

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 64 students of Grade 5 standing of the St. Andrews School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Siddle. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, the Honourable the Attorney General. On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take leave of the House to file **The 49th Annual Report of Chief Inspector, Liquor Control Commission and The Report of Court of Queen's Bench** as required and **The Financial Report of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board** for the period April 1st 1975 to March 31, 1976.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HONOURABLE RONALD McBRYDE (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table **The Annual Report for Minago Contractors Limited** for the year ended March 31st, 1976.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Reports or Ministerial Statements? Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet) introduced **Bill (No. 3), The Farm Income Assurance Plans Act.** (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface) introduced **Bill (No. 20), An Act to amend the Social Allowances Act.**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk) introduced **Bill (No. 21), An Act to amend The Real Property Act, and Bill (No. 22), An Act to amend The Personal Property Security Act and certain other Acts relating to Personal Property.**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY introduced **Bill (No. 24), An Act to provide for The Amalgamation of La Centrale des Caisses Populaires du Manitoba Ltee and La Centrale des Caisses Populaires du Manitoba Credit Union Limited.**

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the First Minister. I'd like to ask him in view of the seriousness for some 140 workers whose jobs are at stake, whether the First Minister can advise the House whether a particular bias exists as charged by a government member in respect to the government's attitude toward the union involved in the Griffin Steel strike?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I, without asking my honourable friend to ask that question, welcome it because it affords me an opportunity to, I believe, demonstrate to my honourable friend that we are greatly concerned, in fact, very greatly concerned. But that does not mean that there is any miraculous course of action that particularly manifests itself to us. If there were, we would attempt to take it. And lest there be any suggestion that there is bias, I point out that there is one other industrial dispute that has been going on for some considerable time. It also greatly agitates and disturbs us. There is nothing that can be effectively done under current industrial legislation. I haven't heard any bright suggestions from the other side, or anywhere, as to what substantially could be done differently. And in the case of that other industrial dispute there are men and women involved and, yes, children too and it involves another collective bargaining unit and we have been powerless to do anything there as well. We are equally concerned in both cases but let no one suggest that there is some facile answer.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Honourable the First Minister, I ask him whether he has investigated or will investigate to his satisfaction and the satisfaction of the government and the House that there is no particular intransigence on the part of any particular individuals that is impeding settlement in this dispute.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that with respect to those who are within my purview

to attempt to influence, namely my colleagues, that there has been no intransigence whatsoever. There has been, need I say it, objectivity. If my honourable friend is suggesting that he has reason to believe that there is some kind of undue and unusual attitude and position being struck by those who are more directly parties to the dispute, I would suggest to him that my colleague, the Minister of Labour, has been prepared in the past, is prepared now, and indeed I believe has conversed with my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry to apprise him of all the details and the facts. But lest there be any misunderstanding I say, once again, that there is an equally disturbing and grave industrial dispute involving another company and a completely different collective bargaining unit or union, which we have not been able to somehow miraculously solve. That being the case I think that effectively destroys any allegation that we are somehow manifesting a bias because of particular company or particular union in this case.

MR. SHERMAN: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the First Minister whether his legislative assistant was reflecting the views of the Ministry which he serves, in the public statements he made yesterday.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that my colleague, the Member for Thompson, is human and that once in eight years he may well make the kind of mistake in judgement that my honourable friend makes every day.

MR. SHERMAN: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in the area of mistakes in judgement, would this Minister consider that better justice could be served if he took a hand in terms of personal intervention in this dispute and personal contact with the negotiating committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member is asking for an opinion. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if you regard it within the rules to answer but I will simply say that I have colleagues who are among the most experienced in industrial labour relations in the country.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C.: Mr. Speaker, my question will be to either the First Minister or the Minister of Urban Affairs. It deals with the proposed defence research laboratory to be built by the Federal Government in Winnipeg. I wonder if the appropriate Minister or the First Minister is in a position to indicate whether there has been any protest by the Provincial Government to the Federal Government with respect to the location of the research laboratory.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the only information we have on it is what has surfaced in the newspapers. I don't believe any firm decision has been made by Canada on the subject. To my knowledge, Winnipeg has not as yet either indicated any position one way or the other.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps in the interests of further elaboration, I could indicate to the Honourable Member for River Heights that there has been some discussion with the Minister without Portfolio in the Cabinet of Canada and my colleague, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, has, in fact, been in written communication with the Honourable Barney Danson — I leave it with him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, then maybe I could address my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can indicate whether in fact the question of the location has been discussed and an alternative location as the result of the protests that have occurred with respect to the proposal as it was advanced before and which appears now to be moving towards completion.

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

HONOURABLE LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I can advise that there was no discussion on location. Of course we are concerned that there is an adequate location but our main concern is that the Federal Government do not reverse their position in this matter because we are very concerned with obtaining this type activity which I believe the honourable member will agree, will be very important in terms of commercial activity in the province.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister, possibly the Minister of Urban Affairs as the other Minister, could confirm that the City of Winnipeg has not in any way made an approach to the Provincial Government for assistance in trying to relocate the proposed research facility from the location that was first announced, basically in the Charleswood-Tuxedo area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: I answered that the first time, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, and I don't recollect the City of Winnipeg making an official representation to the province through Urban Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I direct a question to the Honourable

the Minister of Renewable Resources and ask him whether or not the Minister is considering taking any initiatives in discussing with the appropriate federal authorities the growing number of problems that the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation is seemingly encountering?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Renewable Resources.

HONOURABLE HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I reported to the House before that we have had a number of contacts with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and the Minister responsible for that corporation, the Honourable Roméo LeBlanc, all to no avail. I might add that the suggestions that we have made and the proposals that we have made for improvements have largely gone ignored.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister. Would he then, in view of reliable reports that our fishermen, marketing our fish, pickerel in particular, from Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba, through the aegis of the glorious Marketing Board, are receiving something in the neighbourhood of 65 cents a pound whereas northern Ontario fishermen in the Kenora area are bringing the same fish into Winnipeg and receiving \$1.15 a pound; would he consider checking with the authorities as to whether or not in some instances we should not be withdrawing from the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, that aspect of our fisheries that would provide our primary producers with that kind of a price advantage?

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the case which the honourable member is presenting. We have been discussing price with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation to the extent that we can make suggestions to them but, as my honourable friend knows, the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation is in charge of establishing the prices and it is not within the purview of this government to make that kind of decision. The idea of whether or not the province should pull out of the corporation is not being considered seriously at this time.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister a final supplementary question. Would the Minister not consider, in view of the general plight and difficulty that fishermen have and traditionally have had in their industry, that a 50 to 55 cent price margin difference in favour of off-board marketing, is not a serious question for the Minister to consider in the interests of his fishermen? .

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice. I would hope that the honourable member could supply me with the accurate information and the source of his information in this case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister responsible for Renewable Resources. A couple of weeks ago I asked the Minister if leases on the fire-fighting aircraft have been arranged in view of the severe fire conditions existing and he indicated that they were going to be renewed. I wonder if the Minister could now inform the House if the leases on the aircraft from the Alberta Fighting Firemen have been in fact renewed.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I believe we have in fact exercised our option to renew those aircraft leases but I will take the question as notice and make sure of that fact for the honourable gentleman.

MR. BLAKE: Another question to the same Minister. In light of the reports of the overpopulation of moose on Hecla Island, I wonder if the Minister is contemplating a special moose hunting season in that particular area or will the department continue or depopulate the moose by themselves?

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, the decision on whether or not to hold a moose hunting season within a provincial park is in the jurisdiction of the Honourable Minister in charge of parks. My staff are in a position to advise on that aspect and we are in a constant monitoring position in that case as well as in other cases.

MR. BLAKE: I direct a supplementary question then to the Minister responsible for provincial parks. In view of the report that some 110 moose are wintering in the north end of Hecla Island in the area of the golf course, I wonder if he is aware of the condition of the greens on that particular golf course at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister responsible we will take the question as notice. It's just as well in as much as it's a matter of detail involving moose biology.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works. Would the Minister confirm that of the 184 housing units at Aspen Park that approximately less than a hundred are occupied and rented? Would you know the exact number?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

MR. WILSON: Then I have a supplementary. I was wondering in light of the desperate housing shortage for welfare families recently burnt out by fires, would the Minister make these vacancies available to these needy families?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that would be a convenient arrangement but it could be considered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have consent to file two more reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? (Agreed.)

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. PAULLEY: One is a Report under The Controverted Elections Act from the Court of Queen's Bench, and the second is the Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Annual Report for the year 1976.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. The federal government announced a few days ago a major repair program involving some \$275,000 on a wharf at Gimli. My question to the First Minister in his capacity speaking for Manitoba Hydro is that can he assure me that a limitation or demarcation line prohibiting building under a certain level, which I believe has been set by Manitoba Hydro at 722 feet, will in no way interfere with the repair work announced by the federal government on the Gimli wharf?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can, even without the benefit of notes or technical material before me, indicate to my honourable friend that there is no practical problem with respect to the construction of a wharf at Gimli in as much as coming from the point of view of Manitoba Hydro and the regulation of Lake Winnipeg, inasmuch as the hydraulic regulation management of Lake Winnipeg is such as to put it in layman's terms, take two feet off the top of the extreme and to add a couple of feet to the trough of the natural extreme at the low extreme, so that there is no practical problem.

Any reference to 722, of course would be a reserve line which I don't think would have a bearing on it. I'll check.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Telephone System, whatever Minister is responsible. My question is: is it correct that female applicants for positions with the Manitoba Telephone System are asked to submit to a test by Manitoba Telephone System doctors for pregnancy?

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

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge unless the honourable member has names. I'll investigate same, otherwise I wouldn't want to leave it on the record as being a fact. Certainly not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I refer the honourable member to the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. WATT: The question, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Minister then, is it possible that the Government of Manitoba ask for the same test by their doctors for applicants for the Civil Service?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, being responsible for two departments of government, I know I don't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Highways, and I see he's not at his desk, so I'll ask the question of the Acting Minister of Highways.

A MEMBER: I see he's coming in now.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member finish his question.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, in light of the announcement this week of auto insurance reductions in British Columbia and Wawanesa Insurance Company up to as high as 10 percent, I wonder if the Minister can advise the House if Autopac is considering reductions in rates similar to Wawanesa and the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HONOURABLE PETER BURTONIAK (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to answer that question. I'm also glad to hear that insurance rates in British Columbia are coming down, but our rates are not going to go down because our rates are going to be the same as last year, but our rates were lower long before that, and we're enjoying the lowest rates anywhere in Canada.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the Minister or the government consider taking the two cents a gallon gas tax off the automobile drivers in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General. Yesterday there was a question I asked with respect . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Yesterday the question was asked with respect to Dr. Kasser as to whether the

government was proceeding. I wonder if the Attorney-General is in a position to inform the House whether the province is proceeding with respect to the civil action with Arthur D. Little.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes we are, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Attorney-General is in a position to indicate when the civil action was commenced and where it stands at the present time, that is the proceeding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Inkster): Well, Mr. Speaker, when it commenced would be on the record in the Court of Queen's Bench, but to facilitate my honourable friend not having to look at it, we'll get that information for him and I will give him the present status of the action.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder then if the Minister would then determine whether a Statement of Claim has been issued and whether a Statement of Defense has been filed at this time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there was a Statement of Claim issued. I believe that there was an amended Statement of Claim issued. I believe that there are several proceedings on the record, and if my honourable friend is going to persist I offered to facilitate him, but I'm not required to. That material is all on file at the Court of Queen's Bench.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, then to the Minister. I wonder if he can inform the House whether the procedures that have taken place with respect to this matter, have been the subject of discussion between the government and the solicitors as to the manner in which the proceedings should take place as a result of the amended Statement of Claim and the other proceedings that he's already referred to. In other words, were there alternate instructions given to the solicitors by the government with respect to this matter?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of discussing the instructions as between counsel and the government. I'm indicating to my honourable friend that proceedings are being taken against Arthur D. Little.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System, a Crown Corporation. I have in my hand an advertising piece by the Manitoba Telephone System in the form of a small lighter that is made in France and I wonder if the Minister — he might want to take the question as notice — to find if these particular items might be manufactured in Canada and if not what price was paid for these particular advertising items and how many were ordered.

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

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I can only assume that the item that the honourable member is holding and possibly making use of went out for bids.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I have another question for the Minister of Public Works. Would the Minister care to advise the House if the William Tell Restaurant is now being run as a provincial taxpayers' restaurant and is it succeeding? Is information available, it seems very secretive?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, although I have some association with provincial restaurants, I have no association with the William Tell other than to eat there once a month with the representatives of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. WILSON: A supplementary then. Could any of the members opposite or the Acting Minister of Tourism advise if the William Tell Restaurant is now a provincial restaurant? Is it being run by provincial people?

MR. DOERN: I can take that question as notice for the Minister of Tourism.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development who has a further responsibility in the area of fitness and amateur sport. My question relates to the meeting being held today in Ottawa in connection with the awarding of the 1979 Canada Winter Games and the siting of those games. My question, Mr. Speaker, would be to the Minister, is his department represented at that meeting today with other members representing Brandon and the Federal Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, no the department of the Provincial Government is not represented. I think that the reason for this trip to Ottawa is to make sure that they can still retain the games. This is not something that is decided by the Province of Manitoba, but by the Games Committee and the Federal Government.

Our responsibility, our interest is to look at their budget and to see to what extent we're ready to fund them for the games if they are held here in Brandon.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the Minister then advise the House if,

to his knowledge' that budget that has been presented by the Winter Games Committee in Brandon, has that budget been accepted by the Federal Government?

MR. DESJARDINS: The news report stated that it had been. The last time I was talking to the Federal Minister, she told me that that was a misunderstanding and had not been approved at that time. But I must say that that was approximately a week ago and I expect to hear from her or her staff sometime, by this weekend.

MR. MCGILL: A further supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister. Is there a difficulty in respect to the provincial share of the budget as it now set up and presented to you?

MR. DESJARDINS: I stated yesterday I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we received the information that we wanted a few days after the deadline and that information was next to useless — the first batch that we received. It was one or two pages with just certain facilities, so much money, no square feet, no further information there, there was no way that we were going to base ourself on that kind of information to decide to what extent we would finance the games. I've written to the games committee in Brandon and, as I stated yesterday or two days ago, they did send me the information. This is being considered now and as soon as possible we will let them know and of course we are discussing this with the Federal Government. The intent is, in principle at least, to have the same formula, the same sharing of the capital budget with the Federal Government and the City, the three levels of government, of an approved budget. Now this is something that has to be done and once we approve the budget, of course it goes without saying that we will announce it and they will be guaranteed the funding providing the games are held in Brandon.

MR. MCGILL: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Then could the Minister give some indication of when he expects some resolution of these budgetary difficulties, as a result of this meeting. Does he have any indication at this stage of when this final decision will be confirmed as to the siting of the games.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well as I stated, Mr. Speaker, this is not the responsibility of the Provincial Government. The Federal Government and the games . . . I understand that there's difficulties that have to be ironed out in Brandon as per the skiing as a sport. There is a possibility, I am told, that this might be moved even out of the province and of course if that is the case there certainly won't be any contribution from Manitoba for that part of it, for that capital cost, and there is also a possibility, there is some leeway that that sport will be cancelled from the games. These are some of the information that we must have and this is, as I say, a decision that will have to be made by the games committee and when they give us this information, and after analysing the information that we have now, we will be able to move and give a decision as per the funding.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, just by way of clarification. When the Minister spoke of skiing events he meant, I believe, alpine skiing. There is no question about the Nordic skiing part of it taking place in Brandon.

MR. DESJARDINS: I noted your statement and I accept your statement of two days ago and I hope that you will register for the games. I'd like you to carry Manitoba to victory in that.

MR. MCGILL: Thank you. I'm in training.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Some time ago the Honourable James Richardson, then Minister of Defence, resigned from the Federal Cabinet on the basis of the proposal that he considered the Prime Minister . . . Well this is a preamble to the question, Mr. Speaker. He resigned on the basis of proposals of the repatriation of the Constitution, the amendment formula of the Constitution . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . including the veto of one province. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate whether there has been any communication between the province, himself, and Mr. Richardson, in support or against his position.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that subject matter doesn't lend itself to any brief reply but may I make two points, Sir. The first is that indeed there has been communication, in the form of long personal discussions. The second point is that it is quite incorrect to suggest that there is a single-province veto proposed.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the First Minister can indicate whether the communication was verbal or written and was it after he was Minister, as well.

MR. SCHREYER: Well both, Mr. Speaker. There was communication while he was Minister. There was even more communication after, since he had more time to communicate, but surely the point here is that there ought to be no lingering basic misconceptions about theories of single-province veto. What was proposed in the first instance has to do with veto accruing to a province or any combination of provinces that have a certain given population.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would be in a position to indicate whether in the communication he communicated the official position of the province with respect to the proposals that Mr. Richardson discussed and the position he took. Was it an official position on

behalf of the province?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, again I would suggest that the Honourable James Richardson was aware of the position taken by all the provinces with respect to the negotiations that took place in 1970-71 and again in 1975-76. And those positions of the provinces was really put on the public record, more than once, and reported on quite pervasively.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the First Minister and relates to the subject that I asked him questions on earlier this afternoon, Sir, but I, as you'll appreciate, used up my sequence of questions at that time. I'd like to ask him another question and it arises out of his answer to one of my questions and his reference to a mistake in judgement on the part of his legislative assistant. I would like to ask the First Minister if he would tell the House what that mistake in judgement was.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated to my honourable friend that, from whatever source, any suggestion that there is some kind of bias or preinclination here is simply without foundation in fact. And I offer it as one very obvious and telling reputation of such a theory or allegation the fact that, in another part of the City, involving another company and another union, there has been a long drawn-out industrial dispute which has bothered us a great deal as well and we have not been able to bring to bear any effective or miraculous solution. And because that is the context in that case, it is of almost identical context in the other case to suggest that we have a bias in the latter case only is to fly in the face of this living proof.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the First Minister a supplementary, whether what he is talking about is a mistake in fact, or a mistake in judgement. He referred to a mistake in judgement by his legislative assistant. And my question was: what was that mistake in judgement? Was it going on television?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, need it be said, there is free, but completely free, expression of opinion. When I was asked as to what was the mistake in judgement, it is my opinion that in light of the example, circumstances that I have just given, that in perceiving the fact, it was a mistake, error in opinion, or judgement, in interpreting the facts in such a way as to come to the conclusion that there is bias when there is a perfectly analogous problem that is preoccupying us in another case, involving a different union, and with an equally problematic set of circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister could inform the House, in view of the pending increase in the toll rates on the St. Lawrence Seaway. I wonder if the Government of Manitoba has taken any steps to assess what the impact will be on transportation of western grain, particularly Manitoba.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that there has been communication on this matter by the Minister of Industry and Commerce to the Federal authorities. If I recall correctly this took place several days ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, if I could direct a question then to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder could he indicate to the House what impact this may have on transportation of grain in terms of dollars and cents as related to bushels.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I missed a portion of the previous question of the honourable member, so I wonder if he wouldn't mind elaborating.

MR. WATT: The question that I posed, Mr. Speaker, was: In view of the pending increase in the toll rates that will be charged on grain shipped through the St. Lawrence Seaway, what impact would it have on the movement of grain from Manitoba through the eastern seaboard?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, such an estimate is always a difficult one to make. It obviously could have some negative impact. I suspect, however, that the bulk of grain will continue to flow eastward as it has historically rather than westward. We did make a very rough calculation and that is that at least a million and probably closer to a million and a half dollars per annum will have to be paid by Manitoba farmers for the shipment of grain because of these increased tolls. I also indicated, Mr. Speaker, the other day, that there could be a second negative effect and that is it might discourage other types of traffic through the St. Lawrence Seaway, and that in turn may cause the tolls to go up higher at some future date, which again would have a negative effect.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could proceed with the Order Paper as it appears on

Page 2. There are some Orders for Return and then Debates on Second Reading.

ORDERS FOR RETURN — ORDER No. 29.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West,

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information with respect to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation's beef stocker program:

1. The total amount of loans approved and disbursed between the period of November 1, 1974 to April 15, 1975.
2. The total amount of loans repaid free of interest by April 15, 1975.
3. The total amount of loans repaid with interest after due date.
4. The total amount of loans still outstanding.

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Public Works, Bill No. 4, the Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Public Works, Bill No. 5, the Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. KEN DILLEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of grievance, not so much about the matter that is before us with regard to the dispute at Griffin Steel, but more to outline the kind of inept, inefficient, inadequate, mismanaged opposition that we have in this province. I find it incredible that members of the Opposition would rise in their place in the Question Period and ask such questions regarding a dispute that centres around how many people were charged today, how many people were arrested, how many of those arrested were civil servants, how many of them were charged; and then the questions that came to us again today. I suppose a better question that should be asked — and if you want me to provide you with some questions, I could certainly do that — the question of whether or not we are going to have to resort to civil war in order to prevent slavery from continuing in the province. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DILLEN: I respect the positions that are presently being taken though the interview on television may have indicated otherwise. I respect the view of the Minister of Labour on this issue. I respect the view of the Minister of Mines and I respect the view of the Premier of this province. Unfortunately, we do not agree and that's not surprising. I am sure there are people on that side of the House who don't agree with people on this side of the House, unless you all think alike which is unusual. But to suggest for one minute that somehow the process of collective bargaining is going to continue, that the process of collective bargaining is going to solve the issue in this particular dispute or any other dispute of the same nature in this province, is to delude oneself that there is somehow a magic wand that is going to come down and brush everybody that's having a dispute, and somehow that dispute is going to go away. That will not go away on this issue and you cannot make a comparison between two separate disputes. The dispute at Quality Bed is on an altogether different issue than the dispute that is presently occurring at Griffin Steel.

The dispute at Griffin Steel is on the basis of whether or not the employer is going to have the right to tell his workers to work as much as he wants them to work, for as many hours as he wants them to work. That is the dispute that is in question. If anybody thinks, for example, Mr. Speaker, that what this dispute is all about is that this company will be able to operate its plant by utilizing one worker at one and a half times a day.

Mr. Speaker, if we could have a little quiet on the Opposition side of the House, I am sure they will learn something here today, if it is possible to learn them anything.

The dispute here, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not a company will have the right to determine that an employee will work one and a half times per day the number of hours that he is entitled to. In other words, for the same level of production, one and a half employees will be used, at the time when you are only using one employee.

Now, that may seem strange but in what way one must examine — will this kind of continuation contribute to the unemployment situation in the province? If every industrial plant takes the position — and every industrial plant is watching what is happening in this dispute. Every industrial plant will be making a conscious decision at this point. If this company is allowed to get one and a half times the amount of production from only one person then why shouldn't we all do it. Why shouldn't every industrial plant in the province lay off 30 percent of its employees immediately and say to the balance of the employees: "We are now going to work you one and a half times longer."

But, of course, that is completely foreign, that concept, but I believe it will be the case, and while there are efforts and pressures being applied in the federal sector and in the provincial sector in order to create and develop and stimulate employment in the province and elsewhere in Canada, we will see a reduction in the amount of industrial staff, mark my words, because everyone is watching. We are watching a situation where an employer can simply lay down in front of a bargaining unit and say, "These are the requirements; this is what we require from you and if you don't accept it, go on strike."—(Interjection)— Go on strike. Then every other employer in the province and throughout Canada is watching this situation and they are saying, "If . . ." Mr. Speaker, if I could just get some order from this side of the House, from the opposition side of the House, maybe the people there would learn something.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DILLEN: You see, they don't want to learn anything, Mr. Speaker, because they are simply an extension of that same system that exists in the province that is determined to keep the workers deep down in the province. You see, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— no, we were led to believe that there was going to be twenty days work. I'm sorry, twenty hours per month was the latest proposal put forward by the Company. —(Interjection)— Well, you see — the Member for Minnedosa says, "Read the agreement again."

A MEMBER: Don't listen to them.

MR. DILLEN: There has been an agreement in existence at Griffin Steel for some 15 or 16 years, and in all of those years there have been no provisions in the collective agreement for compulsory overtime, not one mention of the word "compulsory" in the agreement. But the question is now that they want to retain

the right to insist that a person will work more than their required eight hours a day, and nobody wants to look or talk or think about working conditions; nobody wants to look at the issue of extreme heat in the plant in which they are working; working with molten metal, it is bound to increase the heat in the plant. Nobody wants to talk about fatigue; nobody wants to talk about heat stress; nobody wants to talk about dehydration, but you will be compelled to work. It doesn't matter if you've got a wife in the hospital that you want to visit; it doesn't matter if you've got children that have to go to a dental appointment or see a doctor, we'll set all of that aside, or if you just want to sit home in front of your television and rest. That's beside the point. If you are required to work, you will work. And that's slavery. That is slavery.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: Don't listen to that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: Don't listen to them, Ken. Just go on.

MR. DILLEN: And not only that, Mr. Speaker, not only is it slavery, but these are the kinds of things that were fought against for the last hundred years and, Mr. Speaker, I am working, I am trying to put forward here what has been an issue that has been discussed many many times in this province. As a matter of fact, it is party policy that I'm talking about as a result of a resolution that was passed at our last provincial conference. A resolution was passed requesting that the government examine the feasibility of establishing a forty-hour week will voluntary overtime. A similar resolution was put forward and passed by the Manitoba Federation of Labour. The provincial council of our party also passed a resolution and submitted it to this government requesting that the use of strikebreakers be disallowed. But, of course' the opposition wouldn't understand that.

A MEMBER: The present Minister of Labour wouldn't understand that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. DILLEN: I want to continue by indicating what the recent proposal is from this company. I believe that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DILLEN: You know there was a questionnaire and it sort of outlines the company position, and

let me ask every person in this House, every member of the Opposition, every government member and the Liberal Party as well, the question goes like this: Does the company still insist on 14 production Saturdays per year which is contrary to the open letter that was sent to the citizens of Manitoba. The answer is,

We "Yes. You will be compelled." have a group of people, Mr. Speaker, running around the province telling everybody that they are freedom fighters; that they are fighting for freedom; that they are fighting for the freedom of choice; the freedom to choose. Well, join me in a fight to give the workers at Griffin Steel the freedom, the freedom to choose whether or not they will work after their regular eight-hour day. **MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. **MR. DILLEN:** Not only that — (Interjection) — Yes, the answer to the question of 14 production Saturdays, Sir, is yes. There will be two per month between the months of September to April and a total of two Saturdays during the months of May to August. Now what other months that are there that a person, a family, can enjoy some of the pleasures of the outdoors in Manitoba that's not being denied to anybody else in the province except the workers at Griffin. How can they go out and enjoy the outdoors with their families?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DILLEN: Now if that isn't bad enough, Mr. Speaker, the question is: Are production Saturdays considered part of the required 20-hours-per-month of compulsory overtime? The answer is no! — (Interjections) — The answer is no. Production Saturdays are extra overtime.

Again, is the maximum production Saturdays, two per month as stated? The answer is yes except when an emergency arises and extra Saturdays are required in the month but the extra Saturdays are counted as part of the required fourteen Saturdays.

Are non-production Saturdays voluntarily accepted counted as part of the fourteen required Saturdays? In other words, if the foreman came to me and said, "Will you work this Saturday? And I said, "Yes," then it is not one of the required fourteen Saturdays. — (Interjections) — Well, I want to get to that. I want to get to that, see?

If I refuse compulsory overtime, can I be fired? The answer is yes. — (Interjections) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DILLEN: But you know, there is another in here. If you receive more than two warning slips within a one-year period for refusal of compulsory overtime, you can also be fired.

Will I be penalized for time off for the first two warning slips? The answer is no. If you refuse to work overtime, you will simply be given a slip because in some plants where this requirement is in effect, if a person wanted a day off and he had no warning slips in that twelve-month period and it was an important thing, he would say to his foreman if he was requested to work, he would say, "I'm sorry, I can't work" and the foreman would then say, "Well, the penalty for not working is a day off." — (Interjections) — So you could accept a day off? But only warning slips are issued. If you receive two warning slips in any twelve-month period, the third time that you refuse to work overtime, the third time that you refuse, you are fired. And this at a time when we are supposed to be developing freedom? What kind of freedom is that?

If I accept overtime voluntarily, in other words if there was a provision in the collective agreement that provided that I would work 20 hours, that insists that I work overtime for 20 hours, and I accept overtime voluntarily, overtime which I am not compelled to accept, then that is not part of the compulsory 20 hours.

You know there are other things in this country more important than a nice pay cheque. There is such a thing as freedom. There is such a thing as comfort. There is such a thing as spending time with your family. You know it's ironic, Mr. Speaker, at a time when an American company operating in Canada says to its employees, "We are going to compel you to work overtime; we are going to compel you to be in this plant as long as we want you here." That the President of the United States is saying to his senior employees, "Stay home; spend more time with your families. Don't run the risk of family upheaval, of family breakdown; spend more time with your families." That's what he is saying to the senior people in the United States within the government itself.

I notice that there is a great deal of chuckling and laughing from the opposition. — (Interjection) — They think it's a great joke, that's right. They think it's a great joke when people are trying to protect their jobs on a picket line, you know. And you know that I can make an argument and I'm sure that other people in this government and in this House can make a reasonable and logical argument as to why the conditions are continuing on the picket line as they are. But you know that reason and logic will not get you through a Safeway check-out with your groceries. Reason and logic will not pay your rent or your mortgage. You see? — (Interjections) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Those people who are fighting for recognition — (Interjections) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm going to once and for all request the members to contain themselves. They all have an equal opportunity to speak on a grievance and if they are so desirous of saying something, will they do it properly with decorum and not interject so the honourable member can't be heard? I'm requesting that of all the members of this House. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. DILLEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. See, that's the kind of attitude that's so prevalent with respect to labour disputes, as though it's some kind of a lark, that it's a joke, that people have to stand side by side in order to protect the position that they're in. There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, that will in my view resolve this issue short of accepting what is the principle of the resolution that was passed at the recent New Democratic Party convention that calls for a 40-hour week and voluntary overtime.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. This is a grievance; it isn't a debate. It's not a debate. — (Interjection)— All right. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Can the Honourable Member for Thompson indicate what solution the Conservative administration had to people who went on strike, to workers who went on strike? — (Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question isn't related to what was spoken of by the Member for Thompson.

The question before the House is the House to go into Committee of Supply. Is it agreed?
The Honourable Member for Fort Garry on the grievance.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would perhaps not have used my grievance opportunity at this juncture had the Member for Thompson not just spoken and had the Minister of Labour not left the House in the midst of a critical examination of a very critical problem. But since the Member for Thompson has spoken, I would like to enter the debate at this stage and I feel that I would be happy to devote my grievance opportunity to this particular problem because I view it as likely to be the most important one that some of us will be confronted with during this session.

I think it's been a remarkable performance on the part of the Member for Thompson during the past two days, the past 24 hours. First a public interview on television in which he revealed one of the truthful aspects, in my view, of the current situation where the Griffin Steel is concerned, and, secondly, his remarks just concluded in this House in which he attempted, at least in the beginning of his remarks, to affix the blame and the responsibility for the difficulties existing in this field at the present time on the opposition in this Legislature. Not on the government, not on the people who were elected to govern, not on the people with whom he is in dispute and in public dispute, not on the people who defend him in Question Period in this House against the positions that he has put himself into and his colleagues including the Minister of Labour have studiously put themselves into over the past few months, indeed years, in this province, but, Sir, on the opposition. And I suggest to you that that is one of the most ludicrous developments in the life of this Legislature, indeed I would say probably in the life of this province.

All the backing and filling and protestations of the Member for Thompson betray only one truth and that is his ignorance of the parliamentary system and the system in which we are operating here. He obviously doesn't understand that unfortunately he belongs to a group that has the greater number in this House and by virtue of that has the right to govern, has the right to make laws, has the right to intervene where intervention is necessary or to say we won't intervene because we believe intervention is not necessary. All the opposition can do, and if the Member for Thompson needs a lesson in basic parliamentary procedure, is do what we're doing and that is attempt to get this government to assume the role which it has abdicated and that is the role of leadership in this province.

This government, Mr. Speaker, is finished. This government does no longer lead, initiate, display any kind of courage, display any kind of innovation right wing or left wing or centre, of any particular philosophy or political persuasion. At least when they came into office, and heaven knows I had a good many fights with them and my colleagues have had a good many fights with them over the directions they've been taking, but at least they came into office with some imagination and with some ambition and with some inclination to innovate, but, Sir, this government is finished and dead. They no longer lead, they no longer have the unanimity and the loyalty and the collective determination to be able to come up with a policy or to be able to determine a position that doesn't fracture them from within, and they no longer have the courage to demonstrate that they have the interest of the province, whatever segment of that province, at heart as elected representatives of the people. They're asking for leadership and the Member for Thompson has just finished asking for leadership from the Conservative Party. Sir, we are the only ones who have been giving any leadership in this dispute up to this point.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: Sir, we have repeatedly made representations to this government that we do not believe in government intervention in the free collective bargaining process, all things being equal. We don't want to see government intervention in that process. And I'll say one thing for the Minister of Mines and Environmental Management, he has consistently taken that position too. But what our position in this particular situation is is that an impasse and a deadlock has been reached in this situation as a consequence of immovable positions having been adopted by certain individuals involved from both parties, both the management side or the government *cum* management side and

the union side, and there are 140 jobs going down the drain. And the people who are out there on the picket line, having put in eighteen, nineteen, twenty years' work at Griffin and with that kind of seniority, are prisoners of a situation from which they can't escape at the moment.

They are captives of a situation which was not of their own making and they are being sacrificed in a dispute between some strong-headed, in fact I would say bull-headed, principals on the two sides here. And when you reach an impasse of that kind, Mr. Speaker, I would put it to the Minister of Mines and Environmental Management and others in this House including the Member for Thompson, when you reach an impasse of that kind where those jobs and livelihoods are at stake, there is a role, not for government settlement of the dispute, I'm not asking that the government move in and settle the dispute, I'm asking that the government take some leadership in getting the two sides back around the table. There is nothing happening around the table. There is no hope of any settlement or any solution unless there is some compromises made on all sides in this dispute, Mr. Speaker.

And one of the compromises has got to be a compromise on the part of this government and those members who share the view of the Minister of Mines and Environmental Management that they were elected to lead and that they're therefore going to have to lead, because I can tell you, Sir, on the basis of the situation as it stands at this moment, there is a deadlock and an impasse that is insoluble. I recognize the Minister of Labour's position with respect to that problem because at the moment, it is insoluble. And it is insoluble because one side is out to break the other and the other side is out to break the first side.

And what the Member for Thompson said on television last night, and the First Minister can evade and duck all the questions he wants, there is no way that I can pin him down in Question Period, there's no way that any member of this House can pin him down in Question Period. All we can do is ask the type of questions that we ask and get the kind of evasive, and I would suggest, in some instances, offensive answers that we get from him.

The fact of the matter, Sir, is that I can tell you from first-hand personal experience, and I am sure that the Minister of Labour, if he cared to, would be able to tell you the same thing, that there is a very great deal of truth in what the Member for Thompson said. And I didn't need him to go on television to tell me that; I know that that's the case. I know that there is a fight to the death between three or four principals in this particular strike at Griffin Steel. I didn't need the Member for Thompson to tell me that. I was glad he did because the government won't take it from me or won't take it from anybody on this side of the House. In fact, the public probably wouldn't take it either, so it was very helpful and very constructive that the Member for Thompson should do what he did. The only thing is now they won't take it from him either because that caucus is split right down the middle on this issue and has not got the courage to whip themselves into line to demonstrate some leadership.

Now the Member for Thompson, in my view Sir, in addition to betraying an abysmal ignorance of the parliamentary system also misses the whole point in the dispute. He treated us to an examination of the specific issue in terms of compulsory overtime and the specific conditions and factors that have gone into the different offers and counter offers and rejections. And that's beside the point at the moment. I say to my honourable friend from Thompson, that is beside the point at the moment. Nobody is going to settle that problem at the moment. The problem at the moment is 140 people whose jobs are going down the drain. That is the problem. Those jobs have got to be saved for those people. That particular 140 group livelihood has got to be preserved and then we'll worry about whether this government has the courage to bring in legislation limiting or prohibiting or outlawing compulsory overtime or not. But first of all, for heaven's sake, if the Minister of Labour can't do it or won't do it; if the Deputy Minister of Labour can't do it or is incapable of doing it; if the parties on the other side representing Griffin Steel can't do it or won't do it; then somebody of goodwill and conscience who is as good as the word that this party has always professed to follow and has the interests of people at heart, whether that be the Minister of Mines and Environmental Management or the Member for Thompson or the First Minister, somebody, Sir, has to intervene to take the out of the arena; to eliminate the personal animosities and antagonisms that are cluttering up the whole situation at the present time; to remove the intransigents to which I referred this afternoon and to allow the negotiating committee of the union and people of goodwill in the government if there are any left, to work out a situation that will call for a compromise on all three sides; a compromise by the union, a compromise by the company and a compromise by the immovable members of the government so that the 140 employees at Griffin can go back to work; that work can resume, and that the contract to be negotiated and to be developed to exist in the plant over the next year or two whatever the life of it is so the contract can then be the subject of negotiations going forward from that date.

Now to do that this government is going to have to go back on a pledge that it made to Griffin Steel and that's going to be very difficult because I know that this government has guaranteed Griffin Steel that it could deliver to them 20 hours a month compulsory overtime. It could deliver that kind of legislation. And the fact of the matter is that that was the last offer made by the company to the union and the union turned it down, Sir, so that the government cannot deliver that kind of legislation. But

the government said that Griffin Steel — and you know that Griffin Steel's first offer was pretty far out. They were talking in terms of 40 hours and additional days production days on the weekends. It was pretty far out and no union could be expected to accept that. So all of a sudden there was a tremendous refinement and modification of that offer because this government and this minister guaranteed Griffin Steel that they could get legislation through this House that would bring in and permit compulsory overtime up to 20 hours a month and on that basis Griffin was to go back to work and go back into production. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: Griffin . . . —(Interjection)— . . . so what has happened, Sir? Sir, the Minister can say all he wants, I've talked to —(interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Minister can fuss and fume and practice evasive bombasts from his side of the House. I happen to know these things, Sir. He hasn't been near this dispute for days.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. SHERMAN: I've talked to all parties night and day for the last ten days in this dispute. Now I don't want to —(Interjection)— Yes, I don't . . .

A MEMBER: No way, no way.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: I don't want to rake the Minister of Labour — if he would stay of this, if he would stay out of this, Sir, I wouldn't engage in this kind of personal debate with him, if he would stay out of it — but he keeps interjecting things from his seat. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister persists in that vain and he wants to get down to private conversations it's all right with me. I'm fully prepared to do that. But I say this to him, Sir, that he can practice all that kind of attack from his seat on that side of the House that he wants but the fact of the matter is he cannot deliver and I'm not suggesting he should be crucified over that I'm trying to point out to him and to the House, what part of the impasse is. The Member for Thompson relayed part of it on television last night and the Member for Thompson is right. There is a vendetta existence on the part of certain principals in this administration and the Canadian Association of Industrial Mechanical and Allied Workers and its President. Now that's fact number one.

Fact number two is that this government and this Minister could not deliver to Griffin Steel what they guaranteed them they could deliver so Griffin has gone back into production, had to go back into production and the Minister is hoisted on the spikes of his own making because the union is not going to accept that kind of legislation when it represents the precise final agreement that was proposed by the company which it, the union turned down so, Sir, all I'm saying is that faced with that impasse, faced with that deadlock, let us at least consider the desirability and the advisability of removing the principle antagonists from the arena. Either the Minister of Labour should get into it or get out of it but to have toiled and laboured for resolution of this dispute which I know he did for many months, Mr. Speaker, to have worked hard to resolve this dispute — and the Minister of Labour did — for many months attempted to resolve it and I think he probably expended a good deal of his health on that effort. I salute him for that and I thank him for that — but I say, Mr. Speaker, that it then reached a point where everybody is only human and the old antagonisms and the old competitiveness crystalized and polarized and we got into a position, where in the opinion of the Minister of Labour, there was nothing more that his intervention could do or could affect.

Now that being the case, Sir, if it's polarized to that degree where he and the head of the union Pat McEvoy cannot affect anymore progress or the conciliation officer so appointed cannot affect anymore progress and whether the company and its representatives and I include its legal counsel cannot affect anymore progress then, Sir, it seems to me that since the livelihoods of these people are at stake and they're the prisoners of this situation —not of their own making— is there not some reasonable justification for suggesting that consideration should be given to removing those antagonists from the arena and allowing the men of goodwill that you can find, whether it be a new conciliation officer whether it be the First Minister, I don't know, but somebody who is prepared to go in there with a fresh viewpoint and with the initiative of goodwill and deal not with Mr. Pat McEvoy because I think his position is polarized on this issue too but deal with some of the members of the negotiating committee who, I'm given to understand, were a lot more malleable and a lot more approachable and a lot less stubborn in some of the early negotiations than Mr. McEvoy was so who is being served in this situation? 140 people are caught. They are members of a fraternity of which they justifiably should be proud. It's not easy for somebody who has worked as a rank and file union member all their lives to break with that kind of tradition and cross a picket line and defy his or her friends. I haven't had that experience but I'm willing to learn from those who have that that is an extremely difficult if not impossible thing to demand of a human being, that after living in that fraternity and that community —I mean community in the broad sense of the labour community and also the geographical community— to be expected to defy those ties and those bonds and go back into work. I think it's asking too much of people. That's putting too big a burden on them. So what's

the alternative? They see their jobs going down the drain and I say at that point, Sir, although I go along with the Minister of Mines and Environmental Management that I don't like government intervention in the free collective bargaining process, at that point, Sir, you're saving lives. You're really saving lives because you're saving livelihoods.

And I put it to you, Sir, that with the kinds of personal antagonisms that exist at the base and at the root of this issue that there is an impasse and a deadlock at the moment that cannot be solved any other way. I would say, Sir, that in general I think the labour relations record of this government of has been dismal, really dismal. I mean if one looks back to Bell Foundry and looks back to Flyer Industries and looks back to Metro Transit and looks back to the Inco strike. Now we look at the shining jewel in that dubious crown, Griffin Steel. Throughout all, for the past four or five or six years, Sir, we have had enormous unrest and antagonisms in the industrial community in this province. Part of it is because of the Labour legislation introduced by this government which has got away on them. Part of it is a result of amendments, for example, of The Employment Standards Act. Part of it is because they have created such a gap between what the rank and file union member has been given in terms of rising expectations and what he or she can actually hope to achieve in an industrial and technical society and in a big union. Part of it is because of that particular frustration and that particular shortcoming in the legislation itself so I say, Sir, that this government has reached a point in terms of labour legislation where they have nothing to show at the moment for their record in industrial relations but a pretty dismal record, but a pretty dismal escutcheon. If they hope to do anything to retrieve their position — and frankly I would like to see them lose their position but I don't want to see this thing exploited for political purposes — (Interjection) — That's fine, Mr. Speaker, they can laugh. They can laugh. You see the Member for Thompson made a remark, made a statement during his remarks about the fact that there was some. . . One or two of the things he said — there was some laughter and he said — "That's an attitude that's prevalent about labour disputes", as though it's some kind of lark. Well, Sir, I say to you that that kind of remark can cut both ways.

I tell the doubting Thomases opposite and they can take it or leave it. I don't care. I tell them that I'm not interested in persuading this or exploiting this for political reasons. If I were — if we were — we could have the New Democratic smashed now in this province today because the labour union movement generally is so disenchanted, so frustrated with a labour ministry which is really only interested in big union leadership, not in the rank and file union members, that if we wanted to exploit it, Sir, they ain't seen nothin' yet. If they want to see exploitation we have been extremely reserved and careful and moderate in our posture on this thing in this House. I went for several days and I told the Minister beforehand that I was going to go for several days without asking him any questions about it because I felt that some of the issues and the cause generally in this strike would not be served by having the of answers delivered day after day in this house that we get from this posturing labour minister.

Why should I ask any questions about the strike? We never get a straight answer. We get a political speech. If I ask him a question about the strike we get some kind of partisan political answer so there is nothing to be served. But if these people opposite, Mr. Speaker, think that we have attempted to move into this area for political reasons, I say, well, there is the biggest political turncoat and cynic of them all, the Minister of Health. We don't have to. . . — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the caucus of the New Democratic Party, completely surrounded by the Minister of Health, speaking again from his seat who attempts to get into this. . . — (Interjection) — Yes, I'll answer it when I've got my time. — (Interjection) — I will answer it but, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, Sir, that if anybody in this House should talk about political purposes and political motives the one person who can't do it is the biggest opportunist in this House, the Minister of Health. The person who changed parties so that he could get a seat in the government, the Minister of Health. The person who supported and sustained this government, Mr. Speaker, when it didn't have enough numbers of its own, it got its support and its sustenance from that member. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that people who live in glass houses. . . — (Interjections) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the people who. . . — (Interjection) — I hope you are taking this off my time, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister of. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am going to suggest that we conduct ourselves in the parliamentary way and I would hope that the honourable member who has the floor would not direct personal attacks, would conduct himself in a parliamentary manner and then we would have no interruptions from the other members of this House. Order please. Order please. I don't need any defense, I am trying to take care of the rules of this House and as long as members keep interrupting I don't get an opportunity to say what has to be said. I'll repeat again, I would hope that the honourable member who has the floor would conduct himself in the fashion which is parliamentary and address his remarks to the Chair and not go on personal attacks. And I would hope that all the other members would contain themselves, we have plenty of time, they can all participate in the grievance as well.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your direction to all members of the House and I simply point out to members opposite that this exchange started by my making the simple statement that we were not exploiting this situation and it could be exploited, politically. —(Interjection)— We are not. What we are saying, and over and over again the question comes up from the other side, in fact it was asked by the Honourable Member for Radisson of the Honourable Member for Thompson, what are the Conservatives' solutions to this kind of a problem?

Our solutions to this kind of a problem are to take care of the people whose jobs are going down the drain, that's what our solutions are, and then if this government believes that there's something in the field of legislation that should be done then let them bring it in, let them govern, let them bring a bill in, but they can't get that bill through their caucus. I want to hasten to tell the Honourable Member for Thompson that we are not in disagreement with him with respect to his position on compulsory overtime.

My own personal position in that respect is that overtime is something that should be negotiated in a collective agreement on the work site. We don't favour the concept of compulsory overtime. I say that where there is good labour relations you don't need compulsory overtime. There are many industries that need overtime but they don't necessarily need compulsory overtime. Where there is good labour relations you don't have to have compulsory overtime, you can do it on voluntary overtime.

But the dispute at Griffin has gone beyond that point. For 17 years they were on voluntary overtime as the Member for Thompson points out. Then a dispute largely related to a dispute over a cola agreement plus a couple of other factors, but largely over a cola agreement, led to an ultimatum being delivered among the union against overtime, and the confrontation over overtime started at that point, subsequently went to the Labour Board, subsequently went to the courts, was resolved in favour of the union and astounded the company because they had always assumed they had the right to impose overtime at their volition.

There are about 90 grievances or 86 individual grievances still hanging out of that particular dispute alone, still unresolved. I simply say to the Member for Thompson, through you Mr. Speaker, that this is a point at which and to the Minister of Mines and Environmental Management, this is a point at which, I believe, intervention is necessary. Let us not get bogged down in the philosophical argument over whether the union is right in holding out for all voluntary overtime or whether the company is right in holding out for compulsory overtime.

Surely that is something that will be resolved once legislation is introduced in this House, but if we wait for legislation to be introduced and to be piloted through this House and to be cleared through this House, those people's jobs will be gone forever. There's no way that legislation can save their jobs for them at this juncture because obviously on the testimony of the Honourable Member for Thompson who may be somewhat uneducated in the parliamentary system, but who I believe is knowledgeable in many labour matters and certainly in this one, on his testimony there are eight or nine members of the government caucus who are directly juxtaposed in position to the other members of the caucus on this question. So how on God's green earth are we going to get legislation through that caucus and through this House in time to save those 140 jobs when 6, 8, 10 new hires are going into Griffin Steel every day? It can't be done, Sir. It can only be done by reserving that aspect of the dispute and the debate for settlement later on and moving now to intervene in such a way as to protect those jobs and to put people around the table again.

So, Mr. Speaker, I said at the outset that one has a tendency to go into these situations in the House reserving one's grievance for as long as possible because obviously there are unforeseen occasions down the road when one would like to use his grievance. But I consider this one of the most important subjects or issues that many of us will face in this session, and I have no qualms about having used my grievance at this juncture. If it does any good, if it's of any value in terms of injecting some new ideas or some new concepts into the dispute that could lead to some kind of resolution of it, then my grievance will certainly have been put to good purpose.

I certainly could not accept the answers of the First Minister this afternoon, or the half answers of the First Minister. Many of the questions I asked him were not answered, and I could not accept the initial premise and some of the remarks of the Member for Thompson who seems to feel that everything that's wrong in this province is the fault of the people who have not been elected to govern. The fact of the matter is that they have failed dismally in their obligation to the people who elected them, and they're in deep deep trouble in this dispute and in this debate and in this strike and we know that. But while they wrestle and wrangle with the problem of how to hold their tenuous coalition together 140 jobs are going down the drain, and if anybody's playing politics in this thing — and this gets back to the remark which apparently touched off such an outburst before so I hesitate to say it again — but we are not the ones. If anybody's playing politics in this thing, Sir, it is the New Democratic government of this province.

They're not prepared to lead in a situation into which they were elected to lead because of the

philosophical cleavage in their caucus on this question. So that's the party that's playing politics. They're trying to be all things to all men and women in this situation.

Well, the Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health reacts with one of his usual semi-literate grunts from his side, but I say to him to cast his mind back a half an hour, or three-quarters of an hour to the answers that the First Minister gave. — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, would you allow me to have order here so that I can continue my remarks. The Minister of Health has developed over the past few years a tactic and a strategy of jamming. He believes that if he just keeps up that bombastic dribble from his seat he jams everybody else out. Well, Sir, I suggest that that is unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: So the jamming machine, if he would just unwind for a minute, I'll be finished in about two minutes.

But, Sir, I asked the Minister of Health and his colleagues about the questions that I put to the First Minister this afternoon and the answers that we did not get. I asked him whether the Honourable Member for Thompson, his legislative assistant, was reflecting the policy of the Ministry which he serves, and what kind of an answer did we get from the First Minister? We got, I thought, a facetious and somewhat offensive non-answer that had no bearing on the question that was asked him, and I would like to know, and we would like to know does the Member for Thompson who is legislative assistant to the Minister reflect the views of that Minister? What about the other eight or nine in the caucus who stand in opposition to their position over there? Well this is the difficulty and the quandry that those workers are caught in, Mr. Speaker, so there's not much point in looking to the government for legislation to bail them out. They're not going to be bailed out that way. They're going to be bailed out by taking the antagonists out of there and by allowing the dispute to be dealt with by people who don't have long simmering antagonisms and long simmering rivalries that obscure the major issue and by permitting negotiations to resume around a table pending ultimate solution of the compulsory overtime issue.

Sir, that is the lead and the initiative that the Progressive-Conservative Party is prepared to give to this government, and the public of this province in a situation of this kind, and has done in this situation. This is the way we have talked to the people on the picket line, to the people in the union, to the people in the company, all the way along the line since this dispute started. Now if this government has an idea or a better idea or a concept of any legislation — they are the government. We're waiting for them to bring it in and to show some leadership. If that doesn't happen, then the only hope that these people have, Sir, is that there will be an opportunity for others in this province, notably the members of the Progressive Conservative Party, to form a government in time, in time to make sure that their livelihoods are not sacrificed on a political gain, sacrificed as a political football while the Minister of Labour, his Deputy, the company, the President of the Canadian Association of Industrial, Mechanical and Allied Workers, and one or two other principals of that kind, fight out their long simmering battles, revive their old long-time feuds and refuse to negotiate in a spirit of goodwill with the interests of those workers

at heart. **MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member suggests that leadership should be taken. I suggest to the honourable member that sometimes leadership is not resorting to panic action when other people would do so. If I may paraphrase it for my honourable friend: "If you can keep your head when all about you are losing theirs and blaming it on you, you are a man" — in the words of Kipling. I say, Mr. Speaker, that that applies sometimes when an army is moving or defending a position and some of the people in his group start retreating and running away. That that's were leadership counts, that that's were leadership is necessary to deal with the situation.

And I suggest to you that the Honourable Minister of Labour has been prepared to do at all times the kinds of things that my honourable friend is suggesting. That if what we are talking about is providing a means for the parties to get together and discuss matters and to facilitate such discussions the Honourable Minister of Labour can't be faulted one step by the Member for Fort Garry. But if the honourable member is suggesting, if the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is suggesting that there is always a way to protect every labour dispute and that all that is necessary is for some government to do something then I suggest to the honourable member that there would be more labour disputes and more problems in the province of Manitoba because various heads of government, and various heads of companies, and various heads of unions would be continuing to create that panic which is designed to bring in the Minister of Labour and the Legislature to attempt to solve those problems.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says he didn't say that. If he didn't say that, what did he say? Mr. Speaker, what did he say? He suggested that people's jobs are in danger, that people are going to be out on strike, that there is an impasse and that this impasse must be solved by the government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the honourable member that in 1967 or '68, I'm not sure of the year, there was an impasse. There was an impasse between intransigent management and intransigent

labour and I'm not going to try to say who was right, in a dispute in Selkirk, Manitoba involving Brown's Bakery. And the Progressive-Conservative administration was in power. The bakery went out of business and all of the people lost their jobs and the Progressive-Conservative administration and their type of leadership, with all the means at its disposal sitting in the seats of government, was not able to solve that dispute.

Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, there was a different law at that time. There was a different law. What they did was to get an injunction against people in Selkirk, walking down the streets, saying that they were screwed by their employer. We have got no injunction against workers standing in front of that plant saying that they want to go back to work or that they want voluntary overtime, or that they were screwed by the NDP. We got no such injunction. We have not stopped that type of activity. That type of activity was illegal under the Progressive-Conservative administration.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says that he believes in free collective bargaining. He believes that overtime should be a subject of free collective bargaining. And the government? That is the law of the province of Manitoba today. And by and large, Mr. Speaker, I would say that 95, and I think I'm being light, 95 percent of the work force has been able to have voluntary arrangements, freely arrived at, between management and labour dealing with overtime, in a free society. And the honourable member says that because there is one strike in one plant in one year in the province of Manitoba, and there will be suffering, I'll admit it — there will be problems and the people who are involved will have problems — that because of that problem one should undo what has found itself commendable to all of the employees and the employers in the province of Manitoba to deal with that one situation.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have to reiterate my position. The fact is that when I was on that side of the House, I believed in free collective bargaining. I believed in undoing the laws against injunction; I believed in undoing the laws which prevented men from striking or which required them to go back to work; I believed in letting employees go wherever they want to, including those at Griffin Steel, trying to prevent or to use whatever economic power they had to to make their position against Griffin Steel. I suggest that the Conservative administration would not do that. Let there be no mistake about it. They would have laws which saw to it that that kind of freedom was not available to the people of the province of Manitoba. That's not hypothetical. —(Interjection)— That was their position and that is their existing platform. That is the platform of the Leader of the Conservative party.

So, Mr. Speaker, freedom has its price; it has its benefits and it has its responsibilities. And one of the problems that emerge in a free society is that it doesn't solve all problems and that that is one of the prices that we have to pay for freedom. It requires responsibility and the people engaged in that particular dispute, both on the management side and on the labour side — and they will both suffer — one of the things that have been fought for to preserve free collective bargaining in our society for many many years.

You know, I don't have the time, but the honourable members know, not one of them will accuse me — not one of them will accuse me of what the Member for Thompson has accused me of — of handling this dispute in a different way than we have handled every other dispute. Not one of them would say that because they know that I have behaved the same way with the Steelworkers, that I have behaved the same way with the Paperworkers, that I have behaved the same way with the Bus Workers, and that the people who he said I'm opposed to because they picketed outside my house, that when my children looked out the windows and saw them picketing, I said that I am proud of myself because I gave them the right to do that. To suggest that I have animosity and would subject these people to the kind of thing that they are involved in because of some personal grievance, I say, Mr. Speaker, that that suggestion which the Honourable Member for Fort Garry now picks up and adopts, is absolutely without foundation, scandalous and scurrilous, as it applies to anybody on this side of the House. There is, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, even the Member for Thompson didn't say that, if he has become your spokesman. He said, "Eight people feel this way about compulsory or voluntary overtime". He did not say, "Eight people on this side accuse the government of having a prejudicial position vis-a-vis that particular union." Because, Mr. Speaker, even the Member for Thompson would not make that kind of allegation. It just is not true. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Garry says that he is not using this as a political issue. I do not know why politics suddenly comes into disrepute. Why is it wrong to use a situation in the province of Manitoba which you feel would commend itself to you if you exercised it properly and would bring down the government. Why should that be something that you do not want to do? From what I have learned in the past 8 years, you've wanted to do that every day while you are in opposition, and I would assume that you still want to do it. And you are now suggesting to us that you've got a way of throwing us out' but you won't use it because you are too kind. My honourable friend knows full well that the reason, Mr. Speaker, the reason he will not exploit that issue in a way in which he says it would be exploited is not because it would result to his political credit; it is because it would result to

his political debit. And that's his problem. If it would result to his political credit, he would be using it in that way, and Mr. Speaker, there would be nobody on this side of the House who would fault him for it.

The fact is that the honourable member has not suggested anything, he has implied that a Progressive Conservative administration would have a way of dealing with this problem, which we obviously have not used. He then says he believes in free collective bargaining. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Conservatives would have a way of dealing with this question. I believe that they would set up a system of rules such as existed in our province previously, that if a judge doesn't like the way you are walking down the street, he can issue an injunction preventing you from doing so. That if a judge doesn't like the fact that you are not at work, he can issue an injunction preventing you from not being at work and that this would bring the men to the jobs and we would have industrial stability in our province. Well, Mr. Speaker, we had a Conservative administration and, you know, I'm not going to make a big issue out of every strike because there will be strikes in every province in every jurisdiction but was there industrial stability when we had the Conservative administration? Or will we have one now? When the civil service or the teachers — and I can't remember — publish a big ad in the Toronto Globe and Mail saying that Bill Davis is a tight-wad and the teachers all then leave their jobs and refuse to go to work until the government of Ontario passes a law requiring them to work or go to jail, is that industrial stability?

A MEMBER: The Conservatives think so.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the fallacy — (Interjection) — pardon me? Well would the honourable member be satisfied if I gave him an example of Manitoba under a Conservative administration? — (Interjection) — No, it's not there either.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, what the honourable member is doing is repeating what the Member for Lakeside said last year. Mr. Speaker, what he is doing is repeating what the Honourable Member said last year, Don't bring up anything we have done; don't bring up anything we are now doing in another province; and don't bring up, by all means, anything that we might do in the future, because to do so would be not to fight fair and we want to fight fair."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot proceed on that basis. I have to tell the honourable member that the Member for Fort Garry has come into this House; he has suggested that great words of truth emanated from the Member for Thompson when he suggested a prejudice by this government with respect to a particular union. I say to the honourable member that leadership under those circumstances is not panicking, that one must and I repeat, you must keep your head when all about you are losing theirs and blaming it on you.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the Member for Fort Garry as well as anybody else and that is a stronger form of leadership given existing circumstances because it is exactly in line with what the labour movement applauded and said that they wanted when we were in opposition. They said they wanted free collective bargaining; they said they wanted equality of rights; they said they wanted the right to withdraw their labour; they said they wanted the right to disseminate their position anywhere in the same way that the Progressive Conservative Party could or the New Democratic Party could. At that time, nobody suggested there be a law which prevents an employer from hiring somebody during the existence of a lawful strike. Is that what the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is suggesting because we have resisted properly and in accordance with straight labour union principles passing any such laws and I hope that we would continue to resist it. And, Mr. Speaker, we have also, it was also confirmed by the labour movement that no one has the right to prevent the freedom of action of any other person and that if people blocked the street, then it is the obligation of the state to keep that street clear, just the same as if the company committed a criminal offence, it would be up to the government to prosecute that criminal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are certain . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize the Honourable Member hasn't finished. This is one of the areas where our rules aren't covered and I have a proposition to make to the House if they're prepared to listen. The Honourable Member has not finished, completed his time. The motion on the floor is open, has not been resolved. Now we can proceed into Private Members' Hour or we can, by leave, give the Honourable Member extended time or we can tomorrow, when we've gone through and come to Orders of the Day, come to this particular question and the Honourable Member can then carry on. Now that are the options you have and I'm prepared to have a discussion on that at the present time. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell on a point of order.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I believe that there is occasion, if you check back through Hansard, where we have taken up the entire time until 4:30 on a grievance on a Wednesday afternoon and it has ended at that point in time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel. On a point of order.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK: Yes, on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think you would be setting a

precedent that doesn't have too much parallel from the past procedures in this House if you extended into the Private Members' Hour so I suggest if the Minister wants to complete his time that it be done during the regular time tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that that would be correct. I believe that 4:30 having arrived, it would be different if we were going into Supply but the motion will again be open tomorrow. It will be the same motion; there will be that much time left on my remarks and I will be able to complete them tomorrow. The motion has not been put; the question has not proceeded.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - RESOLUTION NO. 1

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, at this time we go into Private Members' Hour. The question before the House is Resolution No. 1 by the Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs had the debate adjourned in his name.

MR. GREEN: I wonder if we can just hold it for a second, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think you had better call the question because the Minister is not here.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Resolution before the House is Resolution No. 1 by the Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor on this resolution and in doing so I want to indicate that hearings are now being held in the Province of Manitoba and in North Dakota with regard to the Garrison diversion unit. As a matter of fact, I believe that the Leader of the Opposition is presently speaking on this issue in Souris and I gather that the Leader of the Liberal Party will be presenting a brief.

I would have hoped, Mr. Speaker, that that which is the case with other governments and in other areas as it refers to relations with another province, that one could adopt a common front and that one would not be attempting to suggest that there isn't a position which the government of the other country could take as being the position of the province. It is generally the rule, Mr. Speaker, in external affairs that except in extraordinary circumstances, one does not try to undermine the external relations of your own country in dealing with another country. Of course, if your own country was engaged in external relations which were demonstrably damaging, I suppose that that is something that a person would have to exercise a judgement in in dealing with.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Garrison diversion program, despitewhat I believe has been a continually correct position adopted by the government of Manitoba, concurred in by the government of Canada and pursued on the basis of consistent co-operation between the government of Canada and the government of Manitoba, there have been continuous attempts for people to suggest that one is not behaving as he should. I think the Member for Fort Rouge said, "It's not sufficient to be merely correct; one must get mad; one must make motions; one must, I suppose he could go push it forward, pour gasoline on one's head and light a match in order to demonstrate just how seriously — (Interjection)— Yes, I know that the member would think it's a good idea and I know, Mr. Speaker, that he knows that there is no other way in which he could damage the sustenance of our position so he would suggest anything like that is a good idea.

Now, the Member for Fort Rouge reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of Hamlet when they were mourning over Ophelia's grave and everyone was trying to out-mourn the other person and Hamlet said that he loved her more than anybody else. What would you do for Ophelia? Wouldst eat a crocodile; wouldst do various other things and finally leaps into the grave. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of eating a crocodile; I have no intention of leaping into the grave; I have intention of conducting Manitoba's policy vis-a-vis the Garrison diversion in a sound and as a reasonable a manner as is possible.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the parties who have made this an issue of antagonism and now see that the issue was conducted as reasonably as possible and I have never guaranteed success nor would I have the temerity to do so because I don't know what will be the result. What I do know, Mr. Speaker, is that if you behaved in a certain way, you would achieve a certain result. If you behaved in an alternative way; you would achieve another result. What the government of Manitoba has tried to do is to behave as reasonably as possible while not in any way detracting from our position. The position that we have taken is now referred to, Mr. Speaker, as a strong line and I'm sorry, the Member for Portage La Prairie in introducing this resolution said that he hopes that by him being militant that the government will achieve a strong line and that they will see to it that the government maintains a strong line with regards to the Garrison diversion.

Well, Mr. Speaker, well exactly, I said that that's what they would say. I said exactly that that's what they would say. It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that in the Minot newspaper it says, "Manitoba does not retreat from its early position." This is in Minot. This is an objective source. "Many newspapers newspaper present interpreted Mr. Green's restatement of that stand and his reference to building a project within the Souris and Red Rivers to keep return flows from entering Canada as a very hard

line. He, himself, pointed out that it was the position he and the government of Premier Ed Schreyer had taken from the beginning. Manitoba does not retreat from its early position." And again, Mr. Speaker, in the same newspaper: "Actually it was the identical position the government of Manitoba has taken for some three years." This is by somebody named Jack Bone. "During that period, the Premier and his Minister of the Environment have resisted great pressures by environmental zealots to communicate objections to the U.S. government and to get the project into court to stop the project."

So, Mr. Speaker, what has been our difference of opinion on this question and I really don't know where there has been a difference of opinion except an attempt by some people to suggest that we were not doing everything possible and the Member for Fort Rouge says that it was never his suggestion that we go to court. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have his questions and answers in Hansard — to sue in court, yes. Mr. Speaker, I have his questions and answers in Hansard in which he says, "Have you not taken the matter to an international court such as was done with the case involving Cuba; have you not told Governor Link that you are going to take him to court?" Well, Mr. Speaker, yes, you know, that question, I suppose the honourable member says it's not a suggestion that you would go to court but he was making it when the Environmental Council was asking me to go to court, and he was grandstanding to the Environmental Council, "Why are you not taking this matter to court?" It's not a suggestion when the honourable member says, "Why are you not taking this matter to court?" — he is not suggesting that we take it to court.

I suggest that the honourable member in those years told the newspapers, told this House that we should be taking that matter to court, that that was what he was doing, and that he now sees that that was a disastrous kind of suggestion and therefore, Mr. Speaker, has disowned the Liberal party from having made that suggestion. Mr. Speaker, he has disowned the Liberal party from having made that suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, if the honourable members are going to object to what this party has done, then I want to put what we have done in the form of a resolution, as an amendment to the Member for Portage la Prairie's resolution, and I want him to vote against it. I want to say what we have done and I want them to vote against it. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie says that when we go down to the States all we do is get conned by the Governor of North Dakota. You know, the honourable member can't even remember his own complimentary remarks. The first time I went to the States and spoke to the people of North Dakota, the next day the Member for Portage la Prairie got up and he said he wants to commend the Minister of Mines for the message he took to the people of North Dakota when he went there the other day. That's what he said.

But apparently it wasn't good enough for the party lines, for the Member for Fort Rouge, so that has to be undone and there has to be some suggestion that what was accomplished was accomplished by the Liberal Government in Ottawa and that Manitoba Government did nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I have not had one word of criticism of the Liberal Government in Ottawa. Does the member think that that's because I never had reason for criticizing because I tell the member and it will be proved on the record when the time comes, that I have taken that position, as I have told the newspapers I have taken it — I believe that it is not good for the Canadian position for it to be undermined by local politics in this matter of external affairs. I am not going to say that I agree with everything that they have done, but what I do agree is that they should be doing it and that I should not be nit-picking.

Now the honourable member does not follow that. The honourable member thinks that he can take the good position and also say that he "would eat a crocodile" or that he "would leap into the grave" and that we have not done enough. And I'm going to give the honourable member the opportunity to vote for his principles because I'm going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, an amendment to this resolution which in every way indicates the steps that have been taken and which indicates the steps that have been resisted and which I think, Mr. Speaker, should be a good position for the Province of Manitoba, and which I think should not be undermined in jurisdictions outside of this province. And the honourable member can then proceed to say that he wishes to show that the Government of Manitoba did nothing or didn't do the right thing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable, the Minister of Corrections, that the resolution be amended by deleting therefrom all of the words following the word "Whereas" in the first paragraph thereof and substituting therefor the following:

WHEREAS pursuant to action initiated by the Province of Manitoba in January of 1970, the Government of Canada referred the issue of an alleged potential violation of the Boundary Waters Treaty by virtue of the Garrison Diversion Irrigation unit in the United States to the International Joint Commission; and

WHEREAS the said alleged violation is presently pending before the International Joint Commission; and

WHEREAS it is desirable that there be no question as to the support of the Government of Manitoba in its presentation before the International Joint Commission and its action with respect to

the Garrison Diversion unit;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

1. That this government confirms and endorses those steps taken by the Government of Manitoba designed to place the province in the most favourable position before the International Joint Commission; namely

- (a) In continued use of reasonable diplomatic means to deal with this problem and in obtaining progress through the use of such means;
- (b) Accepting the validity of the undertakings given by the United States Government and the Government of North Dakota;
- (c) In encouraging the documentation of Manitoba's complaints by sources in the United States and in Canada;
- (d) In the presentation of two briefs before the International Joint Commission;
- (e) In maintaining solidarity with and in not undermining the Canadian Government in its external relations.

2. That this House endorses the action of the Manitoba Government in resisting the taking of such steps as would have jeopardized the position of the province; namely

- (a) By not considering the matter satisfactorily resolved upon receipt of the American undertaking and continuing to prepare ourselves to deal with arguments which would be made over the use of the words "pollution" and "injury" as used in the Treaty.

In this, Mr. Speaker, I'm just going beyond this — as soon as Mr. Mitchell Sharp, the Minister of State for External Affairs received the American undertaking, he said, "The matter is solved. They obey their undertakings and Canada has no more problems." We did not take that position.

- (b) By refusing to adopt grandstand and fruitless advice to sue the United States Government either in a United States court or a Canadian court;

- (c) By refusing to involve the Government of Manitoba in the internal politics of the United States by opposing aspects of the Garrison Diversion which the United States undertook would not involve the Red and Souris Rivers;

- (d) By refusing the temptation of demanding compensation as an appropriate remedy for problems which would arise in Canada; — which the Leader of the Liberal party did less than a month ago on television.

- (e) By refusing to deem as acceptable the proceeding with the Diversion by the United States if full compliance with the International Joint Commission Study Board Report Recommendations were guaranteed; — which other people in our province have said would be acceptable.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Minister of Mines, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Corrections, the amendment as read. Do the members wish me to read the amendment or do they have copies? Are you ready for the . . . The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To suggest that I am ready is really overstating the fact. The amendment just provided to this resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie likely would require a bit more time than the 30 seconds that I have had to address myself to it. But, Sir, I had some comments that I wanted to make generally on the subject matter to this resolution and will deliver them at this particular time.

Coincidentally, Mr. Speaker, they also happen to relate to the subject matter that just was previously discussed, although far removed from the labour scene, but on the point that the Honourable House Leader was making just a few moments before 4:30 on the debate that we spent most of the afternoon on — on the grievance matter raised by the Honourable Member from Thompson, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, and then entered into by the House Leader.

Sir, the Honourable House Leader has indicated in an earlier debate that there was nothing wrong with being "super political" and using the full influence of politics on all or every occasion that it recommended itself to a political party in furthering their interests. I should indicate to the Honourable House Leader that we on this side have, for reasons not political chosen, have chosen to act in what we know to be and what we hope will appear to be to most Manitobans, as a pretty responsible way, in the full position that this Minister and this government has taken with respect to the Garrison Project and its possible effects on Manitoba, and the kind of actions and activities that we should exhibit in strengthening our position to its maximum with such bodies as the Committee, which is the International Committee that is now studying the matter, and acting in any way that wouldn't weaken the position of our government in making its presentations before: (a) the Canadian Government, (b) the American government; and (c) in front of the International Committees charged with the particular responsibility of investigating and studying the matter.

That, Sir, is not to say that we have been satisfied or are satisfied today with the output that he has solicited from his own department, from his own resources. We have on numerous instances

indicated to him that we should be far more up-to-date in terms of what our assessment of possible damages are; what acceptability to us means, spelled out in actual terms, in actual quality of water terms if you like, in actual flooding potentials, in actual biology damage to our lakes. To suggest, Sir, that we have been satisfied with what the people, the resource people that this Minister has at his disposal in his department, that they have in fact done the kind of homework, done the kind of work that we think could immeasurably have strengthened our position, could have at least in many ways prevented some of the kind of alarmist discussion that we seem to enter into from time to time when environmental matters are at stake. We simply believe that they haven't done their work and that this Minister hasn't done his work.

But we have desisted, we have desisted from making this an all-out political issue in the Province of Manitoba because we do happen to believe from time to time, issues do arise that call for recognizing, that call for a relatively non-partisan position in order to strengthen the position of the public and the people of Manitoba as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, this situation was not always thus . . . —(Interjection)— was not always thus. It was a very good political position, I suggest for all parties of this House to have adopted on another major environmental question not that many years ago. I would suggest that for all Manitobans today, we would be four or five, six hundred million ahead of the game had that position been taken on a greater question some seven or eight years ago. But that was not the position of our opposition at that time. Political hay was to be cut and to be mowed and to be hung up for public view and it was done, Sir, it was done by every opposition member that we faced with the possible exception of some who qualified that position. Oh, they enjoyed that position, they enjoyed milking the last of the politics out of it, to the extent that no flooding would take place on South Indian Lake, which was the official position of the Liberal party at that time; to the extent that most New Democratic Party members that ran for the election, who weren't perhaps members of the House, certainly used it prominently in all their public statements and all their public literature at that time; to the extent that the First Minister indicated, in fact, that there would be no flooding at South Indian Lake — the present First Minister so indicated.

There was, Mr. Speaker, some caution exhibited, some rationalization of the position taken officially by the New Democratic Party, then in opposition in this House, that prevented them from being completely irresponsible, that prevented them from saying completely that the government of the day was wrong. But certainly, Sir, no hesitation to milk the politics of the situation to its full. Sir, I suggest that if the present opposition, that is, Her Majesty's Official Opposition, were to take that attitude with respect to the serious problems' the grave concern that we have for the potential damages that the Garrison Project can reek on Manitoba, then, Sir, that would be following the dictates of the House Leader who just a little while ago lectured the Member for Fort Garry that there was nothing wrong with taking politics into every and all situations at all times.

Well, Sir, I suggest to you, Sir, it was precisely that attitude that has cost Manitobans the most massive single waste of public funds and has frittered away one of our most precious heritages and that will have saddled our children, their children, and their grandchildren with debts that we can never erase.

I do not want the Minister to believe that the kind of acquiesce position that we have taken with the Minister on Garrison indicates complete satisfaction with the manner and way in which he has directed his own department and handled his own resources in arming ourselves as a province, the people of Manitoba, against the potential danger, the potential threat that Garrison may offer.

I suggest that it was a shock and a surprise to us when we, as an Official Opposition Party group visited Garrison some two years ago, and when we were asked by American officials what would be acceptable to us in terms of water quality, what is the present condition of our rivers and streams that are to be affected, namely the Souris, the Assiniboine or the Red, we didn't have the information, Sir. I understand that some of that information is now being gathered, is not being collated but Sir, in terms of and overall impact study based on our information, provided by our experts, not relying on experts of another country, not relying on experts that could be presumed to have a bias or a prejudice in favour of projects to their advantage. Mr. Speaker, this Minister doesn't employ X number of hundreds of employees, biologists, engineers, water hydraulics, everything else, simply to rely on other people's data, simply to pick up other people's interpretation of what constitutes a hazard to us. So I'm suggesting that when the Member from Riel and others have suggested to him from time to time that we could have and should have, since the time, and perhaps even since the time previous to this Ministry's acceptance through this government's responsibility in this area. Because certainly the Garrison Project does date back to some time and I believe the reservoir was built in '64 - '65, the actual impoundment of water began at that time.

Certainly at that time there was time to use the lead time — from then to now — and so if he wants me to I'll share four years of inactivity on the part of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources with him, as having been a Minister responsible for part of that time.

But Sir, he has been Minister now for the last seven years and we haven't got Manitoba impact

studies available to us. We have not — (Interjection) — they are certainly not adequate ones. Certainly not adequate ones, Sir. We have relied essentially and virtually totally on information supplied to us by the American sources in this instance. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll ask the Minister in the most graphic way that I can whether we have done the sufficient studies that I talk about? And I want to ask him whether we know and whether he can tell me definitively, for instance, can the gizzard shad survive in our northern waters? Yes or No? Have they done those studies? Have we done those studies? Have we taken a . . . gizzard shad and put him into an isolated lake — one of the former Ministers of Highways he said he liked to boast about the 100,000 lakes that we have — and have we determined for ourselves whether or not that particular species is a danger to our waters? Well, Sir, I suggest we have not. I suggest we have not. While the Honourable Minister's position with respect to his understanding of the due process of how governments relate with each other, how in this particular situation we're dealing with an international matter, that it is correct and the proper role that we should rely on our senior Federal Government in Ottawa, that it's a correct and proper role that because international matters are at stake that very senior positions have to be entered into with both the federal government on the American side and our federal government so, therefore, it's the state departments of the respective countries that have the primary responsibility in making sure that international agreements — treaties — that have long stood the test of time, since 1909 in this case, be not in any way violated to the detriment of either country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we accept the correctness of the Minister's position in this area; we have not criticized his position in this area; we have not suggested or grandstanded as the members to my immediate left have about court actions in different countries, in different places to heighten the drama of the role or to heighten the profile of this Minister and the government so that he can be able to indicate to the people of Manitoba that he is doing all — and not only 100 percent but 110 percent of what he should be doing. No, Sir. We have assumed that that was not a responsible opposition role to play and we have not played that role. We have not joined in any whipping up to a high fever emotional pitch the concerns that many people, particularly in the southwestern part of the province along these rivers and streams, communities that depend vitally on the water supply coming from the Souris, the Assiniboine or the Red, we haven't gone into those communities and whipped up a highly emotionally charged concern and have indicated with a degree of vindictiveness that this government, this minister, aren't performing their duties, aren't doing their jobs. We have desisted from that too.

Mr. Speaker, my memory is just too fresh not to forget how, when on the subject matter that I referred to a little while ago when public hearings were held on South Indian Lake, minister after minister — well, they weren't ministers then but members of opposition after members of opposition, the Member for Thompson, the Member for Inkster, chose to use that public platform to encourage that particularly aroused group of Manitobans about the imminent disaster that the flooding of South Indian Lake would impose upon Manitoba. It didn't preclude them, Sir, from using and from indeed charging the fires under that emotional question to their full political advantage.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you and I refute the House Leader's suggestion that politics have to be front, right and centre on every issue. Certainly not on issues of this nature. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to chastise a minister and the government if we feel that they have not in certain ways carried out their responsibilities. We believe, Sir, that the relatively wait-and-see attitude on the part of this minister, and the relatively total dependency on negotiations being carried out by other people on our behalf, is not good not good enough.

Sir, while I have considerably divergent views on this particular subject matter than that shared by many other Manitobans perhaps and many of my colleagues and before I voice some of I might remind you, Sir, and all honourable members, — I retract that, Mr. Speaker, it's not for me to remind you, Sir, of anything — but through you, Sir, I remind honourable members that we sometimes lose sight of the fact that this is Private Members' Hours and that it is an opportunity, not all that often granted us in the party system of government that we enjoy that we have a tendency of being whipped into party position all too often. I have a grave concern about the future problems of having adequate water supplies in the south part of this Province. I have a grave concern that there are, whether you want to believe some of the doom-sayers, the climatologists that are becoming more and more prominent, that we are moving into very unsettled weather conditions, that we could be moving into a prolonged period of drought. Certainly when one reads, as one can read in the latest issue of Time and other reports and we see about us this unusual kind of weather pattern that is being developed, dust storms in Southern Alberta today, I understand, that has caused the RCMP to stop traffic at high noon on the highways of Alberta, then, Sir, it would not at all surprise me that within a relatively short period of time, this Legislature or a government, any government, will be sending down delegations to this project pleading for some water, pleading for some water to assist drought stricken areas in the southern part of our province. But, Sir, that's conjecture into the future. We're faced with the unknown; we're not satisfied that we have used our resources to collect the necessary data that we can speak definitively and with confidence about what is injurious and what isn't; what will, in fact be

damaging to us and what won't be damaging to us.

That really moves me to the position that I would like to put forward at this time and move a further amendment to this resolution respect (?) and I do so, not out of any to the lengthy amendment that the Honourable House Leader just moved to this resolution, although, Sir, it contains a great deal of verbiage, perhaps mine is more to the point. So, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Arthur, that the resolution be amended by deleting all words after the word "Canada" in the first whereas, and stating thereafter the following:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Legislature take the position that no water, regardless of stated quality from the Garrison diversion, be allowed to enter the natural water courses of Manitoba."

Be it so moved.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have a problem with the drafting of this amendment. The Honourable Member goes from a whereas into a resolve in the middle of a whereas which I find difficult to construct.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, all that could produce is perhaps a bit of pizzaz . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Well, if the honourable member will reconsider it, if he's got a copy of what he wrote; at the present moment, it doesn't make sense.

MR. ENNS: I would ask the page to return the amendments for a moment. Perhaps, Sir, I have a half minute on my time . . . Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment is simply to . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the amendment has been made and I don't know that the honourable member can make a speech after the amendment but if the honourable member is being given an accommodation in trying to correct it but I don't know whether that gives him the opportunity to make another speech.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader is correct. He can make the correction but he can't speak any further.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order to hopefully make this amendment to the resolution acceptable. We simply want the gist of this amendment attached after the first Whereas.

MR. GREEN: Does the Member want it inserted or does he want all of the balance of the resolution to be removed?

MR. ENNS: To be removed.

MR. GREEN: And have the part that he has moved appear after the Whereas that all the other paragraphs be removed and that the Resolve be put into the . . .

MR. ENNS: That's right.

MR. GREEN: . . . the amendment.

MR. ENNS: . . . that the order that the amendment can be accommodated, it is simply left with one whereas followed by a resolve.

MR. SPEAKER: As I understand it, the first Whereas is going to remain and everything after that is deleted and the Resolve is then substituted. Is that correct? Very well. So therefore, the honourable members can look at the first whereas as the Honourable Minister of Mines had introduced and further to that the resolution then reads: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this . . .

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Mines left the first Whereas in that was stated by the Member for Portage La Prairie.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, that's not my impression. When I took the Minister's amendment, he deleted everything after the word Whereas.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the problem that arises is that the amendment proposed by the Minister of Mines and Resources the deletion part was verbal, only the portion of the draft resolution was printed.

MR. SPEAKER: Correct, but I had that corrected for the record. I asked the Honourable Minister to put it in his own writing and I have a copy of that, so does the Clerk.

MR. GREEN: It will be on the record, Mr. Speaker, because I stated quite clearly that all of the words following the first word Whereas in the first paragraph be deleted and that the following be substituted.

MR. SPEAKER: Therefore, the amendment now reads after the first Whereas of the Minister: BE IT RESOLVED that the this Legislature take the position that no water, regardless of stated quality from the Garrison diversion be allowed to enter the natural water course of Manitoba. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would rise to say that the sub-amendment moved by the Member for Lakeside is certainly one that our group would have no hesitation supporting it, it certainly is much preferable to the very spiteful and self-serving amendment that was moved by the Minister of Mines and Resources but we know that we have become used to that particular kind of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: Imputing motives to the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: State his point of privilege.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Yes, the Member for Fort Rouge is imputing motives to the Mines Minister and that is improper under our rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker. I would say the apparent spitefulness and self-servingness of the Minister of Mines as I see it. I think that that is a fair statement that the particular original intent behind this motion was well stated by the Member for Portage La Prairie when he introduced it and that was to provide a basis upon which parties in this House could initiate and endorse an all-party position in relation to the Garrison and their opposition to what was being proposed in the North Dakota scheme.

The Minister of Mines and Resources, so filled as he is with an attempt to chart or defend what are sometimes totally indefensible positions, was not able to understand that particular motivation or intent and therefore his only ambition thereby was to simply wield his own peculiar form of invective and misinterpretation of the intent of that resolution.

In fact, what is interesting, Mr. Speaker, is that one of his colleagues, the Minister of Lands and Renewable Resources, speaking prior to him, had nothing but strong praise for the resolution of the Member for Portage la Prairie. —(Interjection)— Well, the Minister says he didn't object to the resolution, yet he destroyed it, which shows that he doesn't know what his mind is. He agrees with the resolution but then he goes about destroying it which shows to me, Mr. Speaker, that if there is any Hamlet-like person in this legislature, it must be the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. He doesn't know what he agrees with and what he doesn't agree with; what he supports or what he is going to destroy. It just simply shows that what he is, is simply motivated out of his own bile that works inside himself and that there is no apparent consistency other than to get even. I think that is a trait which is not unknown in politicians; it is certainly one that we have seen.

But it is unfortunate that that particular characteristic had to be so dramatically displayed in this particular instance, particularly when his colleague in the Cabinet had taken a much more statesmanlike and correct position prior to the intervention by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I think it is still important to put some of the history of this Garrison debate in perspective. The Minister has made some pretty strong accusations and imputing motives. I know that the Member from St. Matthews didn't rise to my defence when the Minister imputed motives to me, but I guess he has a fairly one-sided sense of justice. However, when he imputed the fact that we were trying to grandstand, what it simply was that for the last four years in this House, our party has attempted to try to provide a certain stimulant and a certain reminder as opposition parties are supposed to do, towards the kinds of actions that their government should be taking in representing this province.

In suggesting and recommending steps to be taken, there was never any, at any time, attempt to grandstand on the basis of saying that what was being done was itself wrong because we always said that the steps that were being taken were perfectly right but that we just felt that other steps should also be examined. And if the Minister would look at the record much more carefully than he usually does, he would find that that when we spoke in this House in 1974 and '75 and '76, that the kind of statements that we were raising were, if it is true that an advisory body that the Minister himself has established, composed of 100 individuals representing a variety of interests in the environmental field, the resource field, in industry and commerce in this province, were prepared to say publicly that the Minister should be looking at other steps — was it not incumbent upon an opposition to ask a question in this House, why he was not taking those steps? In other words, if his own advisory group provided some of the best experts, some of the most interested people, those who have studied and looked at the problem themselves were somewhat critical of the limited steps that were being taken — was it not also the responsibility of an opposition party to at least ask the government why they were not doing so. If their own body advised them to do so, didn't this House deserve an explanation why not?

And that was the kind of questions that were being asked. When we posed the issue of whether in fact the government was examining the feasibility — and those were exactly the questions — we were examining the feasibility of looking at what kind of legal steps should be taken and was the government prepared to go into court, was the government prepared to support any court interventions on the part of private agencies. That seemed to be, certainly to my mind, the kind of questions that should be asked. And those were the kinds of questions that we were asking. Simply on the basis — and I know that the Minister has an aversion to the courts, he doesn't trust them but I can assure him that the federal circuit courts in the United States are not full of sort of Liberal appointees that he seems to think all the courts in Canada are. It's a strange position that he always adopts, as someone raised in the law, that he doesn't have any trust in the courts. But that's another characteristic of his own that he has to deal with on his own.

What I am saying is that when we recommended legal action it was simply that at that particular point in time, a number of States in the United States were introducing legal actions. A number of societies like the Audobon Society were so doing. We asked the question, "Was the Government of Manitoba prepared to do likewise, or support the activities of the Manitoba Environment Council, or the Wildlife Federation, or whoever, to do that?" The Minister rejected it out of hand and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, and this is what disturbed us, he rejected it without even looking at it. He was not even going to examine a feasibility of that. He dismissed it out of hand. He is so full of self-righteousness, so full of omnipotent knowledge that he doesn't have to examine the steps that are open to him. That is the great blindness of this Minister, Mr. Speaker, that he doesn't take advice lightly, in fact he doesn't take advice at all.

He's immune to advice because he is so self-contained with his own wisdom and knowledge, or at least what he thinks to be wisdom and knowledge, that he isn't prepared to take advice. He doesn't take advice from his own advisory board that he has set up as a Minister; he doesn't take advice from people sort of anywhere else in this province because he knows, Mr. Speaker, he really does know, you see.

Of course, that then becomes the responsibility of the opposition to pinprick those who have so puffed themselves up with self-righteousness and all-powerful knowledge, that the only way perhaps they can be sometimes motivated into action is if there is someone on the other side saying, "Hey, the Emperor has no clothes." Mr. Speaker, this Minister opposite has been undressed far too many times in this province for him to try to pretend that he's always wearing those invisible clothes. And I think that that is the role of the opposition.

So, Mr. Speaker, I find that the kind of attempts for the Minister to defend and to move the amendment he does, really does not deserve the respect that the original intent of this resolution, I think, was attempting to provide. And that is unfortunate.

Now, I think that the Member for Lakeside brought the debate back into its proper perspective from the peculiar, particular personal vendetta that the Minister himself was following. It did bring it back to the issue of what is the stand this House is going to take in relation to Garrison? And I believe that his stand of saying that water shall not pass and shall not come into this area is a stand that we can certainly endorse.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, if memory serves me correct, that in fact the statement made by the Minister to the IJC just yesterday I believe it was, had a slightly different tone from the position that the Government of Manitoba has been taking up to now. It appears, Mr. Speaker, that if we would compare the record that there is some nuances and differences there. —(Interjection)— We will compare the record, we will. Because we will see that there are probably partisan differences, probably attributable to the fact that he's beginning to feel just a little pressure, which is what the role of the opposition are supposed to provide. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, what does disturb me about the amendment that was placed by the Member from Lakeside is that it still does not maintain the other kinds of recommendations or proposals that were contained in this resolution such as that the kind of information that should be disseminated and distributed to the communities and the organizations in this province which are going to be affected under the kind of resolution that the Member for Portage had prepared, would be available. —(Interjection)— It should be the normal responsibility of government, but again, when the Minister says from his seat, we know what's happening. It's a good thing he knows, because he certainly hasn't told anybody else. He hasn't revealed those impact studies and reports that he says he has, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of thing that we've been asking for. Let's insure that the municipalities would know exactly what it is that they have to prepare for in case there are problems.

MR. GREEN: I rise on a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister state his Matter of Privilege.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member says that we have not revealed that information. That information was presented to the International Joint Commission when we presented our first brief and was available to all the citizens of Manitoba and has been continually sent out to those people and others who ask for it.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I would make a bet with the Honourable Minister that if you took a canvass to the house of the members of the Legislative Assembly, who represent ridings which are directly affected or could be affected or would be affected by the Garrison, that not one of them has received any of those reports. —(Interjection)— Oh, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Member from Lakeside and the Member from Portage, if they got a little package in the mail from the Minister of Mines and Resources, saying, "Here's our studies, here's what it shows, go to your communities, give it to your mayors, give it to your organizations". I'm asking these members, has any of them received it? Of course not, Mr. Speaker, because once again, the Minister is saying, "Well, let them come and get it if they want it", but the fact of the matter is that this Resolution was designed to provide what we

think is the proper responsibility of government' not to sit in his office waiting for someone to call, but to go and provide the information in an open and available way, and to take the initiative in so doing.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the first priority, almost common courtesy, would be for this government to provide to the members of those constituencies in which the Souris and the Red are affected, in fact to all members of this House, those kinds of studies, you would think that that would be the first thought. Well, of course, it isn't even a thought at all. It's not even a last thought. Because this Minister really doesn't like to give much information away. When you really get down to the truth, for all his protestations, he really does like to play the game of "What they don't know won't hurt me". And I think, Mr. Speaker, that again is the kind of problem that we face with this government.

We get this five page, sort of mimeographed submission which doesn't really — it's a good political statement for the eye to see — but what we're talking about, Mr. Speaker, and what we have been talking about for 3 or 4 years, is the kind of intensive examination that would show what was going to happen to the industries in Portage if the kind of diversion went ahead and certain properties were introduced into those waters. So they would understand the kind of implications it would have and therefore be able to understand what steps they, themselves, might be prepared to take.

And the fact of the matter is that exactly that kind of mobilization was going on in the state of North Dakota to the south of us. Governor Link and the legislature of North Dakota were not passively waiting in their offices for the honourable member or the Premier to come down and pay visits. Boy, they were out spending money. How much? Half a million dollars, to get the information out, to mobilize the community, to get the PR machines going, and what was our government doing? Well they were giving this 5 page press release.

All we were saying in our Resolution is that it is not incumbent upon this government to mobilize the full resources, not just of its own bureaucrats, but also to make sure that the mobilization of all those people and individuals and businesses and communities that could be affected, would also be sufficiently attuned to what the problems were and therefore be able to organize their own efforts. But this government says, "Oh no, because you see, we represent the people", Mr. Speaker, "and when we represent the people it means we don't have to tell the people what we're doing." That's the theory of representation that this Minister works on. "As long as I'm, by some Rousseauian general will, representing the people, they don't have to know what's going on, because it's me."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I've learned, not necessarily, to trust the man sitting in that chair, and that's why we do have this particular Chamber in front of us, to make sure that an Opposition party such as ours does play a certain kind of role, and if it's called grandstanding — if grandstanding can be interpreted to provide the sort of countervailing opinions and the options and choices in trying to push and prod this government for more information, then, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to grandstand every day this House is open, because I'll tell you, that's the only way to get these guys to move to do anything. If not, Mr. Speaker, they would simply clam up, keep quiet, keep their cards close to their desk, and do nothing at all.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the point of this Resolution, brought in as it was, was not only simply to provide a basis for this House to get itself into a frame of mind and to begin providing the kind of endorsement which I think that debate, if I can recall, brought together this House with a degree of unanimity, so when they went to appear with Mr. Link, there was a total and complete sort of sharing of opinion and stand, and I think that that strengthened the position of the Minister. I thought what he said was proper, and what the Premier said was proper. They were doing what they were supposed to be doing, and it was important that all members of this House, of all parties stand behind him, which they did, and I think that the debate that that Resolution brought about, added to that particular point of view, and the discussion added to it. I think that is important itself to have. — (Interjection) — Certainly, because ... Oh, Mr. Speaker, the Minister takes great umbrage of the fact that the Member for Portage might suggest that one of the reasons why the meeting was called, is because Governor Link was going to go down there to play a little bit, a sort of a fast shuffle.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't that the Member for Portage la Prairie could have conjured this up in his own mind. If the member had been watching the statements of Governor Link being broadcast by the media in the United States coming back up to Canada, he was saying, "I'll tell you the reason I'm holding that meeting, I hope to be able to convince the Premier and Government of Manitoba to back off", and he's been saying that for a long time. I can recall a statement, Mr. Speaker, made by Governor Link about two years ago or a year and a half ago in the same Minot paper, that the Minister quoted from, saying, "I have met Mr. Schreyer and Mr. Green, and they are in agreement with us that the project is not going to be that damaging, and that all things are fine and good, and that we get along well".

MR. GREEN: No such statement was ever made, the honourable member is quoting from newspapers. No such statement was ever made, and I would like to have that . . .

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, is this a Point of Privilege or a Point of Order that the member is standing on?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says that he is quoting from a newspaper,

Wednesday, March 9, 1977

a statement of Governor Link's, that he met with us, that we agreed that the program wouldn't hurt Manitoba, I ask him to produce that statement because no such statement was ever made.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I believe, if the member will check my words, I said that first, it was on television the night before the meeting was held, that the reason why Governor Link wanted to hold the meeting, he's going to come up to try to convince the Premier and the Minister that the project should go ahead. And that was on a television and radio program.

MR. GREEN: I did not raise objection to that. I agreed with that, that that's what Governor Link did say. The honourable member said that he read in the same Minot newspaper that Governor Link had made a statement that he met with Mr. Schreyer and myself, that we agreed that there was no great problem with the program, that it should proceed, and that we were not worried about it. I ask him to produce that newspaper because no such statement was ever made, and I doubt that Governor Link ever made such a statement, so I want him to produce that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member, just a fast reply because time has run out.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I assume that I have a few minutes left in my time and when the Resolution comes back up for debate that the report of that will be produced.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.