

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Thursday, 3 July 1980**

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND  
TABLING OF REPORTS**

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I would like to table a Return under Section 13 of The Special Municipal Loan and General Emergency Fund Act.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** At this time, I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have Mr. and Mrs. Patrick Molloy, of Calgary, Alberta, in the gallery. Mr. Molloy was a Page in this Assembly 59 years ago, in 1921. On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

We also have 27 visitors from Prince of Wales College, St. Johns, Newfoundland. These students are here as guests of the students from the city of Winnipeg under the Canada Week Committee. On behalf of all honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon as well.

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the House Leader. In view of the abnormal number of requests that are being made at the Clerk's Office for briefs to be submitted pertaining to Bill 83, The Landlord and Tenant Act, is the House Leader prepared to consider additional staffing in order to ensure that the requests can be properly dealt with, and names, addresses, phone numbers taken down so that the public will have the opportunity they seek in order to make representations pertaining to Bill 83?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the calls will be handled in the usual, efficient manner of the Clerk's Office.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development. In view of the fact that the latest report from Stat Canada pertaining to building permits indicates that in total, for residential, industrial, commercial, institutional and government, the total dollar building permits issued in 1980, April, over April 1979, shows a 65 point some decrease in Manitoba, the highest decrease insofar as any province is concerned in Canada, while there has been an increase Canada-wide of 10.5 percent in such building permits, my question to the Minister responsible for Economic Development, is the Minister, in view of this alarming information, prepared at this time to announce any programs that will assist those that are engaged for a livelihood in trade in construction in Manitoba, in order to undertake some action to stimulate the construction industry in Manitoba?

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

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen the figures as yet, the honourable member is speaking of, but we are well aware of them. We've had them presented to the House even by myself. I have stated that the housing and the apartment block and the office buildings and retail construction is down in the province of Manitoba. Thank heavens, Mr. Speaker, the manufacturing investment still continues to be going ahead.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Economic Development mentioned apartment blocks. I point out to him that the Stat Canada report refers to decrease in commercial construction as well, and a decrease in industrial construction. A question again to the Minister. Is the Minister prepared to make any announcement pertaining to an expansion of the Critical Home Repair Program or the Pensioner Home Repair Program in order to provide some of the additional stimulus that is required, I think, obvious to all Manitobans, except unfortunately for the government across the way?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Attorney-General and the Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder if the Attorney-General could tell us whether he is aware of any repeated or unusually difficult state of criminal activity within our public parks in the city of Winnipeg which would justify unleashing dogs on people who are in the park at night.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in response to the Member for Inkster's junk question, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any activity of that sort that has been brought to my attention.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, to pursue the question which has been categorized as junk, can the Attorney-General advise us whether he considers it a proper law enforcement technique to use dogs on young people in the park at night?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, that matter has not been brought to the attention of my department. I can undertake to enquire into that matter with the city of Winnipeg authorities and respond to the member at a later date.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, to pursue the question and to pursue the Minister's investigation of it, could the Minister satisfy himself from the authorities of the city of Winnipeg, that whatever dogs are employed, will be able to distinguish between criminal conduct and the normal tendency of the young people to desire to be in the park with members of the opposite sex in the evening?

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

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance. Can he advise as to whether the government is proposing to monitor rental increases which are payable by tenants who are on the SAFER Program in order to determine the additional amounts payable by the province of Manitoba as a result of these rental increases.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I should say that the government will of course be engaged in the effects of rental increases, whether monitoring is the right word or not will remain to be seen, but undoubtedly the SAFER program will come under some sort of influence of the increases in rents.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Could the Minister indicate as to whether there is any program intended by the government to ensure that the province is not required to pay increases of 25 and 40 percent in rental on those properties where you have tenants who are on the SAFER Program?

**MR. CRAIK:** As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, if there are rent increases, it will impact the costs of the SAFER Program as well.

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

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Again, to the Minister of Finance, is it then the intention of the government to increase the ceilings on the SAFER program, because there are many tenants who are currently in a position where the additional rental increase they are now experiencing is one which is solely coming out of their pockets as opposed to out of the governments pockets, because they are already

paying rent higher than the existing ceiling of the SAFER program?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that from time to time the limits on the SAFER program will be changed, and that has been examined and is under consideration. I want to also indicate that the SAFER program administered by the MHRC does act as a buffer for those people against rent increases and is providing some buffer against the rent increases that are taking place at the present time.

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

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Labour who is responsible for negotiating Manpower funding with the federal government. I gave him prior notice of this question. I am wondering if he has had a chance to investigate whether in fact the federal Department of Employment and Manpower is cutting back its funding on programs such as COPE in the community colleges, which is geared to initiating women into non-traditional training, leading to jobs in what was hither to non-traditional types of work for women. Has the federal government been cutting back on its funding of these types of programs?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of the Member for Transcona in this particular instance, where the federal Minister responsible for employment has certainly had his share of headlines in relationship to the programs that allegedly are going in place to assist working women in our country and those that wish to get into the workforce. I should tell the Member for Transcona that we have attempted to get the precise information, and I mean precise, for him, and I have not been able at this particular time to. I share his concern in this particular instance and I assure him, Mr. Speaker, that once the information is available, he'll be the first one to let know, and I appreciate him bringing it to my attention, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. PARASIUK:** A supplementary to the Minister. Since the federal Minister of Manpower and Employment will be in Winnipeg for the next couple of days, supposedly on some important business, would the Minister for Manitoba please contact that Minister to enquire whether the federal Minister has instructed his staff directly to cut back on funding for working women, while at the same time his Minister responsible for the Status of Women going around making rhetorical speeches saying that the federal government is intent on promoting greater involvement of women in the workplace, could the Minister please directly ask the Federal Minister whether in fact this is not a contradiction of positions?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, for my personal concern, this government's concern, and the concern of the Member for Transcona, he can consider that done.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** I would like the Minister to give us the assurances of this government that this government will not cut back on its funding for working women, training programs at Red River Community College, despite the fact that the federal government is attempting to do so. Will this government give us the assurance that even if the federal government, somewhat, and I have to say this word because there is no other one that can be used, hypocritically cuts back on funding for women while at the same time saying they are promoting equality of women, will this government ensure that it won't cut back funding for that type of programming?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the Member for Transcona was in the House during my estimates, but I know his seating partner was and I think the members opposite shared with me the pleasure with the fact of some of things that we are financially doing to assist women to get into the workplace and to particularly get into the apprentice program in Manitoba, not only with additional staff, but with additional dollars. The member can rest assured that we have no intentions of cutting back on those particular efforts.

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

**MRS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to whichever Minister is answering for the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs today. I wonder if we could yet be advised how many renewed tenancy agreements coming up for September 30th renewal and in the hands of tenants before the end of June have been referred to the Rentalsman, how many complaints he has received, Mr. Speaker?

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

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I would be happy to take that question for notice and advise the honourable member that in all likelihood when he is concluding debate on Bill 83 he will be able to answer that, plus a number of other enquiries that have been made.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On another matter to the Honourable Minister of Health — in view of the huge deficit being experienced by the Health Sciences Centre, would the Minister advise the House what steps he is taking to ensure that the quality of service at that hospital does not suffer, Mr. Speaker?

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

**HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** The usual steps, Mr. Speaker. The level of service at the Health Sciences Centre has not been impeded or compromised in any way by its operating budget or by its current proposed deficit and this government will not permit the Health Sciences Centre to be in trouble.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Health could advise us as to the status of the appeal that the Health Sciences Centre has filed on the matter of its budget.

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, Mr. Speaker, other than to confirm that they have appealed their budget.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister of Labour advise what action he undertakes within his department when he receives notices of layoff under the provisions of The Employment Standards Act?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, the first thing that we do is assure ourselves that the Act is being adhered to.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would honour us with his second step. Beyond just simply ensuring that the Act is being complied with, does the Minister undertake any action within his department to ascertain whether or not, as is referred to in the legislation itself, any effort in order to facilitate alternative employment for those that are, in fact, involved in intended layoffs?

**MR. MacMASTER:** We do just precisely that, Mr. Speaker, in a good number of cases. I should tell the member, in answer to a question yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition, that the situation with the 40 employees and the 45 employees at Selkirk, that particular problem, the second group layoff, in my opinion appropriate notice was not given. The appropriate letter was given initially, as I said in this House, for a smaller group; the second group certainly wasn't appropriate. The company has, in fact, corrected that. I should suggest, Mr. Speaker, that correction could have been made by a phone call or a visit by any individual employee, a member of the Steelworkers Union at that particular plant or a shop steward, or the president of the Union, or the staff rep, who I happen to know personally, is very well versed in the labour relations situation. So the second group of employees at the Selkirk Plant will, in fact, not be laid off at this particular time.

I understand the union is doing what they do best in these particular situations. They know that there are ups and downs in the particular industry and they are working with the company in an effort now to come to some type of arrangement re different types of shifts or scheduling to accommodate some

of the employees. If they reach a satisfactory conclusion, that will be fine.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the union and the union rep will do everything that is humanly possible to avoid the layoffs, as I am sure the company itself will. What I would like to know is what the Minister of Labour and Manpower of the province of Manitoba proposes to do in order to minimize the layoffs, not on his part, rather than to simply ensure that the provisions of the legislation are complied with?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Again, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is not understanding what the legislation is all about and that is, of course, not uncommon. The legislation is in effect so that you can prolong the notice. This is of great assistance to the union and to the employees in hopes that something will in fact take place over a period of time. What in fact was the case years ago, and I don't particularly think it happened in Manitoba, but it happened in Ontario, where companies shut the doors and men were out on the street and there was no particular notice given. Legislation was then implemented in Ontario and I think from there it flowed into Manitoba, where an appropriate type of notice for certain groups of people has to be given to give them all time to work out some system where they can be accommodated in other jobs, if in fact due to lack of back orders, or whatever the case may be, that their jobs are not there. It also gives the companies some period of lead-time to put extra pushes on in marketing and sales, which may in fact end up with the employees not getting laid off in the first place.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Following up on the questions from my leader, I would ask the Minister if he can clarify the situation in regard to the second group of employees that he talked about. Is this the group of 45, or 40, I'm not certain of the exact number, that were to be laid off at the end of this week, and is the Minister implying that those layoffs will not take place at this time, and if so, can he indicate if there has been any time schedule given for those layoffs to occur in the future?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, the first group of employees will, in fact, be laid off. The second group are to be laid off on July 11th; I understand they will not be laid off now. The company's normal shut-down period for three weeks for maintenance, renovation and holidays, which they have always had, will in fact, take place on July 11th. I know that the union and the company are discussing, and it's their business, but they're discussing the possibility of a different shift schedule to accommodate more people.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So in fact, the Minister is confirming that there will be 85 people in total, laid off. The Minister has indicated that the second group, in his earlier answer, the notification

process was not the correct process. I would ask the Minister then if he has given exemption to the rolling mills in regard to the notification process, which is his alternative under the act, so as to allow them to lay persons off on July 11th, which, if the original notice was not the proper notice, would be too short a time period to meet with the other provisions of the act in regard to notification periods.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Maybe, Mr. Speaker, I'm not speaking distinctly enough. I said, the second group would not, to the Member for Churchill, will not be laid off. There was a group of 40 and a group of 45, so the assumption in the words which will be recorded in Hansard, that 85 people in fact, will be laid off, is not correct. One of those groups will be laid off, and I share the confusion with the Member for Churchill, whether it's 40 or 45, I don't know, but there will only be one group at this particular time laid off, not 85, it will be 40 or 45.

I reiterate that the union and the company are both aware of the fact that they will be shut down on July 11th. On that particular day, there will be layoffs that were being considered, and they are considering now a variety of shift type changes to see if they can't accommodate these people, and I think they both, the employees and the union and the company share the hope that the company can be aggressive enough to get some further sales.

The member should know that the steel industry across the country is having some pretty disastrous problems. Algoma Steel in Ontario just laid off 500 people and they will not be hiring their normal 600 summer students this summer. Stelco is laying off 300 people and is proposing 200 to 400 more people. So the steel industry, for a variety of reasons, is having a bit of a slump country-wide.

**MR. COWAN:** I thank the Minister for clarifying the statement. I had either misinterpreted, or perhaps had not understood him properly as to the second layoff. I would ask the Minister, as he has the opportunity under the act, and I'll just quote very briefly from it, it says that "any employer who has given notice under Subsection (1)" which is the subsection we are talking about, "to the Minister, shall co-operate with the Minister in any action or program aimed at facilitating the re-establishment in employment of the employees involved". I would ask the Minister if he has exercised his authority under this particular subsection, and if the company has, in fact, co-operated with him; or I would ask him if he has allowed this process to unfold between only the unions and the company involved, and has not acted in an activist way in dealing with this particular layoff.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, once the union and the company can come to some conclusion about the new type of shift arrangement which may, or may not be agreed to at that particular time, our staff will be in touch with the steel workers and the company to see what type of accommodation, be it short-term or long-term, what we can do for the 40 or 45 employees that are presently being laid off.

While I am answering that particular question, I should ask the Member for Churchill if he would carry on reading the act, because he was reasonably sure himself yesterday that employees are not given

notice. The fact of the matter is, employees, unions, and the company — the company gives the employees the bargaining agent for the organization representing the employees and the government, all notice. So I think he'll find that section if he reads farther in the act.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Brandon East raised a question yesterday with regard to the passing of the 35 increase in the government income supplement. I indicated at that time that we were reviewing it, and I would like to advise the House that an Order-in-Council was signed yesterday covering those senior citizens who have been grandfathered into a group that receive social assistance as well as the GIS, and they will be receiving all of that money that has been increased. There are possibly one or two cases that would not be covered under that Order-in-Council that may be receiving social assistance, and in cases of such, the GIS is considered an income, but I have requested my field staff that if they should run across any cases of this type, to notify me before making any adjustments. It is not possible, at this time, to know if in fact there are any cases existing that we just described.

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

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** I thank the Minister, Mr. Speaker, for that information. By way of clarification, can the Minister advise, because it wasn't quite clear from his qualification, whether the senior citizens who live in nursing homes or personal care homes in Manitoba will be disqualified? I take it from his statement that they will not be disqualified in obtaining the 35 GIS bonus which the federal government seems to want to pass on.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that at the present time, any increases in GIS are automatically passed on to residents that are in personal care homes or in their own homes. The only situation that could occur would be those that are receiving social allowance as well as the GIS.

**MR. EVANS:** Again, Mr. Speaker, by way of clarification, is the Minister saying that if there are some pensioners who qualify for the social assistance, otherwise known as welfare, does this statement mean, Mr. Speaker, that such old age pensioners will not therefore receive the GIS supplement, or if they do receive the GIS supplement, is it simply a matter of deducting it from the social assistance payment?

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I believe it was in 1977, or early 1978, there were, I think approximately 630 people receiving social assistance that were grandfathered in a group that automatically receive any increases in GIS, whether they be the quarterly ones or the last one which was 35 per household. That is what that Order-in-Council covers,

and at the present time, that number has reduced to approximately 450.

Now, as I indicated earlier in my answer, there could possibly be one or two people out there that would be receiving social assistance that are not included in that group, and this is where I have requested the field staff to advise me of such cases before any adjustments are made.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the information from the Minister. One final question, and really it's by way of clarification of some confusion, because the Minister of Health, who answered yesterday, initially to my question, stated that the bonus, I think it was about a 20 bonus, was passed on last year, and I have now read, a second time in the press, whereby Manitoba did not pass on. It was one of two provinces that did not pass on a federal bonus, and I was just wondering whether the Minister could clarify, I'm curious, whether there was perhaps an error, either in the news report, or whether, perhaps the Minister didn't understand my question, but did Manitoba pass on the bonus last year, or did it not?

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm rather glad the Honourable Member for Brandon East raised that question, because I, equally, similarly, have some difficulty with understanding the news report which he read and which I have read with reference to the 20 guaranteed income supplement increase last year. My reference, yesterday, I believe — I'll have to check the record, but I believe my reference was to the 200 federal child tax credit, which was considered in the context of mothers' allowances. I did not refer, specifically, Mr. Speaker, to the 20 GIS increase, although I am sure that I did indicate to the honourable member and the House that to my knowledge, all increases in income security programs for senior citizens had been passed on last year. I concede that point, because that was my understanding.

It's still my understanding. It's possible, Mr. Speaker, that I'm wrong, and I will investigate it for the honourable member, because I don't understand the news report either.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Back to the questions responded to by the Minister of Labour, who announced his expertise on his legislation and presumably on his role as Minister of Labour, and in view of the statement, which I believe was made by the Minister of Economic Affairs yesterday, that he was sure that if there were notice of substantial layoffs given to the Minister of Labour, he would immediately inform the Minister of Economic Affairs who works closely with him. Would the Minister of Labour clarify whether it is not within his responsibility in his mind, that when he expects to consider methods by which he can re-establish in

employment the employees involved in layoffs, that he would not be discussing this matter with the Minister of Economic Affairs, who presumably has a greater knowledge of job opportunities in this province?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, my friend from St. Johns is wandering with his words. At no time am I recorded as saying that I was an expert in a particular legislation. I said that I knew the particular section that I was talking about, so we'll just get it straightened out. There are a lot of government departments that are put to work, Mr. Speaker, when there are layoffs of which we get ourselves involved in attempting to help people get re-established, whatever the situation may be in that particular case.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister, who clarified that there are a number of departments involved when situations occur of layoff, and my question then would be, the specific relating to the Selkirk Rolling Mills, and my enquiry from him whether this is not a matter which would justify his at least discussing it with the Minister of Economic Affairs, or any other Minister, to see what could be done in the long range, knowing as the Minister does, that there are more than 40-odd people about to be laid off, to see whether there could be some responsibility accepted in accordance with the implication of Section 35(1)(7).

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I don't share the pessimism of the Member for St. Johns that there may be other groups laid off. We are aware certainly at the moment that there are either 40 or 45 people being laid off. We are also aware that they are attempting to work out a shift situation which might accommodate the others. We are also aware that there's a three-week shutdown, which is a normal annual happening at that particular plant.

I would rather hear the Member for St. Johns stand up and optimistically say that he hopes, really sincerely, that sales pick up and the markets pick up and that in fact instead of laying those additional people off, that people in fact could be hired back.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge raised a question yesterday with regard to inmates that are released from the Winnipeg Remand Centre and who may have entered the facility with money and were issued a cheque when they were released.

I would indicate to the House, Mr. Speaker, that the reason that is done, is that it was requested by the provincial auditor and for auditing purposes, and arrangements have been made with two banks in the vicinity of the remand centre to have the cheques cashed there, and if there is any concern with identification, then they can contact the remand centre and be identified by phone. Also if it is not during banking hours, they normally will receive adequate cash to get them home. You can appreciate with 9,000 admissions a year at that

facility that it became necessary for auditing purposes to follow this procedure.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour, and again in regard to the notification process. I would like to take this opportunity to ask the Minister to clarify a statement he made in response to questions from my leader earlier, when he said that the first act of his government, or his department, when notification is provided to him, is to assure that the legislation is being adhered to by the company.

I would ask the Minister if he can confirm in this instance then, that the legislation was not being adhered to by the Rolling Mills Limited, and perhaps or I would imagine inadvertently so, and that is why there was a group less than 50 that were being laid off, and the fact is that if a group of less than 50 is being laid off there is no need for notification? Can he confirm that their original notification did not meet the criteria of the legislation and that is why they have had to stop the second layoff?

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that, in fact it's the very opposite. The original notification was quite correct and quite adequate. What was improper, and what took place, and I should tell the Member for Churchill I suspect that he knows, that the personnel manager at that particular company left on June 10th. There is a new one in place and I believe, in all fairness to the new personnel manager, that he probably did not precisely understand the legislation. He gave improper notice, in my opinion. But there is no notice required in fact for those companies that do in fact give notice to numbers of people under 50, so the Member for Churchill is correct in that particular instance, but initially the original notice was in fact correct.

**MR. COWAN:** I would ask the Minister, as there seems to be a tendency and a pattern which the Minister has referred to in previous questions as to this particular problem and other problems involving other employers that a general notice is given saying we shall lay off a number of employees by such and such a date, I would ask the Minister if it is not necessary for the company according to the legislation to give the date upon which the first layoff will proceed with, and that is the reason why in this instance the notification was not the proper notification in that it gave an end date instead of a starting date, and in that case are other notifications that are being routinely provided to the Minister on a yearly, or an annual, or a semi-annual basis, are they in fact not improper notification under the Act, as they do not give a specific starting date for the layoffs?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, again, there seems to some confusion about the numbers. If in fact the number was over 50, then the precise date of notification for the layoff has to be given.

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

**MR. COWAN:** I thank the Minister for that answer and would ask him in regards to his analysis of the situation across the country in regard to the steel industry, and he mentioned that, and I forget the exact name of the firm, but one of the firms would not be able to hire summer students because of the problems that they are experiencing, and it's a question we asked the Minister earlier in the session, is his department doing anything to analyze the effect of these layoffs and the affect of this down turn in the economy on employment opportunities for summer students in the province, and are they preparing a program that will in fact take into consideration the impact and will be able to provide alternative employment opportunities for summer students?

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, our government is on record as being very concerned, very interested in backing up those concerns and interests with dollars for summer employment for students in the province of Manitoba. It's just a week or two ago that I went back and got additional funds to help out with the Private Sector Youth Program, which we think this year will be extra numbers of students compared to previous years. I say to the members opposite that the young people in Manitoba seem to be versatile enough to get themselves involved in a large number of areas and large number of employment opportunities seem to be available because there certainly will be many more students without question, many more students employed this year than there have been in the past years.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the House Leader and ask him, given that there are now some 85 bills printed and before us, how many more bills we can expect?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, members opposite can expect at least 23 more bills to be distributed, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, of that surprising number, can the House Leader indicate whether some of those two dozen bills still to be introduced will be of the size and complexity of Bill 72, which we were handed today, which is some 116 pages long.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for asking that question. Bill No. 72, The Securities Act, is 116 pages long, but I point out, Mr. Speaker, it was distributed in this House last year by the Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs and there have been very few changes in it. The Minister will obviously expand upon that when he has an opportunity to introduce the bill for second reading. There are very few changes, Mr. Speaker, and surely even members opposite could consider this bill in a year.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, if it's a good bill, our administration may introduce it a year from now.

The other question I'd like to ask is in view of advertisements around the downtown area concerning proposed height limitations on buildings in the vicinity of the Legislative Building and there has been legislation on the books to that effect. I gather the government now wants to amend that, and the city is advertising that and having zoning hearings, etc. Will there be legislation amongst those bills mentioned by the Attorney-General, or is that still to come?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** No, Mr. Speaker, but we are prepared to bring other bills forward if members opposite wish.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Attorney-General how the city of Winnipeg can have advertisements in the area on telephone poles telling people that there are zoning hearings and this government is not going to have new legislation to back that up?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and enquire into that matter with the city.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for question period having expired, we will proceed with Orders of the Day.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY ADJOURNED DEBATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, would you call the resolution in my name on Page 8 of the Order Paper.

## SPEED-UP MOTION

**MR. SPEAKER:** The resolution of the Government House Leader standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, because I believe that the Honourable House Leader is honourable, and because I believe that he is sincere, I was rather upset by the fact that yesterday for the second time within a week I had a run-in with the Minister. I feel badly about it, Mr. Speaker, because I do have respect for him, and I have tried to recollect in my mind just what could have gone astray in interpretations of understanding. Mr. Speaker, I came to the conclusion that there was no real understanding arrived at, and that was supported by a newspaper report today.

Mr. Speaker, after a discussion with the Minister of Health, I sent a memo to him setting out what I understood he and I had agreed upon and which was

to go to the various caucuses. Yesterday the Honourable House Leader came to see me while I was still in caucus and said to me, waving a copy of this memorandum, it is okay providing we pass Speed-up today; that was yesterday. I told him then that I was in the midst of discussing with caucus, that I knew very well that there were at least two speakers, that is the Member for Elmwood and I definitely wished to speak, and that there might be others, and I said therefore I could not undertake that the Speed-up would pass yesterday.

I understand from our Whip that he gave five names to the House Leader of people on our side who intended to speak. Of course, that did not include the Honourable Member for Inkster or the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, each of whom has and had every right to speak for forty minutes, nor did it include the fact which subsequently came about that the Honourable First Minister decided to deal with Condolences yesterday.

I now understand that the Honourable House Leader interpreted that he gave me a sort of an ultimatum deal, this is okay providing it passes on Wednesday, and he knows very well that we did not agree that it would be passed yesterday, so I understand that may be the difference. I am sorry it occurred, I don't think it was necessary, and I hope that my regret that this kind of misunderstanding has occurred is shared by the Honourable House Leader. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we intend to deal with this Speed-up Motion without any delay and proceed with it.

What I wanted to do, Mr. Speaker, was just read into the record the fact that there were five people yesterday slated to speak. I was the second, who did speak, but as I say, there was about half-an-hour on Condolences, there was a very important contribution made by the Member for Inkster, which as I say he had every right to make, and I think it was a proper contribution, and it was clearly impossible for the Speed-up Motion to be dealt with yesterday. That is not too important, except that it does mean, Mr. Speaker, that the memorandum, which I understood was agreeable, is one which the government can say, we are not bound by it, because their stipulation that it had to be completed yesterday did not go through.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I was rather stunned to receive, as we all did, Bill 72, The Securities Act, of 116 pages concurrent with a Statute Law Amendment Act of 28 pages, which deals with a number of tax changes. Mr. Speaker, it is just an indication that there will be more and more time spent in discussing these matters, all of which, I am sure, the opposition is prepared to give, but indicates to me that this session's business was not well handled.

Regardless of that, Mr. Speaker, I want to read this memorandum into the record, and I can no longer say that this was agreed to by both sides, because it has become clear from the Honourable Attorney-General's comments, both yesterday and to the press, that they do not feel bound by it, because Speed-up was not passed yesterday. Nevertheless, I will read into the record for whatever it is worth.

It is a memo from me to the Honourable Minister of Health, with whom I have discussed this matter, and the subject is entitled Professional Association

Legislation: "Recent events convince me that it is best to rely on written memos rather than verbal understandings. I believe the NDP Caucus accepts the speed-up procedure for the balance of this session, although it resents the inexcusable and unusual delay in presentation of an inordinate number of bills. A special concern has been the number of private member professional association bills, which will require a great deal of study. We were prepared to make this an extended debating issue with the Speed-up Motion, but the discussion that you and I had persuaded me that we can manage the workload on the following basis:

(1) Bill 30, Canadian Institute of Management; Bill 62, The Pharmaceutical Act; Bill 63, The Medical Act; Bill 64, The Registered Respiratory Technicians Act; Bill 92, The Veterinary Medical Act; and any other professional bills yet to be introduced be referred to an Intersessional Legislative Committee for review and report.

(2) Bill 65, The Registered Nurses; Bill 66, Registered Psychiatric Nurses; Bill 87, Licensed Practical Nurses; will be dealt with this session, but after second reading will be referred to a special committee for a section by section review and to hear briefs, and will be dealt with concurrently so that there can be an attempt to have consistent provisions made where applicable.

(3) You will assign a staff person to this committee to assist in the technical review.

(4) This procedure in itself may be of great help in determining a format for the intersessional committee work.

(5) Cabinet should be given the authority to refer other professional draft bills to this committee.

(6) If the above is agreeable, I will try to persuade caucus to appoint its members to the special committee and the intersessional committee, and to pass second reading of Bills 65, 66, and 87 quickly so that the committee can start its work.

I will hand this memo to our House Leader and review it with caucus so we can act on it as soon as we receive concurrence from your House Leader."

That is the end of the memo, Mr. Speaker.

As I say, I understand now from the reaction of the House Leader yesterday that the government is not bound by this memo of understanding. I accept that for whatever it is worth, and now it is up to the government to decide how it is going to handle its business for the balance of the term.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of how cooperative we are for the balance of the session, it will be a lengthy session, because, Mr. Speaker, when you look at The Securities Act, I will have to go back to see what was said last year on this, but the Act was pulled, obviously before it was properly studied by this session, and therefore, the fact that it was brought in last year, like The Education Bill was brought in last year, that in no way means, Mr. Speaker, that it will receive cursory or summary review and pass without a proper review.

The Securities legislation is highly complicated, highly technical. I don't believe there is any important principle involved that would separate the Conservative from the New Democratic Party's view on the need for it, but that doesn't matter, Mr. Speaker. Legislators have a responsibility to review

their legislation, and we intend to do so in all respects.

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

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will try, in the course of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, to be as brief as possible in order that we can expedite the passage of this particular motion. I would indicate at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I very much enjoyed the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Inkster yesterday. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that it was, quite frankly, indeed an education for me to hear him speak.

It was, I thought, very obvious that he knew the subject matter thoroughly, was conversant with the practicalities and all the difficulties that face a government trying to implement a legislative program. And I think, with the knowledge of those exigencies, Mr. Speaker, he showed that he had a very artful command of the situation that confronts this particular government, and I quite agreed with his conclusion that there is simply nothing in this particular program that merits or demands that this House continue to sit without adjournment on a speed-up basis, and I would indicate — a so-called speed-up basis — extended hours do indeed seem to be unwarranted in the current circumstances, Mr. Speaker. As the member has said, there are but a very few bills that deserve that sort of attention by the government, and they fall within the purview of that attention because they reflect the government's philosophy and doctrine.

So indeed, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all members agree that the government has a right to demand passage of those sorts of pieces of legislation, and I say that, Mr. Speaker, conscious of the fact that the opposition has a right to attempt to deny that passage to the government, but inevitably, of course, must fail.

Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the motion before the House, I did some research. My personal history is such that I can't provide much of any benefit by way of reciting my own experience, but I can, Mr. Speaker, fall back on research material gleaned from the records of this Assembly which I think give us a more accurate perspective with respect to the extended hours motion before us.

Mr. Speaker, members have indicated, and I suppose most specifically the Honourable Attorney-General and Government House Leader, have indicated that there has been an undue prolongment or protraction of the affairs of the House since the New Democratic Party has come across to this side as opposition. Mr. Speaker, I have researched that to find out whether, indeed, more sitting days have taken place since 1977, and my research indicates that there is not much between the number of days, or the duration of the session prior to 1977 and that after. Notwithstanding the spirited resistance that's been demonstrated on this side, Mr. Speaker, the figures are as follows:

In 1974, Mr. Speaker, we had 96 sitting days; in 1975, we had 75 sitting days; in 1976, we had 82 sitting days. I discovered, Mr. Speaker, that in 1977, the year of the present government's ascendancy, there were some 84 sitting days; in 1978, some 88;

and in 1979, 83. So I think if anybody tried to extrapolate from those figures some sort of constant conclusion, they would be, on the basis of logic, unable to do so, Mr. Speaker. Clearly, there has not been a sitting to match 1974 since that year. I suppose, being in our 92nd day today, this session may well do that, Mr. Speaker. But nevertheless, to date we haven't had a sitting of that sort in six years. 82 days in 1976 compares quite favourably to last year's 83 days, so unless we count but a very few days, we can say that there seems to be some parity as between the two parties in opposition, at least on the basis of three-year performance records.

If we want to look at the number of bills, Mr. Speaker, which have received Royal Assent as between the two governments, I would indicate again that there seems to be some constancy and consonance as between governmental responsibility and the number of days required to pass a legislative slate. In 1974, the New Democratic Party proclaimed some 89 bills. That was out of 97 bills, Mr. Speaker, that were introduced for first reading. That was the year that I told you it took 96 days prior to prorogation. This year, Mr. Speaker, we are already somewhere near 85 bills introduced, and we're looking at another 24, if my arithmetic is right, we're looking at approximately 109 bills. So is it really remarkable, Mr. Speaker, that in 1980 we're going to sit more days than we did in that record-breaking year of 1974?

So if we go to 101 or 105 days, Mr. Speaker, in terms of a correlation, we can only say that there is obviously a positive correlation between the number of bills introduced by the government and the number of days the House sits. I think in fairness the government should appreciate that, because they were in the same position in 1974 as opposition.

So there is a constancy again; in 1975, only 58 bills received Royal Assent and that was the fewest number of days in the three years of the Conservative Opposition. In 1976, it went up again, we went up to 81 bills and we are back to 82 days. So there is almost a direct correlation, or direct proportion as between the number of bills, Mr. Speaker, and the length of the session. That's a fact of life.

And I say that, Mr. Speaker, because in doing some research into the situation in other Legislatures, I discovered that Manitoba, much to my shock, is now ranked as No. 3 in terms of the number of sitting days actually prevailing year to year. 1979, only Ontario and Quebec, the Assemblies of those two provinces had more sitting days. Ontario had 119 and Quebec had 93, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the budgets in those provinces are more extensive, more sizable than Manitoba's, a much larger population base, but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, as I said, there is constancy as between the members opposite experienced in opposition and ours.

What I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that it appears that this Legislature for reasons unknown, regardless of party, regardless of who is in opposition or government, is exceedingly active, which, Mr. Speaker, I must say is to the credit of I think, this Assembly. This Assembly works. It would appear that we, and I would hope that would be reported, that notwithstanding the size of our

budget, our population, or anything else, this Assembly sits number three of the ten provincial Legislatures in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I want to note one difference, there is a considerable difference. We are also number three, Mr. Speaker, with respect to another item, and that is the fact that we are now amongst the only three provinces that still adhere to the old-style sessional sitting. My research, and I'm not suggesting it's conclusive, Mr. Speaker, because it's very hard to find definitive materials on this subject matter, but my research, such as it is, indicated that only Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, the two smallest provinces in Canada, still adhere to the one-session, one-sitting rule. They, Mr. Speaker, don't sit as long as we do; they are at the other end of the spectrum with respect to their sitting days. And, Mr. Speaker, they too sit from the late winter to the late spring or the early summer. But, Mr. Speaker, everyone else seems to have abandoned that practice, notwithstanding that many of those provinces sit fewer days than us. Everybody else seems to be on a two-semester basis. Everybody seems to have an adjournment, whether it be for the summer vacation or a winter, Christmas, New Year's vacation; that seems to be the style across our country.

Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Inkster said, and again I think we should consider what he said, it's significant that unless a government has something substantive to present by way of legislative, as they perceive reform, that the government should be willing to consider first the integrity of the system, the need for due process and regularity in the process, and should well consider a system that's more consistent with common sense.

Members opposite I suppose might say that we didn't do it, so that on some sort of basis reflects hypocrisy if any New Democrat rises to say that, but, Mr. Speaker, whether that is factually so or not — I don't know whether in each year that was factually so or not — it seems to me that reform has to come everywhere, and one of things that we have to scrutinize very carefully, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not we are providing a format that is consistent with the necessary business that we must conduct in this House, and I suggest that we simply are failing to do that.

It is impossible, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that Bill No. 72 might have been in some form or other before the House last year; it is impossible during the process of extended hours or Speed-up to contemplate 155 sections of what at very best is Byzantine, complicated, exceedingly technical legislation. The members opposite may feel that we are crying crocodile tears, Mr. Speaker, but I can assure them that's not so. If they were facing our predicament, they would be saying the same things. It is virtually impossible to digest this sort of legislation on this sort of basis, having regard, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that many of our members who are responsible for close research on bills — and the members opposite know that there's a division of responsibility with some members having to pay more attention to bills while others do other work of the House, be it Private Members' Resolutions, or concentrating efforts on committee work, so on and so forth. There is, Mr. Speaker, a division of responsibility within the caucus, and as a result of

that, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be exceedingly difficult for those members, perhaps a dozen on this side, who are responsible more primarily for bills, to closely scrutinize legislation such as this in the days to come. It is very difficult to sit until 2:00 o'clock in the morning, Mr. Speaker, and then take off another eight hours to look at 155 sections of this sort of legislation. It's esoteric legislation. I'm not a securities' analyst, and I daresay no one in this House is capable of looking at that unless they have specialized assistance available.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have good reason to concern ourselves about the processes of our House. Whether they have fallen into disrepair, Mr. Speaker, perhaps is a question for wiser heads than mine, but having heard the Member for Inkster, and then hearing the general concurrence of the Member for St. Johns — both of them, Mr. Speaker, have extensive legislative experience in, not only this forum, but others as well — I would suggest that there is some reason to give credence to the comments made from the opposition side.

Mr. Speaker, I simply fail to see why there is any urgency in the wind-up or the proroguing of the session. I do not understand why we have to live within these parameters. We take the job fully conscious of the fact that it is a primary responsibility. We know that the hours are going to be bizarre, because anyone who is at all involved in political activity knows that's the nature of the beast; I think the expectations in that regard are realistic on the part of most people who enter this forum. We don't expect — I don't think we expect that we are going to be given preferential treatment with respect to our status as working people. I don't we would expect anybody else to pack it up after working four months or five months. I, certainly, as a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, I work 12 months of the year. As a legislator I'm prepared to work 12 months of the year. I would like a vacation, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I full well expect to put in at least a 40-hour week, something approximating 50 weeks a year. Mr. Speaker, in the course of our own affairs, whether we were employees or whether we were self employed, I am sure we all did the same. I daresay there's not a member of this House that didn't follow that pattern of work throughout his or her life.

Mr. Speaker, why do we come here and suddenly expect that we will be able to abbreviate our annual working responsibilities? It makes no sense. We have very serious work to do. It's very complex. It requires a lot of concentration as well as patience, Mr. Speaker. In that regard, I'll digress only to say that when I first came here, I was very very impatient. I was used to a political format wherein meetings were held once every two weeks for approximately five or six hours, and I was used to attending perhaps one committee meeting for two or three hours a week. I was used to having everything compacted and condensed. We were allowed only a debating limit of five minutes. You could get an extension of 10 on any resolution, but, Mr. Speaker, I was used to that. Perhaps I felt I was poorly trained, I fell into bad habits, but I was impatient. Somehow I felt that a lot of what happened here, and I'm being very candid, I think, was window dressing, and perhaps unnecessary.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have through experience learned something about the mechanism that propels this Assembly, and in doing so, Mr. Speaker, I now have gained better than a state of acquiescence. I think I understand the significance, the close significance of why we do things as we do. But this is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that I don't understand. The only thing I can relate this to, this speed-up process to, is an anachronistic falling back, or harkening back to the days when this Assembly had very little work, when the economy of this province was agriculturally oriented, and most of the members of the House came from places far away and had responsibilities with respect to farming activity.

So I presume that's the only logical rationale, that members came in the early new year with a view towards getting back to put in the crop, tend to their farms. That's all I can think of. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, there are better reasons, and perhaps my conclusions are wrong. But, Mr. Speaker, I can't understand, what other reason that would be necessary to wind it up.

It seems to me that the members of the treasury bench do have considerable responsibility, Mr. Speaker, but I note, and I note with respect, because it's a matter of practice on both sides of the House when in government, that members of the Cabinet are given considerable latitude in their attendance. Nobody would expect, for instance, Mr. Speaker, the Premier to be here day in and day out listening to every submission. It's understood that there's business to be done and that members of the Cabinet can absent themselves when they find it necessary to do so. And very few questions are ever asked, Mr. Speaker. I've never heard, with perhaps one or two exceptions, I've never heard a member of the opposition enquire after where a member is, not anyway on a frivolous basis, Mr. Speaker. It seems that everybody works within the understanding, within what appears to be the convention — and it's well understood by all that members are given this sort of latitude.

So what, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of some very important legislation, motivates the speed-up process. It seems to me that there should be consideration given to dealing with legislation on a semester basis, falling into line with the other seven provinces, and certainly the other two who have similar numbers of sitting days. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that that is consistent with good reason, and good will as well, particularly in view of the fact, and I don't mean to be politically opportunistic, but particularly when we are to have a bill dealing with salaries in the next short while.

Also, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I want to remind you that, notwithstanding the fact that the government insists on the early passage of its legislative program, I see no reciprocal haste to vote on private members' resolutions, or public bills. I don't see any great eagerness to broach that particular subject matter, Mr. Speaker, which also defines the government's positions, politically and philosophically, and also would show some consistency in the government's approach in this regard. Nor do I see any great haste or eagerness to deal with matters which have been adjourned for consideration by committee. We are still waiting, Mr. Speaker, and we have been waiting now for more

than a year, I believe, for a committee of this House to be struck to deal with the Freedom of Information resolution that received all-party approval last session. But Mr. Speaker, there appears to be no will on the part of the government side to deal with this.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a two-edged sword that we seem to be dealing with. I think only a detailed assessment and evaluation of our procedures will lead us out of this predicament, if that's what it is, although I don't think it is. I think we could sit normal hours well into the fall and it wouldn't make a bit of difference. That's the business of being a legislator, of being an MLA, and anyone who thinks otherwise, Mr. Speaker, should put it in an election pamphlet, that they do not believe that they should have to sit more than 4 1/2 months a year, and see what results that brings.

Certain members of the House have been almost strident in their discussion of the government's proposed salary increases, and I'm suggesting that some of those members, particularly one, Mr. Speaker, is on the government side. Mr. Speaker, a member such as that should be on his feet fighting for the prolonged hours, not prolonged hours, but for the due process of this House. He shouldn't be supporting this extended hours motion, speed-up motion, he should be on his feet supporting due process. That, Mr. Speaker, would be consistent with the position he's formerly taken with respect to salaries.

So, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it's incumbent on legislators to do their job, certainly to work as hard as all other members of society, and on that basis I am opposing the speed-up motion, and I will indicate that if ever the day should come when I am a member of a governmental caucus, I will do the same. I will say my part in that caucus and I will reflect the views that I have put on the record this afternoon. And, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that one day it is possible, as the Member for Elmwood was reminded, it is possible that in a case where there is a Government Whip, I will be put in the position where I may have to — and I hope it's not the case — I may have to support this sort of motion in the absence of good reason. I hope that will never be the case, Mr. Speaker, but I can assure you that in my caucus, I will be forthcoming and forthright in my opinions with respect to this matter.

Thank you.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will attempt to be brief. I have prefaced some very long speeches with that remark before, but I believe in this instance, I can hold true to my intentions in that that which has been said about the speed-up motion, of the extended hours motion previous to my participation in debate, I feel has said anything that I can say, probably much better than I could say it in this regard, and for that reason I have listened intently to the submissions that have been made, both by some very experienced people in this House, and some people who share with me a newness to this House.

I have done so because I have tried to understand what one of the members on this side has referred to

I think as an annual rush into lunacy. Perhaps I'm paraphrasing him unfairly, but I think that was at least the intent of —(Interjection)— annual trek into madness, I'm informed by the Member for Wellington, and that, indeed is how I view this whole process of the speed-up or the extended hours.

I listened to the contribution from the Member for Inkster with a great deal of interest in regard to trying to determine why it is he was prepared to support this sort of a motion, and have found that there are in certain instances, or there could be in certain instances, very valid reasons to stand in support of extending the hours. He gave us a classic example and that example, of course, was the Autopac debate, where it appeared as if the government would be obstructed in its efforts if it did not in some way impose its will. And imposed its will in a democratic fashion, and imposed its will in the finest traditions and procedures of this House, and it did so because, or was forced to do so because it had a great fear that if it did not do so that they would not be able to pass a very valued piece of legislation and a piece of legislation that they strongly intended to put in place.

In that instance, I can understand the need for sitting extended hours, but we are not in that particular situation now. As the Member for Inkster continued on in his debate, we don't have that sort of legislation before us. Now, I wish we did. I wish we had a good piece of legislation — well, perhaps we do. Perhaps the Rent Controls and the Public Schools Act, those two pieces of legislation are such that we can, to use a colloquial, can sink our teeth into and can get a good debate flowing.

But we don't intend to obstruct those two pieces of legislation. We don't intend to in any inordinate fashion stop those two pieces of legislation from continuing through subversive or through insincere attempts. We intend to argue our case, we intend to make our case as strongly as we can, and that may necessitate making it at some length. Because one politician said, unless you say something a hundred times it really hasn't sunk in, and I try to remember that every Question Period, Mr. Speaker. But the fact is that we will debate these issues and we will debate them in the finest traditions of this House, and that is the way in which a process should unfold.

If ever there was a need — or a lack of need, let me phrase it in the negative — if ever there was a lack of need for an extended hours motion, I believe this particular session is such a session. And if every there was a need to look at a different way of dealing with the work of this House, I believe these times in which we live — and I am talking about perhaps the last five years, perhaps the last two years, perhaps the last decade, I am not certain — are times in which we should review, as the Member for Wellington has said, we shall review our work here in the way in which we attempt to go about performing our functions and our duties.

I have to concur with the Member for Wellington and I think the Member for Inkster suggested that it was a viable alternative also, and I think everyone on this side, maybe with one or two exceptions, has said, let us look towards a different way of dealing with the business of this House, and that is most frequently described as a semester system or sitting with an extended break in between — not two

sessions, but one session that has a prolonged adjournment or two prolonged adjournments, perhaps one at Christmas and one during the summer.

I think that we can look at that now as a Legislature in some sincerity and some seriousness, because I believe that our work as legislators is increasing and I believe that we must develop new ways and means to new parliamentary technologies for the province of Manitoba in order to facilitate the greater needs and demands that are imposed upon us as legislators.

I stand, to go back to my original remarks, not so much to make a prolonged speech, not so much to add a great deal to the debate, because it is already said, but I stand to put a number of things on the record, a number of concepts, a number of personal opinions on the record. I take this opportunity to do it because I, as the Member for Wellington, fully understand that there may be a time in the future when there is a Whip on and we are put in a position of in fact voting against something which we may personally believe not be in the best interests of our personal efforts in this House. I make these remarks while in opposition, because I know full well it is easier to speak against speed-up in opposition than it is if you are part of a government that is trying to impose speed-up or extended hours, and that is why I take this particular opportunity to make the remarks.

The one remark is, I would like to see this House move towards the semester system, or move towards an extended hour system, but not a compressed extended hour system, because that is what we are talking about now. We are talking about taking the extended hours that we know are necessary to sit in order to perform our functions well, and compressing them into a very short period of time. It makes just as much sense to me to take those extended hours and extend them out over a longer period of time, so that we do in our off-hours, from being forced to sit in this House, have time to review the legislation, have time to talk to people whom that legislation may impact, so that we can have their opinion. We can have the time to provide comprehensive arguments, comprehensive suggestions, comprehensive ideas to the government, because even the government has said, and almost every representative of the government from one time or another, has said, a good opposition can make our job easier, a good opposition can give us suggestions, a good opposition can provide us with input which will enable us to be a better government. I believe we have done that as an opposition. That is a double-edged sword also, but there is political considerations that I don't want to talk about at this juncture.

The fact is, I take the role, or I take my role as opposition very seriously, and I believe that we can provide input, suggestion, criticism and ideas, concepts, etc., to the government, and in fact not only can we do that, but we have a responsibility to do so. So if we can and if we have a responsibility to, then we should also have a right to do so. I believe that sitting extended hours reduces our effectiveness, and by that reduces our right to deal with the legislation in a comprehensive way. It will be very difficult to look through this Bill 72 that has

been introduced today, and come up with a comprehensive critique on it, notwithstanding what the Attorney-General told us today, and that is, it is very similar to a bill that was introduced into this House last year and therefore we should know the contents, we should be aware of the contents, we should have developed critiques, we should have developed considerations, suggestions and criticisms, and all that should have been done, not even knowing if the bill was going to be introduced this year. That is a fallacious argument.

The Attorney-General — and I enjoy speaking when the Attorney-General is in the House, because he provides me with gestures and comments that enable me to more fully understand some of the motivations and some of the process that is unfolding on that side of the House.

The fact is that if it is so similar to the Act that was introduced last year, why wasn't it on the Order Paper months ago, which it could have been? If there were so few changes, why did it take so long to bring it before us? It comes before us on a day that we are most likely — and he will like this — we are most likely going to pass the speed-up resolution. —(Interjection)— He says I'm kidding. No, I am not kidding. I hope for his sake and for the sake of the workings of this House that there are no more misunderstandings about that and if understandings have been created, I hope that they are understood well and that they are abided by. But the fact is, we get a bill of 116 pages, how many sections?

**A MEMBER:** 155.

**MR. COWAN:** One-hundred and fifty-five sections, on the day that we are going to go into speed-up and the Minister tells us there is going to be 24 more bills or approximately 24 more bills. There may be 34 more, am I wrong? I'm wrong, okay. There may be more than 23 more. Am I wrong? —(Interjection)— I am right. One out of two isn't bad, one out of two isn't bad. The fact is that there may be more than 23 of 150 pages; I mean there could be. There is nothing that says there doesn't have to be. —(Interjection)— They are all under 150 pages I am told now.

Are they all under 100 pages? Now that is a more difficult question. For those of you who heard the silence, I was waiting for a reaction from the Attorney-General and I didn't get it, and I am not going to suggest that means that there are some over 100 pages. What I am going to suggest is it means that there is some legislation that is going to come before us in the future that may in fact necessitate a fair amount of work on the part of the critics, on the part of the opposition, in order to analyse it, and if we don't analyse it we are not doing our job. Let's make that very clear.

So what we do, as the Member for Wellington said, is we go home at night at 2:00 o'clock in the morning and sit down bleary-eyed with a particular bill and try to understand what is in that particular bill, what impact that will have on the people of this province, and how should we react to it. That is not the best way, at least for myself, in which to perform my functions and my duties, but I have said that before.

The second point that I want to put on the record is I believe that the speed-up in many respects lessens the effectiveness of the opposition and in fact — and I think that is one of the reasons why there is such a thing as speed-up — and I believe also that it lessens the effectiveness of the government. That may be more subtle and less apparent, but I believe it to be a fact nonetheless. I believe that you cannot work the sorts of hours that we are expected to work in speed-up and come in here bright-eyed and able to fully understand what seem to be some very complicated and complex arguments. So the fact is, I believe that it reduces our effectiveness and I believe that it reduces the effectiveness of the government in two ways; one, that they are tired; number two, they need us, this government particularly needs us.

I mean, we saw a classic example. You know, there would have been 85 people laid off at the Selkirk Rolling Mills by the end of the week if yesterday members of the opposition had not stood in their place and suggested that there was something wrong with the notification process, which tempted, I am certain and I am not privy to what happens behind closed doors, but I can guess. And my guess is that the Minister went back and said, let me see that letter, mm-hmm, mm-hmm, uh-huh, that letter doesn't meet the requirements of the regulations. My goodness, if we allow that to happen they will be in contravention of the Act, therefore we are not going to allow that to happen and we saved either 40 or 45 jobs for another three weeks in the community of Selkirk. That is a good opposition, that is a good Leader of the Opposition, and that is good other members of the opposition who partook in that debate.

That is a small example, that is a very small example of the role in which we can play, but it is a timely, topical and pertinent example, and that is why I provide you with it.

The fact is that we in many other ways can make them a better government. Unfortunately, and if only we could, we can't make them a good government, but we can make them a better government. So why do they want the speed-up? I don't understand why they want the speed-up. We are not obstructing them. As a matter of fact by sitting the regular hours we are probably helping them, and they need all the help they can get. If it reduces our effectiveness and if it takes away one of our rights, and I believe it does, although that is a more complex argument that I don't want to take the time to extrapolate into a longer series of comments, I do believe that the speed-up is going to act in detriment of our work here and thereby, and this is important, act to the detriment of the people of this province.

Now we have reached a very crucial issue. If we are not here to provide the best that we have to the people of this province, what are we here for? If we are not here to deal with the matters that so profoundly affect their lives, why are we here? If we are here to do that, why would we want to put ourselves under conditions and circumstances that would not allow us to fully exercise our best judgment and to fully exercise our expertise and our abilities? I don't understand why and that is why I don't understand why we have the speed-up now. I understand why we can have it in certain instances,

as the Member for Inkster said, but I am not certain why it is happening now.

There is another factor involving the people of Manitoba, and I would like to place on the record, although not verbatim, a conversation that I had with an elderly gentleman who called me the other day and said, Mr. Cowan, why are they going into speed-up? You know what I said to him? I said, Call the Attorney-General. I don't know if he got the call or not. But the fact is this man went on to say to me that he was concerned because he had made it a habit of listening to the proceedings of this House, and I know that there are many others out there who make it a habit of listening to the proceedings of this House. As a matter of fact, I am astounded at how many people say, I saw this on question period, or I heard you say this in the House, or I heard so-and-so say this in the House. The people out there are listening. I think that is positive, I encourage it, I think that is great. Perhaps they're listening now; yes, indeed if they are, I told you I'd promised to get this on the record, and I am; another promise fulfilled.

But the fact is, that if we start sitting the extended hours, they will be unable to listen; they will be unable to fully understand the workings of this House. They will be unable to fully judge the government; perhaps another reason for Speed-up. Perhaps they don't want people to judge them in that way. I believe that they have a responsibility to listen, and I believe that having that responsibility, they have a right to listen, and I would not want to do anything to lessen that responsibility nor to lessen that right.

Another reason to vote against the resolution that has been brought forward by the Attorney-General is that I believe the people of this province more and more, every day, more and more, want to understand the workings of this Legislature; are taking advantage of the opportunity to understand the workings of this Legislature, and I want to make that as easy for them as possible, because I believe the more informed the electorate is, the more informed the public is, the easier it is for us as legislators to develop policy, programs, legislation, regulations that more fully suit their needs, because the more informed they become the more vocal they become; the more vocal they become the more they provide input; the more input they provide the broader base your opinion-forming group is, and the broader-based your opinion-forming group is, the better your opinions are going to be. And that's a personal philosophy; not everyone shares that, by the way.

If I can bring to the record another item on a matter that was brought to my attention last year, that is, when we go into Speed-up these committee meetings sometimes last late into the evening. Now I understand that the government wants to get their business done. I understand that they want this House to complete its sitting, and I understand why they want it to, because it's easier on them, because it enables them to spend more time to the administrative work, and a government, I would assume, would like to spend more time to administrative work than to the legislative work. In essence the proceedings of this House in many cases may be perceived by them to be a nuisance

rather than a positive force, and I'm not trying to impute motives and I'm not directing my comments to any individual. I'm just saying that if one looks at the situation in overview, one could legitimately and reasonably come to that conclusion, and if that is the case, then that should also extend to the committee hearings, because I know they want to hear what the public has to say. I understand that, but I know also that they want to tie up the business of this House and get out of here. So then they are going to extend the committee meetings later and later and later. I know the instance of one gentleman who came to me and said, I was called at 12:00 o'clock to come down here in two hours and speak before a committee. Now does that sound reasonable? It didn't sound reasonable to the individual. It doesn't sound reasonable to me. I know that all governments have done it from time to time. I know that does not make it right, but when we go into Speed-up we facilitate that sort of abuse of the system, and I believe it to be abuse of the system. So again I am opposed to going into Speed-up for that reason; one of many reasons.

I promised to be brief. I think I will; another promise fulfilled. That's two this speech. This has been a remarkably unique speech for me in that regard.

In closing, I would just like to put very distinctly and plainly in as strong terms as I feel is necessary, on the record, my opposition to what we are about to embark upon, and that is the Speed-up or the extended hours' sitting. I do so for a number of reasons which I believe I have made very clear. And I too commit myself, as has done my colleague for Wellington and others, I am certain, both publicly and privately, if we are ever put in the position of making that sort of decision, to try to reflect upon the comments that have been made during this debate and to try to come up with a process that we feel will more capably and better serve the people of this province, than the process, the annual trek into madness, as I believe the member for Wellington said, — for Logan, perhaps it was the Member for Logan, one of those two referred to it as the annual trek into madness — and although I understand the process a bit better, I do not believe that understanding has led me to any other conclusion than that it is a disservice to ourselves as legislators, and a disservice to the people of this province, and will therefore vote against such a resolution.

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

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to make a few brief remarks on this particular motion. I don't believe I have ever spoken on a Speed-up motion before — not that that is unusual, I suppose, because a lot of people haven't spoken on Speed-up motions — indeed I haven't spoken on too many bills either.

But I wanted to put a couple of thoughts on the record, and first of all to say that I agree with the comments just made by colleague from Churchill, and also the previous speaker, my colleague from Wellington, on this matter. I think they made a lot of common-sense suggestions and they put forward with great conviction and sincerity their concerns

about what is entailed in a Speed-up motion and the process that it involves.

However, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that with the new system of estimates' review that we have, two committees meeting simultaneously, and with no deadline or time limit on the meeting hour in the evening, or in the early morning, that we are in a form of modified Speed-up throughout the year. It seems to me — well I'm not criticizing the system, I'm just observing that in fact there is some efficiency running two committees and so on. I have the feeling that we've been in Speed-up for some time, and yet when it comes time for Speed-up, the government of course has greater control over the House than it has otherwise, as I understand it, and we could be expected to sit around the clock if necessary and do some very strange things that the citizens out there don't understand.

One gets particularly concerned when we find that there are 23 bills yet to come, particularly if some of them are of the nature of Bill No. 72, which is a very long bill; however, upon investigation, there may not be too much that's very controversial in it. It may be a very technical bill, a very administrative type of bill, something that suits the needs of that particular — the industry, if I can use that term, or people who are involved in this type of legal work.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite probably get very fed up at times during the estimates' process, feeling very exasperated, very impatient with the opposition asking interminable questions and ragging around, so they would think, certain points of view. But, Mr. Speaker, this is not a business. We don't have the discipline of the balance sheet. We don't have a profit and loss situation, and it's the job of the opposition, whichever party, to keep the "government" side honest — and I use that term in the broad sense — to keep the government honest; to keep the government on its toes, and this what we are paid for, whoever is sitting on this side. One of the basic reasons for being here is to ask questions, probe and dig and suggest and so on. I don't expect the government side very often to listen to the suggestions, but nevertheless that is part of the job as well.

I think, Mr. Speaker, without trying to be repetitive as to what has been suggested, I would just like to put on the record, that to my way of thinking, the Speed-up session is part and parcel of the decline that we've witnessed in the parliamentary system in Canada, and the legislative system that we have in Manitoba, the legislative system perhaps we have in other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for a parliamentary system of government to cope with the enormous amount of legislation that we have today. It's very difficult to cope with the very complicated set of problems that come before government today. I think Robert Stanfield has some very apropos comments to make on the state of the legislative process in Canada. He has written an article in the June/July issue of this year in a magazine called *Policy Options*, which I think every member gets. Mr. Stanfield, who I have a great deal of respect for, Mr. Speaker, says: "50 years ago the citizen had no more respect for the politician than he has today, but then it did not matter much because few expected or

demanded much from politicians, the role of government was so much more limited than today."

I think that's a very apt observation, Mr. Speaker, that government has become very complicated, and indeed the Legislative Assembly, not just the Manitoba Assembly, but the parliamentary system of government that we have has been overloaded, and really it's a travesty of the original idea of a parliamentary democracy. Parliament representing the people cannot cope with the great deal of the legislation that comes forward, and even looking at the spending programs and the estimates, to understand all of the implications.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the theory that the Legislature controls government, is not true. That is the theory, the government comes here for one basic reason, and that is to get approval of the legislators, the taxpayers' representatives, for certain sums of moneys to carry on the business of government, and in that process the Legislature asks questions and makes suggestions and considers legislation. But I say simply, Mr. Speaker, let's face it, the Legislature doesn't really control the government. And I include the backbenchers, because I really wonder how many people behind the government really understand all the legislation that's coming forward, really understand the programs that are in the different departments. They are probably as surprised about some of this as members of the opposition are when the legislation comes forward, or when the programs are announced throughout estimates. I think Speed-up makes this even more so. That is that there is even less control by the Legislature in the Speed-up process.

You could ask, well who is in control? Is the Cabinet in control? And I often wonder whether the Cabinet itself is in control of the governmental process. So I ask, who does control? And again I refer to this article by Mr. Stanfield, the Honourable Robert L. Stanfield, former leader of the Conservative Party in Canada. He says, "More and more matters for all practical purposes are being decided by and implemented by the bureaucracy."

Now of course he was writing essentially about the federal system, but it applies also to the provincial system. For all practical purposes much of the material that we are considering has been decided by the bureaucracy, and the question then arises, just to what extent can the Cabinet control the bureaucracy and have the bureaucracy perform the job that the Cabinet wants, and have the bureaucracy bring forth the policy options that a Minister can decide, that a Cabinet can decide.

I think in some ways that this is why this Chamber can be considered more theatre than it can be considered a Chamber of a Legislative Assembly, in a sense that there is a lot of drama that goes on here, a lot of posturing on both sides. I'm not knocking any individual, there's just a lot of drama that takes place here, and it's exciting at times. But unfortunately, I think, for the citizens, there could be and should be more review and intensive consideration and debate of legislation of the major programs that are brought forth, and I believe therefore that the citizens of Manitoba would be better served if we followed some of the suggestions made by my colleagues that have just spoken, perhaps two sittings a year, which would bring us in

line, I guess, with seven other provinces. I think only Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick now have the one sitting per year. Certainly all the western provinces sit twice a year and certainly Ontario and Quebec do.

There could be, and I think the citizens would be better served if there were, perhaps, intersession committees on certain pieces of legislation, and give the backbenchers on the government side more work to do. Make their job more meaningful than it is today, because really — and again, I'm not saying this in any partisan way — the major function of a backbencher for the government side is to keep the government in power, to get up and vote at the appropriate time.

I appreciate the fact that there can be discussion of issues in caucus, and I know there is, and I know there can be controversy and the backbencher on the government side has some opportunity at that point, but sometimes that's limited, too. And as I say, as we get more and more legislation, more and more complicated programs, it's even more and more difficult for all of the members of this Legislature to be an effective legislator, to be an effective member of the House.

So I would support the suggestion of having two sittings a year. I would support the suggestion of having intersession committees, and I would like to put in a plug at this time also for more research for members of the Legislature, for private members of the Legislature. The government side is not badly off because the Ministers, of course, have their entire bureaucracy, presumably, theoretically at their disposal, and perhaps some of the private members on the government side can get some assistance from co-operative Ministers; but on the opposition side, we had very little support, very little research support. There are some moneys, but I would say that is not adequate. Those funds are not adequate, and I really believe that the taxpayers of this province, the citizens of this province could be very well served if we had better research facilities for the opposition in this House, whichever party.

I would not suggest that the House would go on longer, that there would be more sittings, more days of sitting because of this, but I would think that there would be a lot more effective debate, there would be a lot more meaningful questions, and a lot more meaningful suggestions coming forth. I note, in many provinces now, that there are considerable funds available for opposition members. I stand to be corrected, but I believe in the province of Ontario, every member, every MPP in Ontario, has a research assistant, or maybe he or she is called an Executive Assistant, I'm not sure, but one assistant at least. I'm not suggesting that we should have that set-up, but I'm pointing that as an example, and other Assemblies have other arrangements.

So I really feel that improved research facilities, increased research facilities, could make the quality of debate better and the quality of estimates review better. But I conclude by observing again that the Speed-up process which may be necessary to sort of clean up things does contribute to the demise of the effectiveness of a democratically-elected legislature, particularly when we think of all the legislation that we have to deal with, some of it perhaps rather complicated, some of it not so complicated, but

nevertheless, deserving of some attention, and deserving of some study. And I would hope that when the motion is passed and we do go into the speed-up process, that the government side will at least be reasonable and we will not be sitting here until 3:00, 4:00 o'clock in the morning night after night, just to get things through, that we will try to be as efficient as possible, of course, but try to be rational and reasonable at the same time.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader will be closing debate.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, let me first of all indicate, if I had not indicated when I spoke on this motion, that I have had the opportunity to review the debate that's taken place on the speed-up motion for the last number of years back in the days of the previous administration and our administration, and I probably should have indicated at the beginning that I certainly see, during speed-up, Mr. Speaker, that I would make every effort to have committees meet in the evening, possibly on Saturdays, which does tend, I think as the Member for Inkster said earlier and others have said, tends to, in fact reduce the workload for a number of members, and certainly will give to members opposite an opportunity to review legislation, review bills that will be distributed or have been distributed. And I most certainly, Mr. Speaker, agree with their concerns that if significant legislation is introduced, or any legislation is introduced, they require a reasonable opportunity to review that legislation before responding.

It might very well be, Mr. Speaker, that during the course of the next few weeks, it may even be necessary to, for example, adjourn the House for a couple of days if that is required, in order to give members opposite an opportunity to review legislation that is introduced into the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, we should look at this, what's before us. There are some 35 bills that have passed second reading that have been on the Order Paper for some time which there may on one or two of them be a difference of opinion, and I think those would only be one or two, and I think those can be disposed of as soon as we have an opportunity to deal with them fairly quickly.

The bills that are on the Paper on Adjourned Debate on Second Reading have again been there for some time while we have been dealing with the speed-up resolution, and other than one or two, I don't expect will cause much difficulty. There are, of course, ones to come forward that have been introduced for first reading. The Legislative Assembly Act; The Mechanics Lien Act has been introduced for first reading. It, Mr. Speaker, I can tell members, will follow very closely the recommendations of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission Report which has been distributed some time ago to all members. The Elections Act and Elections Financing Act I expect will be available for distribution in the House next Monday, Mr. Speaker, and I intend, as on these bills and others as they are introduced, I have asked that Ministers on introduction of their bills provide members opposite with as much detailed information as possible, so that they can immediately receive all the information the Ministers have on the bills, and I

think that will expedite their consideration of the bills.

On these two bills, Mr. Speaker, I might indicate at this time that I, unfortunately, have some commitments over the next three weeks to attend at least four days of the week at meetings of the Continuing Committee of Ministers on the Constitution, and I therefore will be absent from the House for four days of each of the next three weeks, if the House, indeed lasts that long, Mr. Speaker. I expect by the time the third week of meetings is completed that the House will have prorogued. But I would indicate now, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite can consider it, I hope to be able to distribute those two bills on Monday, and hopefully ask leave, because I have to leave that night, ask leave of the members to allow me to introduce those two bills.

The City of Winnipeg Act, Mr. Speaker, I don't expect to be controversial in any way. We will be attempting to deal with a number of resolutions that have been passed throughout the year by the city dealing with some very specific amendments. There certainly are no fundamental changes in that Act. The Assessment Act and Planning Act, again I don't expect any controversy on. There are three supply bills, a Wildlife Act that's been introduced — (Interjection)— I don't expect any controversy on the supply bills. —(Interjection)— Pardon me? I'll get to that remark later on, Mr. Speaker. The Wildlife Act, again, should not be too difficult. The Statute Law Amendment Act is a bill normally introduced about this time in the Legislature that will have a detailed explanation of the provisions of that Act. A number of Acts will be introduced by the Minister of Finance, who of course also carries the portfolio of Minister of Energy and Mines, that I will leave with him. And there are a couple of other Acts, Mr. Speaker, but not of much controversy.

Mr. Speaker, I don't see, although the members refer to a number of bills, that there will indeed be very many controversial bills. This is a pragmatic government that attempts to deal with the practical solutions to the problems we have in society, and I'm sure most bills will be favourably received by members opposite.

Again, Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, we on this side would like to be as reasonable as possible when bills are introduced, provide as much information to members opposite as we can, either through committees, or if necessary even through an adjournment of the House for a few days to provide members opposite with a full opportunity to debate legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster referred to — I should only deal very briefly with his comments because they are not worthy of much debate. He suggested we should only introduce legislation that's suggested by our constituents. —(Interjection)— That's what he said. We'll examine Hansard, Mr. Speaker, but that was one of the comments he made about a bill, he said, my constituents, I never had a constituent ask me to introduce that bill. If that comment is only applicable to that one bill, then fine, Mr. Speaker, but I'm glad to see that he's, from his seat, withdrawing his comments that were so simply put. He refers to junk legislation. It would be very easy, Mr. Speaker, to go through many of these bills

and refer to the effects that they will have and improvements in the law that they will bring about, and I suggest to him that that's a very inappropriate description of the legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I hope, with this approach of using committees in the evening, on Saturdays as much as possible, providing as much information to members opposite as we can, as the bills are introduced — (Interjection)— well, Mr. Speaker, the opposition House Leader refers to professional bills. There's obviously no agreement concluded on professional bills, and that is something that we still have under consideration within our caucus and that is something that will be determined as the days of the session go along. But to date, obviously there was no agreement on any deferral of those bills, and that will be decided as the session progresses, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I thank members opposite for their comments and their kindly advice on this resolution and their generous comments on the manner in which the business of the House has been handled. I can assure them we will attempt to do everything reasonable in order to complete the work of the session.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster with a question.

**MR. GREEN:** No, Mr. Speaker, you have indicated on several occasions that if a Minister attributes to a member something that he didn't say, he is entitled to clarify afterwards.

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

**MR. GREEN:** The Honourable Minister has said that I said that you should only introduce legislation that is called for by your constituents. What I said, Mr. Speaker, was that there was very little legislation that was vital to the Conservative Party which required to be dealt with at this time so that the House would close soon, that all of the legislation that the Minister wanted was legislation which presumably should be introduced, but which could be dealt with on September 15th. I never at any time suggested that you should only bring in or introduce legislation that was requested by your constituents. Quite often that is necessary, but it is not necessary to rush through it this time.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** We intend, Mr. Speaker, shortly to deal with Interim Supply, Bill No. 2. The Minister of Finance, I believe, had discussed that earlier in the day with the Opposition House Leader and with the Finance critic.

While we are waiting for the documentation, Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 19.

**ADJOURNED DEBATE — SECOND  
READING**

**BILL NO. 19**

**THE EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION ACT**

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

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We were prepared yesterday afternoon to move on this bill, having passed Bill 31, its companion bill several days ago, and knowing that the Minister had called public representation on the bill for yesterday evening and perhaps again this morning. We were a little puzzled as to why the Minister did not bring this before the House yesterday afternoon in order to pass Bill 19 through so that those 30-odd people who had indicated they were coming before the Committee could speak on Bill 19 as well as Bill 31. It did give rise to the Chairman of the Committee reminding members on a couple of occasion, Mr. Speaker, that it was Bill 31 that was before the Committee and any remarks or questions pertaining to Bill 19 were therefore out of order.

We have to question the handling of this matter by the Government House Leader, as to why he has left this Bill dangling over two meetings of the Committee, and presumably it will go to the Committee at its next sitting.

We made it clear in addressing our remarks to Bill 31 that we saw it and Bill 19 as being so closely intertwined or dealing with the same topic that we would not discuss or debate Bill 19 at any length, and we asked for sufficient latitude that whatever we had to say on the matter of education could be dealt with under our remarks on Bill 31. That remains our intention, Mr. Speaker. My indication is that no other members from the opposition intend to speak on Bill 19 and we are quite satisfied to see it go through to Committee this afternoon.

I can't leave the bill without just mentioning very briefly the Minister's closing remarks on Saturday. Mr. Speaker, I don't think I have ever seen a more inept or incompetent handling of a closing of a debate by any Minister on any major bill. The Minister hardly dealt with the remarks that were made on this side at all. He didn't address himself to the criticisms and comments that had been made and it was simply an arrogant and incompetent performance, Mr. Speaker.

Our three concerns on Bill 19 had firstly to do with the matter of suspension by a field representative. This has been dealt with at some length by a colleague under Bill 31, but to sum up our problems with Bill 31 as it regards field representatives, the power to suspend the certificate of a teacher would seem no longer relevant in this day and age. It seems clear that most school divisions have a superintendent who has general charge over the administration of education within the district. Most schools have a principal and it is difficult to see where an emergency situation could arise having to do with the safety of the children in a class or some emergency having to do with a teacher that either the principal or a superintendent could not take action in the normal way, and that they would have

the responsibility to exercise those powers to take care of a situation without the need for a field representative to be called in to suspend the certificate of a teacher.

We also had some concern, Mr. Speaker, with the changes the government proposes to make to the Certificate Review Committee. We note that there has been a change in the balance of the personnel of that Committee, whereby the present Act allows for two persons to be nominated by the Teachers Society out of some eleven members, whereas the Bill proposes to reduce that ratio to two out of eight.

The Minister gave no reasons or justification for this in introducing the bill and we look forward to a reasonable and logical explanation to be coming from the Minister.

We would consider that the Certificate Review Committee, having to do with the professional qualifications and the professional competence of a teacher, should have rather than less representation from the Teachers Society, it should rather have a larger representation than before, for who are more concerned with these matters than the teachers themselves?

I understand, just as a side issue, Mr. Speaker, that there has been considerable discussion over the last two or three, perhaps more years, on the matter of a professional bill for teachers. It has been the policy, I understand, from the Manitoba Teachers Society, that they would like to see their profession reorganized along similar grounds to that of other professionals in this province, which professionals by the way have a considerable degree of autonomy when it comes to the right to practise in this particular province. We wonder why the Minister seems to be moving in the opposite direction from that in which the teachers are moving and several other professional or quasi-professional groups that we have heard from in this session.

There is one other point too where we had some concerns, and that is a particular new section, new principle within this bill, having to do with teacher education programs in teacher education institutions. There seems to be an implication in there that the Minister will approve or somehow set up or dictate to a university as to what programs should be taught in the matter of teacher education. We have heard from several members of the Conservative Party, chiefly when they were in opposition, in defence of the autonomy of universities, something that I believe our party had not quarreled with. Yet we see, according to our reading of this particular section of the Act, that it would seem, again from our reading lacking an explanation from the Minister, that the government or the Minister does intend to infringe upon that autonomy of universities.

Those were our particular concerns about this matter, Mr. Speaker. We had mentioned before, just to sum up, that we saw these bills as so closely linked together that they could be considered as one bill dealing with Education. We made all of our comments on Bill 31. We were disappointed in the response that we received from members on that side and particularly from the Minister. We have no reason nor desire to hold up Bill 19, and we suggest it go through to Committee.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY INTERIM SUPPLY

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** Interim Supply (2), resolved that a sum not exceeding 18,952,909, being 10 percent of the amount of the several items to be voted for the departments as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1981, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1981—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that the Minister would want to introduce this rather unusual second Interim Supply, which would indicate that the government apparently has miscalculated the length of the session, or the amount of time the estimate process would take and is running out of money. I'm assuming that because the Minister didn't give us any indication as to what his reasons are.

I'd like him to tell us how he stands with money now, the amount that was allocated the last time, I don't remember, I'm not expected to remember, the percentage allocated last time and the period for which it was done, and for what dates he is looking ahead for this extra 10 percent, would be of interest to hear it, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, this Interim Supply is for 10 percent. The last one was for 30 percent. The amount allocated by the 30 percent is entirely spent and this second Interim Supply is required for tomorrow. There is no change in it, except the 30 percent was too low. We didn't expect the session to be this long, or I should say that we expected that the Main Supply Bill would have been through by now, but it's not for any number of reasons, perhaps some of them best explained by some of the members opposite, I don't know. But for one reason or another the usual 30 percent has covered the time span expected, but we've taken longer to get the Main Supply through, mainly because of the longer hours on the estimates. Next year, I would

recommend that we move to a larger proportion of 30 percent than perhaps be shooting for 40 percent or 50 percent as Interim Supply. But the final note of it is there is no change. The percentage is based on, I believe the same amounts, the same total amounts, 10 percent of the same total amounts as the 30 percent was in the first bill, but it is required to be through tomorrow or we'll run into difficulties in providing Supply for Government Services.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I'm really surprised that the government waited until the day before doomsday to bring in an Interim Supply Bill. Both members sitting on the front bench now must recall, although one of them wasn't here at the time, the occasion when the opposition of the day, the Conservative Party, took advantage of the Interim Supply Bill to debate all kinds of issues, and especially one which they wanted to debate at great length in the hope of embarrassing the government into dealing with a matter in the way the opposition wanted it done and did in fact drag the Interim Supply debate beyond the deadline at that time, beyond March 31st. I don't have the slightest intention of doing it today, Mr. Chairman, but I do express surprise that the Minister made no mention of it, as far I know, until this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that there have been times, and I have had the opportunity of working in this House under various House Leaders, three Conservatives on the previous occasion, Messrs. Roblin, Guerny Evans and the present First Minister, and then through occasions when we were in government and we had, I believe, two, and I have seen a great deal more co-operation in years gone by than I have this year. I would have thought that one doesn't come at the last minute and say, well tomorrow is the deadline, tomorrow is doomsday, and we must have the money. It would have been much better, Mr. Chairman, if our House Leaders could learn to talk to each other and arrive at understandings.

I am sure that the Department of Finance knew quite a while ago that this Interim Supply was necessary for tomorrow, and to drag it until this date is improper, I think, Mr. Speaker, and unnecessary, because it could have been done, and the fact is that, I believe that as we go through the process to provide this government with this money for tomorrow, they're going to have to ask for unanimous leave, Mr. Chairman. I am sure they are. I don't remember the procedure that well, but I'm sure that through this committee and then through the next committee, Ways and Means, and then with three or two readings, second reading, third reading, they are going to have to say by leave.

Mr. Chairman, I will not withhold leave but, Mr. Chairman, I think the government ought to smarten up and ought to start getting its business in order. Here we talked for two days on —(Interjection)— Yes, and let the First Minister know that he cannot control the length of time for debate unless he wishes to impose closure and he dare not do that, Mr. Chairman, because he knows the opposition has a right to speak, and neither he and the Minister of Finance — Mr. Chairman, once again the First Minister wants to make a speech. Since we can debate back and forth for as long as is necessary,

Mr. Chairman, I intend to sit down at my time, not on his command. I don't think I'm ever going to do anything at his command, Mr. Chairman, and I will not do it because he says sit down.

Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, I will sit down because I do want to hear him and I know I'll be able to respond, so I'm going to do it, and if he wants to drag this debate forever that's his privilege.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to elongate the debate but my honourable friend in his usual semi-malicious way is attempting to blame the government for a situation that he is as much a party to as anyone else in this House. We have no objection on this side of this House, nor could we take objection to my honourable friends taking as much time to debate matters such as the Speed-up Motion, which they have now debated for a good number of days. We can't object to that and we don't. And the fact, and I'm not going to get into the debate about agreements that were misunderstood or anything like that at all. The fact remains, however, Mr. Chairman, that it was not until about 15 minutes ago that the Speed-up Motion did pass in order to enable the government to get on with the orderly conduct of business toward the end of the Session. I'm not standing up to lay any blame in that regard at all, merely to indicate to my honourable friend that it is not a case, as he would try to allege, of bad management at all. It's a case of the 30 percent Supply that was voted earlier having run out, as was anticipated.

We are now asking for a very routine thing, not something to be erected by my honourable friend in his contrived fashion into something relating to negligence. We are asking for a routine matter of 10 percent more Interim Supply. It is a very routine matter, and if we, Mr. Chairman, had had more co-operation from my honourable friends with respect to other matters on the order paper, we might well have been able to bring on the full Supply Bill, but in the light of some of the discussions — and I'm not taking side on — that have taken place over the last several days, we thought it advisable, Mr. Chairman, that we bring on the Interim Supply so as not to indicate to our honourable friends opposite that we wanted to push through Main Supply, which he would have been the first to have stood on his feet and complained about.

I merely say that what we are asking is for a routine 10 percent advance on the Supply. The Main Supply is here. We can bring that bill on now with respect to the regular sittings of the House in the routine way, and if my honourable friends wish to talk as long as they want, they can talk on it. But if we had attempted to do that earlier, before the Speed-up Motion, we would have had no guarantee, based on the conduct particularly of the Member for St. Johns, that that would have passed.

I merely say that is the explanation. I am trying to be as dispassionate as the circumstances warrant, having regard to certain of the activities we have observed in this House in the last several days. I have been in this House, Mr. Chairman, not continuously but longer than anyone else in this House and I must say that it's not pleasant for the

opposition, it's not pleasant for the government to see arrangements that are ordinarily carried on, as between House Leaders or as between Leaders of the Party or whatever, running into this kind of misinterpretation, and I'm not laying any blame. I am merely saying that in the light of those disputes that arose in the last several days, it was the considered judgment of the government this was the better way to bring it on, so as not to arouse any false suggestions on the part of the Member for St. Johns, or anyone else, that the government was trying to withhold the general debate that can take place, and I'm sure will take place on the full Supply Bill. But we can have that full debate on the full Supply Bill and I'm sure we will, and the government is in no way trying to impede that at all. This is one means of getting the 10 percent Interim Supply through, and I commend it to the House as being the most appropriate means of doing that and it was not within the competence of the government heretofore to bring the Supply Bill on with any guarantee that there would have been any passage of it at all.

My honourable friend need not, in his usual way, try to put words into somebody else's mouth or try to, by imputation, suggest that there's been some negligence on the part of anyone on this side of the House, rather, having regard to the tenor of the House, this is the best way to proceed at the present time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, through you, I want to assure the Honourable First Minister that if he had tried to push Main Supply through, he would have had a real problem, and he knows it and he's saying we didn't try because we knew we would have a problem; that's nonsense, Mr. Chairman. Of course, I intend to speak on Main Supply, I intend to speak on Supplementary Supply, and I do not intend to speak on Interim Supply because I do not intend to take advantage of the faulty management of the government in the order of the business.

He can say all he likes, but he says in my usual way of bringing imputations. Mr. Chairman, no imputations, I've said it more than once. There has been mismanagement of the order of business in this House. Mr. Chairman, I said earlier, that the government must have known quite a long time ago that it was necessary to bring in Interim Supply for tomorrow's business, and I say the government did not handle it properly, should have done it earlier, should have discussed it, and if there is a problem about communication then that should be clarified.

You cannot conduct business in this Legislature unless there's a sense of co-operation. It doesn't help one bit to have the First Minister or his Deputy send insults across the room, not one bit. All it does is allow more debate.

**MR. LYON:** Physician heal thyself.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** You see, Mr. Chairman, it doesn't help one bit for people who speak from their seats, like the First Minister who always . . . Sit down . . . Sit down . . . Mr. Chairman, will you have that man sit . . . Have him sit.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue, but if, Mr. Chairman, you are not going to keep people quiet, then there is going to be problems. You must realize that, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— You see, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has no right to speak, except when he standing and recognized by the Chair, is continuing to throw insults and is continuing to act in his usual way, which I've told him before, redounds to our benefit politically. The more he does it, the more I like it, not personally but as a political opponent. So if he doesn't keep his mouth shut, he is going to prolong debate, Mr. Chairman. If he doesn't keep his mouth shut and behave like he thinks a parliamentarian ought to do, we're going to be in trouble here. So he'd better learn to keep his mouth shut, Mr. Chairman, otherwise we will continue to debate this for a long time. —(Interjection)— You see, Mr. Chairman, he wants to continue debate because he doesn't have sense enough to keep quiet when he should, and, Mr. Chairman, I tell you again, if he's going to keep it up, I'm going to keep it up, and, Mr. Chairman, you're going to have to make a ruling.

Mr. Chairman, I was talking about bad management. —(Interjection)— There he goes again. —(Interjection)— There he goes again, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, it has become clear to me long ago that the First Minister has no use for me and would like me out of this House. He has made that clear. He has done it in the most insulting manner possible and he is doing it right now, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, are you going to continue? Do I have to sit? Do I have to raise a point of order to have him keep quiet, or is he going to be allowed to continue debate, Mr. Chairman? I am really addressing myself to you. —(Interjection)— You see, Mr. Chairman.

What I wanted to say was to deal with what I think is the negligence of this government in not coming here in an orderly fashion. Now he says that the orderly conduct was necessary because of the Speed-up. The Speed-up had to be cleared to conduct business in an ordinary way. There is no problem at all, Mr. Chairman, had it been done in a proper sensible way with proper consultation. This was not done and I am really shocked to know that tomorrow is the deadline, because, Mr. Chairman, there are matters that could be discussed in Interim Supply, which as far as I'm concerned are foreclosed on this occasion because I don't want to stand in the way of completing it today.

Mr. Chairman, I won't stand any guff from the First Minister or any of his colleagues who want to talk the way he does and that's what I am saying to him. If he can't keep quiet he is going to prolong debate. He can think all he likes. I know what he thinks. He's transparent, Mr. Chairman. He doesn't have to open his mouth for me to know what he thinks. That doesn't help the parliamentary procedure, but all I know, Mr. Chairman, is that he hasn't got the guts to stand up and say so many of the things that he says when he's seated, because then he would be called to order as he was only a few days ago, when he had to apologize. Do you recall that, Mr. Chairman? He had to apologize, because he thinks he can get away with an attitude that no one else in this House tries to do. And I apply that to all other of his members.

So I want to just say, Mr. Chairman, whether he thinks I'm malicious about it or not, that this matter should have been brought in in an orderly fashion, and could have been cleared easily. When I heard that there was Interim Supply, there were some matters I wished to raise. I did not hear that tomorrow is the deadline. I will not stand in the way of the deadline, unlike the First Minister had been, and others, on previous occasions.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the honourable member would want to have the record corrected. The present First Minister was not in the House when the occasion of which the member speaks took place, and the present First Minister, Mr. Chairman, would not countenance what the former government did, namely to move out of this House, down to the Cabinet Chamber, and pass Supply over the heads of an elected Legislature.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I do agree that I was in error. I meant the Minister of Finance, and not the First Minister, who was not present when that happened. Mr. Chairman, that Minister, however, the First Minister, was a member of that Cabinet which prepared The Financial Administration Act on the basis of which the government found it possible to act in order to frustrate the efforts of the opposition to obstruct the orderly passage of the Interim Supply Bill.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I also want to indicate that I see no purpose in dealing with the Interim Supply Bill in any other way but to grant Interim Supply. I see no purpose in it, because to me, it is a bit of a charade in any event. Over the years, in watching parliaments, I have read on numerous occasions, press reports, that if something doesn't happen tomorrow, nobody gets paid. I've read it on the national scene, I've read it on the provincial scene, and it always appeared peculiar to me, it never ever happened that nobody got paid. It was always sort of an interesting tidbit, but ultimately occurred, and therefore, I, for one, Mr. Chairman, saw nothing wrong with the Act which said that there is a possibility of a warrant during session, which was done, and that being available, I would not criticize it if it were used, I see no purpose in dealing with the Interim Supply Bill.

I do want to say to the First Minister that he is making a big error, in my view, and in my respectful submission to him, which I will try to make as unrespectfully as I can, that he is making a very big error when he gets up and says, as he said the other day when the adjournment was refused, you ain't seen nothing yet, when he says, as he said today, that we are winding up the session, that we are trying to finish the business of the House, that we have some way prevented that. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is not normal. It is not normal, and it is not orderly. It is not orderly. I have suggested an orderly way in which it can be done, and I indicated to all members of the House, and I think it has to be emphasized to

the First Minister more than to anybody else, perhaps because he's not in here as often as he would like to be — I make no criticism of that — that the orderly completion of the business of this House will involve considered, reasoned debate on approximately 48 bills, and therefore, if I calculate properly, and if it isn't a fact that people are going to be withered away or ground into silence, we are not at the end of the session, we are at the beginning of the session. —(Interjection)— My friend says we're getting there, and this is what I am trying to impress upon him, that the First Minister gets up and uses the word co-operation almost as if the members of the opposition are here for the purpose of helping his government govern badly. Mr. Chairman, that is not why we are here, we are here to get rid of him, that is our purpose; and the way in which we intend to do that is to deal, in a conscientious way, with our responsibilities, which is not to co-operate with him in doing silly things. And when he says co-operation, I want to remind this First Minister that he is asking those people to co-operate with him who he has referred to as — I can't remember all of the names, but there have been many of them. I don't think that idiots, soft-headed people — oh, he didn't say idiot, he said, rat-infested nest, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. LYON:** Yes.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, he acknowledges that one. And he said that we cannot run anything, that we cannot run peanut stands. It's coming back to him, Mr. Chairman, the words are coming back, and therefore when he says that these people who he has told that they are useless —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that somebody does not have a list. They took out of the Tritschler Report, the government took out every vituperative phrase that they could find. The opposition has a bigger research department than I have. I think that they should do with the First Minister's speeches, what they did with — take out every vituperative phrase, list them back, throw it to the Minister and said, you are asking for the co-operation of these people. These people are here for the purpose of trying to get you out of office because they believe you govern badly. When I say badly, I am talking about in terms of the direction that you are taking the people of the province of Manitoba.

That will not manifest itself on this motion. I think the Member for St. Johns has indicated that; I have indicated that. I don't suppose there is going to be a great deal of difference of opinion beyond that, because I don't think there is any point to it. If I thought there was a point to it, if I thought that I could defeat this government on this Interim Supply motion, I would do it, but it can't be done. There is the warrant, the civil servants are going to get paid, this is not the issue. The issue, which the First Minister was not here to hear discussed yesterday, is the legislation that is before the House, the 48 bills, and the House Leader seems to indicate that these 48 bills are going to be passed in what is referred to by the Minister as the closing, dying, or last days of the session.

That may be. I may be wrong in my estimation. I may be wrong as to the kind of consideration that will be given to these bills, and the demands that will

be made by opposition members who also have a responsibility when it comes to enacting law is concerned, as to how long it's going to take. But I would urge the First Minister not to keep using that phrase, because I don't think it's there. You can use it after the phrase of dying days, or closing days, or complete the session in an orderly fashion, or speed it up, or the phrase, you ain't seen nothing yet when an adjournment was refused, that's the issue, and that will be dealt with. I want to say that it's my present opinion that legislation and the consideration that's going to have to be given to it, is not the kind of thing that should be contemplated as being completed in a very short period of time; that if the House is to be completed in a relatively short period of time, it can be done, and I gave a method for it to be done to the House Leader yesterday which would not compromise either position, or the position of any MLA in the House. What you absolutely need, go through and do it with extended hours. I voted for, and spoke for the extended hours. Despite what I have heard from the Member for Churchill or the Member for Wellington, I still believe that extended hours is sensible. Not only is it sensible, it is useful. It enables us to do more in a shorter period of time, and my understanding, my experience with it in the last three years, it has been the more relaxed period of the session, not the hardest working period of the session.

But, if it's 48 bills, I am again making the recommendation, deal with the ones that are necessary, come back on September 15th, and whatever time it takes. The Member for Wellington said that what I suggested, or what was being suggested has never been done before. Not correct. When we were legislating, and the Ministers will tell you, we had many bills at the end of the session. We went in, and I said, everything that is not absolutely needed, take off the Order Paper. We will take those off the Order Paper and we will start with them at the next session. That was done. We opened up the next session with 35 bills. We looked like a very efficient group. Actually, we were not efficient, it was last year's bills. But it started at the next session. —(Interjection)— Well, but it was done, and it was done properly. And the people of Manitoba did not suffer by the fact that legislation was delayed, and that's all I'm saying to the House Leader. If you start that legislation on September 15th and you're right, it can be done in two weeks, nothing will be lost. If you're wrong, it will take another two weeks. The legislation that you need will be passed, the other will not be. And I say to the First Minister that is the issue.

The Member for St. Johns has used the words, mismanagement of the House. Since I have been a House Leader, I have some sympathy with what is referred to as mismanagement. The mismanagement has not yet occurred, because regardless of what's here now, we can still deal with it in an orderly way. The mismanagement will take place when you try to get those 48 bills passed on the assumption that it's a very easy, short thing without a great deal of controversy. That will be mismanagement. It has not yet occurred, but it can occur.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make one particular point to the Minister of Finance and the First Minister about their fiscal operations and their abandonment of the principle of fiscal responsibility, because those of us on this side of the House have listened, from the time of the election to the present about the government talk about fiscal responsibility. This was the great watchword of the Conservative Party in the 1977 election, and I want to make it clear that they have abandoned that principle and they have adopted something that they condemned before which is Keynesian economics and that the same people who spent a great deal of time going up and down the province and debating in this Legislature, telling us that you can't have deficits, and you must have balanced budgets, and that deficits are destructive and that the only way to go is to get expenditure and income in line. These are the same people, Mr. Chairman, who now are presenting us with 191 million deficit, rising. And what is happening, in effect, is that we may be the witnesses right now of the largest deficit ever in the province of Manitoba. I think the Minister of Finance is going to have to do some explaining in that regard, how it is that he could say one thing for almost three years and act in another way.

So I don't ever want to hear again a statement from this government and this political party that they believe in balanced budgets. I don't ever want to hear that again, Mr. Speaker, because it is simply a complete sham. When they say that, we know that what they say and what they do are two different things. We've listened to it before; we've listened to the condemnations. I regard myself as a Keynesian, and I'm prepared to act in a Keynesian manner, but I think that's consistent between what is said and what is done. But this government, I think, no longer has the right to pretend that they believe in the balanced budget. I think that word is gone, that has left their vocabulary. Their record shows otherwise.

Similarly, they better not give us any of this Tory philosophy of the fact that they believe that government is best which governs least. They are now beginning to rival the number of bills and the total amount of legislation that was brought in by our government, and they were continually criticizing us for bringing in legislation when they said that it wasn't necessary. They ridiculed us when we brought in over 80 or 90 bills. Well, they brought in 85 right now and the House Leader is bringing in 26 more, so if those are the right figures we are up to 110 plus, and it seems to me that there again they better keep quiet when it comes to talking pure Tory philosophy to us, because again they have abandoned their first principles. They have done it philosophically and they have done it economically. This is just something that I think bears underlining.

I also want to say, in watching the First Minister, that it was interesting to watch him respond to the Member for St. Johns. He found it barely possible to contain himself. Normally he gets abusive; today he was restrained in that regard, but his temper was getting the better of him, and I often have to think, Mr. Chairman, that if his aunt or his mother years ago has occasionally washed his mouth out with lye soap, what a difference it would have made in terms of the quality of debate in the Manitoba Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, the final point that I want to make is that this government will now tell us, the First Minister will tell us, the Minister of Finance and all of the backbenchers from the rural areas will tell us, well, you see the reason that we have a deficit there is a drought. You see, you have to understand this fundamental point about economics: When the farmers are in trouble you have to give them everything that they need, so when there is a crisis then you have to take action which will remedy the crisis, and even if it is necessary to run a deficit of 200 million plus, then you still must do it, because you must rise to the occasion. Well, Mr. Chairman, that has been said for at least the past 50 years, if not longer, and there have been economists and political spokesmen who have argued that in a time of crisis, like in war, that you have to suddenly come up with funds that weren't there the day before.

I have listened to the illustrious Leader of the New Democratic Party, Tommy Douglas, speaking on that matter, because he was in the Commons in 1939, and they needed a couple of billion dollars to start the war effort, and do you know how they got it? They had a vote and in a split second they created a couple of billions dollars to fight the war effort. In the Depression measures could have been taken, and were taken in certain countries, to respond to a crisis. So I am saying the members opposite, they seem to understand one point only, and that is, if there is a drought on the farm then they can respond to that, but if there is what has been called in this Chamber an economic drought, if there is high unemployment or if there is a slowdown in the construction industry and if there is problems in the urban sector or maybe in the north of Manitoba, they don't seem to understand that. No, they don't understand that. That is different; we will just have to tough it out. We will have to tighten our belts and we will have to just let things go as they were, because we cannot intervene. That would be government interaction, government intervention; it would be Socialism; it would be Marxism; it would be the destruction of that sacred principle in the Tory theology, the balanced budget. We just couldn't do it.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that our government did run deficits and I am not afraid to defend those deficits and I wouldn't be afraid again of bringing in a deficit to counter unemployment and to act as a counter-balance to very bad conditions in the economy or in society. I am not afraid to do that, but they are afraid to do that in a sense that they are intellectually afraid. They have been so brainwashed by their own philosophy about how dangerous it is that when they do it, as they have done it this year, they can't believe it; they can't believe it.

All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, and I conclude on this point, we have listened for years in this Chamber about the dangers and the dire consequences of deficit financing and now we have a government that is doing it, so that is fine, but, you know, do one or the other. —(Interjection)— The greatest deficit ever, no doubt about it.

The Honourable Minister of Finance is going to preside over the biggest deficit in Manitoba history. He is now moving posthaste in that direction, the King of Deficits, Deficit Don, who is going to have to say to the people of Manitoba that he doesn't

believe in it, he didn't want to do it, but nevertheless he has now brought forth this 191 million plus, out-distancing the New Democrats in the home stretch. —(Interjection)— My colleague said, maybe the Devil made him do it. But whatever his explanation is, he is going to have to do one or the other, either talk about balanced budgets in the future and bring them or he is going to have to in effect keep his mouth shut, because he is the one who has talked about the need for and the value of balanced budgets. I don't want to hear him say from now to the end of his term the words "balanced budget" or to preach the balanced budget to members of the opposition again.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to make a few remarks, having heard the Member for Elmwood. The Member for Elmwood, Mr. Chairman, who is in a government in a period of time when inflation increased dramatically and their government lived off, siphoned off the revenues from those dramatic increases in inflation at that time and increased spending at dramatic rates, Mr. Chairman.

Let's, Mr. Chairman, consider the facts that have occurred over the last two years. Let's consider the facts. —(Interjection)— They are not excuses, Mr. Chairman, they are facts. We have experienced, Mr. Chairman, despite reducing taxation in every year, significant areas of taxation have been reduced in Manitoba, and with that, Mr. Chairman, we have experienced in Manitoba a flood last year that exceeded the 1950 flood, and our government has moved since that time in not only fighting the flood but in moving to ensure that permanent work is being done to combat future floods.

Mr. Chairman, under their government Hydro rates increased some 150 percent. We have moved last year and this year to spend some 50 million to freeze those Hydro rates. Mr. Chairman, 50 million have gone to stabilize those Hydro rates.

We have experienced, Mr. Chairman, over the last year to 18 months interest rates which are simply without any precedent, over which we have had no control as a provincial government, which have had — and I am sure reasonable thinking members opposite would agree — a dramatic increase or a dramatic effect on small business and on individuals, Mr. Chairman. That was not caused by this government, a fact that has existed over which this government has had no control.

We have experienced a drought and are continuing to experience a drought, Mr. Chairman, which we so far are planning on spending some 40 million. Hopefully there will be revenues to offset a major part of that. —(Interjection)— Your decision. Well, I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Elmwood opposes that program, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— We are prepared to stand up, Mr. Chairman, for that program; it is a necessary program to protect the basic part of the economy of this province.

We have had to, Mr. Chairman, and I believe the Supplementary Supply Estimates indicate an additional 5 million is required over and above existing provisions to fight fires, Mr. Chairman. The

members opposite are suggesting that we just allow the fires to burn without fighting. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting and it is a fact of life, they may have had some fires, but they have never had the fires such as we have had this year, combined with a drought, combined with those interest rates, combined with a recession in the United States, which is bound to have an effect on this economy, Mr. Chairman.

Those are the facts of life, Mr. Chairman, and this is a pragmatic government, Mr. Chairman, hopefully some day a balanced budget will be achieved in this province. But taxes have been reduced despite all of these extremely unusual events that have occurred, Mr. Chairman, over which this government has had no control, and I commend the Minister of Finance for the manner in which he has been able to deal with the finances of this province in spite of these extremely unusual circumstances.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Attorney-General having spoken has given me a few points that I would like to raise in this debate.

Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General tried to impose inflation as a problem which was giving the government some difficulty. He talked about the great amount of inflation, and I got the impression that was the difficulty for a government being able to pay its way and so on. —(Interjection)— That was our lifesaver. Okay, that is fine, if that is what you said, my point is still valid, and that is, Mr. Chairman, there has been far more inflation the last year or so, the rate of inflation has got to be near double digit, and I would say that if you look over the whole period of the New Democratic Party administration that we had some years that the rates of inflation were a lot lower than they are today. So you can't wipe it under the table by saying, well, the situation in inflation is so different that we had an easy time compared to yourself.

The words of the Minister sound incredible when he talks about the moneys that they have to spend on fighting floods at one point or now fighting droughts, or fighting fires, and so on, as though never before have we ever had a flood or so in Manitoba, never before did we ever have to hire more people to fight fires, or whatever. There are always some very good reasons why governments may have to engage in additional expenditures and, Mr. Chairman, I make no apology for the additional amount of money we wanted to spend in 1977, I believe it was, because we did have a fair amount of unemployment, and we wanted to do something to give some jobs to the people. It was stated in the Legislature the purpose of that additional money that we brought down by way of Supplementary Estimates was explained and that, Mr. Chairman, is a valid reason for engaging in some deficit spending.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that we had the co-operation of municipal governments, school boards and hospital divisions in that Job Creation Program, co-operating with them in providing certain funding so we could give some useful work to many thousands of Manitobans.

At that time we were criticized, all the unemployment is our fault, but today we hear the Minister of Labour speak and he explains away the unemployment in Selkirk as part of a national phenomenon, we have got a recession and it is happening all over the country, so different now. The economic problem today is so different from when we were in government. When we were in government, we had to take all the flak; every lousy job, every bit of unemployment was our fault. So if that is the case, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Highways has given me a point here, I'm glad to see he agrees that it was all our fault; if it was our fault, then I say, Mr. Chairman, the amount of unemployment we're witnessing today, and it's going to increase, it's going to be your fault, it's going to be the government's fault. This government is going to have to take full responsibility, full and total responsibility, because —(Interjection)— yes, that is true.

So Mr. Chairman, I believe, and I would really like to get an explanation from the Minister because we have had no explanation regarding the 10 percent except his reference to our lead slinging during estimates time. Mr. Chairman, I say, to the members of the opposition, one of the chief reasons for being a member of this Legislature, is to keep the government honest, and to ask the questions, and to probe, and to examine. There is no profit and loss sheet, you don't have to worry about a balance sheet, but you do have an opposition that has to try to probe and dig and ask as many questions, and maybe at times it sounds repetitive, maybe at times it sounds very tedious, but nevertheless, that's necessary.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Highways, who is so good at talking from his seat, would really like to be the dictator of this province. He wants to have all the control; he wants the opposition to stop talking and he will run it, he and his Cabinet colleagues, he doesn't even want his own backbenchers here, he wants the session out so he can go and run this province as a dictator would.

Mr. Chairman, I would still like to get from the Minister an explanation of why you need the 10 percent additional funding at this time, because, as was pointed out by the Member for Wellington, and perhaps the Minister of Finance wasn't here, the number of days that we have sat has still not reached a record level. We have had a very large number of days of sitting, it's all relative, it's large compared to maybe 20 years ago, but there's been no upward trend necessarily that you can detect in the number of days that we're sitting. I understand we've sat 92 days so far this year, but we've had other years, back in '74, we sat 96 days, and there were other years, 1978, we sat 88 days. I don't see any particular significant trend in this respect.

But Mr. Chairman, what I would like to have by way of explanation from the Minister of Finance, is what is happening to revenues? Are the revenues lagging? Are the revenues of the province of Manitoba lagging because of the weak economy that we are experiencing, and according to the Minister of Highway's reasoning, which is all your fault; if we have a weak economy, it's all your fault. Is it because building permits are down very, very seriously? My leader pointed out some figures today, and I think

we're the worst situation of any of the provinces in this country in terms of the trend of building permits, which is not only residential housing, but industrial construction and commercial construction. Or is it because it reflects the fact that our retail sales are reducing in terms of real physical volume? The physical volume of retail trade that has occurred thus far this year, the first four months of this year, is lower than the physical volume of retail trade that took place last year.

Is it because we see the level of private investment spending less than the rate of inflation, so that we've got less real private investment occurring this year, according to the Statistics Canada survey, than we had take place last year. We know public investment has faltered under this government. I only talked to the members opposite in their own terms what they think is the good aspect of investment, the so-called private investment which is the only true investment in terms of Tory ideology. So even on their own terms therefore, Mr. Chairman, the private investment is lagging very very badly. The rate of private investment increase, I think, is the second lowest in Canada, 1980 compared to 1970, and certainly it, too, is below the level of inflation. So as I said, we've have a smaller amount of real investment taking place this year than we had last year.

I also can't help but note the rapidly declining number of farms in Manitoba — and we're still waiting for an explanation from the Minister of Agriculture. We've asked him twice now and these are statistics that are essentially the period in which the Conservative government has been in office since 1976. 1976 to 1979, the number of farms in Manitoba has declined by 8.7 percent, four times the rate of decline in Saskatchewan and Alberta. There may be some special explanation for these figures, but they are recent figures, they are recent data and there's been no explanation coming forth from the Minister of Agriculture. I know he's concerned about it because he says he's very concerned about the family farm. Well, if he's concerned about the family, I say, Mr. Chairman, the family farm is going out the window pretty rapidly in the province of Manitoba when the rate of decline is four times the rate of decline of the number of farms in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Of course, we know the figures on the population loss. Manitoba has never experienced a serious drop in its total level of population in its entire history, apart from World War II, 1942-43, when many people were transferred out of the province to fight the Second World War. Apart from that period, there's never been as significant a drop in the population of this province as we've experienced in the year, 1979. So given all these facts and, of course, that's a reflection of the loss on interprovincial migration where we lost 15,473 people according to the estimates supplied by Stats Canada in the year 1979, through interprovincial migration. So given all these facts I would think, Mr. Chairman, that it's possible that the government's revenues are lagging.

I'd like the Minister to explain, he surely has monthly estimates of revenues. Can he enlighten the Legislature on what the revenue picture is compared to last year or compared to the estimate of what the revenue was expected to be? Similarly, can he give us an idea of what's happening to expenditures?

Expenditures may be rising as my colleague, the Member for Elmwood, stated. There are expenditures that this government is engaging in because they seem to have been suddenly converted to deficit spending and it's possible that there's an explanation here for wanting to move at this time to get an addition 10 percent. Well, I don't know but I think the Legislature is deserving of this explanation at least. I agree with the members who have already spoken. I don't think we want to rag this out inordinately. We could make lengthy speeches on many subjects of concern to the members of the opposition but, nevertheless, I gather that is not the intent of those that have spoken so far; it is not my intent. But at least, Mr. Chairman, the people of Manitoba have a right to have some explanation as to what's happening to revenues on the one hand and what's happening to expenditures on the other.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, before this debate goes too much further, the questions are piling up somewhat and I want to make some comments on them. First of all, there will be five occasions where this debate can take place: Main Supply; it already has taken place on the first Interim Supply Bill; Sup-supply No. 1; Sup-supply No. 2 and Interim Supply No. 2. There are five places where the same debate can take place on the same issues and already have. Well, I guess there's Concurrence coming along and at any rate I count five. No doubt, the Member for Inkster can count more positions, being more familiar with the rules and procedures. What this simply is is a bill that comes before the House that says we ask for an amount because of the extension of time. It's the same principles involved as with the bill that was in the House before us. So I find it very difficult to find why the ire that's being generated across the way because of this coming in on short notice. We brought the first Interim Supply Bill in and we were criticized by the opposition for not bringing it in sooner. We checked the records and it was about the same. I read out the dates of all the other ones. It was about 10 days, 7 to 10 days, usually on an Interim Supply Bill, read out the lead times that were provided historically. It was about the same. They amount to the same argument, a kind of vitriolic argument that the Member for St. Johns is so capable of doing. I checked with some of your members; I didn't check as soon as I perhaps could have. I tried the Member for Lac du Bonnet, to try and talk to the Member for Lac du Bonnet this morning; I tried to get a hold of the Member for Seven Oaks before the session today; I did catch the House Leader in the hallway to try and explain a bit to him, albeit the time was short.

But I really wonder, Mr. Chairman, I should say I don't accept the fact that you need a lot of lead time to do a second Interim Supply because of the fact the session has taken more time, for whatever reasons. But the arguments that pertain to the Second Interim Supply, Mr. Chairman, are the same, by and large, arguments that take place on the First Interim Supply and there are three other bills or three that are going to have to be before us where the same arguments can place again, all to do with

supply. That doesn't even mention Capital Supply, so there's plenty of opportunity for it. I don't buy the accusation that there's an element of mismanagement. It could have been in sooner; it got tied up in the debate as to whether to proceed with this or to go with the Speed-up and that was done. But for the member to suggest, well, he and the First Minister got into a very undesirable kind of an exchange that ought not to take place in the House too often, a very personal exchange. But I have to tell the Member for St. Johns that perhaps I spoke to the Member for Lac du Bonnet because he's officially, I thought, the Finance critic, I tried to get hold of him and talk to him. I tried to get hold of the Member for Seven Oaks because he's a very reasonable man, I don't have any trouble talking to him. The member says, why didn't you speak to our members? I perhaps may have phoned the Member for St. Johns, maybe I should have officially because he's the House Leader. Well, he's the Deputy Leader of the Opposition but those are the facts. Perhaps he can be critical of not doing it soon enough but some of his accusations are not well-founded and principally the fact that somehow there's an element of mismanagement; what's happening is terribly unusual. I happened to think that we made a mistake on the last Interim Supply. We allowed the sort of normal amount of time on the introduction of that Interim Supply. We let it run over the deadline. The Provincial Auditor was critical of us having done that because the opposition wanted to carry on and I spoke to the Leader of the Opposition and we had the problem of holding cheques and mailing out cheques so they didn't arrive, all this sort of thing. I would recommend to the government in the future we don't do that again. We did that because we didn't want to force the House. We went, in this case, to a second Interim because we didn't want to force the House on Main Supply. It hasn't been unusual for the House historically to ask for 30 percent of supply in Interim and have no difficulty in doing it. We could have forced Interim Supply and taken up House time to deal with it. We decided that the opposition would have a fair criticism of us if we tried to force Main Supply now under the Speed-up and get it through by a fixed date. We decided to go this way to be as fair to the House as possible. So I don't think there is a fair criticism to be levelled, Mr. Chairman, because of the opportunities that are before the House still over the next several days to say anything that has to be said or asked the questions of the government that they want to ask.

The Member for Brandon East has asked a number of questions regarding the picture with regard to revenues which are current. Those are current questions I know are of current concern. I've said before in the House that we cannot predict the effects on the revenue picture because of the drought and the other things, I suppose, that are happening but mainly spinning off from the effects of the drought. We cannot predict them with accuracy. There will be some impact. I can tell the member that we are watching it closely. There has not in fact been any substantial impact through June with regard to the revenue picture. There was no impact in May that was measurable. The revenue picture for the year to the end of June for the first quarter there's nothing unusual happening as a result that

you can pin down to the drought. So that's as much information that can be given at this time.

The expenditure side is different. We've had to make expenditures. We're having to advance moneys. The major change in the expenditure side this year has been the advancement of moneys to the school divisions on a new pattern of advancement, to cut down on their interest costs and those moneys have gone out — and I indicated that formula to the House — and there's a very heavy draw on those funds in April. As a result, they go out much more rapidly than they used to but the school boards save on the other end by not having to pay interest charges at the bank. So we are getting a heavier flow in the early part of the fiscal year and, as a result, you'll find that it isn't one-quarter of the total spent in one quarter of the year. As a result, the draw has been probably a little heavier than it would have been in other years. So, Mr. Chairman, I make these comments simply to remind you, as some guidance for whatever help it can be, that there is plenty of opportunity to discuss all of these things and ask all the questions under all the other supply bills that are before the House.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to clarify. I accused the government of mismanagement and I do. I accused the government earlier of mismanagement by the long delay for the extensive bills that are now being brought to us at this stage, and I think it's unprecedented and I think there's an unusual number of bills and I don't think in previous years — Mr. Chairman, I've been around quite a few years, 18 I think, 17 or so — I don't recall an occasion when bills were so late in coming in and the number in which they were coming in, to the extent that we had a 116 page bill today, and that is my criticism primarily.

The point the Honourable the Minister makes, at which I expressed surprise, was that tomorrow's the deadline. No indication. There could have been an indication a week ago that it was coming, that it was necessary.

My main criticism, Mr. Chairman, is that there has to be — and that's the point I made earlier — co-operation on both sides in relation to getting business done; not on agreement on bills or how you vote, but co-operation on getting business done. The Minister's right. It shouldn't be necessary to have a lengthy debate on a 10 percent Interim Supply, which is very understandable.

The point I'm making, Mr. Chairman, is that the spirit of co-operation has to exist. I'm glad the Attorney-General is coming in. Yesterday, we had clearly a misunderstanding about the agreement on how to deal with professional bills. I believe, Mr. Chairman, we're going to deal with it that way anyway because I can't see members opposite wanting to spend countless hours reviewing so many professional bills. Now, yesterday we had a little exchange, the Attorney-General and I; today I tried to be conciliatory in understanding his ultimatum of yesterday which apparently was if you don't pass Speed-up then I will not agree to that understanding about professional bills. But today when he was

asked by the House Leader what was the intent on the professional bills he said, since we didn't have the agreement, we will see in due course. That, Mr. Chairman, I criticize as being a poor attitude from the House Leader who should be the person who is trying to get co-operation from the opposition.

I don't ask the First Minister that he and I should have to agree on anything really but the House Leader should be able to agree with our House Leader on procedures. This Interim Supply bill could have been cleared in this way, and it will be dealt with. I haven't heard anybody speak against passing it today but when I said bad management, I'm talking about the fact that it is necessary to consult on House procedures.

In the House of Commons, I know in what they call the Mother Parliaments, I know there is constant communication about the procedure and what will happen next. I think it's been lacking. I think it's been missing in this session in the last week or two and I deplore it. Now I try to make my effort; obviously it didn't succeed very well but that is the extent of the criticism. I am not criticizing the bringing in of Interim Supply a day before deadline except I think it would have been better had it been cleared earlier and agreed on as to how it would be handled.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, if I might make a few comments with respect to the comments of the Member for St. Johns. The Member for St. Johns rightly suggests there should be discussion between members opposite and our side and between myself and the Opposition House Leader, and I agree, Mr. Chairman, but it's not a one-way street. I suggested on a number of items in the past week or so, there have been suggestions made by the members opposite who want some bills to lay or some time to give consideration to some bill or something like that. At the same time, if members opposite expect the government to make concessions — and we're prepared to make reasonable concessions — at the same time, Mr. Chairman, the members opposite have to be prepared to make some commitments too. It's not a one-way street, Mr. Chairman, it's a two-way street and on a number of issues we've been prepared to make concessions but, at the same time, members opposite also have to make some concessions. If we're going to give away or concede that there are certain items that should be laid over for consideration by a committee or another session of the Legislature, there are some small things that we have suggested we want in return.

So I suggest to members opposite that they, when subjects like that come up in the future, and there's still the item of professional bills in which we're, I think, open to some discussion, but at the same time members opposite better be prepared to make a commitment also, and there they have a real problem, Mr. Chairman. They have a real problem because they have difficulty — and we've experienced on numerous occasions in the past — that they cannot make commitments. I don't know whether it's because they lack leadership or whether they don't meet in caucus or everyone doesn't

attend in caucus, Mr. Chairman, but they've been unable in the past to make commitments. The examples in this Legislature go on and on and on, of suggestions by some members, well, we'll finish these estimates; you have your members sit down and we'll finish these estimates in an hour, and we've gone on for three hours. The examples are numerous throughout the session, Mr. Chairman. We're prepared to be reasonable, Mr. Chairman, but I suggest if members opposite want to discuss agreements on proceedings, we're open but they'd better be prepared to make commitments in the same way and live up to them, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster when he spoke earlier said that he didn't see any reason to dog this particular item. The House Leader, speaking latterly as the House Leader and formerly as a member I suppose, has given a basis for prolonging this perhaps because the government is finally facing up to the fact that the Legislature exists and perhaps if their counterparts in Ottawa had learned that, there wouldn't have been a federal election. But perhaps it's a good thing that there was, I don't know, time will tell.

But earlier in his remarks . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Are we not meeting in Committee again this evening? Because I asked the Honourable House Leader what would be the format for this evening and he indicated we would be in Committee of Interim Supply. Now if you are calling the Speaker in that means we're adjourning, and if we are adjourning then I would like to just throw back to the Honourable House Leader the bit of co-operation which he has indicated is necessary if he intends to have Speed-up tonight. I'm prepared to live with that. I was prepared to live with, even though it wasn't raised, the fact that we would give up the Private Members' Hour, which we still had a right to, and that was discussed and I never challenged the fact that we went past the 4:30 hour because I felt it was an agreement. But if we are now going into Speed-up as of this evening, then I say that the House Leader, with all his pious words of two or three minutes ago, is not living up to the agreement of trying to negotiate because he never indicated that we would be sitting into Speed-up this evening. That's my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** On the point of order, I would believe that Speed-up has been passed and I'm just following the routine that is normal after Speed-up has been passed.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Very well, Mr. Chairman. All I would like to indicate on this point of order is that there has been no consultation as to when Speed-up would start.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** On the point of order, I don't think that any consultation is required with the Chairman, I just follow the rules unless I receive some instructions from the House.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that Speed-up went into effect immediately. I know the Opposition House Leader indicated they were prepared to grant unanimous consent, if it was necessary, to go into time for Private Members' Hour to complete the discussion on the Speed-up resolution. When I indicated to him we would be in Committee of Interim Supply tonight, I'm sorry if he misunderstood, but I think it's necessary that the House meet, that we go into Supply. We then have to report back if those deliberations are completed and go into Committee of Ways and Means, so it's necessary that the House sit.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Very well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to belabour the point but I do want to indicate that I can't live by assumptions. When I ask a question as to what we're doing in the evening, I expect an answer that is straightforward and that's what I expected. When the Honourable House Leader said we're going into Committee of Supply in respect to Interim Supply, it did not indicate to me that we were going into Speed-up or anything else.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could indicate, and it might be helpful not only to members opposite, to people who wish to speak to Privileges and Elections, it would be my intention that the House would meet tomorrow morning and tomorrow afternoon and that Privileges and Elections Committee would meet tomorrow night and Saturday.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

## IN SESSION

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

**MR. KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, report of Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned till 8:00 o'clock this evening.