

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, April 11, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the Gallery, where we have 47 students of Grades 4, 5 and 6 standing from Sir John Franklin School. These students are accompanied by teachers, Mrs. Jan Burman, Mr. Doug Illsey, and also accompanied by a former Premier of this province, Mr. D. L. Campbell. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

PRESENTING COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain Resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson that report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a brief statement respecting the operations of vehicles on highways in the province of Manitoba. The owners and operators of vehicles will please take note that pursuant to subsection (1) and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the honourable member got copies for other members of the House?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm making copies available to all members of the House, because it's of interest to members, particularly rural members, as well as the members of the opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, then I would suggest that the Honourable Minister await his completion of the copying of his statement so that he give his statement at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways on the same point of order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, the information is not earth-shattering, but it is of interest the moment it is available to all users of Manitoba highways. It's namely the announcing of the restrictions on weights and I would ask leave of the House, permission of the House to enable me to make that statement at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I'm advising the owners and operators of vehicles that they will please take note that pursuant to Subsection 1 and 2 of Section 82 of the Highway Traffic Act, being Chapter 860 of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba (1970), that on and after 6:00 a.m. central standard time, April 17, 1979, and continuing until further notice, weight restrictions will be imposed on Manitoba

I've listed all the highways and the specific weight restrictions that will be applied. I would ask the usual co-operation of the members of the media to make this information available to as many Manitobans as possible. Thank you.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We thank the minister for his announcement. We understand that it's a tradition and normal practice to bring in restrictions in spring, in order to protect our provincial roads and highways. I would like to ask the minister, however, in view of the high risk this year of flooding, throughout the province, in many areas of the province, where there may be loss of grain because of flooding, I'm wondering if the minister would take into consideration the possibility of making exceptions where there is going to be grain loss because of heavy flooding this year? 4

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I believe I could answer that in the Question Period; that would be a more appropriate time.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson) introduced Bill No. 35, An Act to amend The Workers Compensation Act. (Recommended by Lieutenant-Governor).

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Labour. I wonder, in view of the First Minister's statement that this government was one which was elected to reduce confrontation from one group to another, if the honourable minister could confirm that in fact the number of days lost due to strikes and lockouts in Manitoba in 1978 increased by 1,000 percent over the same number of days lost in 1977?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice for the Minister of Labour.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if at the same time the Acting Minister would accept as notice whether or not during that same period of time that Manitoba's share of the number of days lost due to strikes and lockouts increased to 4.5 percent of the Canadian total compared to under 1 percent of the Canadian total in the year previous in 1977.

MRS. PRICE: I'll include that in the notice, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I did want to reply to the Honourable Member for St. Rose, with respect to the question about allowing sufficient time to move threatened grain and other items from flood prone areas. It's been my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that for the last several weeks farmers have been calling in and receiving the cooperation of the good offices of the Minister of Agriculture and the cooperation of the Wheat Board in getting extra cars and extra delivery quotas to move some of the grain out of the flood prone areas and of course one of the reasons for wishing to make that announcement today with respect to impending weight restrictions was to give at least a further weeks notice to enable farmers and others who have loads or heavier loads to move in and about the Province of Manitoba to take advantage of this week of lead time prior to the

of weight restrictions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister to whom the Manitoba Development Corporation reports. I wonder if the Minister would acknowledge that the MDC statement which was filed in the House yesterday, in its assessment of assets would show the shares in Tantalum Mining Corporation to be valued at \$1,500,000.00.

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

HON. Robert (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that's correct. I'd like to check once more but I think that's correct.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister also acknowledge that if the shares were valued as to their actual value, with allowance for appreciation just as there has been allowance for losses on the same statement, that this would have shown the statement with approximately a \$500,000 profit at a minimum, rather than a million dollar loss which is shown.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that is the cost of the particular shares. The member should also note that with regard to that particular item, that could have, if the shares were increasing over the last number of years, could have been taken into consideration any number of years and doesn't necessarily have to apply to that particular year that he refers to.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I merely asked the Minister whether he would acknowledge that if the shares were put in at the price that a company was willing to pay for them, namely 3.2 million, that it would show that the Manitoba Development Corporation would show a profit of roughly \$500,000 rather than the loss of a million dollars, which would mean that the Corporation would have shown a profit two years in a row including this year, which would make it three years in a row. Would the Minister, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with that matter further acknowledge that by transferring that share to the Department of Mines or to the Government in any of its other Departments, that it is now impossible for that appreciated value to be reflected as a profit on the Manitoba Development Corporations statement.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will concede that if we would have sold the Saunder's aircraft for \$10 million we would have shown a \$10 million better position. I'll concede to that too. But I think the fact that remains here is that it's the matter of the public owning the shares, whether it be through the Manitoba Mineral Resources or the Minister of Finance or the Manitoba Development Corporation and it doesn't really make any difference to the taxpayers of Manitoba because the money will stay with them and is held by them.

So, it becomes a matter of arguing how they're accounting. The member can argue the way he wants, but all I'm saying is that the moneys have not been lost to the Province of Manitoba, they stay within the Province of Manitoba and we felt because of the expertise in the Manitoba Mineral Resources that they would be better equipped to manage that particular asset.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a fourth Question.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Since the losses on Saunders Aircraft and on Flyer were charged and shown as losses on the MDC statement, is it not a fact that the way in which the government has now managed this particular asset, the MDC statement is being put in a permanent position where it will not reflect the profit which it made on Tantalum shares and therefore, the statement is misleading?

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

MR. BANMAN: Well, first of all Mr. Speaker, the statement deals with the year 1978, March 31st 1978. If the member wants to get into that particular argument, he can get into it next year because the transfer wasn't involved in this particular year, it wasn't involved at all. As a matter of fact, the allowance at the end of that year for all the losses in William Clare weren't even included, so we're going to come up with an increased . . . with regard to that particular thing will show up March 31st, 1979 because that is the year that we were talking about right now. The statement that we dealt with, and it was tabled yesterday, was the statement for ending March 31st, 1978.

The Tantalum deal that he talks about has no bearing on that particular statement because it was transferred later.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a fifth Question.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the minister acknowledged that in the 1978 statement, the statement ending year end March 31st, 1978 there is provision for doubtful accounts in the future, but there is no provision for appreciated assets in the future and we now know that asset was appreciated at least 100 percent.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the member wants to use that argument, how do we know that our investment in A.E. McKenzie or in Flyer is worth what's written in on the book.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I suggest to the honourable minister that the answers that he is giving lead to argument rather than providing information. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. In view of announcements by the Winnipeg School Division that they're reconsidering or reassessing their Summer Enrichment Program for Inner City Children, is he receptive to a proposal whereby some 2,000 youngsters could be provided with a recreational and educational opportunity; and secondly, and last and not least, which would also provide some necessary employment for the large number of unemployed teachers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, we're always prepared to look at any proposal that may be put forward that would provide worthwhile employment and at the same time would benefit people. My answer to the honourable member would be certainly yes, we'll take a look at any proposal.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd then like to direct a question to the Minister of Fitness, Recreation and Sport and ask him whether he has had any discussions with the Winnipeg School Division concerning the development of a Summer Enrichment Program, which was referred to in the press?

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

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I understand that members from my department will be meeting with the representatives from the Winnipeg School Division, as well as some of the other organizations, such as United Way, and looking at the programs that are being offered. My particular department this year, again, will be offering what we call the "Birds Hill Day Camp Program", which accommodates from 800 to 1,000 inner core students, who will go and be taken out by a bus to Birds Hill, and we will employ something like 18 to 20 STEP students, as well as a full-time co-ordinator, and also utilize the facilities of the Volunteer Bureau here in the Province of Manitoba.

So, in an effort to co-ordinate, we're trying to maximize the input from all levels of government and co-ordinate that there isn't the overlap, to try and evolve some proper programming for these people that are underprivileged, we are trying to meet with the different people and develop those programs along that line.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the Minister whether he gave any indication or whether his staff gave any indication that provincial lottery funds might be available for the broader purposes of the program?

MR. BANMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that. I have not been approached with that regard and I have not instructed my particular staff that we would be pursuing that matter, but that could be a possibility as far as some of the comments made. If such a situation arises, of course, it will have to be dealt with by myself and my Cabinet colleagues.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for Housing. In the light of a City of Winnipeg report that 345 dwelling units in the inner city were demolished or boarded up because they were unsanitary or otherwise in violation of health regulations, does the Minister still stand by his statement that he made in the House last week that Manitoba and Winnipeg had no housing problems?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I still stand by the statement that the vacancy rate in all areas of the City of Winnipeg are higher than they have been in years.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary to the Minister. Since all told over 800 dwelling units were taken out of the rental market in the inner city last year because of health reasons, because of boarding up or because of abandonment and the city and the province only built 200 units in the entire City of Winnipeg last year, does the Minister still feel or think that the low income people in the Inner City of Winnipeg do not have housing problems, because their stock is being decreased at the rate of 800 a year?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, there are still some housing problems in the Inner City of Winnipeg and we are working on it, as we have been for two years. We have built more units in the Inner City of Winnipeg in two years than the NDP did in eight, Mr. Speaker, and we will continually be working at that particular problem.

The member is not correct when he says we only built 200.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister to look at Page 3 of the Annual Report, which he submitted to us yesterday, which indicates that only 207 units were built in the City of Winnipeg last year. Would he please confirm that number, since it's his report?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wish the honourable member — I know he hasn't been in the House too long, but that report was for 1977-78, year-ending March 31st, 1978.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Attorney-General. Could the Attorney-General advise whether he agrees with the City of Winnipeg Police Department's complaint investigation policy, as enunciated in statements made to the press by police authorities this week? Specifically, does he believe that police authorities are the best suited persons to carry out investigations of their own members and does he believe that such investigations subsequently facilitate the work of the Manitoba Police Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I have in fact, with respect to this subject, asked the Manitoba Police Commission to look into this matter. They made a recommendation to me and I forwarded that recommendation to the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, proposing a change in the legislation, in fact, that would, for all purposes, eliminate the present function of the Winnipeg Police Commission and transfer responsibility to the Manitoba Police Commission for investigation of all complaints.

I have had no formal response from the City to date and expect that this matter will be reviewed again with them in the near future.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, I thank the Attorney-General for his response, Mr. Speaker, but I would note that he seems to have misdirected himself. He didn't hear me. I asked specifically whether he believed that police authorities are the best people to carry out investigations prior to hearings by Police Commissions, either by the City of Winnipeg Police Commission or the Manitoba Police Commission, and I would ask him, in that regard, whether he is aware of the recommendations made by a 1974 Federal Commission into the handling of police complaints by the RCMP and, if so, does he agree with its proposal to create a non-police review board to carry out such investigations of public complaints against the police?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, when I indicated in my previous answer to the Member for Wellington a transfer of responsibility for the investigation of complaints would go with it, a new procedure for the investigation of the complaints and I am in the process of awaiting a reply from the City of Winnipeg on the proposal and I have not yet received any reply to that.

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

MR. CORRIN: Yes, a supplementary to that response. I would be interested in knowing whether the Attorney-General communicated his support or disapproval to its Federal Cabinet counterpart with respect to legislation before parliament this spring, which would have created such a non-police review board respecting the RCMP's activities.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he can advise the House as to any changes of staff allocation within the Eastern Manitoba Region, mainly whether he has in fact made the decision to transfer staff out of the Provincial Office Building in Beausejour to Steinbach?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES DOWNEY (Arthur): There has been no final decision made on that, Mr. Speaker. The member may be referring to a report that was done in 1971 that indicated the regional office should have been built or should have been located in Steinbach, and for some reason was put in Beausejour with the regional office being there, and we are reconsidering that report that was put out. There has been no final decision made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister assure me that no directive has been issued with respect to the regional director for eastern Manitoba, and some of the staff, that they must be transferred to the Steinbach location?

MR. DOWNEY: At this point, Mr. Chairman, I can assure the member that it's being considered, but no final decision made.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister then explain his particular comments that were reported in the Carillon News with respect to the transfer of staff from Beausejour to Steinbach.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, if the member would have read the report, I think he would have seen that it said it was being considered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask a question to the Minister of Mines, and it is with respect to the provincial government's ownership of valuable mineral resources in northern Manitoba near the city of Flin Flon, and my question is, has the Minister made moves to sell or otherwise dispose of these mineral resources to the private sector?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and the Environment.

MR. RANSOM: I assume, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member is referring to what is known as the Trout Lake or Granges find? Well, I have explained a number of times in the House, Mr. Speaker, and during my Estimates, that the interest that the province had in those agreements had been transferred to Manitoba Mineral Resources for management by that Crown Corporation.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, did the Minister give instructions to the Manitoba Mineral Resources, or give them permission to dispose of those resources to the private sector?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the direction that has been given to Manitoba Mineral Resources,

the request that had been made to Manitoba Mineral Resources, is to make recommendations as to how the interests of the province would be managed. At this point, there has been very little activity in terms of further exploration on the site, that is my understanding. Now, the honourable member had an opportunity at the last occasion when Manitoba Mineral Resources appeared before committee, and he will have the same opportunity to appear before the committee and question the officers of Manitoba Mineral Resources, and he can get at some details on what has happened with respect to that interest that the government has.

There has been no move, on the part of the government, to my knowledge, to dispose in any way of that interest.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Can the Minister then assure this side of the House and the people of Manitoba that the people's interest in that resource will be protected and that this interest will not be sold or given away to the private sector.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has contradicted himself in his question by saying first of all, that the public interest will be protected, and secondly, that it won't be disposed of. Now, I have said, time and time again in the House that the public interest will be protected and that the Manitoba Mineral Resources, having the knowledge with respect to the management of mines and mineral properties, will make recommendations to us. Now, it could be, from a hypothetical point of view, that the interests of the people would be protected by selling it.

Now, I'm not about to say that there is no possibility that sometime in the future, as any holder of a property would consider ultimately the possibility of selling it. Now, if the honourable member thinks he has some information that we are now in the process of disposing of that property, then he's absolutely wrong and the source of his information is faulty as it seems often to be.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to pose a question to the Minister of Agriculture, and ask him if he could advise myself and this House of the changes in the Market Share Agreement in the turkey industry, in the National Market Share Agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information with me at this time. I could make that information available though.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Minister as to what action did he take to protect the interests of the producers of this province in the changes that have been made.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to fully investigate the implications of any changes that were made.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, while he's investigating the those changes that he's not sure of, can he assure the producers of Manitoba that their share of the national markets in the turkey industry will not be eroded as it relates to the cost of production and their share of the marketplace.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as the Member for St. George is well aware, the Manitoba Turkey Board is a member of the National Turkey Agency and is pretty much involved in fighting for their share of the quota, and they have had ground rules set up between each province and working on what percentage of the share that they are going to work within, so to have any direct involvement of a government, he knows that it is very difficult for a Minister of the —(Interjection)— it is, they know very well, it's very difficult for a Minister to become directly involved, a provincial Minister to dictate to a national plan what can take place.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Agriculture indicate to us whether he has familiarized himself with the contents of agreements that were entered into, as between the provinces and the government of Canada on that very issue, and at which time, Mr. Speaker, we went to great lengths to assure that we would never get into a supply -management position that reflected our share of the market as related to our population share of the country. And that's what's already

happened, Mr. Speaker, under his administration.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker, I have another question of the Minister. Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicates that he doesn't know what the question is. I asked him whether he was familiar with the negotiations that took place several years ago which guaranteed, Mr. Speaker, the agreements that were subsequently signed, guaranteed, that we would never get ourselves into a position where we would allocate quotas relative to agricultural commodities on the basis of the population of the people of any one province, relative to the population of Canada.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the only comment I would have on that, if he is so sure of the quality of any agreement that he had entered into at that time, why is it happening at this time?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is indicating that he doesn't know why it is happening. I can tell him it is happening because he isn't doing his job.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question expressly to the Minister of Health, to ask him whether he is now able to provide copies of the correspondence which he promised to give us relating to any agreement arrived at with the Dental Association on the review committee of the Dental Health Program? The Minister undertook to supply a copy of the letter from the President of the Dental Association to him, dated February 13, 1979, and any other correspondence that would relate to that. Is the Minister going to give us that information before we get much further into his Estimates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): I don't have that additional correspondence or information at the present time, Mr. Speaker, but as the honourable member knows I did supply him with exchanges between the Dental Association and my office and I told him that I would check on linkage communication, that is still being done.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary then, the minister, is he not aware that the letter which he supplied to us which he wrote dated March 22nd starts out by saying "Thank you for your suggestions on the terms of reference for this Committee contained in your letter of February 13th, 1979. I find myself in agreement with many of those suggestions and want to commend your Executive for its efforts." Therefore, it is the letter to which the minister replied. Does the minister not have that? It's not a linkage, it's the terms of what an agreement is when one replies confirming a letter addressed to him. Can he not supply that letter?

MR. SHERMAN: I'm fully aware of that, Mr. Speaker, and as I told the Honourable Member for St. Johns at the time, I would make available to him what I felt I could, that had no caveats attached to it. I'm investigating that situation.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, does the minister then inform us that although he gave us the undertaking a week or more ago that he feels that there might be a caveat placed by the Dental Association against his giving us a copy of a letter which he received and to which he replied and a copy of which he's given us? Is he saying that he's waiting to find out if the Dental Association will permit him to file a copy of that letter?

MR. SHERMAN: I'm not saying that at all, Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying is that there are common courtesies that exist between parties to an agreement. I am in the midst of my Estimates, my department officials are in the midst of my Estimates, I do not have that information checked out to my satisfaction, when it is I'll supply it, if I may do so provided there are no caveats attached, to the Honourable Member for St. Johns. In the meantime, that subject was thoroughly discussed under the Dental Services Item in my Estimates, which has been passed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the minister's having to get to have his salary approved; and in view of the fact that we have discussed certain matters relating to a Dental Health Program

and not settled it because the minister undertook to give us information regarding the arrangement; and in view of the fact that we on this side are attempting to judge his Estimates on the basis of known facts rather than conjecture; does he not agree that before we deal with his salary and pass his salary, that we should have a definitive answer as to whether or not he's going to give us the information relating to an agreement between the Dental Association and the minister, on behalf of the people as to the matter in which the Review Committee will deal with the Childrens' Dental Health Program?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member well knows that he is at liberty to raise any question relative to the Department of Health and Community Services when we reach my salary item. I expect he will. I expect if he's not satisfied, he'll raise considerable objection and lengthy objection. In the meantime, I will attempt to supply him with the information that I can, I have already supplied him with some, I think that I have supplied him with more, and in general, supplied the opposition with more information of that nature than was ever done when our positions in this House were reversed. And if the honourable member wants to debate Dental Health Services and the Childrens' Dental Health Program and my salary now on Question Period, I'm prepared to do it, Mr. Speaker, but he knows full well he will have ample opportunity to take a fifth run-through on that subject. He's already debated it to exhaustion, but he'll have ample opportunity to take a fifth run-through on it when we reach my salary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a fourth question

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the minister whether he is so exhausted that he is not prepared to furnish us with the proper information on the basis of which we will be able to deal with his salary.

Does he not recognize that to earn the salary, insofar as this House is concerned and the Committee, that it will be necessary that we have the information which is in his possession in order to discuss it?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: The only thing that's exhausted, Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Member for St. Johns' area of legitimate debate on this point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns, sixth question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to see whether the Minister of Finance can respond to a couple of questions in a more positive way. Firstly, did the Minister of Finance complete his negotiations with the private auditors who've now been instructed by the government to do certain audits, some 13 Crown agencies?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. Donald W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, they're not entirely completed yet.

MR. CHEIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if to the extent that they are completed whether the minister is now in a position to inform us those portions that have been completed, and also inform us whether any of these private accountancy firms have entered into the actual task of performing the audit before negotiations have been completed?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, some of the firms have started on year-end work. The actual final documentation with regard to a number of them that aren't necessarily involved in year-end work but with regard to a number of them, will be dealt with shortly and finalized by Cabinet and the information that the member requests will of course be public knowledge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a seventh Question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Dealing again with the Minister of Finance, has he arrived at any conclusions and made any statements as to policy regarding this government's views on mortgage interest payments being deductible from income tax?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure of the first part of the member's question.

MR. CHERNIACK: The question was relating to mortgage interest payments being deductible from income tax, whether or not the government has arrived at a policy and whether or not he has enunciated his opinion on that matter in any way whatsoever.

MR. CRAIK: No, Mr. Speaker. The government has not enunciated a policy on that matter and in due course, if they have one to announce, that will be done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with an eighth question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you for counting, Mr. Speaker. Well, then, may I ask as a supplementary to the Minister of Finance whether he accepts the leadership of his federal leader who has announced that that will be a clear-cut policy of the federal government and, in that way, will this minister not be then bound by the agreement with the federal government relating to income tax collections?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see the tacit assumption in that observation that the Conservatives, nationally, are going to be the government. If in fact that is the case, Mr. Speaker, we will certainly have to look at any impacts it might have with regard to the benefits to the people of Manitoba and, on the other hand any impacts it would have on the revenues of the Province of Manitoba and so on. But until that happens, Mr. Speaker, then we'll deal with it as a hypothetical question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a ninth question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, finally. I think my final question, having already seen the disaster to the Province of Manitoba from the election of 1977, I do not wish it federally on the rest of Canada, but I do want to know the extent to which this Conservative Government is prepared to forgive more and more taxation as it has already shown it has done in its short term of office. That is the question I raised and if the Minister has no policy decision to announce, then I have to accept it that way.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before the Honourable Minister answers, may I suggest that there is only one minute left in the Question Period. The answer should be confined to a reasonably short answer.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I thank you, and I'll try and expand my answer to one minute. Mr. Speaker, I could just tell the member in less than one minute that it would be certainly the objective of this government to reduce as many taxes as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Co-op Development. Inasmuch as the Brandon Consumer's Co-op is scheduled to close down later this year with the loss of 70 direct jobs and 30 indirect jobs, would the Minister consider offering the assistance of his department to a new committee that's been set up to help save this Brandon Consumers Co-op.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I was asked that very same question in the Legislature, maybe not with regard to the particular committee, but at that time I assured the members that if there was any assistance that the department could give to the people out in Brandon we would certainly do so. Since then we have been in contact with the Co-op out there to see what the problem is. I understand that they feel at this particular time that the particular Co-op, the retail outlet that they're running there is not a profitable one and they wish to close it because of business reasons.

Now, as the members know, the Co-op legislation that we have is a permissive one and the department is involved in the day to day operations, but if there is any technical assistance that we can lend anybody, we're certainly willing to do so.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to advise the House that it is the intention of government to convene the Standing Committee of Public Utilities and Natural Resources in Room 254 on Tuesday, April 17, at 10:00 a.m. for the purpose of receiving and considering the Annual Report of Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited.

Mr. Speaker, would you call bills for Third Reading as they are listed?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS — THIRD READING

MR. MCGILL, on behalf of the Honourable Attorney-General, presented Bill No. 15, an Act to amend The Garnishment Act, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. MCGILL, Attorney-General, on behalf of the Honourable presented Bill No. 4, an Act to amend The Testators Family Maintenance Act, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. MCGILL, on behalf of the Honourable Attorney-General, presented Bill No. 5, an Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented. MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried. .

MR. MCGILL, on behalf of the Honourable Attorney-General, presented Bill No. 8, an Act to amend The Mental Health Act, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, debate be adjourned. **MOTION presented and carried.**

BILL NO. 9 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CROWN LANDS ACT AND THE REAL PROPERTY ACT

MR. MCGILL, on behalf of the Honourable Attorney-General, presented Bill No. 9, an Act to amend The Crown Lands Act and The Real Property Act, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, in perusing the bill, and in discussing the bill with our colleagues, we of course have had no problem with the substance of the bill whatever. We think it is something that probably makes a lot of sense and something which, Mr. Chairman, I know many people

the years have questioned government on with respect to what happens to properties where there is a change in the water levels of rivers and streams and lakes, and how do we decide the disposition of those lands that become available if the waters happen to recede for a period of time, and so this bill deals with that fairly well, Mr. Speaker.

My reason for rising today though, Mr. Speaker, has to do with a broader concern. It has to do, Mr. Speaker, with the fact that it has been revealed to us that we're not sure any more whether we would want to broaden Ministerial discretion with respect to the question of the disposition of public lands in the Province of Manitoba. It is in that context that I wish to address myself to the Assembly, Mr. Speaker. And I raise, Mr. Speaker, in the knowledge that most, or many members, were not able to witness the events of the Committee of Supply in Room 254 over the last three or four days. Many members were not able to be there because of the two committees sitting simultaneously and are not aware, Mr. Chairman, as to what took place.

And so, Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about the disposition of Crown lands, the sale of Crown lands, the conveyance of Crown property to private citizens of Manitoba or to corporations or whatever, Mr. Speaker, then we find because of what has transpired that we have to look at these measures with a more critical eye, Mr. Speaker.

There are subtleties creeping in that one must not overlook, Mr. Speaker. Yes, one must not overlook, Mr. Speaker. The other day during the discussion in the Department of Agriculture Estimates debate, we had an example of how this government is administering the public assets of this province, Mr. Speaker, and that is the point that I want to delve in to. We have here, Mr. Speaker, an example contained in Order 168, dated February 28th, 1979, an example of how this government, Mr. Speaker, who claims to be an efficient government, a government that is looking after the interests of the taxpayers of this province, has managed to give away public assets at reduced prices, Mr. Speaker, based on the admissions, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Agriculture and other members of the Committee on the government side.

And so it is of great concern to us, Mr. Speaker, that in passing of any bill having to do with the conveyance of public assets, land or otherwise, that we would want to take a much more critical look from this point on, as a result of what happened this week, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, O/C 168, dated February 28th, involves the disposition, the sale of nine parcels of Crown land.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I, too, was going to raise a point of order. We're dealing here with a bill which refers in part where a Minister is satisfied the title to land forming a bed of water as accreted.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to perhaps ask members to confine themselves to debating the provisions of this bill. There is a committee in Room 254 dealing with another subject and I suggest the matter just raised by the member has nothing to do whatsoever with the contents of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: I, too, would like to speak to that point of order. Perusal of the bill deals with a very specified kind of land, the kind of land that comes into play when a body of water recedes. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet is obviously now wishing to abuse the rules of this Chamber in the same way that he abused them last night in the House of the Committee.

I look to you, Mr. Speaker, for some firmness with respect to not seeing the rules of this House being so abused. The rules governing the debate on Second Reading on Bills are clear and well understood, particularly by veteran members like the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

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

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. First of all I'd like to indicate that unfortunately the Minister of Highways was reflecting upon the Chairmanship of last night's Committee when he was indicating that there was abuse taking place, which I don't think did take place.

Secondly, in respect to the question on a point of order, the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet is discussing Crown lands and the kind of thrust and direction that is taking place, and I believe that is valid.

First of all, the Crown lands, whether they're with water or without water, is not pertinent to the topic of debate but what is pertinent is what the Minister's actions are, and this is what the Member for Lac du Bonnet is discussing. The bill itself, true, only refers to certain matters but

what is actually taking place is another matter and that is the debate that it is centred around, not just the bill but what is taking place by the government. And that is the point of order that you should address yourself to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would hope that any member speaking in debate would attempt to confine himself to the parameters that are included in the subject matter of the bill. I have not the benefit of the statutes to see which particular section has been amended, so I will allow the member to continue. I hope that he will attempt to confine himself to the sections that are under discussion.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your comments and the concerns of members of the House. I appreciate the fact that the two members that raised the point of order are the members . . . Yes, they didn't have a point of order, Mr. Speaker, because the bill specifically deals with the disposition of Crown lands, under certain circumstances. The name of the bill is An Act to amend The Crown Lands Act and The Real Property Act. So we are dealing with public assets, Mr. Speaker, and that is what I am addressing myself to. That is the question of how this government is handling the public assets of this province, whether it's under Bill 9 or Bill 29, or Bill 199, is irrelevant. The fact is that there is a common approach that has been applied with respect to this government's policy as to how it disposes of public assets and as to how much consideration this government is giving to the taxpayers of this province with their properties, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I was about to give you an example, an example of what we think is irresponsible government, government that is giving away public assets that were paid for by the taxpayers of this province, but, Mr. Speaker, this government appears to be desirous of rewarding some people throughout the province with a gift. Yes, Mr. Speaker, with a gift.

Order-in-Council 168, dated February 28th, 1979, deals with the disposition of nine parcels of land that belongs to the Crown, Mr. Speaker.

The first parcel was sold for \$141,000, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, you would be interested to know what the reserve bid on that property was. It would interest you to know, Mr. Speaker, that the reserve bid on that land was only \$105,000.00.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a shocking state of affairs. The government, who claims to be efficient, prudent, business-minded, didn't know the value of the land before it put the land up for sale. Well, that's one interpretation, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, in questioning the Minister of Agriculture we find that, yes, he thought he knew the value of the land, but he didn't know that it was in the public interest to recover to the taxpayers of this province full market value. That was his explanation.

And so, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney-General is going to operate in the very same fashion, it is a matter of concern, Mr. Speaker, to this Assembly, because we have that minister giving away public assets. Now, we have a bill that permits another minister to give away public assets, and next week we might have a third one that will give away public assets, Mr. Speaker. So these examples are very relevant to this debate, Mr. Speaker — \$105,000 but the actual market brought back \$141,000, and we find that the minister chose not to have an appraisal done of this property before it was offered for sale.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General on a Point of Order.

MR. MERCIER: On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of these amendments is to provide a procedure for obtaining title, to determine whether land is accreted or not, it has nothing whatsoever to do with value of land. And the comments, Mr. Speaker, of the member are totally irrelevant again to this bill, and I wonder when members opposite are going to decide to deal with the matters before us. Mr. Speaker, unless they're prepared to do that the whole work of this House is going to be frustrated.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I would ask the honourable member in his remarks to attempt to stay within the confines of the bill. I see no reference made here to value and appraisal of the bill, and so if the member would continue and attempt to stay within the confines of the bill, I'll let him proceed. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, you are so right. There is no reference in this bill as to value, and that's one of our problems. —(Interjection)— Yes, we are asking for that. Assume, Mr. Speaker, that this minister has a choice piece of property in Winnipeg Beach, where the lake has receded because of some public works or for natural reasons, and this minister now has a \$1 million beach, which he is now going to say to the adjacent landowner, you can have this \$1 million beach because

we really don't have an interest in keeping this resource for the people of Manitoba. Yes, that's what we're talking about, Mr. Speaker, it is germane. The matter that I have raised, is very relevant, Mr. Speaker, because it deals with the way in which this government is giving away the public assets of this province. And we like the minister, the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker, we think he's a nice guy. But we don't trust his government's policy with respect to the disposition of public assets.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there was a social purpose in mind, which was explained to us, and which sounded reasonable, we might support the giving away of public assets for that particular purpose, but that has not been explained to us. We know that in the example that I have introduced to this Assembly this afternoon, that there is no social purpose. We don't know, Mr. Speaker — well I do know, I shouldn't say we don't know — I am told, Mr. Speaker, that the purchaser of this land for \$141,000 already owns somewhere in excess of 50 quarters of land. So, obviously there is no social purpose in the sale of this parcel. Obviously, this minister doesn't care about what happens with the public asset, he doesn't care who purchases it. He doesn't care how much he gets for it, because he has indicated that in committee, Mr. Speaker.

The reserve bid he told us in committee, was based not on the appraised value of the property, Mr. Speaker. The reserve bid was based on the original cost to the Crown. Now, Mr. Speaker, the original cost to the Crown was \$105,000 in this example, and the minister was prepared to receive \$105,000 and accept that as fair value. At the same time, he would like us to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the marketplace is the best judge of value. In fact the Tories have helped to enshrine the concept of the marketplace as the rule of thumb in our society, excepting when it comes to the disposition, the sale of public assets. They have proven that they didn't believe in the marketplace, Mr. Speaker, because they were rushing out to tell their friends that if they would only make the applications that they can get an awful lot of free gifts all over the province. Maybe not free, but at a good discount price. Because the public really doesn't want to receive the market value on the sale of their assets. That's been the posture, the philosophy, the policy of this government with respect to the sale of all of the assets that they have sold to date, Mr. Speaker. We have ample evidence of that. They are not at all interested in protecting the taxpayers of this province, who have made the investments and who are entitled, and who are entitled, Mr. Speaker, just as much as any private owner, to receive a return on those investments, Mr. Speaker.

Well, you know, we are now getting through to the First Minister because he knows that my arguments are valid. He knows that his ministers, under his direction, yes his direction, are disposed to the idea of giving away every public asset that they can lay their hands on without losing too much credibility. Well, the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, talks about public tender. Mr. Speaker, we have in this particular Order-in-Council an example where out of nine parcels of land, three parcels were sold where there was only one bid. One of those parcels, Mr. Speaker, happened to be sold to the brother of the Minister of Mines and Resources — yes, —(Interjection)— one of the parcels was sold to Mr. C. W. Ransom of Boissevain, Mr. Speaker.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, would my honourable friend permit a question?

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I invite the question.

MR. LYON: Is my honourable friend suggesting by his reference that brothers or relatives of members of the House should not be able to participate in public tenders? If that is the case, why is it that the brother of the former Premier of this province was able to participate in public tenders and get them on construction jobs?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister makes a good point. And he only justified my comments the other day in committee, yes, because it is not we who said there was something wrong with that, Mr. Speaker, we never did. It was the First Minister's colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when they were in opposition, alleged that there was something wrong with that kind of practice. And so we raise it only to remind them that they are now running the show and because they are now running the show, it now is not wrong, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— Yes, oh no, we don't mind it all, Mr. Speaker. I wish Mr. C. W. Ransom well, Mr. Speaker. I have nothing against the idea that he had the opportunity to submit a tender.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please.

MR. USKIW: But, Mr. Speaker, I have a problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I find the debate and the argument put forward by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet to be very interesting, however, I do find difficulty listening to his debate. If we could have a little more interest in the debate and only one speaker at a time I would appreciate that.

MR. USKIW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I was trying to indicate to members opposite that there is nothing wrong with the bidding process. What is wrong, Mr. Speaker, in this instance, is the fact that there were no appraisals done of the properties. That is what is wrong, there was no appraisal done before these properties were put on the market and then when we received 3 bids, one bid from the brother of the member for Souris-Killarney, yes, Minister of Mines, there was no examination done to determine, Mr. Speaker, whether that was in keeping with the market value and whether or not we should have had . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please, order please. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order again. There is no reference to any sort of bidding procedure in this bill whatsoever. It is merely a substitution of a simpler procedure for determining title to land rather than proceeding through the courts, where there is the consent of all of the adjoining owners and I see no relevancy whatsoever in respect to the member's comments.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we proceed I'd like to caution the honourable member to attempt to stay within the bounds of the bill that is before us and I should also like to caution the honourable member that he has to be responsible for his own words in the chamber and if he cares to bring in the individual names of individuals in society, he may very well be doing harm to those individuals. He has to assume responsibility for the words that he uses.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for reminding me of my responsibility. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of the opposition is to remind the government when they are doing something wrong and when there's a public interest that demands that there be a debate on what they are doing and that's what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about Bill No. 9, an Act to amend The Crown Lands Act and The Real Property Act, Mr. Speaker, and it deals with the power of the Minister. It says the Minister may convey properties to private individuals at his discretion, at his discretion, Mr. Speaker, he may. It says, "Where the Minister is satisfied that title to land forming part of the bed of a body of water and reserved to the Crown out of the original grant of adjoining land from the Crown has through accretion become vested in the owner of the adjoining land, he may, in the manner required," and so on. He may do certain things with respect to the disposition of that property.

Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid of the word "may." After the experience we had with Minister of Agriculture, and I have yet to get to the experience that we have with respect to the Minister of Highways, Mr. Speaker, because what he indicated is mind boggling, Mr. Speaker, and we will yet get to that point. But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture thought it was reasonable that there be no appraisal done on properties that were sold. He thought it was reasonable that the reserve bid on property should only be the original cost of those properties to the Crown even if they were bought 20 years ago. No relevance to the inflation factor, Mr. Speaker. Yes, in answer to questions in committee, he said he was not interested in the value of property, he was only interested in getting the original dollar value back.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would challenge the Minister of Agriculture and the first minister to tell me that they could take \$105,000 of this first example and buy that kind of property anywhere for \$105,000 when the real value, according to the marketplace which they believe in, is \$141,000. I would challenge him to purchase an equivalent piece of property for that \$105,000 that he was prepared to accept because that was the original cost of the property which was bought 4 or 5 years ago, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows what has happened to property values over the last few years and so we can't afford to give the Attorney-General, under Bill No. 9, the right to convey property without consideration of value any more than we can afford to give that authority to the Minister of Agriculture who has already abused that permissive authority; any more than we can give any other Minister that kind of authority in a Legislative Act of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, That is what we are talking about. Mr. Speaker, I don't care which Minister it is. Mr. Speaker, I don't care who the Minister is. I would trust the Minister of Tourism or whatever his name is, less than I do the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of faith in the Attorney-General, a lot more than I have in his colleagues. After the Jarmoc affair relative to Crown lands, the Attorney-General wants

me to have faith in that Minister, Mr. Speaker, an issue that is yet to be resolved.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the second parcel of land in this Order-in-Council had no appraisal done, no appraisal done. The reserve bid was \$11,000. They received \$12,600. Well, at least on that, Mr. Speaker . . .

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

MR. LYON: I would like my honourable friend or yow, Sir to explain how ' a debate that has taken place in committee or may for all I know be still continuing in committee, can be carried on under this heading because, No. 1 - - it offends against the rule of repetition, No. 1. No. 2 - - what has my honourable friend's comments, not that I mind them because they are silly, but what have his comments got to do with the relevancy on accretion. A-C-C-R-E-T-I-O-N, a well known old legal term. It means something that accretes to because of. Now, Mr. Speaker, in my humble judgment the honourable member hasn't been in order for the last fifteen minutes. I would hope that you would pay some attention to that submission.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order please. I have asked the member on several occasions to try and stay within the bounds of the subject matter of the bill and I would hope that he would continue to do so. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: I appreciate very much that the First Minister was not paying attention to the debate, he was over in the corner discussing other matters with his colleagues and had he paid attention he would have realized that I read into the records the powers that this bill gives a Minister of the Crown and that is what we are objecting to, and all we are doing is using the example of those powers and how they are being administered by another Minister in this debate. That's all we are talking about, Mr. Speaker. And so, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to see a Minister in charge of this bill having the power to give for nothing a valuable public asset to some private individual or corporation. I don't want that to happen. I don't want that to happen, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we had ample debate about the policy of this Government on how they are going to dispose of public assets, but it's worthwhile for those members who were not there to hear what has to be said from the opposition, who has a responsibility to point out when the Government is going in the wrong direction, Mr. Speaker. That is the role of the opposition, Mr. Speaker.

Another example in O/C 168, dated February 28th, is a case where there was no appraisal done of this piece of property, Mr. Speaker, the reserve bid was set at \$54,000, and Mr. Speaker, the land sold for \$80,088.88. But no appraisal was done to establish its value, according to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, he first said there was an appraisal, then he said there wasn't an appraisal, then he said he might give us the information, then he said he couldn't give us the information, —(Interjection)— yes, and they want us to approve, in Bill No. 9, powers to give another Minister the right to dispose of public assets. Not to this government, Mr. Speaker. We cannot agree in the giving of powers like that to this government.

Mr. Speaker, we have here in the last example a discrepancy of some \$30,000 between the reserve bid and the actual market value that was received by tender, by tender. And that one isn't bad, Mr. Speaker, at least there were five bids there. You know, the one before only had one bid.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has 10 minutes left.

MR. USKIW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that you have taken into account all of the interruptions which have detracted from my time.

Mr. Speaker, a further example, on Page 2 of O/C 168, where we have a reserve bid of \$20,000, where we had no appraisal done, according to the Minister, and which was sold — the property was sold for \$26,326.00. But I have a problem with this one, Mr. Speaker, because in this one there was only one tender. And you would think, Mr. Speaker, that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is this germane to the bill that's before us? Would the honourable member please confine his remarks to the bill? The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I tried to illustrate, for the benefit of the members opposite, that should the Minister, who has the responsibility, according to Bill No. 9 to convey properties to the private sector, if he, five years from now, or next year, or at any time in the future, happens to find that

there is a piece of property that happens to be very valuable, because of the waters receding and creating a new resort potential, that he would want to convey that asset for nothing to the owner adjacent to that piece of property. That's what he is talking about, Mr. Speaker.

And I would hope that there was something in this bill that would have prevented him from doing that. And I say that only because I now find that we are not in a position to trust the Ministers of the Crown, after the examples that we have had in the administration of public affairs and the sale of public assets by the Minister of Agriculture.

So yes, the example I give, of what we fear in Bill No. 9, Mr. Speaker, is where we have one tender, and the government, yes, the Cabinet, has to agree to the Order-in-Council, the Premier has to sign it, Mr. Speaker, but somehow, they decided that it was not worthwhile, not worthwhile asking for a re-advertising procedure to see if we could receive more than one bid or one tender. That is the common sense thing to do, especially if you have not carried out an appraisal of the property, especially if you have not carried out an appraisal of the property, Mr. Speaker.

—(Interjection)—

Mr. Speakei, I challenge the First Minister to stand up in this House and tell me that he would sell his personal assets, as he sold 9 parcels of public assets on February 28th of 1979. I challenge him to do that. —(Interjection)— Yes, certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: . . . and this is repetitious. I asked my honourable friend the question in committee the other day, he refused to answer it then. Has he got the will to answer it now? When he was buying over 200,000 acres of private farm land to put into a state farm system, with the public's money, against the will of the farmers of Manitoba, did he tender out the leases? Did he tender out the leases? Did he let anyone apply for a lease? Or did he just buy the land for particular friends that came along?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to answer that question. If you will permit me, I will be pleased to answer that question.

A MEMBER: We were willing to give to everybody, the more the better.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the land-lease program was available to every Manitoban —(Interjection)— yes, everyone, who had a certain value of assets. Not beyond, that's right, it was a social program, Mr. Speaker. And the First Minister fully appreciates, Mr. Speaker, that where you are zeroing in with a program in an effort to help a certain sector of the economy, that your criteria —(Interjection)— yes, Mr. Speaker, the criteria was set and it was open to anyone in Manitoba who met a criteria, to apply, to participate in that program. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister would like to know, I'm sure it can be found out, Mr. Speaker, how many lessees who are still there, pursuant to that program, carry Conservative cards. Yes, there are quite a good number there, I'm sure. I'm sure that there are as many there, Mr. Speaker, as were represented in the popular vote that this government received in the last election. I'm sure that it's proportional, at least proportional. .

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe it probably is weighted on the other side. Probably most of the leases are in the hands of people that have a habit of voting Conservative. —(Interjection)— Yes, yes. I happen to have a number of discussions with some of them and I know their politics. And they told me, Mr. Speaker, in fact there's a father-son- son-in-law operation near Brandon, they thought this was an excellent way to introduce young people into agriculture. They were not New Democrats, Mr. Speaker, they were Tories, openly. —(Interjection)— Yes, well, no, it wasn't Ransom.

So Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the First Minister, let him understand that that was not in the public interest to do it in that way because if you were to do it that way, Mr. Speaker, then we would have the example of this person, on Page 1 of this O/C, of the Appendix, who already owns 50 or 60 quarters of land, acquiring another dozen or so. The program was designed for people that were land short and couldn't afford to buy it, Mr. Speaker. That's who the program was designed for. —(Interjection)—

I don't believe in the tender system in social programming, Mr. Speaker. For the benefit of the First Minister, yes, absolutely not. And I appreciate that they can't understand what social programming is all about. I appreciate that they can't understand that, Mr. Speaker, because their God, Mr. Speaker, is the dollar bill, and the person that has most of the dollar bills can own everything, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the person that has the dollar bill should have the capacity to even own this Assembly and dictate to the people who serve in this Assembly. That is the philosophy

of the Conservative Party. Yes. That is why the First Minister, Mr. Speaker — and I know that I'm straying off the path here a bit, but if you will just bear with me a moment — that is why, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister was personally funded by private sources in order that he can leap into this office, Mr. Speaker. That's what that is all about.

So Mr. Speaker, when we recognize, I'm not even aware whether they took him off the salary, he may have two salaries today, Mr. Speaker, one from that shadow government and one that the people of this province are paying. He may be enjoying the benefit of two salaries. Mr. Speaker, we can't know that. We can assume that it may be the motive operation of the private investment world who wants that First Minister here.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After having sat four years in the opposition and now some 18 months in government, you learn to appreciate both sides of the role that is being played within this particular Legislature. The role of the opposition in this particular instance, Mr. Speaker, is very, very clear. And it is their hope, because their ideological bent is in that direction, to embarrass the government, or to try and get the government into the position where they will no longer sell any more land.

Well, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I for one won't accept that. And the constituents of La Verendrye won't accept that. And the constituents of Emerson won't accept that. Mr. Speaker, we are here to implement some of the policies that we said at election time we would implement. It was on my campaign literature, it was on many members' campaign literature. We were going to move some of the many thousands of acres of Crown lands that were vested in the Crown and see that the public would have benefit and ownership of those lands.

Mr. Speaker, this particular episode that we're going through right now in dealing with Crown lands, as it applies to Bill No. 9, is a very good example of how the parliamentary system should work in order to try and embarrass governments into moving into a different path, which the opposition feels is the path that they should go. Now I think, one very significant thing happened yesterday — and I have to revert to a comment made by the Member for Lakeside. One of the things that really bothers the members opposite is the fact that we are going to move those four proverbial steps back, and maybe even go two steps towards accomplishing what we want to accomplish, and that way negating the things that the former government did. And that really bothers the Member for Inkster, because when the Member for Lakeside mentioned that I noticed he sort of changed colour and he started rubbing his face a little bit, and then you know that he's starting to think, and he's getting pretty excited about the whole thing.

So Mr. Speaker, that is what bothers them on this issue. It's not the fact that it was public tender, that everybody in the province had a chance to bid on it if they wanted to buy it, that doesn't bother them. But they're concerned that their social programming, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet just mentioned, is going down the tube. Because this government is going to see that that land gets into the hands of private people.

Now, what kind of land are we talking about? We're talking about land, Mr. Speaker, that was acquired when we in opposition said it shouldn't be acquired. We didn't believe in that state farm program, the government was buying land. Mr. Speaker, if you wanted to accomplish what the members opposite were doing, they could have sold that land, picked up the mortgage, and subsidized the interest rate up to five percent on some pieces, and still held the mortgage on that property. Mr. Speaker, those people that would have bought that property would have owned it. They would have had pride of ownership. They would have owned that property.

Mr. Speaker, I speak about people in southeastern Manitoba, I'm going to be rather parochial here for a minute. When travelling through Emerson, one of the reasons the Member for Emerson is over here, after a short sojourn of the other member here for four years, is because of this policy of the past government. There are many people in the Sprague area, in the Tolstoi area, and other areas, father and son units that own maybe 160 acres of land and would like to own that quarter that's next to him. They might be leasing it right now, but they're scared to make improvements on that land because they don't know what's going to happen, whether the rules of the game are going to change, Mr. Speaker.

The members opposite can chastise us and can catcall, the Member for Ste. Rose can raise his voice and scream as much as he wants, but let me tell you, this particular debate is going to do more to enforce our position and will prove out, Mr. Speaker, to be a policy that is very, very acceptable in Manitoba. And let me tell you, I was at a meeting in the EastMan region — and the member is from the EastMan region — just the other night, and several people came over and said, boy, you're sure catching it for trying to get rid of some of that land that the socialists

bought, but he said, "Don't let that bother you because you're headed in the right direction."

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the feeling in rural Manitoba. So the members over there who, understandably, because of their policies, don't represent rural Manitoba very well and didn't in the former administration and that's part of their problem of why they are sitting over there and we're over here, can get up and chastise us for selling this land. Mr. Speaker, that's the type of debate I would like to get into with them in the rural areas, because the people in the rural areas know what we're talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned before the expansion of existing farm units in areas such as southeastern Manitoba, Hadashville, even Lac du Bonnet constituency. These people would like to expand their holdings.

Another problem that has been facing municipalities over a number of years and they have complained loud and long, I think, to the former members in charge of Municipal Affairs is the Crown holdings within their municipalities. One of the problems that you have is drainage problems. There is no tax base to evolve from that.

Another problem we have within a 40-mile radius of Winnipeg with a lot of the Crown land and in my own constituency is that there are parcels within there which cause real problems for Hydro or for Telephone, when they are leading services. You very often go a quarter of a mile or a half a mile without being able to service any people in that area because it's Crown land and there are no buildings or no users on that particular property. This is property that has been tied up, Mr. Speaker, and that should be made available to people who want to settle that area and develop that area. And I don't think it's the government's wish, and thereby the people's wish, that that should happen. —(Interjection)— Government by the people.

Mr. Speaker, all we are doing here right now is emulating what our people, what our constituents, are saying to us. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what I meant to say, is that the people that we are representing are asking for this particular policy, and I make no apology for it.

Mr. Speaker, I guess really what's happening here is that the Member for Lac du Bonnet, who has hung his hat on this one issue which he says is the issue whether there were assessments or appraisals made on that particular land, is one which he is hanging his hat on. He says that's the issue.

Mr. Speaker, that's not the issue. The other day, reading the paper, I am reminded, which I think is an example over here, the election which is going on in British Columbia and the statement by the now Premier of British Columbia when he says during the time in opposition and during the election the NDPs act like Groucho Marx and then when they get into power they act like Karl Marx.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this particular program, when you're dealing with the purchasing of buying up a lot of farmland is a classic example of that, and I think it points out very clearly to the people of Manitoba exactly what direction those members would like the whole situation to go.

You know, the Member for Lac du Bonnet also brings in that one of the purchasers happens to be one of the brothers to one of the colleagues over here. Mr. Speaker, I know from personal experience that when one is dealing with problems of close relatives with regard to elected officials, whether you're dealing with elected officials themselves, the line of conflict of interest runs very thin sometimes.

I am reminded of my own personal case, Mr. Speaker. Several years ago they were widening the shoulders on the Number 12 Highway. I happened to own a small parcel of bushland, about 30 acres, out 12 miles south of Steinbach and they needed about an acre. And that land over there is worth about \$200 an acre, I guess, Mr. Speaker. So the land value appraisal people came and they said, well, we will offer you that much money, and I said, well, sure, it's for the public good. Take it. I think it was \$186, or something. It wasn't worth the transaction. But it was for public purpose, so we went ahead, sure. However, then I was informed that the Crown cannot purchase land from a MLA unless it's done through expropriation.

So, Mr. Speaker, that was fine. We went through the expropriation procedures. A year went by, a little more than a year. Finally, I wanted to clean up the particular problem and I said, "What's holding this thing up?" And then I found, Mr. Speaker, that I was tied in with an unfortunate, or I had made a strange bedfellow in this particular instance, and that was the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

Now, in this particular instance, there had to be an Order-in-Council passed by Cabinet. And it just so turned out that my \$186 was tied in with the Member for Lac du Bonnet's fairly large chunk of money, compared to mine. He didn't phone me up and, of course, offer to share it, because it was more, but that was okay.

But, Mr. Speaker, what happened is I guess the previous administration was kind of concerned about that and held that Order-in-Council up for quite awhile because they knew of the problems that it might create.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it was done through the Land Value Appraisal Commission and I think it was passed and I finally got my money. But the point I am trying to raise here is that they were concerned about problems, just as everybody else in the Legislature is. But there are transactions which have to be taken into consideration even though they affect the members here, and I think if things are done, such as this particular instance, when you're dealing with a public tender, I don't see any problem with it.

The other thing that I would like to touch on, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that I believe the more of this particular land that we get into the hands of private individuals the better off the farming population and the people of Manitoba will be. I feel that there is nothing that beats pride of ownership. When somebody owns a piece of property, whether it be a house, whether it be a farm, or whether it be a small thing like a garden, when they have got something of their own they look after it properly, much better than if they are renting.

Mr. Speaker, I speak with personal experience, having something to do with rental properties. When it belongs to you, you make sure that you look after it much better than if it's somebody else's. And that's a problem we face in government all the time. Somebody says, "Hey, you know, that car over there. Ah, that's a government car," you know.

Mr. Speaker, like it or not, that is a fact. That is a fact, because you do not own it yourself and you do not look after something as well when it belongs to somebody else. Unfortunately, that is a bad human characteristic, but I am the same. I think all the members in the Chamber are the same, that you do not look after something as well if it's not your own.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would raise the same point that I raised with the Member for Lac du Bonnet, that debate on this bill should be confined to the provisions of the bill. And I would ask you to rule accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I realize the Attorney-General has raised a very good point. However, I have allowed a certain degree of latitude up to this point in this debate. The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that the Conservative Party's strength is its weakness and one of our strengths is that we're all individuals and do not hesitate to speak our own minds, but in this particular instance I would just like to once again refer to Bill No. 9, which is before us.

Mr. Speaker, this Act to amend The Crown Lands Act and The Real Property Act dealing with Crown lands, Mr. Speaker, and dealing with the subject material that the Member for Lac du Bonnet had raised and in reply to some of his concerns, let me continue with the particular debate.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, the problems to municipal people, to the people in the farming industry and to, I believe, rural Manitoba as a whole, faced with Crown lands, will require a considerable examination.

Not only are we talking, I believe, in this particular instance when we're talking about Crown lands, about agricultural Crown lands but it has to do with the whole Crown lands policy, period.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that means that we're talking about recreational lands, that we're talking about lands that are on lease which are Crown lands, as well as the particular parcels that have been acquired by MACC.

Right now I understand that the Crown lands are divided between several departments, and, Mr. Speaker, it becomes fairly hard when somebody is looking at or interested in a piece of Crown land to try and get an exact designation and see who exactly is in charge of it.

I think one of the things that should be done is there should be an amalgamation of the different Crown lands to see exactly what we do have in relationship to the whole overall picture and then develop a system whereby we can go ahead and dispose not only of the lands that were mentioned with regard to this particular matter that the Member for Lac du Bonnet raised but also the farmlands and agricultural lands that are on lease, as well as some of the other properties that could be used for recreational and other purposes.

So, Mr. Speaker, I realize that in this particular debate we are philosophically opposed to the members opposite. I think there hasn't been any argument about that. I think that this whole debate centres around not about how the particular property was sold — I think that's a smokescreen — I think the main concern of the members opposite is the fact that we are going to move something, which they think they would like to control, we would like to see the individuals in Manitoba control, the local population and the people in rural Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in supporting this type of direction of the government. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would be very upset if that is not the path that we would follow, because not only is it our stated intention to get some of these things cleaned up and go ahead and get these into private hands but also, Mr. Speaker, I think in the long-run it is my belief that the Manitoba people, the people of Manitoba, will be better off for owning their own properties and being able to use it the way that they feel it should be used. And I think history has showed itself time and time again that the husbandry practised on this particular land and the different advantages of private ownership far outweigh those of the public ownership.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I have, up to now, allowed a fair degree of latitude in this debate but I think the honourable member is straying a little far away from the bill and I hope that his remarks from now on will be confined strictly to the subject matter of the bill. And we're dealing mainly with accretion and the transfer of property. The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm going to have to heed your warning but I must say I feel I was sort of dragged into that by the Member for Lac du Bonnet and I should have known better, Mr. Speaker, but I think what happened is that the Member for Lac du Bonnet did, in this particular instance, cause me to state some of my concerns on this particular thing.

Mr. Speaker, that, I would then conclude, is my contribution to Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Crown Lands Act and The Real Property Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Bill before us deals with the subject of particular Crown lands being given, or being handed by a minister to a private person. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that when the Bill was first presented, it appeared to be a technical matter whereby when a person's land adjoined on a water stream and the stream dried up, the person was permitted to have that piece of land to his own and it was done by a certain type of court procedure. This Bill says that the minister can do it and, Mr. Speaker, it looked innocent enough until last night. Last night a Minister of the Crown said that he would like to give away all of the land that is owned by the public at this time, and I remind the speaker that that involved 75 percent of the land area of the Province of Manitoba, that he would like to give that land away for nothing to a private individual. And, Mr. Speaker, when we saw that and looked at this Bill we had to take a second look. And I tell the member who is just about to leave the House, the Minister of Tourism, that he made one statement that is very significant. He said that he would like to see this Bill and this concept debated, Mr. Speaker, he didn't use the word "ad infinitum" but as much as possible, that's what he said. That's why Speaker, ' Mr. the Minister of Highways yesterday moved a motion that the debate on that question be terminated immediately. Mr. Speaker, that is what the Minister of Highways did —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: I don't mind the honourable member attributing . . . I think if the member will check Hansard that I said that when I go out into the hustings and they want to join me in the hustings, I'd debate this particular philosophy that the Member for Lac du Bonnet raised, reads "ad infinitum". —(Interjection)—.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I suggest to honourable members that if they are misinterpreted in the Debate, they have the opportunity to correct that. I realize that so often we have allowed that correction immediately, but technically speaking that correction should be made at the end of the member's speech, should not interrupt him while he is speaking. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your assistance but I do want to tell all honourable members in the House that if I am stating them incorrectly I do not wish to proceed on that assumption and, therefore I would prefer — and I say this to the Speaker and I thank you for your assistance — that if I'm saying something that you did not say, I would prefer that you tell me because I try, Mr. Speaker, scrupulously to accurately represent the honourable members and if I'm wrong I would like to be corrected. But Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's correction doesn't change things. He said that debating this question indefinitely will accrue to the advantage of those people over there.

And I say that's why the Minister of Highways got up yesterday and said that he wants to terminate debate on this question immediately. That's why, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways, when I challenged him that I would go into his constituency, he should name the place, he should name the occasion, his rules, fight fair, you know don't say anything that is opposed to Conservatism, just dealing with this question, Mr. Speaker, that I never received a call. And I offered to do it during the election campaign, but apparently, the Honourable Minister of Highways thought better of it and I now tell the Minister of Tourism and all the other members, Fitness and Amateur Sport, and all the other fellows over there that if they think that they're going to win votes on this question, debating this question, I tell them that I will be their straight man, I will come to their constituency, debate this question on their terms, in their homes and, Mr. Speaker, they will lose votes, not gain votes. I want to tell the Minister of Fitness . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that there is an election on at the present time but it does not concern this House and I wish he would confine himself to the subject matter.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you what I have said in this House many times, that I am fighting an election every day of the year, every hour of the day, and I'm fighting one now. The next provincial election, that's what we are all doing in this House.

I tell the honourable member something which will be of particular interest to him. I told Tolstoi's story, how much land does a man need in this House and the story ends with the Tolstoi saying that they found that this man needed 6 feet from his head to his toes. And the Minister of Highways said "You come out to my constituency and tell that story." Well, Mr. Speaker, I would love to, I wanted him to invite me and I wanted to go there, but he didn't, so who did this job for me? Would the Minister for Tourism and Fitness and Amateur Sport — thank you — would you believe it? The Mennonite Brethren of the Province of Manitoba told this story to all of the people of this province by a television production last Sunday night. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that they have far more wisdom in this connection, they have far more wisdom in this connection as to the validity of that story than have the members of their church in this House. They did it for me and I am not suggesting to the honourable members that we should leave it at that. I'm suggesting that I'm still willing, if they think they will get votes by it, to come to their constituencies and participate in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that I would like to say just before the hour closes. The honourable members of the House should be aware that when there is an attempt to stop debate, when there is an attempt to limit discussion that it's almost like stopping up one hole in a sieve, then it goes out through another hole.

The honourable members will be aware that there are grievance time on the Order Paper, that there are Second Readings of Bills, that there are Third Readings of Bills, that there is Interim Supply, that there are numerous occasions when various matters can be debated and if there is an attempt, Mr. Speaker, and I'm dealing with this Bill, if there's an attempt to close up one of the opportunities for the Opposition to speak, then as night follows day, Mr. Speaker — and it happened when you were sitting over there and you know very well of what I am speaking — as night follows day the Order Paper will be used to discuss this matter. I say this, Mr. Speaker, not as an admonition to my honourable friends, but rather I am pleading with them. The business of the House was being fairly conducted, things were moving along in an expeditious manner, it's true Estimates were taking longer than one would have expected, but you can't say they were disinterested or repetitive.

Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural Committee this year has received more attention, more members going to it, more media attention, more public attention than it has ever received. Why would one want to take the democratic process and attempt to shut it off under such circumstances? Mr. Speaker, I plead with the honourable members across the House there is an Estimates procedure, it is now on limited time that was done both with the concurrence of the present House Leader and the House Leader for the Opposition when I was then the Government House Leader, there are opportunities if we are taking a long time to work well into the morning. There is no necessity, Mr. Speaker, to attempt what ultimately is impossible in any event and that is to shut off the debate. Because now, Mr. Speaker, I don't blame my honourable friend, the former Minister of Agriculture for looking for an opportunity — and there is one with the Crown Lands Act being on the Order Paper — to desist this problem when what has happened? He has discussed it, we've had a speech from the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, Fitness and Amateur Sport, we've had two members on the other side standing up seeking to get into the Debate. It may be that that will involve two members on this side. I ask the Minister of Agriculture isn't it better to do it in Committee, or are you going to have a Motion at Committee that the Debate be terminated?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order Please. The hour being 4.30 we're now in Private Members' Hour. The Honourable Member for Inkster will have a chance to continue in a different Debate.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RESOLUTION NO. 6 — USE OF THE LORD'S PRAYER IN THE HOUSE (As amended)

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 6. The Honourable Member for Inkster has 15 minutes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have been given reason to believe, although I have no assurance in that regard and can't expect any and am not entitled to any, that it's possible that this Amendment which refers the question as to whether or not the Lord's Prayer will be recited by all of the members of the Chamber, or at least honoured readings by all of the members of the Chamber, prior to Proc commencing will be adopted by the Legislature that the Motion was referred to the Rules of the House Committee. And I got up, Mr. Speaker, because I felt it was necessary not to leave the impression that by supporting this Motion there appears to be an acquiescence in the idea, and therefore Mr. Speaker, although I support the motion and want the Rules Committee to consider the subject, I want to make it perfectly clear that I am in favour of any member of this House who wishes to obtain spiritual solace from the Lord's Prayer to be able to do so.

But I am equally, Mr. Speaker, adamant that any other member of the House who wishes to obtain spiritual solace in any other way have the same opportunity of doing so. And I'm not suggesting Mr. Speaker that there be a multiple number of prayers and that each be treated in some type of equal time fashion. That's not what I'm suggesting at all. I'm suggesting that prayer is a very personal thing, that religion is a very personal thing, that we in this House represent many denominations, many religions and, Mr. Speaker, to make it even broader, many beliefs which can be classified as religious or classified in another way but nevertheless, sincere beliefs. And it would be better, Mr. Speaker, it would be best if the moment of spiritual solace which the members should provide, I am very much in favour of it, prior to the commencement of the House activities because I believe that it is good for persons to look within themselves or look to whatever authorities or spiritual support that they can obtain before embarking on the job which we have and which we are very responsible to complete. I think that it's good to be introspective in that sense.

I think that it's bad to try and impose one person's form of introspection on another person. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to stop my friend, the Member for Point Douglas, from saying the Lord's Prayer. I don't want to stop another member from reciting to himself the 24th Psalm; I don't want to stop another member from using other communication, either with himself or with whatever he considers the Powers that Be, in his own way. We have, up until this point, agreed upon what most people felt was a non-denominational prayer, but Mr. Speaker, the Member for Point Douglas has pointed out that there is, what he thinks, is a better way of doing things. And normally I would have let this matter completely alone although it is not necessarily my particular prayer, I would not have been wanting to disturb this question which is one which touches upon personal faith, but it has been raised by the Member for Point Douglas who wants to impose upon me the Lord's Prayer.

I tell the Member for Point Douglas that I want him to have the perfect opportunity of reciting the Lord's Prayer. And therefore, when it gets to Rules Committee and I hope that it will, I want to tell the honourable members that I'm going to suggest that instead of reciting the Lord's Prayer, just to make sure that everybody has an opportunity of reciting the Lord's Prayer or such other prayer as may be of spiritual comfort to him, I'm going to suggest that there be a period of silence. I don't know how long it will be necessary, that I am prepared to negotiate with, I'm prepared to argue about, but if it's 20 seconds of silence, then the Member for Point Douglas will be able to say "Our Father, Which art in Heaven"; I will be able to say "Shmai Yisrael" if I wish to; somebody else will be able to say "Je vous salue Marie pleine de grace," or whatever they wish to say. And if that way, Mr. Speaker, everybody's spiritual needs and spiritual desires will be looked after and, at the same time, we will be recognizing the non-denominational character of our society and of our Chamber. We will also be recognizing, Mr. Chairman, that in matters of faith and belief, despite the fact that the community may be 90 percent Christian, that the Christian way is not to say that the other ten percent have to follow suit. That is my understanding of Christianity.

And if that is correct, Mr. Speaker, then the solution that I propose, and I don't propose this — and I did not, I was not the aggressive one in seeking it, I was prepared to continue to abide by something, even though perhaps people of greater principle and perhaps more stubbornness would have fought it. I tell the honourable members that without being a facetious about it.

Baron Rothschild, or one of the Rothschilds, was elected to the House of Commons on several occasions, and could not enter the House of Commons because he would not take the Christian oath. And he kept refusing, and he kept getting elected. And therefore he was a man of very strident principles. Eventually, the House of Commons changed the rules which permitted members to enter into their midst. And he took his seat, despite the fact that on several occasions, he refused, despite his election, to take his seat in the Commons because he would not deal with a religious faith which was not his own. And I would think that all of the honourable members would respect that.

So when I support this motion of the rules of the Lord's Prayer going to committee, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, the other honourable members, that yes, it's a convenient way of getting it off the Order Paper, which is probably desirable in view of the heat which it could generate and the light that it would probably not generate, that Rules Committee will consider it, that I hope that there will be a sensible consideration of it, and as far as we can go in accommodating all citizens of Manitoba and making this Legislature reflect the views of all people of the province of Manitoba, we should do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, my thoughts are very much those of the Honourable Member for Inkster. When this matter was brought up last year, I took the trouble to try and find out what was the Lord's Prayer, and I discovered that it's not that clear. Encyclopedias refer to the fact that there are two different Lord's Prayers, one Catholic and one which is, I believe, called the St. James Version. I just did that in order to see whether there was any Jewish Lord's Prayer, as last year's resolution suggested, and I confirmed my impression that there is no acceptance of the Lord's Prayer as being a prayer, and that's why I suppose this present resolution reads, ". . . is pre-eminently the prayer of the whole Christian community . . ." And my attitude is very much that of the Member for Inkster's in regard to that. I don't think there would be any suggestion, and I don't really think that there should be support of the idea that because it is, and I quote, "pre-eminently the prayer of the whole Christian community, and is accepted by most religions," that that necessarily makes it justified to bring it in.

I must say that, like the Member for Inkster, I'm not too concerned about the aspect of the Prayer. To those to whom it is important, it is important that they have the opportunity to say it. I'm not sure that one can say that the level of debate or the service to the people of Manitoba is particularly enhanced by the fact that you, Mr. Speaker, at the opening of the Session every day, recite a prayer. I see many members who follow it and say "Amen" at the end of it, and I'm not sure that five minutes later that they are any more purified or sanctified than they were the moment before you said the Prayer. Nevertheless, as I said, if it's important to anyone, then that person should have the opportunity to say what is important to him.

From that standpoint, I too, find that it is a matter of courtesy, simple courtesy, to stand, while to others the Prayer is said and is of import, and I stand silently with them out of courtesy to them and recognition of how important it is to them. But I don't feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is proper to foist it on me. I can't help but recognize that this evening is the first day of Passover and which has a great deal of meaning, not only to the Jewish people, but I think to all people who are aware of the history of the exploitation of Jews in the land of Egypt. I use that word "exploitation" advisedly and intentionally, because to me, the celebration of Passover is more a celebration of a revolution by the under-privileged people than it is of any great religious significance, although of course the whole story of the exodus deals with God's will and with miracles that God wrought in order to help the Jews. I rather have a more pragmatic approach and feel that it was the result of oppression that lasted for so long that a people rose up, rebelled and left the land which had dealt with them as conquerors would.

But I mention that because I believe that it is of significance to all people, and yet it is known as a Jewish celebration, and I know that others respect it, as I respect the need for various members here to start their day in a special way. I would only hope, as I say, that I did not have to be so cynical as to wonder the extent to which their attitude is improved.

I do quarrel with the amendment before us, well, it's the amended resolution now, because it does say that the matter of the inclusion of the Lord's Prayer be referred to the Standing Committee. By its wording, it would seem to deny the opportunity to discuss anything else, and the Member for Inkster said that he would propose that that committee, that there be a silent period where anybody can say whatever prayer is important to him, or whatever thoughts he has, to himself. And his interpretation is, that his proposal would be included in the resolution as it has been amended and approved.

I think that the Standing Committee has the right to deal with the rules and deal with the Prayer even without this kind of reference, so I feel that what has been accomplished is just to pass over

the question for discussion at a committee level, which is probably where it ought to be. —(Interjection)— The Member for Inkster suggests that Passover is a good time to pass it over, and maybe if there will not be any further debate, it might be the proper occasion today to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? All those in favour of the motion say aye — pardon me, perhaps I'd better make it clear to the House, the motion has had an amendment and I will read the amendment. The amendment refers the matter to the Rules Committee. Are you ready for the question on the amendment? —(Interjection)— The amendment has passed. Pardon me. Then we are dealing with the motion as amended.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the member got support?

MR. MALINOWSKI: I'm looking for support.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, the member has not got support.

RESOLUTION 7 — CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 7, the resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre has 18 minutes.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion this motion was before the House, I had said that I really wasn't opposed to the imposition of the death penalty for what we considered capital punishment, but by the end of what I have to say, perhaps people will understand why I won't be supporting this particular motion.

First of all, one of the things that usually takes place in Legislative Assemblies across the country, the things which are considered are things over which the Assembly or the government has some control. Now, it is the prerogative of any member to introduce anything that he wants for discussion as a private member, but nevertheless, this is something over which we have no control.

The first question a person has to resolve, I guess, in coming to grips with this moral question, is what is life? And of course this is one of the most profound questions which face us. I understand that there is a debate going on in the province right at the moment of how to describe death. And some statutory amendment, I imagine it is in the interests of the medical profession to have such statute, so that they can have some protection under law when a person ceases to live. But then if we go to the other end of the scale, when does a person start to live?

There was a very interesting experience in my teaching career in high school, I had asked a group of high school students just exactly when they thought life began. If you're familiar with the terms of gametes, the male/female cells, is that life? When they get together, is that life? At what point does life begin? Most of us are familiar with the spartan way of looking at things, that life didn't begin until a year or so after a child was born, and if there was some reason for not accepting this child as a living human being, the child was destroyed. So in their terms, life didn't begin until a year after the physical birth. one. And then we get into the question of depriving some who could be considered alive, of a life through abortions and all the rest of it.

But Mr. Speaker, when we talk about taking somebody's life, I know that our generation moves on and there's not too many of us left in the House who have been involved in taking of life. One particular incident comes to mind, on Christmas Eve, at Christmas time, 1943, the particular battle cruiser, the Scharnhorst, I was part of the fleet that sank that ship. And in the matter of an hour or so, over 2,000 people died. In a matter of an hour or so, 2,000 people died. And I know, Mr. Speaker, you were involved, as a number of others of us were, fewer in number now, in this sort of thing. And I think this always becomes part of us, that maybe those of us who have been involved in the taking of life, have more respect for life.

It just so happened last night that when I went home from the Session, I turned CBC on to see what was on and they had The World at War. And I hadn't seen one of those things for a long time, and it showed some of the battles on Omaha Beach and the rest of it. We recall those days well. And the corpses floating around. I guess that's why I'm in the kind of mood I am today.

But people who advocate capital punishment, I go back a bit. I'm not speaking from notes, I'm

just sharing some thoughts perhaps with members, that the taking of life is, I think it demeans us all. And for people to suggest it solves the problem of murder, there is no evidence to support that claim. There is no refutation of the argument that relative to the individual, who is executed, he will never commit another murder. The chap that I referred to, I think it's in Alabama, the execution was stayed once again — 350 crimes this person has committed. I believe it was six murders, Mr. Speaker. That makes a pretty strong case that if he had of been caught the first time, or the second time, or the third time and executed for one of those three murders, he would not have murdered the other three people. It would have been a deterrent in that regard. But as far as other people being deterred, there is no evidence to support that argument.

A person could make the philosophical argument or moral argument, that there is a social contract which exists, that we all rely on each other for our existence, and when somebody deprives themselves of the support of the rest of us, they have actually deprived themselves of life. And it isn't you or I or society that is doing it, but that is rather an obtuse argument. So that when we say that we should have a reimposition of capital punishment, I would have to argue against this Legislature passing such Motion. If I was a Member of Parliament of Canada, with the time to debate this issue, and to look at some of the evidence, I may be of a different persuasion. I say that, not as an equivocation, Mr. Speaker, because when I think of some of the individuals to whom this would apply, then I think that these people have themselves, to use an obtuse argument, deprived themselves of the support of the community.

One of our local people, who took an axe and chopped somebody to death, and during the evidence at the trial, it appears from the witness that survived, that while he was doing this he was saying, "Cry, baby, to the person who actually died in that event. Of course, some people will make the argument that the man is mentally ill, that may be a valid argument, but it still begs the question. What are we going to do about it? —(Interjection)— Well, the Member for Wolseley adds to the debate — I didn't quite hear him, but it prompts me to think —(Interjection)— Oh, I thought the member wanted to put on the record some of his remarks. I believe the member said that they knew when he was 16 that he was going to commit murder.

Well, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— there are people who express different opinions about different people, and I wouldn't give too much credence to that which they said. And it's always easy to say in hindsight that, you know, such and such was evidence that they would . . . people had a propensity towards capital murder. Some of the investigations that they have done suggest that it is chromosomal aberrations of a kind which give people these kind of propensities, but I don't know just exactly how much credence we should give to such investigations.

But to have this matter properly considered, Mr. Speaker, if we look around the House I don't think we have that much support for an intense look at it, I don't think that we have the capacity to bring forth the kind of evidence, which was suggested by the remark by the Member for Wolseley. Perhaps if we did have, you know, such capacity then perhaps we could deal with the question in a more enlightened manner, but with all of the information which I have available to me, Mr. Speaker, in voting on such resolution is that at this point in time I would have to support the present policy, the present policy in Canada. It may be that evidence of another kind can be presented to me, and I don't think the rhetoric and the polemics which enter parliamentary debates are evidence which one could be persuaded with.

So, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a position, while having some sympathy for the Motion, that I will have to vote against it, and I realize at the same time, that in not supporting those people who think that it is a protective device for them and their families, that I put myself and my family in the same position that I put theirs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say just but a few brief words because I didn't at any time think that we would be voting on this resolution today, but if we are I have a great deal of difficulty with the resolution but I'm going to have to support it. The difficulty I have is that I'm not convinced that the laws of this country are fair to people, based on mainly environment, economics, and on non-professionals vis-a-vis professionals. I note with interest that many of the murder trials of which best-selling novels are written about, and murders by professionals and people of wealth, seem to indicate that money talks and that the court system eventually tires, witnesses disappear because of remands, and there seems to be a lack of initiative on behalf of the court system to bring people with money to the same quick justice that they bring people who lack the funds.

And, it is this type of dilemma I find myself facing. I noted with interest that some of the least punished members of our society are the legal profession, and I note the light sentences that they get and then simply spend a month in jail and then are transferred to what they call a special

privileges prison, namely, the 3rd Floor of the YMCA in Vancouver, of which they are paid their full fee to design a prison — I'm talking about two professional architects that were sentenced, or a member of the legal profession who is permitted to become a Chartered Accountant or a Ph.D. or an Assistant Professor. And the man who drives that lawyer from prison to the university every day cannot afford to send his children to university.

So it is this type of justice which disturbs me. I recall, not too many years ago, a fellow that seemed to premeditatedly go out and shoot his wife and then proceeded to pump several bullets into his father-in-law, and if he could have reloaded the gun probably would have done in several other people, who were within shooting distance. However, our valid court system very hurriedly gave him a ten-year sentence, and now being a model prisoner, he'll probably be out on parole in four years. Yet a Metis fellow is involved and he's only a material witness to a murder in which three people were convicted, one I believe got 20 years, and he got ten years without parole — without parole. He wasn't involved in the murder, he was only . . . he was part of a gang, who went out and killed somebody and he was a material witness.

So, it's this type of disparity between the have's and have not's, which sort of convinces me that while I think that brutal murders, such as the one the Member for Winnipeg Centre talked about, where it was indicated at a very early age that Lucas was a homicidal type that was identified by probation officers, history has proved that the man is definitely a danger to society, and it is these types of individuals, who without any care, who laugh all the way as they put each blade of the axe into some other human being, is an indication to me that they might be better to get a lethal injection and to be disposed of in the manner and surroundings in which they are used to, namely, the law of the jungle.

So it's therefore because of these types of individuals and because I have some faith, that some people will still, a very few people will ever be given the lethal injection or the electric chair or be hung, but there will be those odd people that appear to the general public to be just generally animals without feeling that will be put away, and I say the numbers will probably be very few, but we should keep that option open as a deterrent to, causing these people who live in that environment to think twice about murdering innocent civilians and bystanders, who took no part in their environment of which they just happened to be around when the slayings took place.

I did want to comment about the treatment that appears to me that professionals get compared to the ordinary person on the street, and I would hope that that would some day be corrected by some guidelines being given to the judging system, and I realize there has to be some finality to judging — that there is some guidelines, and it might be wise that if you're going to have the ten years with no parole for non-professionals, you should have the ten years with no parole for the professionals.

And those are the few brief comments I have. I've got an awful lot of extensive information on this type of subject. I do believe it is a federal responsibility, but I think I share with my colleague from St. Matthews, that possibly our endorsement of this resolution might give the federal members a chance to review and come in with the return of capital punishment under very severe and extenuating circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Also, I would like to make a few remarks concerning this very, very important resolution that we're dealing with. Capital punishment, I think, is a very emotional issue. Both sides of this issue are easily carried away by their emotions. There have been some very horrible crimes committed in the recent time, including some brutal murders. Every time a murder is committed, the advocates of the death penalty cry out. Let's kill the murderer. Let's hang them. They very seldom want to consider the causes of crime. But one of the Commandments of our Christian religion, to which most of us on both sides of the House believe in, says: "Thou Shalt Not Kill." And we have a statue here with Moses. I don't know why he's looking on our side, on the Royal Opposition side, but if the Honourable Minister of Highways will just have a little turn —(Interjection)— you can find out. It says this is the fifth number which says, "Thou Shalt Not Kill." This commandment applies to individuals as well as to the state. If an individual breaks this commandment by committing murder that does not justify the State to break the commandment by also committing murder.

I know that advocates of the death penalty have little patience with those of us who approach this question from a Christian or a humanitarian view. They don't ask us to reason why: They just want us to join them in shouting, "The murderer must die."

Mr. Speaker, we are living in very disturbing times. We are living in a society full of pressing social problems. We are living in a society that is far from being a just society. There is an enormous gulf between the very rich and the very poor. We live under an economy which produces massive

unemployment.

Many people live under great stress and insecurity. We sometimes say ours is a sick society. We have witnessed some of this sickness in Jonestown, Mr. Speaker, where 900 people ended their lives.

There has been a sharp increase in crimes of every sort in recent years. We must ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, why this sharp increase in crime? Why has there been such a particularly large increase in crimes committed by young people? We must ask, Mr. Speaker, ourselves, what kind of social environments and economic conditions may most likely produce crimes and criminals.

Mr. Speaker, It is not enough to say, "Hang the guilty murderer." We must ask ourselves to what extent society is also , guilty. We should rather save, Mr. Speaker, human lives as much as possible. It's very easy, Mr. Speaker, to destroy a life, and during the Second World War I witnessed how many millions of lives were destroyed.

I want to refer briefly to a book by Jessica Mitford. The book is titled, "Kind and Usual Punishment". It deals with the question of crime in the United States, but it applies equally well to conditions in Canada.

Jessica Mitford had made a lengthy study of United States prisons. According to her findings 80 per cent of the people in American jails come from the lowest 12 per cent of the income group. I am sure it is about the same situation, the same condition, we have here in Canada. Why is it that most crimes, including murder, are committed by those in the lowest income groups?

It should come as no surprise to us that the sharp increase in crime among young people has taken place during the period of the sharpest decline in employment opportunities. We have to, Mr. Speaker, find the infection of this crime. We have to find out the conditions and circumstances in which crimes are committed.

It is a tragic fact, Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of young people in Canada who are denied the opportunity to earn money legally. Every day of the week when young people go to the employment office they are told by the State, "No, you cannot earn money legally. There are no jobs for you." Can you imagine what it means to have young people between 17 and 25 years of age in the highest unemployment category? It is not easy for young people to sit around without a job watching life slip by. They would like to be working. They would like to earn the money to be able to afford the same lifestyle enjoyed by the more lucky ones that have jobs.

Prolonged periods of unemployment can easily result in bitterness, frustration, leading to desperation and in many cases even to crime.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that murderers have come from all classes of society. The murders are committed for a variety of reasons and under various circumstances. We may recall even from the Holy Bible that when we had only two persons on this earth and they have two sons by the names, Cain and Abel, and already between those two, not strangers, but brothers, and crime was committed.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a fact beyond dispute that in most cases where murder results in armed robberies, or other shootouts with the police, the killers have a poor background. The case histories of many killers invariably reveal that the economic circumstances and the environment in which they grew up was far from ideal.

Even a casual study of the backgrounds of the prison population reveal the fact that an unhappy, impoverished home life was a big factor in starting many young people on a life of crime.

I have never heard, Mr. Speaker, of a millionaire being arrested for stealing. You never hear of a millionaire being arrested for snatching a woman's purse or holding up a grocery store, except one — Patricia Hearst. Most of the wealthy are able to rob us in a legal way by holding us up at the supermarket check-out counter or by charging excessively high prices on everything else we have to buy.

The noted American criminal lawyer, Clarence Darrow, thought our present system of society is responsible for creating a lot of criminals by depriving people of the economic opportunities of making a decent living. In addressing a group of prisoners he said we must create a better and more humane kind of society, and he said, "Give men a chance to live. Make them partners in the good things of life." Since Clarence Darrow said that in 1902 there has been considerable improvement. More people than ever before are able to share in the good things of life, but still far too many are not. We still have nearly a million people in our country denied the opportunity to earn money. There is still too big a gap between the super rich minority and the 40,000 Manitobans

living on the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, in considering whether the death penalty is suitable punishment for certain crimes of individuals we must also consider the crimes of society itself. Ours is a society full of injustices. The expression, "A law for the rich and a law for the poor" is no idle phrase. It is a statement of fact.

For the poor there is the minimum wage law limiting their incomes to \$2.95 an hour. For the rich, there is no limit. They can make as much money as they can, in almost any way they can.

Apart from the unjust aspects of our society we must also consider the environment children of all classes grow up in. The average youngsters nowadays can see more murders in one month than those of us in my age bracket could see in our entire life before we had TV. Many of those being convicted of murder grew up in a mental environment of murder. They could sit for hours on end in front of the TV watching people get killed in every possible way. If they got tired of watching murders on TV they could go to the movies and see more violence and murder on the large colour screen.

Mr. Speaker, Sociologists, Psychiatrists, and others who have given this serious study, are agreed that the way all sorts of crimes and violence and murder are portrayed in the movies and TV have a bad influence on young minds. They are a contributing cause to the widespread crime prevailing in society.

Why do we permit so much murder and violence on TV? The answer is very simple. Because there is money in it. Because the advertisers believe the murder and violence programs sell more goods and make more money for the advertisers. And in our society naturally money talks.

Mr. Speaker, I have stressed the environment that people grow up in. I have strongly stressed the defects in our economic system which deprives so many of the opportunity of earning a decent living. I have stressed the unjust aspects of our society. I believe all these have a strong bearing on the prevailing crime rate. I believe that with the conviction of most murderers and most criminals our society, in most cases, also stands convicted.

As a Christian with some humanitarian feelings, I am not willing to join those who say: "Let's kill the killers. Let's hand hang the murderers", and that is why I cannot support this Resolution put in by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

There have been murders throughout the ages and no doubt there will continue to be murders, even under the most favourable social conditions. But the reason I'm in this Party, Mr. Speaker, is because I firmly believe improved social and economic conditions would lessen the incidence of crimes of all sorts, including murder.

Building scaffolds for the hangmen will not provide jobs for all the almost 900,000 unemployed. I firmly believe that if all people are given the opportunity to lead good lives, if there are jobs for all those looking for jobs, if all people are able to share in the good things of life, there will be less murders and less crimes of any sort.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my honourable friends, who favour the death penalty, to think positive. The death penalty will kill people. It will not deter murderers because it does not remove the conditions that lead to crime. And let us remember, Mr. Speaker, the fifth commandment, "Thou shall not kill."

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put a few brief comments on the record regarding this Resolution which has been placed before us by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. And I find it a very difficult Resolution to debate or to discuss, not having any legal background. Your conscience tells you to do one thing and the law tells you to do another.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to look at the way that the capital punishment is being carried on today in the country of Iran, where, without any quarrels at all they just line the people up and carry out the act of capital punishment, due to the political struggles that are taking place in that country.

There are other jurisdictions, Mr. Speaker, not in the western world but in the world of South America or Africa today where the same laws seem to apply with political struggles or struggles over various tribal wars and for control of government, etc, etc, where capital punishment seems to be carried out at the will of the masses and very few questions are asked.

And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, where is the abolitionist today in the role of society. Where is the abolitionist from the United Nations and all these world organizations while these acts are being carried out in the world around us today?

Mr. Speaker, I know there is a federal election on at the present time and there are maybe some of the candidates that feel that maybe this matter should not be debated at this particular time. There are other schools of thought, Mr. Speaker, who think that because it's a federal matter that it should be discussed openly and very thoroughly at this time, so that the majority of the people, when they go to the polls on May 22nd, is it, or the 23rd, that they will have a very good idea of where the various groups and individuals stand regarding this matter.

Mr. Speaker, it's very interesting for me to go back to the poll that was done in 1975 by the Winnipeg Tribune regarding this very matter that we are discussing at this time. And in that March 15, 1975, release by the Winnipeg Tribune, if you happen to refer to it, Mr. Speaker, a poll was conducted in that year by that daily paper with a random sampling of Winnipeg citizens. And the answers, Mr. Speaker, were very interesting.

To the first question: Are you for or against capital punishment, that is the hanging of convicted murderers? The respondents answered as follows: For capital punishment 69 percent, Against capital punishment 24 percent, No opinion 7 percent.

And the writer of this editorial, Mr. Speaker, goes on to say, "Rarely do we find such a heavy majority of people on one side of a very contentious and well-argued issue. We think it's significant," the report continues, "that both men and women and persons of all age groups show almost the same support for capital punishment."

And the next question, Mr. Speaker, that was offered to the recipients of the poll, by age and sex, these were the proportions of respondents supporting the death penalty: All respondents who favour the death penalty, 69 percent; men under 35 years of age, 72 percent supported the death penalty; men 35 and over, 68 percent in Manitoba supported the death penalty; women under 35 years of age, Mr. Speaker, 68 percent supported the death penalty; women 35 years and over, 69 percent supported capital punishment in Manitoba.

And it goes on, Mr. Speaker, in the editorial, "By age and sex, these are the proportions of respondents opposing the death penalty," in that particular poll, "All respondents, 24 percent opposed; men under 35 years of age, 22 percent opposed; men 35 and over, 21 percent; women under 35, 32 percent; women 35 and over, 23 percent."

So, Mr. Speaker, as the writer poses in the article, he says, "There is no question that the fear of criminal activity from all segments of the population is an important factor in the heavy majority who favour the death penalty. The fear, we believe, is reflected in aggression against the criminal and the resultant belief that a the person committing a crime should be severely punished."

Mr. Speaker, there are arguments for and against this subject matter, the abolition or the retention of the death penalty, that have gone on and on and on, and there are reams and reams of reports pro and con.

The matter is a problem. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that brought this Resolution, has created a real problem for us in this House, who must speak on the issue and then try and find what our constituents think we should do and our conscience tries to tell us to do, whether we support or oppose the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that all classes of society, regardless of the statements that were made by the honourable member who just spoke, are prone to crime. All classes are prone to crime.

I can't argue, as I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the punishment is adequate, it's equitable or it's fair. I think I would say, Mr. Speaker, that that's the decision for the judges, that's the decision for our courts and the legal process in this province and across Canada to decide.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you leaf through some of the many and the various briefs that have been presented by the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, by the Chiefs of Police of our own province, you will find that there is a strong sense of feeling from that group especially, those who protect us from the time we get up in the morning and while we sleep at night. The policemen and law enforcement officers of our province are very, very important people, not only here but all across Canada, to make sure that everything is fair and justice is performed. And they come out, Mr. Speaker, strongly supporting the capital punishment law in our country.

I believe I heard this morning on the news on the radio or the television, was it, that the National Association of Chiefs of Police are hoping to get the matter raised before the candidates in this federal election that we're facing at this time.

And there are some very interesting statistics and very interesting statements that are made by the Chiefs of Police, Mr. Speaker, that certainly should be put into the record in this particular debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Perhaps the honourable member will have an opportunity to do that when this next comes up. The hour being 5:30, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning (Thursday).