



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

---

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

---

**31-32 Elizabeth II**

---

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable D. James Walding  
Speaker*



MG-8048

**VOL. XXXI No. 104A - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 11 JULY, 1983.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

Name	Constituency	Party
<b>ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)</b>	Ste. Rose	NDP
<b>ANSTETT, Andy</b>	Springfield	NDP
<b>ASHTON, Steve</b>	Thompson	NDP
<b>BANMAN, Robert (Bob)</b>	La Verendrye	PC
<b>BLAKE, David R. (Dave)</b>	Minnedosa	PC
<b>BROWN, Arnold</b>	Rhineland	PC
<b>BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.</b>	Gimli	NDP
<b>CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.</b>	Brandon West	IND
<b>CORRIN, Brian</b>	Ellice	NDP
<b>COWAN, Hon. Jay</b>	Churchill	NDP
<b>DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent</b>	St. Boniface	NDP
<b>DODICK, Doreen</b>	Riel	NDP
<b>DOERN, Russell</b>	Elmwood	NDP
<b>DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth</b>	Kildonan	NDP
<b>DOWNEY, James E.</b>	Arthur	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Albert</b>	Emerson	PC
<b>ENNS, Harry</b>	Lakeside	PC
<b>EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.</b>	Brandon East	NDP
<b>EYLER, Phil</b>	River East	NDP
<b>FILMON, Gary</b>	Tuxedo	PC
<b>FOX, Peter</b>	Concordia	NDP
<b>GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)</b>	Swan River	PC
<b>GRAHAM, Harry</b>	Virten	PC
<b>HAMMOND, Gerrie</b>	Kirkfield Park	PC
<b>HARAPIAK, Harry M.</b>	The Pas	NDP
<b>HARPER, Elijah</b>	Rupertsland	NDP
<b>HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen</b>	Logan	NDP
<b>HYDE, Lloyd</b>	Portage la Prairie	PC
<b>JOHNSTON, J. Frank</b>	Sturgeon Creek	PC
<b>KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene</b>	Seven Oaks	NDP
<b>KOVNATS, Abe</b>	Niakwa	PC
<b>LECUYER, Gérard</b>	Radisson	NDP
<b>LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling</b>	Charleswood	PC
<b>MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al</b>	St. James	NDP
<b>MALINOWSKI, Donald M.</b>	St. Johns	NDP
<b>MANNES, Clayton</b>	Morris	PC
<b>McKENZIE, J. Wally</b>	Roblin-Russell	PC
<b>MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)</b>	St. Norbert	PC
<b>NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)</b>	Assiniboia	PC
<b>OLESON, Charlotte</b>	Gladstone	PC
<b>ORCHARD, Donald</b>	Pembina	PC
<b>PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.</b>	Selkirk	NDP
<b>PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson</b>	Transcona	NDP
<b>PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland</b>	Fort Rouge	NDP
<b>PHILLIPS, Myrna A.</b>	Wolseley	NDP
<b>PLOHMAN, Hon. John</b>	Dauphin	NDP
<b>RANSOM, A. Brian</b>	Turtle Mountain	PC
<b>SANTOS, Conrad</b>	Burrows	NDP
<b>SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic</b>	Rossmère	NDP
<b>SCOTT, Don</b>	Inkster	NDP
<b>SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)</b>	Fort Garry	PC
<b>SMITH, Hon. Muriel</b>	Osborne	NDP
<b>STEEN, Warren</b>	River Heights	PC
<b>STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.</b>	Flin Flon	NDP
<b>URUSKI, Hon. Bill</b>	Interlake	NDP
<b>USKIW, Hon. Samuel</b>	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
<b>WALDING, Hon. D. James</b>	St. Vital	NDP

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 11 July, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . .

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. V. SCHROEDER** introduced Bill No. 109, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act (2). (Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

**MR. G. LECUYER** introduced Bill No. 104, An Act to amend an Act to Incorporate The Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK** introduced Bill No. 110, An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Constitutional amendments

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

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister.

This morning the present Member for Ellice, and the NDP candidate for mayoralty of Winnipeg, indicated that any change in the Constitution should be based on some public consensus, and that lacking public consensus, there should at least be a free vote of the members of the Legislature. Can the First Minister advise the House whether or not the Member for Ellice is reflecting the views of the government on that issue?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated previously, the question of whether the vote will be a free one or not will be a matter that will be dealt with in our caucus, as I'm sure it will be also one that will be dealt with in the opposition caucus.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, it's evident that the issue is not being dealt with in the NDP Caucus, because the Member for Ellice stated his position this morning on an open-line radio show.

My question to the First Minister, perhaps it's repetition, but perhaps you would care to answer it: Does he intend to pursue that avenue of having a free vote? Is he going to take that position, the same one that the Member for Ellice takes?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I've already dealt with that question several times, both last week and this week.

## Mayoralty election - Winnipeg

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the First Minister. Will the NDP Government be endorsing the Member for Ellice as a mayoralty candidate in this fall's civic election?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

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

Perhaps the Honourable Member for Tuxedo would wish to rephrase his question so that it refers to a matter which is within the competence of this government.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's possible, so I will go to another question.

Has the government agreed to broaden the powers of the position of the mayor under The City of Winnipeg Act, should the Member for Ellice be elected as the mayor as a result of this election? Mr. Speaker, is the government considering broadening the powers of the mayor under The City of Winnipeg Act in view of the fact that there is a candidate who they, I believe, have some sympathy for?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I thought it would not be necessary to rise to point out that's a hypothetical question.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I am sure that it's hypothetical that the candidate, the Member for Ellice, has some sympathy from this government, but it isn't hypothetical to ask whether or not the government is considering broadening the powers of the mayor under The City of Winnipeg Act.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Minister of Urban Affairs . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am rather surprised by that question, Mr. Speaker. I leave it to you to decide, but there has been a bill with respect to changes to The City of Winnipeg Act that has been debated and received second reading and has been referred to the Municipal Committee of this House. If the member opposite wishes to have that amendment included in the bill, then I would suggest that he raise that amendment in committee discussion of the bill.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I was told over the weekend that the government is considering expanding

the powers as a result of the involvement of the Member for Ellice in the race. So my question is: Would the Minister indicate whether or not that consideration is being given or has been given and, if so, would he consider sharing it with the other potential mayoralty candidates?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** I think the government's intentions with respect to The City of Winnipeg Act are clear. There is a bill that's presently before this House on its way to committee to be discussed; so the government's intention with respect to changes to The City of Winnipeg Act, Mr. Speaker, are contained in that bill.

Anything that may happen in the future is some conjecture of the member opposite. As far as the specific question, as far as any assurances, the answer is no.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Minister's response, my question — (Interjection) — to either . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. H. ENNS:** . . . the Minister or to the First Minister is that anything that may happen, could that possibly be a restoration of the original clauses of Bill 36 that brought Unicity into being, that was introduced to Manitoba by the then NDP government under the chairmanship of Mr. Saul Cherniack, which included very much stronger powers for the mayor of the City of Winnipeg, is that being contemplated by this administration?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I thought it was made very very clear that although Monday is the first day of the week, surely it is not the day for gossip sessions which appears to be what we are developing into.

### Nursing shortage

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Health, and I would ask him, Sir, whether he can confirm the observations of the president of the Manitoba Organization of Nursing Associations to the effect that the danger to patients in hospitals in Manitoba continues unabated and that the danger has continued to increase as a result of a number of poor staffing situations in hospitals in Manitoba throughout the year?

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm this. I can confirm, however, that I have asked the Manitoba Health Services Commission to initiate a review, that they are doing a thorough review on a

priority basis, and as soon as I get a report I will share it with the members of this House.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House as to the method or form in which the president of MONA, Vera Chernecki, communicated her concerns to the Minister's office and to the government? Reports indicate that those concerns have been directed to the government and that the association itself is stepping up what it calls its campaign to make the public aware of these problems.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, the usual way that this is done, there is such a thing as the Manitoba Health Services Commission and there usually is a dialogue, or the concerns should be brought to the Commission, and I can't answer at this time. I will check; I don't know what form or when they did communicate with the Commission.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister confirm that MONA raised concerns of this kind publicly several months ago in Manitoba, and could he confirm that presumably, at that time, those concerns were made known to the Health Services Commission and the Minister's office, and that the public of Manitoba would have expected that the Commission and the Minister's office would have acted on those concerns by this time?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, the concerns have been expressed on occasion and that's checked immediately. Now, this is a general concern and accusation, or a statement that this is done, and I say that my honourable friend would know exactly how he deals with it, because that was done. This is not something new. Ever since I have been sitting in this House, there has been the concern of a shortage of nurses. That has come up two or three times a year. Sometimes it's valid; sometimes it isn't. Because of the fact that a general statement was made that it is happening all the time, this was the reason why I have asked the Commission to look into it. As I say, when I have a report, I'll be very pleased to share it with the members of this House.

I think there is a concern already said that I don't overreact every time that there is a statement in the media. You know what would happen if I did that, is that everybody would go directly to the media. There are a lot of people that are doing that. In a democracy, this is their right, but I think it would be wrong to overreact until we have facts and figures. This is what I'm committing myself to, to sharing the report and the findings with members of this House.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, given the fact that - to use the Minister's reference - a shortage of nurses or a difficulty in providing adequate nursing supply is not new, conceding that fact, would the Minister also concede that concerns levelled by the major umbrella nursing organization about danger to patients in hospitals in Manitoba is new? It's not new in 1983. It was raised earlier this year by the organization referred to, but in essence that situation, unlike the cyclical nursing supply situation, is new; a situation in which

nurses are saying that patients in Manitoba hospitals are in danger. Would the Minister concede that point, because certainly the majority of Manitobans would concede that point?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly won't concede that. It certainly isn't new to me. It is something, as I said, that I have heard at different times from either the nursing profession or the medical profession. This is something that we have to be very careful. This is something that we might agree with them or we might not.

Now the responsibility is shared also by the government - of course, I'm not trying to duck any of my responsibilities - by the Commission, and also the different boards of the different hospitals and institutions, but that is not the first time that has been said by any stretch of the imagination. At any time that I've heard and I have had representation in the last three or four years, I think some of my colleagues were with me, where MONA and other groups have told us that they were endangering the life of the patients in that freeze that the former government had made, for instance, that they were putting an extra load on the nurses and would endanger the life of the patients. In fact, there has been a form of process to follow through for the criticism and for a chance to express their concern. That has been used for a number of years now, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Considering the fact that the president of the organization concerned says that the danger to patients continues unabated and has continued to rise as a consequence of staffing problems throughout the year - I presume she is referring to the year 1983 - would the Minister concede that a lengthy casual easy-going diffident review of the situation, which might produce some results and some answers for this House and the people of Manitoba several weeks from now, is not good enough, and would he agree to this House to pursue that exploration immediately with all haste and urgency this week and to report to the House as quickly as he can, hopefully this week, with respect to the safety level of patients in Manitoba hospitals?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member might try to put words in my mouth, but I don't think I can allow that. I think that when I stood up, I stated that I've asked the commission to investigate and get a thorough investigation as a matter of priority and to have it as soon as possible, and I've also committed myself to share this report as soon as I get it. Now, as I say, this is not something new; this is something that's been going on for a number of years, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that no hospitals have been asked by the commission to reduce their staff. So if this that exists has been existing quite a while, in fact, there has been some review; in many instances, staff has been increased — (Interjection) — If you have any other questions, instead of yelling from your seat, why don't you stand up like a man and ask me the question?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** You cut staff . . . You've got the half-truth disease . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Stand up and ask the question like a man.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I did and you lied to me . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** . . . I've been accused of lying and I will insist that there be a withdrawal of that statement. The Honourable Member for Pembina said that I lied to him and this is not the case, and I would expect that you would ask him to withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Health had responded to a question and there was an audible accusation that the the Honourable Minister of Health had lied to this House. Now, the Honourable Member for Pembina uttered those words from his seat. He wasn't formally on his feet, but everyone heard him and he owes it to the Minister of Health and all members in this House to apologize. I call upon you, Mr. Speaker, to advise the honourable member that he must apologize for that remark.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain to the same point.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Yes, on the same point, Mr. Speaker. I believe that if we come to the point where heckling that's carried on back and forth across the Chamber between two members, the exchange which is not on the record, then, Sir, I think that it will be extremely difficult for you to handle that situation. This particular situation is one that is not on the record and it took place between two members who had not been recognized by the Chair.

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** To the same point of order. I think it is hardly right to say that you can hide behind the word, or supposedly heckling, to have no decorum at all in this House. I think it is very easy to establish that the honourable member, if he said it, should withdraw it or at least say that he did not say it. Then we'd have to take his word if it's not on the record, but he is not doing that.

You can just imagine, Mr. Speaker, what's going to happen if this is allowed if on the pretext of heckling,

if you can yell any name, it could be obscene material or anything in this House, what kind of decorum we're going to have in this House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The point that the Honourable Minister of Health makes is a very valid one, that members should not heckle from their seats in such a way as to make unparliamentary remarks or to say those things which are against the decorum of the House. However, Beauchesne is clear that unparliamentary words are those which are spoken in debate.

I would have to ask the Honourable Member for Pembina whether he wishes to comment on this matter or whether he has any explanation to the House.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw no comments to the Minister of Health.

### Autopac - new claims centre

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Autopac. Can the Minister indicate to me whether or not Autopac is planning the construction of a new claims centre in the City of Winnipeg?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** I'll have to take that question as notice. I'm not aware at the present time of any such intention.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister's answer. Would he in taking that question as notice indicate, if indeed those are the plans of Autopac, what area of the city the new claims centre would be located?

### Predation of farm animals

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, another question to a different Minister - to the Minister of Natural Resources. I have sheep ranchers in my part of the country that are suffering a continuing loss of sheep to predators, wolves and coyotes in these cases; also, bear, I believe, are causing some of the problems. Is the Minister prepared to react to them? The special area that I'm referring to is the Inwood-Narcisse area. This particular rancher has suffered a considerable number of losses in the last little while. Could the Minister consider giving him a special permit to rid himself of these predators?

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, predation of farm animals is something that's gone on for many many years. One of the worst problems we have, of course, is the human predator and the poaching that has taken place. I do believe that in some portions of the Interlake

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Sheep. It's sheep, Al.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** . . . there have been significant losses of sheep. I know we had . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable members don't want to hear an answer to a question. Their baying reminds me of lost sheep, Mr. Speaker. They are looking for their leader. Mr. Speaker, there have been problems not only with the opposition but with some sheep ranchers in the Interlake, and it's true there has been predation by wild animals.

The department did track down a wolf that was alleged to have been the cause of some significant sheep loss and destroyed that wolf. If there are significant problems, there's no difficulty in our department granting special permits if the area can be identified, and there is a strong likelihood that it is a predator animal that is causing the problem. I would invite the honourable member to give me the particulars and I'll see that the department is apprised of it.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister's willingness to, in this case, co-operate with the rancher in question. I want to assure him that it is bear, likely, or wolves that are taking the sheep, not humans in this case. But, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister will grant a special permit to allow the rancher to help himself in this particular instance, I'll see that the Minister gets the specific information.

### French school for Ile des Chenes

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

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Acting Minister of Education, I would like to answer a question taken as notice by the First Minister, a question from the Member for Tuxedo the other day. It was with regard to the French Regional School at Ile des Chenes. The Minister of Education was informed that tenders for the project in question actually came in at \$600,000 over the budget. The Minister was further informed that a meeting between the representatives of the Seine River School Division, which is Division No. 14, and the Public Schools Finance Board did take place on July 8th. At that point, the school division representatives committed themselves to effect whatever reductions would be required to bring the cost of the school down to the budgeted amount. The chairperson of the Public Schools Finance Board made it very clear to the representatives of the school division that the board would not authorize any additional funds over those that it had provided according to its costing formula.

The Minister has been assured that the revisions now being considered by the school division and by the architect in question will succeed in bringing the project into line with the original budgeted amount. The Minister completely endorses the position taken by the Public Schools Finance Board.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, is the Acting Minister saying that they can achieve a one-third reduction in

cost in the construction of that school by redesigning it and still be able to offer all the services and programs that were intended?

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, my own experience with the Public Schools Finance Board and their planning that they do with school divisions when a school is built is that this association is rather close between them, and they do communicate hopefully between one another.

When original plans for a school are drawn up, they can be added to along the way as a school division sees a need or a wish to add more programs. In this particular case, I don't know whether the Seine River School Division is removing programs that they added later or whether it's actually the physical design of the school that is being changed to effect the reduction. But the fact is that in their consultation with the Public Schools Finance Board, originally, there was a budgeted amount set. As the planning progressed, they exceeded that budgeted amount. They are now saying that they can effect the change and come in at the original budgeted amount by making whatever changes they feel are appropriate. It is the school division's responsibility and right to do this.

### Constitutional amendments

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

**MR. H. CARROLL:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. On Thursday last in Brandon, there was a hearing on the amendment to the Constitution that was chaired by the Attorney-General. One of the ground rules was that there was to be two hours, and two hours only, for this meeting, and the Attorney-General proceeded to speak for a good half of that time.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is: Is it the government's policy to limit the debate or to muzzle the people of southwestern Manitoba from giving their opinions on this particular amendment?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** No, Mr. Speaker. The very fact, in case the honourable member is not aware, that informational meetings are being held is to ensure that there is public input and the opportunity to receive information from the public. Those meetings are taking place in Thompson and Brandon, in Dauphin and in Winnipeg.

My information is that the Attorney-General spoke for much less than that time which the Honourable Member for Brandon West indicated, closer to 20 to 30 minutes. There was one-and-a-half hours opportunity insofar as public input.

In addition, of course, there will be the legislative committee opportunity for public input, contrary to what is the general procedure pertaining to resolutions that are brought before the House.

**MR. H. CARROLL:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could advise how much money was spent and

where the advertising was done, in terms of local newspapers and newspapers in southwestern Manitoba, with respect to the hearing last Thursday night in Brandon.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I think that's a reasonable question for the member to ask through an Order for Return if the member wants to have a calculation as to the costs of the advertising pertaining to the holding of the meetings.

**MR. H. CARROLL:** An Order for Return is perhaps the correct way; however, the government is in such a rush to rush this bill through that perhaps I would like to have my information before the bill is passed.

### Municipal information re budget

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs if he or his department have seen fit to instruct the municipal auditors to mail certain letters out to the municipalities in this province when they do the audit, and ask them to sign, the reeve and the secretary, and designate that certain things have happened in the municipalities before the audit is complete?

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

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice, and get the information for the honourable member and report back to the House.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can I also ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs if this information that the auditors are requesting of these municipalities on their own stationery is confidential and it's filed with the Minister and the department, or is it just for the confidence of the auditors?

**HON. A. ADAM:** I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Can I ask the Honourable Minister if he is prepared to use this auditor's vehicle in the conflict of interest legislation that is now facing the municipalities as well?

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, there is a bill before the House, Bill 47, on the conflict of interest. Any views, such as the member puts forth, can be dealt with at committee or in the debates as it's presently before the House.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I hate to disagree with the Honourable Minister. I don't see anything in the legislation, and I wish that he would correct the false impression that's in it, and advise me if the

municipalities have to live up to those regulations of the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is standing in his place making a speech, and I would like you to advise him that this is question period. I would like you to advise the honourable member that this is question period, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs again, do the municipalities in this province have to abide by these letters that are being sent out by the municipal auditors asking them to disclose certain confidential information to the auditors, which they understand is going to be public information? Is that the policy of this government? Is it the policy of the Minister, or when did it start, or where did it come from?

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

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the honourable member is asking about the approval of municipal budgets. Certainly, there are regulations in regard to the information that is required in order for the department to approve the budgets. There are certain regulations that have to be followed by municipal governments in order to have those approvals for their budget.

Mr. Speaker, if there are transfers of funds from reserves, unauthorized expenditures and so on, certainly those have to be approved before the budget and Finance will give approval to the budget.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Can I ask the Honourable Minister when that change was brought in? Is it government policy, or just changes brought in by the department?

**HON. A. ADAM:** It is my understanding that policy has always been there; that there has been no change, insofar as I am aware, in that direction.

### **Royal Insurance Company - staff transfers**

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Economic Development. In view of recent news reports that indicate a major portion of the Winnipeg staff of Royal Insurance Company is going to be transferred to Calgary, I believe some 50 people, has the Minister been in touch with the company to determine why Winnipeg is being de-emphasized in their corporate reorganization?

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

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, no, we haven't, but I, too, noticed that in the paper and will undertake to speak with the management of that firm.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder if the Minister could question them as to whether or not it's the payroll tax, or the fact that the CPI is increasing more rapidly in Winnipeg than it is in other cities in the country, or the fact that the government is planning to enter into the life insurance industry, that is causing them to make this decision about their corporate reorganization.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, if I am asking them for their reasons for rationalizing their business, I will ask them just that and I will listen to the reasons that they give. I don't intend to put words into their mouth. If they raise those particular questions, I will certainly listen and attempt to enquire to what extent those taxes or costs are impinging on them, and also if there are any balancing factors of costs between the two sections that also need to be looked at. According to our most recent information, the cost of doing business in Winnipeg overall is substantially lower than the cost of doing business in Calgary. However, I intend to listen to what they have to say and then analyze the results.

### **Crow Rate**

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the First Minister.

Could the First Minister confirm and would he agree that Manitoba's livestock and poultry production, the importance of it to Manitoba and particularly to the farmers, that it, in fact, makes up about 40 percent of the income to the farm community; that is, the livestock production and poultry production?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I think that's a matter of record that the honourable member himself can easily check out as to whether it's 40 percent or 38 percent or 42 percent; certainly, it's in that neighbourhood, I believe.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the First Minister's recognition of the importance of the livestock industry to Manitoba and the incomes to farmers, as well, I'm sure, as he's aware of the major packing house industry in Manitoba which we're on the verge of losing if something isn't done, would the First Minister meet with representation from the Manitoba Livestock Industry, which held a press conference this morning, pointing out that if the proposed Crow rate changes are to be implemented, as has recently been introduced in the House of Commons, that it would cost our hog producers a potential of \$5.00 a hog and \$30 for every slaughter animal, would the First Minister meet with the livestock producers?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, this government has been consistent in its opposition to the Crow rate proposals that have been enunciated by way of Mr.



Pepin. There has been no uncertainty insofar as this government's position pertained to Crow rate changes. Will I be prepared to meet with the livestock producers? Certainly, I will be prepared to meet at any time with the livestock producers in the Province of Manitoba, as will my Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, as well, could the First Minister confirm that it is the choice of Manitoba livestock producers to have the \$651 million paid to the livestock producers in Manitoba rather than directly to the railways? In view of that, Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister reassess his government's position and try to encourage the production of livestock in Manitoba and rethink his total approach to the change in Crow rate?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I thought that this chamber but a short few weeks ago passed a resolution unanimously, I thought it was all 57 members of this chamber unanimously opposing the changes that were being proposed by Mr. Pepin. I thought that resolution reflected both the views of opposition and of government members. There certainly is no change in respect to the position of government members on that resolution.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, a final question to the First Minister.

I would ask the First Minister if he would consider getting in step with some of the people of Manitoba at some particular time, because on every other issue, he's completely out of step, and I would ask him to get into the real world and deal with the real problems of the people of Manitoba?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, if there has been a group that has been out of step, has ducked the issue of the Crow, has wobbled on the issue of Crow and has sometimes spoken out of both sides of its mouth, it has not been members on this side of the chamber, it has been consistently members across the way that form the opposition in this chamber.

Mr. Speaker, if it has also been members that have been out of step with the position, not only of this government but also of the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, it has again been honourable members across the way, Conservative members in this chamber.

### Number of bills this Session

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

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, today is the 104th day of the sitting of this Legislature, July 11th; there are three new bills for first reading today; the bills are piling up at a rate that makes it very difficult for the government and the public to have an opportunity to thoroughly review them. Can the First Minister give any indication to the House whether we have seen the end of the bills that the government intends to introduce?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I think there are very few bills that are left to be introduced. There may be

several bills that will be introduced in the next few days, not of a major nature but of a minor nature.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we have been sitting for 104 days, but there is a great deal of very important legislation, important material, that has to be dealt with in respect to this Session of the chamber and we're prepared, as I'm sure honourable members are across the way, to ensure that the important business of the House is dealt with.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, when the New Democratic Party was in opposition, of course, they frequently criticized the Government of the Day for bringing in bills late, and with some justification, Sir, because at this time of the year when one gets into July, people, the public, don't have the same opportunity to focus their attention on what is happening in the House. So could the First Minister give us an indication whether he intends to have any other bills introduced beyond those routine bills that deal with the necessary supply and perhaps even a statutory law amendments bill?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, The House Leader will take that question as notice as to whether there are any remaining bills to be dealt with.

I do note, Mr. Speaker, by way of interest, that many of the bills that are standing are standing in the names of honourable members across the way, so that I think that should be clear on the record that in fact if there is any delay in respect to debate - I haven't taken a numerical count - it appears rather obvious that a goodly chunk of the bills are standing in the names of honourable members across the way.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my questions have been dealing with the bills which the government intends to introduce, not with the proceedings of the House. As it happens, I believe, on Friday, for example, members of this side of the House allowed five bills to pass second reading; one of them as soon as it was introduced, Sir, and perhaps some of the other five that are standing in the name of the Government House Leader might be allowed to proceed rather quickly if they were introduced as well, Sir. But my question is to the First Minister, since indeed he is the First Minister, can he not tell the House what bills his government is yet to introduce, what laws his government intends to impose upon the people of Manitoba? Can the First Minister not give that information?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I thought that just a few moments ago I indicated, so that we would be sure that we would be accurate, I know that there are some bills that the House Leader has to introduce of a minor nature that we will be . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** . . . that I'll take that question as notice so that I can ensure whether it's one or two or three, and the indication is given to honourable members across the way.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The time for oral questions has expired.

### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on matter of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, in the past month, I have had my secretarial and research assistance curtailed and withdrawn by the New Democratic Caucus . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. R. DOERN:** . . . and, in particular, by the chairman of the caucus.

Mr. Speaker, on June 10th, my secretarial assistance and my research assistance was curtailed because of a questionnaire that I circulated to the people of Elmwood. The secretaries were instructed not to have anything to do whatsoever with that poll. They were told not to open my mail, to count my mail, to help in the analysis of those replies.

Mr. Speaker, 10 days later, I dictated three letters which were then held first of all by the secretaries. These were letters from people in my riding and from outside of my riding. These letters were held by a secretary, shown to the chairman of caucus who read the letters, and then determined that they could not go out, first of all, in one instance, for a couple of days. In the third instance, that letter, Mr. Speaker, is still not in my possession because it has either been destroyed or filed by the chairman of caucus.

**A MEMBER:** Fault the government.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I regard that as a high-handed action by the MLA for Radisson in his capacity as chairman of caucus.

I have asked for newspapers and been told in one instance I could have them, but they had to go back. I asked for newspapers last Friday and the chairman of the caucus came up to me and said that's it, from now on you are cut off. You have to go in there, get the newspapers and bring them out; you cannot have a page bringing you the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, I have had my phones not answered by the caucus secretaries. In this fashion, I have lost messages and my constituents — (Interjection) — well, one of the members says, good. I would like to know who said that. Mr. Speaker, I also have been under some pressure from the caucus, but that is my own concern.

Mr. Speaker, I have also been cut off caucus documents, which again may be an internal matter, but it was "by mutual agreement" that the Premier and I agreed that I would be out of caucus, not attend caucus until the question of bilingualism was resolved. But all caucus documents of any note or importance other than routine matters pertaining to any question of any significance has been cut off from mail to me in spite of the fact that I have said that in most, if not all,

instances I would be supporting the government's program and that I would be speaking in favour of the government's program.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things that have been done. The consequence of this is that I have a backlog of mail. The consequence is that I cannot properly perform my duties as the MLA for Elmwood; that I have in my office - I have asked, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Government Services for the following: a desk, a chair, a typewriter (electric), and a partial budget for a secretary. This was denied.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of this I feel that I am working under a handicap, and I consequently move that this Assembly instruct the Committee on Privileges and Elections to examine the withdrawal and/or restriction of my privileges as a Member of the Legislature for Elmwood, moved by myself and seconded by the MLA for Brandon West.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member makes a motion. It is my submission that his motion dealing with what he alleges to be a grievance in respect to rights accorded to him by the government caucus is a matter for determination within the government caucus. It is not a matter for determination by this Assembly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to make my point of order in relative peace. Mr. Speaker, it is not a question. He doesn't in his motion raise a question about denial of rights of a member of the Legislature, he is raising a question about his alleged denial of rights as a member of a caucus. Mr. Speaker, it is my submission that motion is out of order; it has no basis for consideration for this House.

I would like to speak on the alleged grievance and point out when I do, Mr. Speaker, that I believe there is no basis for the grievance either. But I submit that in respect of the motion that is sought to be placed before you it is entirely out of order, because it has no basis to be placed before this Assembly as a motion for this Assembly to deal with an alleged grievance in not receiving certain services from his own caucus. Mr. Speaker, I therefore submit that the motion should be ruled out of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek to the same point.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I have been in this Legislature for 14 years and all the time I have been here there has been money supplied by the government to support the services of members within their caucus. Sir, we had meetings last year, being among a committee, to decide what services caucus members might have. It was discussed by both sides. There is a bill in the House at the present time which is expressing from the government a need for the government to supply services to caucus members.

The Member for Elmwood stated in his privilege that he had an agreement with the First Minister that he would not leave caucus, but he would not discuss one particular issue. But to take his services away from him is wrong, because the money is supplied by the government to service those members.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The members should not be debating the merit of the issue at this stage, merely whether the matter of privilege is in fact in order or not.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert to the same point of order.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you, Sir, when we hear an allegation that a member of this Legislature's mail has been censored by another member of this House, I think that is sufficiently important enough that it be referred.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, members of the opposition are obviously working to some disadvantage, not having the written copy of the motion before you. But recalling as best we can from what was said by the Member for Elmwood, it is an appropriate matter for the House to concern itself with, when any one of the 57 members in this House has some of their rights curtailed.

The member referred to services by the pages that are being employed by the Legislature, referred to certain secretarial help that we, under The Legislative Act, agreed to provide for all 57 members. I say all this without in any way indulging in the internal politics of the New Democratic Party Caucus but, as the services that are supplied to individual members of this House, they are a matter of concern and legitimately so for this Chamber, Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health to the same point.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** On the point of order, as you rule, we should not discuss the merit of the concern of the resolution, only that should it be in order. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the conduct of any party or any caucus is the responsibility of the members and nobody else. There is always something that can be done by the member, exactly the same as the Member for Brandon. If they are not satisfied that they're getting the proper service as per the ruling of a party, then he can ask any single member, can ask that his money, his allotment for secretarial and research go directly to him, and that is the only recourse to be done. The rest is not the place and time to discuss what's going on in any party. This is the responsibility of the parties themselves. — (Interjection) — That's exactly it, the service paid for is so much per member, and then all he has to do is give instruction that the money go directly to him and take care of his own services. That's exactly what has to be done, exactly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain to the same point.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think what has to be determined, Sir, is whether the motion indeed deals with a legitimate question of privilege. Certainly I would suggest that the matter of withdrawal of services from one member of this Legislature is a question of privilege, especially when secretarial help, for instance, is supplied directly by the taxpayer, not through a grant to the individual member.

In this case the allegation deals, at least in part, with the removal of that privilege from the member of the Legislature, Sir. So I suggest that it is in order, and the role of the Speaker is to determine whether or not the issue has been raised at the earliest opportunity, and, secondly, whether or not the member has established a prima facie case that indeed the privileges of that member have been violated.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson to the same point.

**MR. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know if this is in order, but I have here a letter addressed to the Member for — (Interjection) — let me finish my question first.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. G. LECUYER:** I have stated, Mr. Speaker, in the first place that I didn't know whether it was in order, and I don't propose to read the letter at this point, but I have a letter that I did send to the Member for Elmwood, which I'm not going to read now unless you determine that it is in order for me to do so, but which goes a long way to show that the allegations made by the Member for Elmwood are purely allegations. The Member for Elmwood has the same services of caucus as all members of caucus.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Radisson was surely discussing the merits of the case rather than whether the motion itself is in order.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye to the same point.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could get the Member for Radisson to table the letter he referred to?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell to the same point.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of this House, that's sat here as long as the Honourable Member for Elmwood, I would think that the least that this House could do is to recognize the member's concern in his resolution, and have his problems brought to the committee at the earliest possible convenience, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the charges and the allegations that the honourable member has raised are serious ones. They have never been raised in my time in this House and I have been here since 1966. I think the matter should be dealt with, with dispatch, at the earliest possible date by the committee as the honourable member has requested.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources to the same point.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, honourable members are addressing the question of whether or not this motion is in order, using arguments in respect to the rights of individual members of the House, and I submit that the argument that was addressed to you by the Honourable Member for Elmwood complains about an alleged lack of service from a caucus, not a denial of the privileges of the House.

There's no question, Mr. Speaker, that there has been some brief change in the relationship between the Member for Elmwood and his caucus. That is a matter that was obviously arrived at by a mutual decision.

Now the honourable member is complaining about the arrangements of that mutual decision. That is a private matter for that honourable member to deal with with the New Democratic Party Caucus. If he decides that he wants separate arrangements, if he wants the rights of an individual member of the House as distinct from the New Democratic Party Caucus, he has his choice of action. But to allege that these voluntary arrangements that he has made are somehow not to his satisfaction is not a motion that should be before the House and it is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Virden to the same point of order.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to indicate that when this motion comes forward, I would also like to speak on the motion, but right now I'll speak to the point of order.

Mr. Speaker, as a former Speaker, I recognize the position that you're in, because it is inherent in the role of any Speaker to protect the rights of all members of this Assembly at all times. You have a properly put forward motion of an alleged breach of privilege of this House by a member of this Assembly, and he is asking that this motion be debated and the House make a decision on whether or not that is referred to a committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it is very much in order, and any other action from the Chair that would deal otherwise would be one that would be so grievous in this House that we must always protect the rights of every member in this Assembly to stand up . . . even in the Wilson thing. I realize, Mr. Speaker, it's rather improper . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** . . . on a point of order.

When I was Speaker, and I make reference to it, Mr. Speaker, that when I was Speaker of the House, and until I received instructions from the House to do otherwise, I recognized the Honourable Member for Wolseley as one who wanted to speak, and I was prepared to recognize him in the Assembly.

I put that on the record, because the Speaker's role is to protect the individuals in this Assembly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry to the same point.

**HON. L. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order.

It would seem to me that the motion moved by the Honourable Member for Elmwood rests on the fundamental principle of this Chamber, and that is that those words and statements that are uttered by members of this Chamber are taken at face value and on good faith by other members of the Chamber as being true and intentional statements.

The chairman of the government caucus has interjected a new point of discussion and consideration now into this matter. If it is the view of the government that this is not a legitimate motion of privilege, then the chairman of the government caucus has an urgent responsibility, Sir, to table the letter to which he refers, because at this juncture we have accepted - and I'm sure all members of this Chamber are prepared to accept in line with the fundamental principle of this House to which I referred a few moments ago - the voracity and the truthfulness of the statement that the Honourable Member for Elmwood has said. That statement points to a very serious abrogation of his rights and privileges by the chairman of the government caucus affecting matters which are those between the member and the citizens of his constituency and the taxpayers of this province, not matters purely between himself and his caucus.

**A MEMBER:** Right. He's elected by the people.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** So, Sir, we cannot have it both ways. Either the government has to accept the fact that the motion moved by the Member for Elmwood is legitimate and he's entitled to see it proceed to study, such as he has proposed here, or the subject matter referred to obliquely by the Member for Radisson must be brought to the full attention of the House.

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

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It never quite ceases to amaze me of the Member for Elmwood's ability to try and grab headlines. But on this issue . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Inkster should confine himself to the point of order without making personal remarks about another member of this House.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Well, Mr. Speaker, when a members have a difficulty within their own caucus, they have a choice to make. They have a choice to stay within that caucus or to leave that caucus. What we have right now is we have an issue . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. Order please.

The honourable member is again discussing the merits of the case and not the matter of the resolution and whether or not it is in order.

The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in referring to the point of order raised by the Acting Government House Leader, the argument that he has put forward is that there appears to be some question as to whether or not the Member for Elmwood is properly interpreting his rights.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that those rights, privileges and services that he has referred to in his substantive motion are ones that ought to be therefore discussed. Since there is a question in the mind of the Acting Government House Leader and members opposite as to whether or not he is properly interpreting those rights, privileges and services that he has as a member of this Assembly, the motion should be ruled in order so that such information as the letter that the Government caucus chairman has referred to, and other matters that are being speculated upon here, could be put on the table and could be properly discussed and assessed. That's why I believe it ought to be ruled in order so that we can send it forth for debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows to the same point of order.

**MR. C. SANTOS:** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. Without going into the merits of the motion, we can say that no member of the Legislative Assembly can be denied any right, privilege or service that is equally available to every other member of the Legislative Assembly. That is one bundle of right as members of the Legislative Assembly.

As a subsystem of the Legislative Assembly, every caucus has its own rules and regulations and its own bundle of rights and privileges, but it is a sub-system of the total bundle of rights and privileges of the Legislative Assembly.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. C. SANTOS:** To the same logic, no member can be denied any basic or essential rights and privileges as members of the Legislative Assembly. Similarly, no member can demand any greater right than any other member can have a right or privilege or access to. If it is a right of every member of this Legislative Assembly to have a private secretary, every member should have that right.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker,

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, without attempting to get into the merits of the case, which I see members find it very easy on the question of the point of order, because the question of whether or not the motion is in order and the merits of the case are very closely allied.

Mr. Speaker, I think two things are relevant on the point of order as to the admissibility of this motion. The first one is the question you have to decide as Speaker, and that is whether or not, as it's put on Page

25 of Beauchesne, there is a prima facie case that a breach of privilege has been committed. Mr. Speaker, there certainly is no prima facie case in that all we've had here are allegations, a whole series of allegations about the internal activities of one of the caucuses in this Assembly.

The Member for Fort Garry suggests that members' statements are taken at face value, but if that were to apply to matters of privilege then the requirement to prove a prima facie case would then be irrelevant. So, certainly that requirement, which is contained much later in Beauchesne and relates to statements in debate, cannot be made to apply to the raising of matters of privilege; otherwise we would be doing it daily on all sorts of allegations relating to differences between members, where one asserts against another that he or she has stated the facts as they are and for anyone to say otherwise would be a matter of privilege.

That, Sir, then would seem to rule the matter out of order because a prima facie case has not been demonstrated. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood, and others commenting on this, have pointed out that this is a decision by the government caucus; that none of the services provided directly to the Member for Elmwood by the government as his right as a member of the Assembly have been infringed upon. He's not said that it's right to make long distance phone calls which are equally available to all members, that those rights which are available to all members have not been infringed upon; but only those rights which relate to the internal operation of the government caucus.

Members opposite have made spurious allegations during this discussion about the opening of mail. I don't believe the Member for Elmwood alleged that his private mail was opened. I'm sure that allegation wasn't made.

But, Mr. Speaker, there has been no service denied to the Member for Elmwood according to the allegation that he has made in his matter of privilege, which is a service guaranteed to all members equally.

The allegation that the member has made has been to the inequitable distribution of the services that are available to members by right of their membership in caucus; that's the allegation he's making. Mr. Speaker, if that allegation is to be made, even if it has substance, it relates to the internal administration of the caucus and not to the Assembly as a whole.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the resolution proposed by the member is out of order, but I think the member makes a serious allegation - and because of my own personal concern that the services to members are services about which all members should be concerned - I submit that it would do all members in this Chamber good to air this by its referral to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I think all members would benefit from airing the question of what rights a member has in his or her own stead, and what rights accrue to that member by virtue of their membership in a caucus. That's a very important distinction and one which most members who have discussed this matter have failed to make. So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, even though I submit that on several grounds the motion is out of order, at least for the purpose of clarifying the question, it would be worthy of debate in this House and in committee.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur to the same point.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. Mention has been made that the very principle of the democratic system is in question. The Member for Elmwood has been sent here by the electorate of his constituency; he's had privileges in operating effectively interfered with. I think it's the responsibility of this Assembly to support his motion.

I, as well, Mr. Speaker, would think that there has been reference made to a letter by the Member for Radisson, that it should be tabled in this Assembly because of reference made, and that we should get on to debate the content of what the motion is.

### SPEAKER'S RULING

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I thank all those members who have offered their advice on this matter and I also refer to Page 25, which says that there are two conditions to be satisfied whenever a matter of privilege is brought before the House. One of them, which has been referred to, is that there should be a prima facie case shown that there has been a breach of privilege, and the other condition being that the matter must be raised at the earliest opportunity.

In looking over the motion and listening to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, it would seem that he has indeed made a prima facie case and that his privileges as a member of the Legislature have been reduced or restricted in some manner.

As far as the second condition is concerned, I have heard nothing from the Honourable Member for Elmwood that this in fact is being raised as a matter at the earliest opportunity and that it therefore deserves to take precedence over every other matter of the Legislature in being debated at this time.

Since the resolution does not satisfy both of those conditions, I would have to rule it out of order.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, we must respectfully challenge your ruling.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question before the House is, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained. Those in favour, please say aye; those against, please say nay. In my opinion, the ayes have it. I declare the motion carried.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you call third readings, starting on page 3 of the Order Paper, Bill No. 50?

### ADJOURNED DEBATES ON THIRD READING

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Bill No. 50, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. (Stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Bill No. 15, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways, Bill No. 15, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Morris. (Stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Bill No. 35, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Bill No. 35. (Stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Bill No. 12, Mr. Speaker, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources . . .

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Why aren't you debating it? Why aren't you moving on the legislation? You're disgusting! I told you Friday, you are disgusting . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Bill No. 12. (Stand)

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Bill No. 57, Mr. Speaker, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Bill No. 57, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. (Stand)  
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Bill No. . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I am having difficulty hearing myself articulate the Order of the Day.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, during his comments, accused me of being in need of psychiatric assistance. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if honourable members are not prepared to debate these bills, they might be in need of psychiatric help.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** We told you what piece of business we were prepared to debate.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 73.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Bill No. 73,

standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. (Stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 76, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Bill No. 76, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. (Stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Bill No. 26, Mr. Speaker, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

### THIRD READING - AMENDED BILLS

#### BILL NO. 26 - THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

**HON. V. SCHROEDER** presented Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act for third reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Tuxedo, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 18, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson. He was in the House a moment ago.

### ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 18, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson. (Stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Bill No. 30, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 30, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo. (Stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Bill No. 31, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 31, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Stand, Mr. Speaker, but I'm sure if any member on the other side wishes to speak, we would have no objection.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Stand.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, you might say on a point of order, it's very gracious for the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain to indicate that other members can speak. I might indicate that later on, of course, we may not be prepared to allow bills to continue to stand.

Bill No. 47, Mr. Speaker.

### BILL 47 - THE ELECTION FINANCES ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 47, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, just for the benefit of the House, Sir, which was something that would have made your job much easier, if we had a person leading the House at the present time that was using any brains at all, we would not have had to go through all this nonsense that he's been going through for two days, mainly because he is very vindictive and using the same procedures he did when he was last in this House to get himself kicked out the first opportunity the people had to do so. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that is well on the way, the way he's going, and I can almost guarantee it.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 47, it's rather amazing to me that the Premier of this province would even allow anybody to bring in a bill such as this; a Premier that at one time was the Minister of Municipal Affairs in this province; a Premier that did, I must say, build some confidence with the elected members of the municipalities when he held that position under the Schreyer Government. Of course, the big difference is Mr. Schreyer was a Premier, and Mr. Pawley wasn't then and isn't now.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that really is amazing is that this bill goes completely opposite to what the Premier used to say about the elected members in this province, municipal members and urban members, etc., is that they were exceptionally fine people, devoted their lives and much of their time to their job, took time away from their families to do their job properly, and regarded it as a sacred vow to do the best for the people of Manitoba.

Now all of a sudden, we have a bill that says, as far as I'm concerned, we don't trust you anymore. We have to know everything about you. We have to know everything about your investments of your wife, and we have to know everything about the investments of the children that live at home with you. In other words, they all have to be listed and documented for the public to see at any time. That's disgusting, Mr. Speaker. In

fact, I can't understand the mind that would think that up. There is an old saying, "it takes a thief to catch a thief." If that's the way that this government intends to operate and if that's their attitude towards the municipal people, if that's the attitude that the First Minister has after praising municipal people for their services while he was Minister of Municipal Affairs, if that's the attitude he has toward them at the present time, I say to him, Sir, that he was misleading them very badly when he was out moving around with them when he was Minister of Municipal Affairs.

I don't recall anybody during the last election discussing a conflict of interest bill that went down to disclosure of assets of all of these people that work with us so hard and for the benefit of the people within the municipal offices that they're elected to.

Mr. Speaker, can you visualize a member or elected member in a town in Manitoba or an elected member in Manitoba - and the same will apply to this Legislature - saying to his wife that you must disclose all your assets for me to run or stay in my position? Does she not have any rights, Mr. Speaker? Does the man's wife not have the right to say that my investments that I have are my own affair? Are we saying to the spouses of people that are elected that they don't have any rights?

Well, Mr. Speaker, you can't read it any other way, and the present Minister of Municipal Affairs said in Woodlands, "This will be better for you." I can almost see it causing a separation in a house. You know, it's just downright cruel to say to the other spouse that you, the other spouse, one or the other - I know that's hard for the Minister of Finance to understand - but you know, for the other spouse, other than the elected person, to make it easy for him to disclose their assets - (Interjection) - and I hear from that firefly cause-chasing Member for Inkster again, the wavy-kneed little boy that sits in the corner with his little green hat on, or I can see it anyway - then you'd have the situation where maybe a child that has been married, there could be a death in that family or there could be a divorce or a separation and one of the children comes home to live with the parents, maybe when they're 25 or 30 or 45, whatever, the minute they walk in the door and make their address the same address as that elected member, they must disclose all their assets. Mr. Deputy Speaker, how foolish, how silly, and actually how cruel can you get? How democratic do you think that is?

Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that's not very democratic. That's saying to the person that wants to run that your spouse or your children have no rights to make any investments that are not going to be disclosed if they live with you. Mr. Speaker, I would say that - and I know the same thing is in our legislation - if I was still a municipal councillor, as I was, and I said to my wife you must disclose all your assets, she would every right to say to me: "Frank, that is my privilege, that is my business and you don't have any right to it." I believe she has rights, and I believe that my children have rights.

I had a situation where one of my children moved home for a while and they would have had to disclose their assets, and I believe they have rights.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of democracy that this previous Minister of Municipal Affairs places upon the men that he praised and the women that he praised

so highly for the work that they have done. It's sheer hypocrisy, absolutely, and the present Minister of Municipal Affairs says, "That is better for you."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I remember an occasion in this House when I first was the Minister of Housing and I appointed a board within a month of becoming government. Then the Member for Brandon East at that time stood up in this House and he questioned whether the people that were on that board should be on the board or not. I said they're on the board because I believe that they are experts in that business, and to be experts in that business they have to work in that business - people like Mr. Denton and those others - and I said I have every confidence that they will do their job for the benefit of the people of this province. Do you know what the then Member for Kildonan, I believe was his constituency - Mr. Miller - he was questioned outside the House about those statements that were made in the House and about the questions that were put forward by the Member for Brandon East, and I can show you the quote in the paper; I still have it. Mr. Miller said, "You either have integrity or you don't." And he said that he felt that he had confidence in people that were appointed to do their job and if they had integrity they would do their job properly; if they didn't, it would come out and discipline would have to take over.

We have had very very few occasions when we've had to discipline any municipal people, Mr. Speaker. I don't think we'll ever go through this life or forever without having some occasion to discipline somebody if they haven't got integrity, and the people will vote them out if they don't have integrity or there'll be rules to see that they have to quit if they don't have integrity. But to put this type of legislation before us, which doesn't say conflict of interest, it says disclosure of assets.

Mr. Speaker, I often refer to the Minister of Resources, the Member for St. James, and I refer to him quite harshly these days and he deserves every bit of it, but if somebody had put that in front of him while he was the councillor in the City of St. James-Assiniboia he would have raised so much hell that you would have heard him across this country.

Now, we have a situation where all of a sudden, because there is a new NDP Government in power under the leadership of the present Premier, all of these municipal people are basically dishonest until they prove otherwise. - (Interjection) - Mr. Speaker, I hear from the Minister of Municipal Affairs that that's a lot of nonsense and I want the Minister of Municipal Affairs, when he closes debate on this one, to tell me that the disclosure of assets of children living in that elected member's house is not telling that person that you don't trust them. You don't trust his children to have the proper assets, you want them disclosed. You don't trust his wife or her husband; therefore, you can't trust them very clearly. You want them to walk in here and give you a list of their assets before they run, and when they run you want them all listed for the public to see. You tell me that is trusting somebody? You tell me that's trusting somebody?

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the type of thing that this Premier has become famous for, because I don't recall at any time, when he was Minister of Municipal Affairs, travelling around the country, smiling at them like he



smiles at the camera every day, and telling them you'll have to disclose your assets before you can run in this province. I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Premier that he worked under, Mr. Schreyer, wouldn't allow it, that's why. Now he gets sitting there and that's what happens.

Mr. Speaker, we now have a situation where you've got a government, you have backbenchers like the Member for Inkster who doesn't believe that anybody should have the privilege of doing anything if they have any assets and who doesn't know how to accumulate any himself. So, Mr. Speaker, we have that situation of the people that are trying to influence this type of legislation coming forward and saying to the municipal people that this is the type of thing that you will have to do, and your wife or husband will have to do, and your children will have to do before you can run for election.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 47, The Municipal Council Conflict of Interest Act, I have before me at the present time - and I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs has maybe talked to the Minister of Urban Affairs, and maybe it would get to him one way or another - 12 pages of questions the City of Winnipeg asked about this bill, 12 pages of questions about this bill; 12 pages that basically everyone of them, and every section on every page that they refer to says this should be cleared up, it's not clear.

It also says in this one from the City of Winnipeg, which will take them into effect as well, it says the City of Winnipeg because of its size operates considerably different from a small town. If a councillor in the City of Winnipeg has to disclose his assets, and I might say and his wife, and his children as well, he can make disclosure and if he's part of a business there's lots of other businesses around in Winnipeg that can, "and you maybe not have to deal with them."

By the way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the man who checked up on Bill 47 for the City of Winnipeg said, "What happens when a committee has the authority to let the tender on a job?" Has anybody figured that one out? Not the council, but the committee has. That member was on the committee, and if he wasn't on the committee, maybe he gave his opinions to somebody else in the committee.

The City of Winnipeg tells them it can't work. Did they talk to the City of Winnipeg? Did the Minister of Municipal Affairs of this province presume to pass legislation that would take care of a city the size of Winnipeg without talking to the Minister of Urban Affairs? I would ask, when the Minister of Municipal Affairs gets up, if he's seen this.

I wonder if he knows what it says about the principle of this bill in here on one section. He says, "The bill is based substantially upon the 1980 Ontario Conflict of Interest Act." You know, the Minister has got up and said it is just about like the Ontario Conflict of Interest and other provinces, but did he ever continue with this and say, however, the Ontario act was repealed and replaced with a new act in February of 1983, which the fellow from the City of Winnipeg attaches. He attaches the new bill which made considerable changes.

So, Mr. Speaker, now we have a situation that if it did work in the municipalities, it won't work in the city; if it works in the city, it won't work in the municipalities and towns. Well, let me say a city the size of Winnipeg

versus a city the size of The Pas - the Member for The Pas is sitting there - doesn't the Minister of Municipal Affairs know that in smaller towns you might have a very reputable person who happens to be the bulk dealer of oil in town? The only bulk dealer in town, and he's a reputable person that's worked at the community club, he's hammered nails, buildings, skating rinks, and he has done everything. He's run picnics, he's taken an interest as an elected member in that area, and he all of a sudden becomes a person that we mistrust because he owns a business. We not only mistrust him, we mistrust his wife and any children that are living with him. — (Interjection) — It is true.

Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to tell me that's not true, ask him to read the bill and it says - it says right in the bill, that's the main principle of the bill - disclosure of assets. It says that the member, he or she, will disclose their assets; his spouse will disclose her assets or his assets; and his children who are living in his home will disclose their assets — (Interjection) — Now, did I hear the Minister say that doesn't mean that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, disclosure of assets before you can become an elected member in this province is saying that if he has any specific assets, that they're going to have to be completely public or he can't be there, or if he does have these particular assets, that gives the people the opportunity, maybe, to watch him more closely when all they really want to be concerned about is his integrity. That's what it's all about, his integrity. By the way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people can decide who they want to elect to office. Then why should the Minister of Municipal Affairs put in rules and regulations to decide who people can vote for and who they can't vote for? Why does the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who casually stands up every time and says this will be better for you. This will be better for you, this will be better for a person running for office if his wife says I won't tell you, or his children say I won't tell you, you can't run or he's got to quite. That's real better for him isn't it? That's real better for him. That's going to make them awfully happy out there.

Mr. Speaker, as I started out to say, when you live with the mentality that "it takes a thief to catch a thief," I guess you write this type of legislation. We haven't had any problems in Manitoba, and this will create problems. It is the old socialist rule, divide and conquer. Get people into conflict and then take over. That's basically the way they work and this will create conflict. This bill will create conflict and they don't care. — (Interjection)—

Well, they are in favour of anything that comes rolling down from the group who writes their legislation; they just get told what to do. There isn't anybody really over there that would stand up to any of the high-powered, high-paid NDP people that they brought in from the head offices in Ottawa and what have you. There isn't a member over there that would stand up to one of them at anytime anyway. So that's why we get the type of legislation we get but, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I think the example I give of a member who has a child who was married and, for some reason, there is a death or divorce in the home, that they come back to live with their parents and their parent says to them, if you live here, you must disclose your assets. That's democracy?

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** That's dependent children.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the little Member for Springfield says dependent children. He always come up with some little gem of wisdom. Could there not be a situation where the parents would be helping out that child who came back?

What is dependency? If the parents decide that you'll only pay for four meals a week instead of all? Is he dependent on the parents for those four meals? What is the definition of dependency? Let's have it. You see, the Member for Springfield, he sits in the corner up there and he laughs most of the time.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** You give me a lot of reasons, Frank. You give me a lot of reasons.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** He laughs. You see, that's what I mean. Here we go, now here he starts again. After he laughs, he sits down and puts his hand on his face and he looks up at the gallery and he smiles at all of them first, then he grins at the press, and then he has another laugh. You see, Mr. Speaker, it's typical. It is the same as the Member for Inkster waves his knees, he waves his knees all the time. There they are; his knees are waving, the firefly with wavy knees. That's about it.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the thing that I am saying is let's get back to the bill that they think is so funny. Let me tell you how funny it is.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** The village smiler.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Let me tell you how funny it is, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have been travelling in this province as an elected member since 1963, and I know a lot of members out there. I have known people that have been in municipal councils longer than I, and I have been 20 years, either at a municipal council in St. James-Assiniboia, plus my legislative days. I was the critic at one time for Municipal Affairs in opposition, and I travelled to all those meetings before. I have travelled to two of them this year. I attended different meetings in Brandon, and what have you, and I know many of those ladies and gentlemen personally.

I didn't just walk away after I finished having my lunch and was back here by 2:00 at the House when I went to Woodlands. I stayed for the afternoon and listened to their resolutions and discussed them with them after. I stayed and had a social 45 minutes with them and had dinner with them and then came home. All that time, I was having conversation with these people, the same as all my colleagues did when they attend these type of meetings.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to inform the Minister of Municipal Affairs very sincerely that he doesn't know what is going on out there if he thinks the elected members in the municipal councils of towns and municipalities like this bill. If he believes that, he doesn't know what is going on out there, and he should. He does not have any idea of what's going on out there — (Interjection) — That's right.

You know, Mr. Speaker, so we have a bill of not conflict of interest. It isn't conflict of interest. You can write in this bill that the member must say that I have some

interest. I can't speak on this. You can have all the regulations you like, if they find the person to not have integrity, to remove him, but disclosure of assets of his wife or husband and his children, I would like to know what assets. You know, I read this thing and I say if somebody has a 12-year old child that has some bonds or something, or if the parents have put some stocks in his name, and I know the legalities of minors, etc., that are available, but I want to know and so will the people who run want to know what kind of stranglehold this bill has on them.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs, he thinks it's all very fine. Somebody sent it down, the person that sent it down obviously knew that it would create problems, and that's really what they try to do, is create problems. Divide and conquer, create confusion, and then go out and try and correct it and make it worse. Then they'll say, well, if you won't run, somebody else will. That's democracy?

You take that privilege away from a person who has worked hard all his life in a rural area and worked for the town, so you take them away. You say to him, we don't trust you. What you also say to him is, you know, we're going to put you through the wringer before we allow you to run. So you take that person who has an interest in his municipality and has an interest in this town and he says, I just don't want to be bothered with all this.

My last comments would be from the Member for Burrows. I can only say that his comments only relate to a place that he has a lot of experience in, and I have a lot of respect for that member, but he does relate his remarks to an area that does not apply to the Province of Manitoba. I don't know where he had all his experience, or where he learned that people must be shackled, or where he learned that elected people can't be trusted, because obviously he thinks that they can't be because of the rules and regulations he believes in. I don't know where he learned that, but it does not apply to the Province of Manitoba. But this kind of legislation will start to make the Province of Manitoba elected people much more bitter. They won't run, and you will create a conflict within all of the people out there that have had an interest in being good legislative members.

Just while in closing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll repeat for the benefit of the Member for St. James, because he wasn't here when I said it, if that bill had been put in front of him when he was a councillor in St. James, he would have raised hell from one side of the country to the other. He would not have bought it.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, get out there and find out what's happening out there because you don't know. — (Interjection) — Yes, I saw you. He said he was and our colleagues saw him very briefly at the meetings. Mr. Speaker, I say to him, find out what's going on out there and then maybe you'll make some changes to this bill that is conflict of interest and not disclosure of the wife or the husband and the children.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Member for Virden.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### COMMITTEE CHANGES

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Riel.

**MRS. D. DODICK:** Mr. Speaker, I have some committee changes. For Private Bills, the Member for The Pas will substitute for the Member for Rupertsland; and the Member for Inkster will substitute for the Member for Logan.

On Agriculture, the Member for The Pas will substitute for the Member for Thompson.

### ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING Cont'd

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Bill No. 55, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

### BILL 55 - THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Bill No. 55, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, standing in the name of the Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't intend to speak at great length on this bill, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to offer some comments in criticism of it and opposition to it. I would begin by asking you, Sir, and members of this Chamber and, in particular, of course, the Attorney-General who is the architect and pilot of the bill, why are we proceeding with this legislation at this point in time, Sir? Why do we need this kind of legislation at this stage and state of Manitoba's economic challenge? It's not essential legislation, unless it's politically essential to the New Democratic Party, the Government of the Day, and therein, Sir, may well lie the answer. I can see very little other justification for it.

My primary objection to it and difficulty with it has to do with the section of the bill that deals with the constituency allowance, the new parameters and the new policies related to that allowance; the constituency allowance that provides for some \$2,500 per fiscal year to be provided to each member of the Legislature on a basis that is laid out in the legislation itself and is somewhat different from that in existence at the present time but amounts in my view, Sir, to the same thing.

It amounts to what the current constituency allowance amounts to, that is an additional burden for the taxpayer of the province to bear in terms of supporting his and her Provincial Legislature. It goes, in fact, beyond the parameters and policies surrounding the present constituency allowance because it seems deliberately designed to me, Sir, to establish a particular kind of constituency support and activity that I think is substantially partisan in its overtones, and I mean

partisan in a sense of being partisan with the New Democratic Party in mind.

We have at the present time an arrangement for constituency allowances that recognizes the fact that over and above the regular expenses that members of this Assembly incur, which expenses are addressed in a separate expense portion of the annual indemnity, there are additional requirements bearing upon each member to carry out duties and functions in his or her constituency that do require some additional assistance. That additional assistance is provided through the \$1,500 constituency allowance which the member then uses to meet those requirements that he or she finds facing him in the conduct of his or her regular political responsibilities in that constituency.

I think that's a reasonable and a responsible approach to the challenges and political responsibilities that MLAs have. This legislation goes beyond that and provides for a new type of constituency allowance totalling \$2,500 per member in each fiscal year, which is set up on the basis of accountability and which is designed in my view, Sir, not very subtly to promote the concept of the establishment of constituency offices.

There is nothing wrong with a constituency office, but I do not think that we should be facing legislation in this House and put in a position of imposing legislation on the people of Manitoba that adds up, in effect, to a constituency office bill. For me, Sir, that's what Bill 55 is. It's the political answer to the community clinic.

**HON. S. LYON:** At the taxpayers' expense.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** It's the political answer to the community clinic at taxpayers' expense - and I note there is some rather wild and irresponsible laughter emanating from the seat of the Member for Springfield who was described by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, during my colleague's remarks of a few moments ago, as one who is given to illogical and outrageous fits of laughter in this House.

I would hope he would think a little more carefully about what my colleague has said in that respect and about what I am saying here because it is no laughing matter when a Government of the Day, whether NDP, Progressive Conservative, or Liberal, or whatever stripe, designs legislation that is very craftily and very subtly but not so responsibly, Mr. Speaker, intended to reinforce the partisan ambitions of that particular party, that particular government. I think that this is a transparent attempt at practising NDP politics at the constituency level.

Any legitimate party is entitled to practise its politics in whatever style it chooses, but I don't think the taxpayers of Manitoba should be made responsible for supporting those particular styles.

**HON. S. LYON:** Let them pay for their own propaganda.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** In this case, Sir, we're looking at a style of politics which is particularly unique to the New Democratic Party. It's what I and others refer to as storefront politics, on-the-street activism, on-the-street recruitment and that's why I say, Sir, that it is the political equivalent of the community clinic, where you open a storefront operation and through outreach

programs recruit all the activity, all the caseloads and all the political involvement that you can.

I think that happens through the community clinic concept, although in the health field community clinics certainly have their place and certainly perform good works as well as questionable ones. But in the political arena, I can't even see beyond the partisan level where any good works are accomplished by that kind of activity. I think only cynical works are accomplished, because I think it is the precise motif and technique of a particular approach to politics; i.e., the NDP approach to politics, to operate at that storefront on the street level. What the government is doing is saying we're going to do that and we're going to ask the taxpayers of Manitoba to pay for it.

The bill is very clear that the new constituency allowance, which has to be accounted for indeed, I don't question that point, but the new constituency allowance shall be payable for certain types of expenses identified in the rules, including expenses for office rental, utility services for the office, salaries for staff, stationery and office supplies and equipment.

So, Sir, I think it is clear and demonstrable that it is a piece of legislation that is highly cynical from a partisan political point of view and, as my leader suggests to me, is unconscionable in its purpose and its principle.

For the Member for Springfield to laugh about that, I suppose is understandable, because he has from time to time demonstrated an inability to recognize and differentiate conscionable from unconscionable legislation and political practices, but that's his business, that's his affair. It is not a laughing matter. It is not a laughing matter to the people of Manitoba who face, probably to a greater degree than most Canadians, a very severe economic challenge in this decade and in these times that is far from being resolved, far from being resolved.

There are signs and evidences of economic recovery in other parts of Canada and certainly in other parts of North America, but they are few and far between in this province at the present time, Mr. Speaker. Manitobans are still struggling with a crippled, nearly paralyzed, economy. They are still struggling under a cloud of political bias and prejudice which operates against enterprise, incentive and investment activity.

They are operating in an environment which shows one of the highest unemployment rates in Canada and the highest unemployment rate in our history. They are operating in an environment, Mr. Speaker, which shows a record level of business failure, farm failures, bankruptcies across the province; they are operating in an environment which had seen four major economic and industrial opportunities which could have been job generators of enormous magnitude, booted away by this government, booted away by that front bench over there, Mr. Speaker.

They're operating in an environment that shows this province in devastating debt, facing a deficit position that is going to burden our children and their children for decades to come, and they have offered no creative or innovative approach to find our way out of that difficulty, and to fight our way through those problems.

So, Sir, let us address the contents of this kind of cynical legislation in that context; a context wherein Manitobans are very hard-pressed now to get mileage

out of every dollar that is produced in this province; and a context in which Manitobans indeed are very hard-pressed under the atmosphere created by that bunch, that government, Sir, to even produce dollars in a meaningful way.

In that context, along comes a Government of the Day, this current inept, incompetent New Democratic Government, which is saying, well, we're going to get our slice anyway. Regardless of how difficult things are for the people of Manitoba, we're going to get our share; and one thing we're going to do is make sure that we nail down those seats that we've got and attempt to nail down and secure our re-election.

I think that's a forlorn hope, Mr. Speaker. I think the people of Manitoba have long since decided that they cannot afford this government of incompetence, but one would naturally understand if the current government failed to subscribe to that view itself. So, in pursuit of their own political ambitions, they intend to do what they can to try to ensure their re-election, and Bill 55, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is a precise, carefully crafted and deliberate document aimed at doing what it can to secure the re-election of the New Democratic Government of the day. They know that this type of politicking, this type of storefront office in constituencies, suits their approach to politics, suits their on-the-street type of politics, better than it does the style of some other parties, Mr. Speaker.

So here we have Bill 55, not an act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act, but Bill 55, the constituency office bill. Bill 55, let's try to ensure and craft the re-election of the NDP bill. Bill 55, the answer as I've said, in political terms, to the community clinic. Bill 55, the bill that is going to promote NDP style storefront politics. That is what I have against this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. S. LYON:** At the public's expense. At the public's expense. Let them pay for it themselves.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** There is nothing particularly wrong with that type of approach provided the NDP and its members, and its legions, and its minions are funding and financing that kind of activity themselves as a political party responsible for raising funds to be spent in elections and to maintain such constituency offices if they wish them. There's nothing particularly wrong with the desire to practise that style of politics, provided the responsibility for financing it rests with and is met by the party wishing to do it. But where the difficulty comes in . . .

**HON. S. LYON:** Let the Canadian Labour Congress pay for it.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** . . . in fact, Mr. Speaker, difficulty is too mild a word; where the unacceptability comes in, where the cynicism comes in and where indeed I suggest to you, Sir, even the immorality comes in, is when that party or any party says this is the way we're going to do it and we're going to load the burden of payment for that on the backs of the taxpayers, the taxpayers are going to fund our type of political recruitment, our type of political pressure, our type of storefront politicization of the community.

If the province were enjoying an enormously healthy period in its economy, it might not be of such concern to me that the government is doing this kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, although I would always find it totally unacceptable in principle, but to take that cynical rejection of principle, that cynical trampling of principle and add to it the burden of additional cost to the taxpayers at this difficult time in our economy is, I suggest to you, Sir, totally unacceptable and constitutes a political position, which I, for one - and I know my colleagues share my view - intend to fight as vigorously as we can.

There can be some improvements made to The Legislative Assembly Act in days to come, in years to come, in sessions to come; no one is saying the current Legislative Assembly Act is perfect, Mr. Speaker, but surely members opposite cannot argue for one second that this is one of the top priorities in Manitoba today. We're faced with a government that has loaded in bill after bill, piece of legislation after piece of legislation, much of it highly controversial, provocative, and divisive, and their excuse has been that there is a great deal to accomplish, and that it doesn't matter if we're here all summer and well into the fall, in our responsibilities to accomplish it.

Well where that legislation is required, where it's called for, where it's demonstrably of importance to the people of Manitoba, I agree, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues agree 100 percent; but where it is patently calculated to be politically self-serving, we do not agree.

This is not a priority piece of legislation in these times and in this economy in Manitoba. This is politically self-serving legislation, and it should be put on the back burner until some time long into the future when that government opposite has done something actively and creatively about solving the real problems of Manitoba.

This isn't going to solve any problems in Manitoba. It may save one or two seats for the NDP, that isn't going to help Manitoba in any way. In fact, it could be argued, Sir, but might sound cynical, that such a result would hurt Manitoba more than it would help it. Certainly the attention of this Legislature to this issue, rather than the opportunity to attend to other more pressing matters and certainly the expenditure called for here which constitutes a greater financial burden for the people of Manitoba, add up to a great disservice to the province and to the citizens of Manitoba at this time.

Now I appeal to the Attorney-General who, as I say, is the architect and pilot of this bill, and I appeal to his colleagues to consider very seriously the morality and the equitability of their forcing the Legislature and the people of Manitoba, to devote time, energy, and money to this kind of legislation at this time.

What this government should be doing is withdrawing legislation of this kind and dealing with the current crucial crushing issues of unemployment and deficit spending, and getting this province moving in a way that we have a vigorous economy that gives men and women the one greatest service you can give them, that is an opportunity to fulfill themselves through career opportunities and job opportunities, that make for self-fulfillment; and then when that is achieved if they want to tinker and tamper in their political way with the political structures that they spend so much time reviewing and revising, let them consider amendments

to The Legislative Assembly Act - not necessarily this kind of amendment because the principle would still be the same - but amendments that they have in mind to The Legislative Assembly Act.

But, Sir, those are simply not the important priority issues for Manitobans today, and this bill is not. In fact this bill adds a much greater note of cynicism and burden to the situation in Manitoba, and to the problems of Manitobans. I think the government, which legitimately faces severe public criticism at the present time for some of the positions it has taken with respect to major issues, would be well advised if it's as interested in its political future as this bill demonstrates it is, would be well advised to consider pulling this kind of legislation at this time.

Sir, one of my colleagues, in addressing this bill, pointed out that in his view it seems to represent a further tendency in the gradualism towards the establishment of the full-time MLA; the sort of the creeping establishment of the full-time provincial politician, and I think that's an important point to be noted for the record and considered by the citizens of this province, Mr. Speaker. I think it does reflect that kind of tendency, in those benches opposite, to make service in this Legislature a full-time career occupation. That is a typical NDP attitude if one may say so, Mr. Speaker.

I do not believe that members of other parties, in this province and in this country, feel the same way about political office. They feel, we feel, certainly my party feels, that the office to which we are elected is an office of high responsibility and commitment, and commands a great deal of our energy and time, and deserves all that we can give it; but should not be exclusive, should not isolate us from the affairs of the world; should not isolate us from life at the working level and life in the real world; and life where livings have to be made; and earnings have to be pursued.

We should, all of us, be engaged in activities of a career nature, outside this Legislature, so that we know what the citizens at all levels of our economy, and in all components of our economy and our society face on a day to day basis. If you go away from that kind of principle, that kind of approach and develop the professional politician, you develop, Sir, a man or woman who is isolated and insulated from those realities of life.

So that's another difficulty that we have with this legislation, that's another reason for rejecting this legislation. It appears, and I think can be clearly demonstrated, to imply a further creeping development in that direction of the establishment of the full-time MLA, which is a concept that I know is dear to the hearts of members opposite, but which is a concept which we in the Progressive Conservative Party reject outright.

So, Mr. Speaker, given those obvious flaws, the fact that this is a piece of cynical legislation which is self-serving political craftsmanship, partisan craftsmanship; given the fact that it represents an increased expense and burden for the taxpayers of Manitoba who need encouragement and help in other ways, not in this way, but in other ways; given the fact that it is a piece of legislation that is well down the priority list, well down the importance list in comparison to the challenges and issues facing Manitobans today; given the fact that

here the NDP has concocted something that is going to provide them with a political mechanism that they can demand the people of Manitoba pay for, that they can see their expenses paid for, their offices paid for, their election campaigns paid for to a much fuller degree than is the case today, and to a degree that I think is totally unacceptable; and given the fact, Sir, that it contributes to that growing trend towards establishment of the concept of the full-time MLA, I have to reemphasize and reiterate my very vigorous objection to it.

I know my colleagues join with me in this position of objection. We appeal to the government to withdraw frivolous and cynical legislation of this kind and get on with the important legislation of building an economic recovery for Manitobans. Leave the constituency office bill, Bill 55, until some easier, more comfortable economic time when it doesn't constitute such an onerous burden and a cynical burden to Manitoba taxpayers.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?  
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that debate be adjourned.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Springfield on a point of order.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the bill today, if I may, before the Leader of the Opposition adjourns it.

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

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have heard several of the members opposite address their concerns on this bill. I have attempted to be in the House when any of them spoke, because of my particular interest in this bill and in the subject matter, and I have heard some very interesting arguments from members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I have some difficulty accepting the logic of a position which is founded on some rather archaic assumptions about the nature of the legislative process, about the nature of parliamentary traditions in Manitoba, and about the ability of men and women in the 20th Century to enter into politics.

It seems that some of the members opposite wish to hearken back to the days when only a very select number of people in our society, perhaps harking back three or four centuries in the British parliamentary tradition, to only those who had the rights and the privileges to represent, what were often called in those days, rotten burroughs, to become politicians or, as they were referred to then much more appropriately, parliamentarians, in a weird turn of phrase. Because, in those days, Mr. Speaker, the House of Commons at Westminster was made up of people who were just as much professional politicians as the Member for La Verendrye, or the Member for Emerson, who spoke to this point, and today the Member for Fort Garry was

concerned about. These were people who, by gift of birth, or some other right, several hundred years ago were entitled to be the candidate in certain burroughs in the United Kingdom.

**HON. S. LYON:** You don't even know your history, Andy.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** The Member for Charleswood says, I don't know my history. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Charleswood would be well advised to do some reading about the many burroughs in England which were handed over generation to generation. There is absolutely no question about that; in fact, in The Great Reform Act in 1832 over 28 rotten burroughs were wiped out because they had represented no one and had become hereditary seats based upon the exclusive ownership of all the land in the burrough by one family; that's history. Now I understand that 160, 151 years later, the Leader of the Opposition still has trouble accommodating the progressiveness of The Great Reform Bill of 1832, but to say that it's not history should send him back to the school books, Mr. Speaker, not me.

Mr. Speaker, the difficulty that some members on that side have is recognizing the fact that the job of being an MLA in the Province of Manitoba is, for all intents and purposes, a full-time job. What I find interesting about their lack of acceptance of that is that every single member, including the Member for Fort Garry who just spoke, acknowledged the fact that it demands a great deal of his time, his energy, commitment and everything else that he has to give. In fact, if he's going to do anything else, it has to be, by definition, a part-time activity; something to which he cannot give anywhere near the energy he could give if he were not involved in the political arena. I don't think the Member for Fort Garry would want to change those words. That is basically what he said, I'm paraphrasing, but I think that's the message that came across, that the demands of politics in this province, of being an MLA in this province, are such that one is virtually captive of that position.

Now that doesn't mean that one cannot engage in other activities; certainly the Member for Fort Garry does; certainly some members in the backbench on this side do; obviously those in the Treasury Benches are not allowed to because of their position; but certainly many members on the other side do.

But the Member for Lakeside would willingly tell this House, and so would certain other members who have been in this House long enough to have seen the difference, is that the responsibilities of government, and the responsibilities of an MLA, even in the last dozen years, have grown to the point where members have less and less time today for their private activities, whether they be business or personal, than they would have had even a dozen years ago. I'm sure the Member for Lakeside remembers speeches by the former Member for Lakeside who was in this House longer than any other elected member, who talked about the dramatic growth of government, something about which he wasn't too fond, and certainly members opposite have expressed some disdain for that growth of government; but the fact of the matter is, even when they were government, they accepted the fact that

government today is much larger and more intrusive in society than it was in the days when D.L. Campbell was first elected in the early '20s.

Mr. Speaker, the days of a four-, six-, or eight-week session are long gone; the days when members' caucus rooms were only open for that short period are long gone. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, MLA's are called upon by their constituents, and by their governmental responsibilities, either in opposition or in the government backbench, to be engaged in a lot more activities than was the case a dozen years ago, and certainly was the case in the days when D.L. Campbell was first elected.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** We're paid more than a dozen years ago, too. We're paid more now, too, so we should do our job, to keep it very simple.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** The Member for Sturgeon Creek makes a very good point. He suggests from his seat that MLA's today are paid more than they were a dozen years ago. Even allowing for inflation, they probably are paid about the same, or a little more, than they were a dozen years ago. I'll accept that point, and that is a direct reflection of the fact of greater responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is no one can hold down a full-time job and be an MLA. In fact, I would challenge any member opposite to suggest that it's possible. Some of us know of one backbencher in the previous government who tried to maintain a professional career while he was an MLA. Those members opposite who know of whom I speak know that individual had a great deal of difficulty trying to do his job as an MLA and carrying on his work as a school teacher, virtually impossible.

Mr. Speaker, what's more important, get into the discussion of the part-time or full-time status of MLA's, is the recognition that for most people it is impossible to carry on a career, or a business activity, and be an MLA, because of the demands of the job. The Member for Gladstone says, we're too far from home. Of course, for many rural members, the ability to carry on a business in their home constituency, or a career in that constituency, is virtually wiped out by their election. For many members in this city who are professional people in private practice the opportunities to carry on, at least some modicum of private business, is reserved to them, they scale down the operation or whatever. But what about the school teachers, public servants, people working for employers in the private sector, who are not able to reserve for themselves that scaled-down position? What about all those people, in effect, who are not self-employed? Those people very seldom have the privilege that those who are self-employed have, of scaling down their job to accommodate the duties of an MLA.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 4:30, when this motion is next before the House, the Honourable Member for Springfield will have 31 minutes remaining.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

### RES. NO. 7 - TOWARDS DEMOCRACY IN THE WORKPLACE

**MR. SPEAKER:** Private Members' Hour. The first resolution on the agenda is that proposed by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, Resolution No. 7, and the Honourable Member for Pembina has three minutes remaining.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When I last addressed this resolution, I made some suggestions to the sponsor of this resolution as to how she might improve democracy in the workplace, through better representation of the working man who belonged to a labour union and having the union leaders better represent their views when it comes to strike action and other matters.

In recent months, I think - and I suggested to the Member for Wolseley certain amendments - but in recent weeks since I've spoken on this resolution, I think there is a whole new need for democracy developed in the Province of Manitoba and that's democracy for the people of Manitoba to have their fair voice with this government, who is attempting to ram down several amendments to constitutions and several pieces of legislation which they are not taking to the people.

If democracy in the workplace is needed, Mr. Speaker, I say indeed democracy is needed in the Province of Manitoba, to allow Manitobans a rightful voice before a Legislative Committee of this Assembly to deal with the issue of the entrenchment of bilingual language services in the Province of Manitoba. If the Member for Wolseley is so interested in democracy in the workplace, she might give further consideration to democracy in Manitoba and allow that kind of an activity to take place.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?  
The Honourable Member for Riel.

**MRS. D. DODICK:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my contribution to this debate by acknowledging the general consensus on this topic that seems to be emerging between the members of this side of the House and those opposite. In listening to the debate, and in reading through the various speeches as they appear in Hansard, I have been able to discern a certain degree of consensus on the principles of the matter at hand.

To begin with, it is generally accepted as desirable, that an effort be made to compliment the political democracy that has come to be so highly-valued in our society with a similar development in the workplace. By and large, we are all agreed that individuals who enjoy the right to choose how they are governed, should also have some say in how the affairs of their place of work and their organizations.

To add to my perspective to this point, Mr. Speaker, I think we should stress the fact that not only is it morally and politically desirable to expand industrial democracy, it is imperative. I strongly believe that the average worker has a great deal more to contribute than he is usually given credit for, especially in today's advanced society. Due to an expanded and more accessible public education system and to the prevalence of printed media, Mr. Speaker, we are

witnessing higher levels of education among the workers, a greater awareness of the world around them and the enhanced civic-mindedness. Those positive developments should serve as a clear indication to us all that today's worker is not only more capable of contributing to every sphere of our society, but that he has a great deal more to contribute.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think we in this House, and particularly those members opposite, must move beyond a quaint and kind recognition that the industrial democracy is "nice" and "good" and "fine" and all those other coldly paternalistic phrases, and recognize worker participation as an essential element in our advancing industrial economy.

I think we should also recognize, and again there seems to be some agreement on this point, that the days when industrial concerns were private and personal matters are over. No longer can we say that the individual investor who owns and operates a firm should be free to direct the functions of the organization without any input from his employees. If we have learned anything from the rampant business failures, rising unemployment, and declining productivity of the past few years, it must be that industrial enterprises cannot be treated as an island unto themselves. The harsh reality of this recession has taught us that when businesses fail jobs are lost, families are broken up, social and psychological problems are created and stress is placed on the governing system. Thus, while the owner/operator may lose his investment, his way of life, his hope for the future, so does the worker and the worker's family suffer miserably.

From this point on, Mr. Speaker, an employee must be treated not as an expandable cog in the industrial machine, but as a vital force that shapes and is shaped by his working environment. And because of the crucial nature of his contribution and the tremendous investment that he has in the organization, his views and attitudes, his suggestions and criticisms, must be seriously considered in both the formal and the informal sense.

Accepting these two points as they are, Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the members opposite choose to criticize the question of worker participation as a "motherhood" issue. We can all agree that it is desirable and necessary to extend political democracy to the workplace and that it is logical and rational to recognize the considerable investment that a worker makes in accepting a job. My contention, Mr. Speaker, is that if we fail to move beyond this level of generality and abstractions, we will never see industrial democracy as anything else but a motherhood issue. We will continue on our merry way giving token recognition to worker participation as a fine idea without ever looking closely at its practical application, without ever giving careful consideration to the means for removing it from the abstract into the concrete, and without ever fully identifying and conquering its potential problems and pitfalls.

In considering the question of democracy in the workplace, I think the first thing we must do is to arrive at some sort of workable definition. On various occasions, the concept has been referred to by any number of different names ranging from "worker's participation", "shop-floor democracy" to "joint consultation", to "co-determination" and "co-

decision." Regardless of what we call it, what we generally mean when we speak of democracy in the workplace, is the creation of some sort of formal or informal system under which individual employees and groups of employees are given a certain degree of input into the organization and operation of their workplace.

In Western industrialized nations, there are several forms that such a system of worker participation can take. The most common, and the acceptable, is the process of collective bargaining which has traditionally employed an adversarial approach to fixing the terms and conditions of employment.

A second form which is less common, although equally applicable, is the appointment of the employees representatives to company boards of directors. At this level, workers can have a direct say in the matters relating to strategic planning, capital investment, and production of the market initiatives.

At a lower managerial level and on the shop floors, worker participation can be organized through the creation of work councils and other specialized bodies such as safety committees, productivity committees, and job classification committees. These groups can have an input in a broad array of concerns including technological change, workplace health and safety, employee welfare and personnel relations, work scheduling, quality control, and job design.

In addition to these forms which relate to the general managerial structure of the firm, worker participation can also be instituted through giving employees a share in the stocks or profits of the enterprise.

Depending on the nature of the firm, the type of business in which it is engaged, the size and composition of the work force, and the social, cultural and political context in which the business operates, any one of these forms may be more effective than another in providing workers with sufficient representation. Most countries recognize this fact and have approached worker participation from more than one angle. If we as a government are to promote this practice within our jurisdiction, I think it would be wise if we gave consideration to each of these forms of involvement rather than relying on any single one.

In doing so we should keep in mind the potential problems associated with each type and keep attuned to the developments in this field as in other western nations. For example, since the mid-1970s there has been a noticeable shift away from representation on company boards to the works councils and other specialized bodies. We might be advised to consider the underlying causes of this shift and attempt to assess their impact on the practice of appointing board representatives in Manitoba. Likewise, in the area of collective bargaining, there has recently been less emphasis placed on using this mechanism for determining wages and benefits and a greater emphasis on new forms and contents of agreement. Examples include data agreements in Norway, co-operation and technology agreements in Denmark, and job security agreements in Great Britain.

On the basis of these developments in other countries, our province's experiment in worker participation through broad representation on Manfor should be continued and carefully monitored. However, I would suggest that we also enter into discussions with business and labour representatives with an eye on



nurturing other forms of participation such as work councils.

In addition, to discussing the various types of workers participation, I think we should also give careful consideration to the avenues open to us in our efforts to establish these types in Manitoba. Generally speaking, there are two ways for promoting industrial democracy. The first is the imposition of the principle through legislating that certain labour relations practices must be adhered to in certain businesses. The second is the voluntary approach where worker participation is enshrined in collective agreements at the initiative either of management or of labour.

Legislating industrial democracy can take a variety of forms. For example, an act may order that all firms with more than X number of employees must have a certain proportion of the employees' representatives on their boards of directors. Similarly, it may be required that all firms in a particular sector of business adopt a system of worker participation as outlined by law.

For some of the members of this House, the idea of enforced industrial democracy may seem a little heavy-handed. However, this is not really so. For years now we have had laws and regulations to guide the conduct of collective bargaining. Surely this experience could be adapted to other forms of worker participation without introducing an altogether foreign labour relations element to the Canadian scene. It should also be remembered that the use of legislation has gained a renewed legitimacy in our Western Nations. In almost every year since 1974 a major piece of legislation has been enacted in European countries prescribing certain labour relation practices.

At the same time that we pursue the legislative options, we should also promote voluntary agreements. The voluntary adoption of worker participation could be induced through an aggressive educational campaign, through favourable tax concessions, and through special purchasing practices. Most importantly, we could promote voluntary agreements by serving as a model and setting a good example ourselves. In Crown corporations we should be innovative in our labour relations' practices in the hope that our improved record will itself induce the private sector to adopt similar arrangements. However, we should not limit our experiments only to Crown corporations. Thousands of Manitobans are employed by government departments as part of the Civil Service, and here too worker participation should be adopted. It is worthy of note that such a development is in line with recent trends around the world. In a growing number of countries, efforts have been made to enlarge the coverage of worker participation systems, to include some special groups of workers who had been excluded in the past, such as those in offices, insurance companies, banks and other kinds of activities in the tertiary sector.

In general, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion on this subject that we must accept the agreement in principle that seems to be emerging and attempt to implement that principle through action. This is only a motherhood issue if we refuse to make it a reality. The experience of other jurisdictions and in our own limited experience should teach us that there are a variety of types of worker participation as well as a variety of mechanisms for enhancing its development. By giving full

consideration to these types of mechanisms in the Manitoba and Canadian context, I am fully confident that we will see tremendous advances made, in expanding democracy in the workplace. This resolution represents a step in the right direction, and for that reason I offer my full support to it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Wolseley will be closing debate.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm pleased, Mr. Speaker, as I went through the debate on this resolution that most everyone on both sides of the House were supporting the principle of democracy in the workplace. However, I find in perusing the comments made by members opposite, that many of them were off on several different tracks and it seems like either they weren't listening to the contributions made by some of my colleagues, or they didn't understand what democracy in the workplace means.

In fact they seem to have it quite confused with the issue of ownership. A couple of members opposite were speaking in terms of either profit-sharing or owning of shares or actually shared ownership in the business. Although that might be a very interesting goal for the long, long, long term, that tends to me to be more of an example of a co-operative ownership rather than an ownership owned by either investors in a group or by one individual, with the workers participating in some of the decisions to be made on how that business would operate.

So at this point, I was not suggesting in this resolution that we talk about joint ownership or even profit-sharing, as was mentioned by the Member for La Verendrye, but was talking about the process of the operation of the business on the plant floor on a day-to-day basis, or in the decisions that affect the workers and the long- or short-term duration of their employment.

The other part that seemed to be confusing to some of the members opposite was the notion that the person who invests their capital might or might not have any better judgment or might have more to lose if a bad business decision was made, than the employees who were working in that operation. It seemed to be confusing to both the Member for Turtle Mountain and the Member for Tuxedo that the workers who work on a daily basis to make that operation viable somehow don't have as good judgment or don't have as much to lose in the viability of that operation as do those people who are investing their capital, whether they be investors or owner/operators.

The Member for Turtle Mountain, for instance, says that he doesn't think it's a good idea, and I'll quote, ". . . to give people responsibility unless those people also have accountability, that to give people the right to make a decision that affects others and then not hold those persons accountable for it just really won't work in practice." He also says, ". . . but if it were carried to the extreme of not recognizing the right of people who have capital invested in a venture to make the decisions about how that capital would be employed within the guidelines that society as a whole sets out for that capital to be employed."

What we are talking about in terms of changing the control of the decision-making process, what ordinarily have been termed as management rights, and sharing those kinds of decisions with the workers is that they do have something to lose, No. 1. They have their jobs to lose if bad decisions are made. They also now have accountability. If a worker does not perform, many things can happen to one; one can be reprimanded; one can be sent home without pay; one can, of course, be dismissed. So that workers now for making bad decisions or not carrying out their responsibilities have to bear the consequences, are accountable.

To suggest that those with the capital invested in that enterprise rather than their years of work, their skills, their brains, their energy and their efforts, the efforts that one puts into a long-term job or the skills one brings to that job, are not as valuable investments as the capital - and I think we discussed this the other night in terms of the basic philosophy of that in The Payment of Wages Act - to suggest that the person with the capital invested has more to lose, has the ability to make better judgments on a day-to-day shop floor decision-making process and that their capital is a more valuable commodity that one can lose rather than one's job, I think, is negating the fact that if we are talking about participation and consultation between management and workers for the long-term benefit of that enterprise and getting away from the adversarial system and having each one to their ability contributing to those decisions, then I think we won't get to the long-term goal of having more democracy in the workplace.

The Member for Turtle Mountain also brought in the issue of politics, and how could management and labour get some common ground if the workers through the MFL were bent on supporting the New Democratic Party. Well, for someone who believes in democracy, I found that a very strange blue herring to throw into this particular debate. In fact, again I will quote the Member for Turtle Mountain on Page 1974 of Hansard, where he says, "Now, what sort of attitude is an employer likely to have towards union members who are making an effort on the job to remove the government of the province from power?"

Now, I suppose if the Member for Turtle Mountain heard of a group of workers out in a plant on the shop floor trying to remove this government from power, he might be very delighted with that, but the thought of workers who democratically choose, through a vote of their membership, to affiliate with the NDP gets the Member for Turtle Mountain rather upset. In fact, he thinks that because of that an employer would not sit down and negotiate things like work schedules and hours of work and holidays and technological change decisions and all the kinds of shop floor decisions that we are talking about.

I find that argument absolutely astounding in that, having come through the union movement myself and worked on many different issues through either my union local, through the union that I belonged to, which was made up of many different locals and through the affiliation with the MFL where we had many different unions sitting down discussing policy issues. It certainly did not ever once prohibit us from reaching majority decisions that were supported by either the local or the MFL as a whole, even though many members did

not share the same political views. Those kinds of things have the same results as what happens in a democracy after an election, and the people choose that they want one particular party in power. That doesn't mean to say that someone who voted Conservative in the Province of Manitoba never again participates in everyday decisions in this society; that they opt out just because they hold different views to those who are in power.

What this says to me is that the Member for Turtle Mountain is assuming that all employers are Conservatives and would not be able to work with union members because they belong to the NDP through their union association. Now, I think that's as crazy an extrapolation of that theory as it is to say that all union members vote NDP, which we all know they don't.

I also contend that all employers do not vote Conservative. So, I think what we're saying in terms of political democracy, that people have the right to their own political opinions and when it comes down to the decisions of running that operation, the political opinions are put aside and the decisions that have to be dealt with on a day-to-day basis, such as we are addressing in this resolution, are not dependent on what the political background is of either of the two parties, if, in effect, we want to make democracy in the workplace a reality and if that is a goal that members on both sides of this House share as they say they do.

I think both the issue of workers not having the ability to make those decisions and not wanting to be accountable if their decisions are not right, and the fact that individuals, be they workers or management, have their own political views are both not parts of the basis for this particular resolution.

I wanted at this point - because when I introduced the resolution, I dealt with some examples throughout Canada of situations where workers and management were developing a process of industrial democracy - to underline that I wanted to give a couple of personal situations and work experiences that I've had. For five years I worked in a textile store in Brandon and there were three people working there. The woman who owned the store was the operator-manager, and she had two employees, myself as a part-time person who came in every afternoon, and a full-time person. When I started working in that particular operation, it was a very small, tenuous operation, and five years later it had grown to having three stores in southwestern Manitoba and there were people from all over southeastern Saskatchewan shopping at that store, and even from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur, right down to the border. There were people that would come to that store because they got service.

One of the reasons that they got service was because the three of us, even though I was making at the time \$1.25 an hour which was minimum wage, and had to pay 50 cents an hour for child care, and had a husband who said that I was costing him money by going to work - all that aside - the three of us worked as a very close-knit team, and even though she was making the profit, she had the investment, she had the loans to pay at the bank, she had to put out the money for the fall order. The woman who was full time was making a little bit more than minimum wage. She followed the labour laws to the letter, that's when we got holiday pay, and there were no more frills than that, all three

of us felt like that store belonged to us; that she had an attitude in terms of dealing with her employees that went far beyond the financial remuneration that we received.

We were brought into decisions in terms of ordering stock and what we thought was appropriate, and how much, and what the window displays should look like, and who should wait on which customers, and where we should move displays in the store, and whether we should order this or order that. Our opinions were valued and were taken into account, and we were part of a team. She rarely, if ever, made arbitrary decisions on how the operation would work. We were brought in totally to those decisions. I must say wages aside, in fact, many people said why do you work for such low wages, you're worth a lot more than that to her, I absolutely loved that job, as much, if not more than any job I've had since. — (Interjection) —

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** What about this job?

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** I'll get to that. — (Interjection) —

Now, I've also worked in situations that were the exact opposite. One of those situations was for a Crown corporation; Manitoba Telephone System by the name. In fact, I must say that was the most autocratic and discouraging and disheartening job that I ever had. I had that job twice. I had it once before I was married, and I had it again when I moved to Thompson, because there weren't very many jobs at the time for women in that community. As a telephone operator for the MTS in this province, and it goes on to this day, where the entire operation is run by Bell Standard practice, where every single word and every single method that one uses is written down and is followed to the letter, capital letter.

I remember two particular instances where one was put in a position of not being dealt with as a human being but being a cog in a very large operation. One was in a particular busy holiday period and we were still using plugs on the switchboard at that time and this was in 1973 by the way, not that long ago. We had a very heavy load of calls come in for the number of people on the board and we worked extremely hard because if you let a phone ring three times it registered as a late so then the whole shift got called up at the end of the month because they kept track of that on a computer recording.

We worked very very hard and we didn't have any lates and when the flurry was over and the chief operator plugged into my desk, I thought she was coming along to congratulate us. What she was doing was coming along to scold me because a kleenex had fallen out of my sleeve and was on the desk and the desk was then messy. Now we were on the third floor of the building with no windows and the public didn't go into that room.

I am using that as an example of how people are treated when they are given no credit for the contribution that they have made to the rules and the upholding of that operation, that we supplied the customers with their service, that we as a team had put in an extraordinary effort in that there were no lates recorded so that we were all working to the utmost and above our efficiency and yet there was no credit

given to any of us. I am not just talking about myself; there was no credit given to that team for the contribution they were making.

I think that is an example of assembly-line kind of mentality in terms of running an operation. That is the kind of thing that this resolution is trying to address, to say that workers, if they are given an opportunity, if they are given incentives, not just in a monetary way because again there I was making \$2.16 an hour and trying to raise singlehandedly my children in a northern environment where the costs were higher.

If workers are given a feeling that they have some skills, and their energy and effort is taken into account and is appreciated and they can contribute to a better way of evolving the daily operations on the plant floor, then I think businesses will end up with the kinds of things I laid out when I introduced this resolution in terms of less alienation, less workdays lost, less antagonism that will lead down the road to labour confrontations and will end up with using the utmost from the workers in the workplace so that they are contributing not just to that enterprise, but to society as a whole. Those are the kinds of things that we are aiming at.

We are calling on businesses, because even though the Member for Tuxedo says that we should call on workers to relinquish their confrontational attitude, I think most workers are willing to do that. We must at this point call on businesses, because they are the ones that now through their management rights, either in a collective agreement or assumed management rights where there is no collective agreement, have the power and the control and the authority to make those decisions and to decide whether they want to share that authority and that power with the workers that are participating in the ongoing success of that enterprise. We are not talking about monetary rewards. We are not talking about sharing the ownership or the profit even. Where workers have some say in the daily operation, then the rewards will come back divided between the two parties.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**QUESTION put on the resolution as corrected, MOTION carried.**

### **RES. NO. 16 - 500TH ANNIVERSARY OF MARTIN LUTHER'S BIRTH**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The next resolution on the Order Paper is Resolution No. 16.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Concordia:

WHEREAS this is the 500th Anniversary of Martin Luther's birth; and

WHEREAS Luther was a central figure in the Reformation; and

WHEREAS Luther made a significant contribution to our historical and cultural heritage; and

WHEREAS the Reformation is affirmed by Catholics and Protestants alike in these days of the ecumenical Christian dialogue; and

WHEREAS some 70,000 Lutherans in Manitoba, 700,000 in Canada and 90 million around the world are celebrating this event in 1983,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that members of the Legislature extend their best wishes to members of the Lutheran Church on the occasion of the 500th Anniversary of Martin Luther's birth.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I guess it is not surprising that someone who was born and raised in the Lutheran Church and who has some interest in the field of history would bring this resolution before this Assembly on the 500th Anniversary of Martin Luther's birth.

Mr. Speaker, the actual date of Luther's birth, as I understand it, is November 10th, but presumably the House will not be in Session at that time, so it would be only fitting that this be done now.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of people in history, I think, who have over the centuries stood out as people of some ability and some courage and have been admired for that from many centuries ago. I can think readily, for example, of the great English administrator, lawyer and perhaps politician, Sir Thomas More, who was someone much admired, I think, throughout the Western World for his courageous stand against the powers of the king during the reign of Henry VIII. Many of us, I'm sure, saw the movie, "A Man for All Seasons," in which his character came through; and I would just read, as an illustration, when at the very end of his career, having been promoted by Henry VII and Henry VIII to one of the highest positions in the land, when he was confronted in court by a solicitor-general named Rich, and he had a couple of exchanges; he said to him, on this trial, and he was only asked to sign a document by which he would, in effect, save his life and recognize the authority of the king in England as opposed to the Pope of that particular time.

He was confronted and confronted the solicitor-general himself and said to him, "I will put you this case. Suppose the Parliament would make a law that God should not be God. Would you then, Mr. Rich, say God were not God?" Mr. Rich replied, "No, Sir, that would I not, since no Parliament may make any such law," and Sir Thomas More said, "No more could the Parliament make the king supreme head of the church."

In another famous exchange, Norfolk, who betrayed him, said to him, near the end of his time in the tower, "By God's body, Master More, the wrath of the prince is death," and Sir Thomas More replied to him, "Is that all, my lord? Then in good faith, the difference between Your Grace and me is that I shall die today and you tomorrow."

Of course, there are many other people in history who stick out like that. Joan of Arc is another one and I did some research on her, Mr. Speaker, and found it very interesting indeed, that she died at age 19, burned at the stake, tried by a stacked French jury under the threat by the English army which was in France at that time - and of course the borders were all different than they are today - under the threat that if the French jury did not condemn her to death, she would be seized by the English and convicted by them. She went through a long trial and finally signed a confession, went to prison for life imprisonment, much to the fury of the English forces, and then was found to have relapsed a few days later; was then taken out of prison and burned at the stake in the year 1431.

All of us, too, are probably familiar with Galileo who was, under considerable pressure, forced to stop writing, forced to stop speaking and, even though he was under the threat of death and imprisonment, he still continued to write and he still continued to publish right up to his dying day.

Mr. Speaker, there are people, of course, around in Poland today that, I think, of any of the countries of the world all of us can take heart in what is going on in Poland, in the sense of the resistance that is being offered by the Polish people and their leaders under the threat of Communism. I think all of us admire Lech Walesa, Archbishop Glemp and Pope John Paul who, of course, has spoken out many times under considerable pressure on this particular issue.

That takes me, Mr. Speaker, to the man that, I think, stands as an outstanding figure in history, whether or not one is Catholic or Protestant, whether or not one is Christian or not. I think, the stand that Luther took at the Diet of Worms in Germany in 1521 is one that will live forever in the pages of history and in the hearts of men. Here was a man who was a monk in a part of Germany, who taught theology and published his famous 95 thesis, which he nailed to a church door, in Latin to debate anyone on what he considered to be certain injustices in the church of that time.

Then, of course, there were some disputations, and some challenges, and some debates, and some trials, and some pressure and, finally of course, he was called to the Diet of Worms which is really simply an old-fashioned, I suppose, name for a political assembly, or a Legislative Assembly in the City of Worms in Germany. At that meeting, as well, of all the princes of the church, and all the princes of Germany, sat the Emperor himself Charles V, and so when Luther was called forward he wasn't just looking at a couple of people in a jury box or looking at a judge, he was looking at the imperial power of his time, the Holy Roman Emperor and, of course, the power of the church and the power of the state. He was asked, they piled up his writings in front of him, and he was asked by John Eck, in Latin, he was asked to withdraw what he had written.

**MR. D. MALINOWSKI:** Or resign.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Right. Mr. Speaker, this is what was said to him at one point - as a matter of fact, I'm now looking at one of my favourite books which comes from Will Durant's Story of Civilization, Book 6 on the reformation - at one point in the proceedings he was asked to withdraw something, and the Emperor, himself, burst out with an explosive, no; while Luther himself was speaking, which must have been rather unnerving, and so finally it came down to this point where Eck spoke to him and said, on behalf of all assembled, Martin: "Your plea to be heard from scripture is the one always made by heretics. You do nothing but renew the errors of Wycliffe and Huss. How can you assume that you are the only one to understand the sense of scriptur?. Would you put your judgment above that of so many famous men and claim that you know more than all of them, you have no right to call into question the most holy orthodox faith instituted by Christ, the perfect law-giver, proclaimed throughout the world by the Apostles, sealed by the red blood of martyrs,

confirmed by the sacred councils, and defined by the church; and which we are forbidden, by the Pope and the Emperor, to discuss, lest there be no end to debate. "I ask you, Martin, answer candidly and without distinction, do you or do you not repudiate your books and the errors which they contain."

Luther then made his historic response, and I note in this book, Mr. Speaker, very importantly Eck spoke in Latin, and Luther spoke perfect Latin and perfect German. He was a master of the German language, in terms of his ability to write and his ability to speak. He was challenged, he was bilingual, Mr. Speaker, he was questioned in Latin and he replied in German deliberately, and he said, as follows: "Since Your Majesty and Your Lordships desire a simply reply I will answer without distinctions. Unless I am convicted by the testimony of sacred scripture, or by evident reason, I do not accept the authority of Popes and Councils for they have contradicted each other. My conscience is captive to the word of God. I cannot, and I will not, recant anything, for to go against my conscience is neither right nor safe. God help me. Amen."

Well, it went on from there and the Emperor, of course, was furious. Luther was then condemned by the Council in a vote and, Mr. Speaker, I also read recently that it came at a time when a lot of the princes had left; there was not a complete assembly at the point when the vote was actually taken so, whatever number of people were there, there was a vote, and Luther was, first of all, condemned as a heretic, he was excommunicated from the church, and then he was declared an outlaw. And in those days if you were an outlaw anybody could kill you anywhere, anytime, anyplace, and be treated and greeted as a hero, someone who had done a service to the Emperor and, secondarily, to the church.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the points, in terms of the background of Martin Luther. His accomplishments are too numerous to mention; he wrote in a very powerful German, a language that was easily understood by the average person, as well as the people who were higher up. The printing press happened to coincide with the time of Luther and, instead of disputations taking place in Latin by scholars, he then debated in public, in German, his views which were then spread across Europe.

He then spent his time, the next part of his life, part in hiding, part in the open then, of course, the massive events of the reformation took place. What happened, of course, was he then translated the bible into German; he wrote a lot of hymns, including one of the greatest hymns of all time, A Mighty Fortress Is Our God. Of course, he is admired as a person who would not yield to the power of the state, or the power of the church, when he believed that he was right.

Mr. Speaker, that all took place a very long time ago. I have spoken to people about this resolution; there are, of course, many things happening in Winnipeg and all over the world to celebrate this. Last fall there was a dinner, I believe it was last fall, took place in Winnipeg. The guest speaker at that dinner, with 500 or 600 people attending, was none other than, Governor-General Edward Schreyer who, himself, is a Roman Catholic. He was the guest speaker at that particular event. So there are celebrations going on all over the world. I think it's only fitting, therefore, that this Assembly recognize the fact that Luther was a central figure in

the reformation; that he was born 500 years ago; that he made a significant contribution to our historical and cultural heritage and that some of the debates and some of the conflict that went on years ago no longer exists. There is an ecumenical spirit abroad in the world between Catholics and Protestants and others. At one time, it was irreconcilable but nowadays, Mr. Speaker, I think Luther's place and role and importance is recognized by scholars on both sides. This is not only my opinion, it is the opinion of Ministers that I have spoken to.

I think it is only fitting in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that whereas there are some 70,000 Lutherans in Manitoba and some 700,000 in Canada and 90 million around the world who are participating in this historic event, just as a few years ago people were celebrating the 500th anniversary of Copernicus. That was celebrated a few years ago and that was a significant birth date as well. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that all the Members of the Legislature would wish to join me in extending their best wishes to members of the Lutheran Church on the occasion of the 500th anniversary of Martin Luther's birth.

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

**MR. R. NORDMAN:** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to hear the Member for Elmwood bring forward this particular resolution. As a practicing Lutheran myself, I find this resolution very moving. I must commend the Member for Elmwood for his historical background on Martin Luther. I have not taken the time nor have I had the expertise or interest in history that the Member for Elmwood has to come forward with all the facts that he has brought forward to date.

I would like to say that this is not a resolution that is at all politically oriented. I think that we on this side can agree with the resolution and have no problem with it. I would like to add a few comments that were put together by Mr. William Davis of the Boston Globe. Just to go back to what the Member for Elmwood said, Martin Luther was born 500 years ago on November 10th of 1483. His anniversary will be observed around the world but nowhere with such enthusiasm as in his native Germany where this has been officially declared Martin Luther year.

Luther came to the Cathedral City of Worms in the spring of 1521 to defend himself and his writing before the Holy Roman Emperor Charles the Fifth and his Council, the Imperial Diet. His spoken defence, based on scripture and the right of conscience, was eloquent and moving, to act contrary to your conscience is neither safe nor right. He follows on that Luther's stubborn refusal to recant his beliefs captured the imagination of the people of Europe and was the real beginning of the reformation so, in a sense, the start of the modern world. To Germans everywhere, Luther is not only a towering religious figure, but also a national hero and the father of German culture. His translation of the Bible into the vernacular is the basis of the standard written German language which replaced the many differing and divisive dialects used in the Middle Ages. This common literary language was a major factor in unifying the country.

In a small park in Worms, West Germany, just outside the fragmented walls that still define the compact medieval heart of Worms, is a large and elaborate monument, erected in the middle of the last century in the florid style of the time. It is a memorial to the Protestant Reformation containing a dozen life-size statues of allegorical and historical figures. Later, well-known religious reformers, the Czech, John Huss, the Italian monk, Savonarola, and England's John Wycliffe among them all - all are positioned around a stone platform as if posing for a group portrait. In the centre of the platform higher than the rest and standing dramatically alone in art as he did in life is the important figure of them, Martin Luther.

On the pedestal of Luther's statue are the words he spoke at the conclusion of that speech, words that radically altered Christianity, the political composition of Europe and the entire course of Western civilization, for all their tremendous impact they make up a short simple statement: "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise, so help me God. Amen."

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

**MR. R. NORDMAN:** In 1517 . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 5:30, when this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have 16 minutes remaining.  
The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

### COMMITTEE CHANGE

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could make a change in the composition of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, and change the Member for La Verendrye for the Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return this evening at 8:00 p.m.