suggests, the Member for Assiniboia suggests an institute of industrial relations and research. And I do note he has had resolutions, I believe he may have one on the Order Paper now calling for such an institution . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you . . . in the province but I do want to indicate that we have sent some of our personnel to McGill University where they have a very good industrial relations research branch for conferences and the likes of that; and then also in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, through the Woods Committee, management-labour committee, they too conduct seminars along the line of researchship. I'm sure my friend would appreciate the fact that it's not enough but at the same time it's an ongoing venture.

In regard to the employment of our university students, I'm sure the Minister of Colleges and Universities can forward full information, but I recall last year the record of Manitoba in student placement was the best record in any province in the Dominion of Canada. I'm sure my colleague the Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister, could be justifiably proud and he is taking every step he can to see whether or not that effort can even be increased and bettered for this year.

Mr. Chairman, you indicated that my time was up or just about up. It was that way last night when I tried to really give a resume of the Department. I think maybe at this particular stage I've given a few answers to my honourable friend and a few points indicating the activity within the Department and it might conceivably be before our salary is either rejected or passed I might have another opportunity to continue answering the questions posed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, several days ago we were dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, we were dealing with the problems of one very important group of workers in our society, the farmers. Today as we consider the Estimates for the Department of Labour we are dealing with the other most important group of workers in our society, the urban workers.

The Department of Labour is concerned with the welfare of the workers. Maybe I better define the word "workers" because most people from presidents of corporations to the Cabinet Ministers consider themselves "workers". Some of us do mental work, some do physical work, some do both. And some live by their wits. I'm not sure in what category we in this House come under but I know the Honourable First Minister and his colleagues in the government are among the hardest working people in the province and honourable members on the other side have not helped to ease their burdens. However, I believe the main concern of the Department of Labour are the great mass of people working in shops, factories, mines, offices. It includes the people in transportation, in the building industry, everywhere; the

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. MALINOWSKI cont'd) . . . . skilled and unskilled workers in a great variety of jobs outside the ranks of the professions or other categories.

Daniel Webster, noted for his dictionary, said: "Labour is the great producer of wealth." William Lyon MacKenzie said, "Labour is the only means of creating wealth." I think we all agree that no houses are built without building workers; no coal is dug out of the earth without coal miners; nothing moves without the transportation workers. Our cities would become impossible to live in if the garbage wasn't collected. Everything would be in a hopeless mess if we didn't have an army of clerical workers to keep records and so forth. The supporters of the private enterprise system agree that all these different categories of workers are necessary but, they don't agree that it is necessary to pay them a decent living wage. So through the years to this day great poverty still exists among millions of working people, even in such rich countries as Canada and the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I did not know the great Canadian and founder of our Party, J.S. Woodsworth. He died before I came to this country. But, Mr. Woodsworth is well known and well remembered in my constituency by the oldtimers. There are many poor people in Point Douglas and Woodsworth worked among them and did what he could for them. Woodsworth was in the habit of using big charts when lecturing before an audience. One chart had a small circle in the middle. This represented the small circle of wealthy people in the community. Around the small circle on the chart was a larger circle representing the people of average incomes. Then outside the circle was still a larger circle representing the low income groups, the aged, the widows, the unskilled, the unemployed, the circle of the very very poor people.

Back in the 18th century a French writer, Nicolas Chamfort said, "Society is composed of two great classes. Those who have more dinner than appetite and those who have more appetite than dinner." In his Budget Speech the Honourable First Minister used a quotation of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is worth repeating a hundred times over what he said: "The test of our progress is not whether we add to the abundance of those who have much but whether we provide for those who have little."

Under our private enterprise system the main drive and objective is to keep up and giving more to those who already have much rather than giving more to those who have little. Honourable members of the opposition never get tired of telling us how important it is to allow those in the upper brackets to make still more money as an incentive to keep the economy going. They can never seem to realize that the economy can only be kept going in a healthy state when the great majority of workers get enough money to buy back the wealth they have produced.

I was surprised to learn, Mr. Chairman, that in 1873 it was still illegal and a criminal offence in Canada for workers to make any organized demands on employers to secure better wages and working conditions. Much progress has been made since then but it has been a long and grim struggle, in the struggle for the shorter work week, for union recognition, for better wages and working conditions, for better safety measures in industry. Every measure to improve the lot of the workers has always been vigorously opposed by the private corporations and the old parties were always on the side of the corporations. Even three years before the great depression of the 30s the Liberals and Conservatives still opposed unemployment insurance. They didn't know how to prevent the depression; they didn't know how to stop unemployment, but they opposed every move to easing the suffering of the unemployed. Both Arthur Meighen for the Conservatives and MacKenzie King, Leader of the Liberals, opposed Woodsworth's move in 1926 for unemployment insurance. And even to this day, Mr. Chairman, honourable members on the other side are opposed to any move for greater equality and justice in the distribution of wealth among the workers who create the wealth.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying that the worker is worthy of his hire. By this we mean that if a job needs to be done the people doing it should be paid a wage that will enable them to make a decent living. Whether a woman is working as a waitress, a clerk in a store, a factory worker or a stenographer in the office, she should earn enough to live in decency and comfort. Whether a man is working as a garbage collector or labourer, a bank clerk or even clergy, or any kind of job, he should earn enough to support himself and his family in accordance with the high standard of living that is possible in this country.

Much has been said about investors being entitled to a profitable return on their investments but it is still hard to convince the people that those who invest their labour have

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. MALINOWSKI cont'd) . . . . even a greater right for a profitable return for their labour. My honourable colleague the Member for Flin Flon is a miner who came from Springhill, if I'm not mistaken, Nova Scotia. He knows. We know mining is hard work and a dangerous occupation. Many men have been killed in the mines. Before the Honourable Member for Transcona became Minister of Labour he laboured for the railway. The Honourable Member for Logan likewise worked in the transportation industry. In this and many other industries the risk to life and limb are always present. Many get killed in the line of their work every year. But for some strange reason the supporters of the private enterprise system believe that the investors who only risk their money in any industry are entitled to greater reward than those who risk their lives working in these industries. They may oppose the higher minimum wage but they don't want any limit set on profits. They may complain about the unions having too much power but they overlook the fact that the power of the big corporation is ever so much greater. Organized labour has to do some hard bargaining to get a wage increase. The supermarkets can raise food prices overnight without any bargaining. Some say the workers are unreasonable in they demand a wage that will give them an income of \$6,000 to \$7,000 a year. But they see nothing wrong about investors making \$50,000 to \$200,000 a year.

I was sorry to hear that the Honourable Leader of the Conservative Party has already promised to set the clock back. His first election promise is to undo some of the good work done by this government. He intends to return auto insurance back to private companies if his Party gets elected. Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago we welcomed to this Chamber Mr. Sherman B . . . . ., Commissioner of Insurance in the State of Louisiana. He and his party had come here to study Autopac. They hoped to introduce the same in Louisiana. We learned from this visit that the New Orleans people are paying \$615 to the private insurance companies for the same kind of coverage Winnipeg motorists can get for \$150 under Autopac. -- (Interjection) -- That I don't know. But the Honourable Leader of the Conservative Party is not interested in how much Autopac saves the people, he's concerned about the small minority of people who profit from private insurance.

What does the Liberal Party promise to do to improve the lot of the workers? The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party is spending a lot of money on billboards all across the province. These billboards have a nice picture of the honourable member and an old style -- I may say meaningless slogan -- "A New Deal for the West." What kind of a new deal, Mr. Chairman? Will he make the sun rise in the west instead of the east? Who in the west needs a new deal? Certainly not the Richardsons. They made millions out of the old deal. Certainly not the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. McLean's magazine lists him among the \$2,000 a year income group so he doesn't -- \$200,000, I'm sorry -- so he doesn't need a new deal. Now there are 3,000 Manitobans listed on page 1124 of Hansard with incomes of 25 a year and over -- thousands, thousands I mean. These three thousand people have a combined income that is greater than received by 107,000 people in the lowest income brackets. Do the people in the highest income brackets in Manitoba need a new deal?

We on this side believe we need a new deal for the workers of this province. In fact what we do need is greater justice in the distribution of incomes both in the east and in the west. There are thousands of people whose incomes are too low to live the way human beings ought to live in this country. I am really glad that my honourable friend from La Verendrye believes and agrees with me, I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be associated with a party which has through the years worked to bring about greater justice in our society. Since this government came to power much has been done to improve the lot of those in the low income groups. The latest installment in this process was contained in the excellent budget the Honourable First Minister presented here.

At this point I also want to compliment the Honourable Minister of Labour for the progress that has been made in his department. I will not list here all the improvements made. Minimum wages have been raised a number of times. The rights of workers have been made more secure by the best labour legislation on this continent. The people of this province have gained in many ways because there was a government in power that put the interests of the majority of workers above the interests of minorities who profit by exploiting the workers.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, we have two oppositions in this House. One on the opposite side and one on our own side. The opposition on our own side is at least constructive. The

## SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. MALINOWSKI cont'd) . . . . Honourable Member for Crescentwood was very critical of the government in his speech on the budget. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood did not criticize the government for what it had done but he said the government hadn't done enough. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Honourable Minister of Labour and every member of the government would agree we haven't done enough, yet. We know there is till too big a gap between the incomes of the wealthy minority and the low incomes groups that have a hard time to make ends meet. We still have much opposition to overcome in creating greater equality in our society. The opponents of Autopac went the limit in their opposition to this measure. They will continue to oppose every beneficial reform. They still have the power to confuse and fool the people. They have done it for years. But, Mr. Chairman, the election of three New Democratic Party governments proves they can't fool the people all the time. After the next election there will be fewer members on the opposition side and more on our side — the government side.

I believe at this point in time the government has done all it could. The first term in office with a slender majority was no bed of roses for any member of the government, but in spite of the great obstacles great progress was made. In fact, under no other government throughout the history of this province have the majority of people gained so much in four years. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, in the next four years the people of this province will make even greater gains under New Democratic Party government. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8 p.m. this evening.