

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 8 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 . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Agriculture, further to questions posed to the Minister of Finance yesterday and which the Minister of Finance accepted as notice. To the Minister of Agriculture, in view of the announcement by the Federal Minister of Agriculture, Eugene Whelan, over the weekend that there would be no federal-provincial cost-sharing pertaining to the provincial program of drought relief, can the Minister advise whether or not he has since been in contact with the Federal Minister of Agriculture pertaining to the probability of any cost-sharing on the part of the federal government?

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

**HON. JIM DOWNEY (Arthur):** First, Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the premise that the Federal Minister of Agriculture made that kind of an explicit statement that there was no cost-sharing because, in fact, we have already got money committed from the federal government in some of the programs that we have introduced so I can't accept the premise that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is laying before this Assembly. But I would also like to add that I have talked to the Federal Minister of Agriculture and our senior staff, as I mentioned this morning, are going to meeting to work out the programs that have been announced. I would say that at this particular point I'm still under the understanding that there will be some further cost-sharing of provincial programs.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the Minister of Agriculture then denying that the Minister of Agriculture of Canada this weekend indicated there would be no cost-sharing except if there were some moneys left over after their expenditure of some 60 million in respect to drought relief?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, without adding to it, I believe I have already answered that particular question.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture, of course, leaves this matter very much up in the air, has not answered the question. To the

First Minister, as the First Minister is the chairman of the Drought Co-ordinating Committee for the province, has the First Minister been in touch with the Prime Minister in treating this matter, urging the Prime Minister and himself to treat this matter of one of top priority in order to ask what actions can be undertaken by both levels of government, federal and provincial, in order to ensure that there is proper and rational and necessary co-ordination involving the efforts of the two levels of government, pertaining to drought relief.

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

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, that action was done. The statement of the drought program, which was announced some weeks ago, was sent by me to the Prime Minister, concurrently with the announcement, and I've since had an acknowledgement from him indicating that there would be federal cost-sharing of some of the programs. Federal cost-sharing would be part of the federal government's participation in meeting the drought situation in Manitoba, and I presume in Saskatchewan as well. It is on that basis and on the clear understandings that the Minister of Agriculture has indicated he has had from officials of Agriculture Canada, that we are assured or feel assured that the federal government will be participating, as it already is indeed, in some of the programs that we have already announced. And if it is necessary to follow that through, that is, the correspondence that I've already had with the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition can rest assured that will be done and will be done in the firmest of terms.

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

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask either the Minister of Agriculture or the First Minister, that in the event that the federal government does not have sufficient funds allocated for the full participation, as anticipated by the provincial government in the province's Drought Relief Program, is the government prepared to indicate that they will not cut back on the amounts allocated in their particular program, notwithstanding the federal role.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question is hypothetical. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I want to argue the point. There have been statements by the Government of Canada, I presume they have to be accurate coming from Government of Canada Ministers, that they will only fund to the extent that they have moneys left over. That is a very ambiguous kind of commitment to this province's program, and therefore, it is not my anticipation, it is on the record, Mr. Speaker, that they are not certain as to how much they are committed to in Manitoba.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the First Minister. Is the First Minister at this time prepared to say anything vis-a-vis the continuance, in legislation presently before the House, of the clause which relates to persons of all kinds making statements in election campaigns which somebody or other may deem to be false?

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

**MR. LYON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am. I'm prepared to state on behalf of the government that section will not be proceeded with.

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

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him, can he indicate, can he tell the farmers of the Gypsumville area why the Department of Agriculture overruled a notice to allow people to draw on a parcel of land that would be up for hay cutting, rather than the Department of Agriculture allocate it to one individual after notices had been posted by the Resources people in the area.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated this morning, I thank the member for making me aware of this situation last night during committee, and I've asked the department to get me that information to find out what exactly took place so I can respond to it, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate whether it is the practice of the Department of Agriculture to overrule decisions made by the Department of Resources in terms of allocating of land which were under their control.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that we are working in full co-operation with the Department of Natural Resources and trying to alleviate the difficulties that the people in Agriculture have and remembering that there is a responsibility to maintain a certain level of wildlife in the province and habitat for that particular resource that we have.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister since I gave him notice on both these matters last evening in terms of the matter that we raised this morning of the Red Deer Lake, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether he's had an opportunity to ascertain who the individuals were who got the contract or the authority from the municipality of Minitonas and the municipality of Swan River, to cut approximately between 2,000 and 3,000 acres of land, people who did not have any equipment at the time, I am advised, and whether the Minister intends to guarantee the farmers of that area that they will be supplied with hay, and whether or not the prices that were quoted are exorbitant.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the issue that the member brought to my attention as far as the allocation of hay, I want to say that we're having it looked into at this particular time. The basis on which hay allocations were to take place were on the basis of the municipality allocating it to the different farmers within that area as we're doing in The Pas area. If there is some irregularity taking place, then we're quite prepared to correct that and that is the process that's taking place right at this particular time.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct an additional question to the First Minister. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that on several occasions, both with regard to this administration and the previous administration, there have occurred in legislation provisions which, not at first glance, can infringe on civil liberties and can result in unnecessary powers to the bureaucracy, would the Minister consider the appointment of, on the legal staff, of somebody who is specifically looking at all pieces of legislation with a design of making sure such provisions do not inadvertently creep into legislation?

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster has an interesting suggestion that we should appoint another bureaucrat to watch the bureaucrats, and who will watch the bureaucrat who's appointed? I rather, on a more serious vein, Sir, think that ultimately the 57 members of this House have to accept that responsibility. From time to time, as he says, it is true, matters do creep into legislation that, if soberly considered by this House, would not be there in the first place. The honourable member has identified one such piece, and it is going to be withdrawn, as I've just said.

But may I say in that connection, in connection with the honourable member's suggestion that so long as we have 57 members of this House who are vigilant with respect to matters of that sort, and they can be on all sides of the House, then that is the best protection that the public can have. And I think that honourable members who call this to the attention of government, particularly in bills that have large numbers of sections to them, are doing perhaps the highest service that they can perform to the public of Manitoba, in preventing that kind of thing from happening.

So I commend the honourable member for his suggestion, but I think that with 57 of us in this House who have the ultimately responsibility, the fact that that particular offending section was pointed out by the Member for Inkster, and spoken of by other members of the House, I think is a good working example of how parliament should function in the highest sense of the word, and the section certainly will not be proceeded with, thanks in large measure to the fact that all members of the House have become alerted to it and of course have seen that it is not something that this House should pass.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Except for the fact that all of the members of the House are to be vigilant, as I hope we accept our responsibility in that regard, wouldn't the Minister agree that from time to time, over the years, despite this vigilance, that this type — and I'm not referring to this particular one, there are several others during the debate in the House — of vigilance on the part of the members would be aided and abetted if there was an attempt to prescreen, by somebody who had a particular direction with respect to those types of points?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is so persuasive in this cause, I almost feel he is preaching for a call, and I can only say to him — (Interjection)— that somebody with his nimbleness of mind and accuteness of interpretation, could well fulfill this bill, but I point out to him, just from the documents that are on our desks today, that we have from the Legislative Counsel, as we have traditionally had, with respect to The Statute Law Amendment Act, which is a compendium of legislation that all governments bring in toward the end of the session, an explanatory document of some six pages from the Legislative Counsel pointing out the effect of each of the sections. That is a very onerous task for the Legislative Counsel to perform but with respect to this bill, it is always thought helpful to all of the members of the House that this kind of documentation should be in our hands in order to flag anything that should come to our attention, as indeed the Legislative Counsel does with respect to private members' bills or private bills, that come into the House.

So without dismissing the suggestion of the Member for Inkster out of hand in any way at all, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there are some forms and procedures that we have built into this. The best procedure is the vigilance of the members of the House and if I may say so, I neglected to say, aided and abetted by the members of the press who have their role to play in this exercise as well.

To make sure that within that ultimate vigilance that there might be some improvement in terms of having a legislative counsellor, people on his staff, flag some of the legislation as it comes through in a manner somewhat similar to what we do with The Statute Law Amendment Act. It would probably require much more staffing and so on, but the suggestion is well worth considering.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, just on a question of privilege in response to the First Minister's statement. May I inform him that at the moment I am gainfully employed, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, on the same question of privilege, we witness daily the fact that my honourable friend is gainfully employed in this House and we have occasion from time to time to thank him for the quality of his work.

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

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Agriculture. I would ask the Minister if he could undertake to provide information in regard to the contract for hay at Red Deer Lake, if he could provide the names of the individuals who have been given the contract to put up the hay and could he undertake to provide why this contract was not tendered out to any farmer who would like to put up this hay.

Also, if he could provide information as to how much the Crown lands are being charged for to these individuals and if he could provide an estimate of production for the amount of hay that will put up on those acres that are being available? Also, if he could confirm if there are farmers in the area who have equipment and are prepared to put up the hay for around 10 per bale, rather than 25.00?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest detailed information of that nature would better be provided by an Order for Return.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister has agreed to provide some of the information in regard to the details of that transaction there, and we're just asking him to look into these matters, which is all part of the package.

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** First of all, Mr. Speaker, I can't provide information that doesn't fall within my jurisdiction, as far as the work done or contracts entered into by the municipality. If they have not followed the guidelines, Mr. Speaker, then I'm prepared to check that out and will report back to the House after seeing what procedure has been followed.

**MR. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My second question would be then, the Minister indicates that whether or not the municipality has followed the guidelines. Could the Minister indicate to the House, what are the guidelines in regard to this kind of a transaction? What are the guidelines?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Possibly, Mr. Speaker . . . the answer earlier and I would refer him back to Hansard. I believe I said that the intent was to allocate the hay to the municipalities, so they could reallocate it to the different farmers within their areas. That is what I said, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and follows up on a question earlier this morning by my leader in regard to the unpublished report on asbestos fibres contamination in Winnipeg drinking water. I'd ask the Minister if his department has had an opportunity to obtain a copy of that report and if so, if they can indicate when that report was first written and how long it has been

since the initial documentation and this public disclosure of the fact that we have fairly high levels of asbestos fibre contamination in Winnipeg drinking water.

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

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** No, Mr. Speaker, we have not as yet had a chance to obtain a copy of the report but I did, subsequent to question period this morning and subsequent to the question by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, ask the Public Health Director at my department for a response and a reaction.

I might say that our Director of Communicable Disease Control and the Public Health Directorate feels that there is no danger, that the suggestion is overstated. However, I will attempt to obtain a copy of that report, Sir.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, we've heard those same sorts of assurances in regard to other toxins and contaminants and carcinogenic substances such as asbestos, so I would hope that the Minister would follow through with that and seek as much diverse opinion as he can in regard to the province.

As it is known that other areas also use asbestos pipe to carry water — and I'm thinking in particular of a community that's come under discussion frequently in the House within the last few days and that's Churchill — I would ask the Minister if there is any program ongoing to determine what other communities are now using asbestos pipe to carry their water through their system and if he can indicate if testing has been done in those areas to determine if they have higher or lower levels than have been found in Winnipeg.

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any such program of that nature. Certainly asbestos has been used for a great many years in pipes and there are difficulties with other types of piping material, as the honourable member well knows, that certainly clinically on the surface at least, appear to outweigh whatever disadvantages there may be to asbestos.

I note that in the media reports on the unpublished federal report, that the Director of Water and Waste departmental operations for the city is quoted as saying that he's been assured by countless articles from the American Waterworks Association that the pipes are not dangerous and do not deteriorate to any great extent. However, I will be pursuing the illusive unpublished federal report, Mr. Speaker, and see where we go from there.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you. I would hope the Minister would seek documentation other than from a group that is organized to promote the asbestos pipe as well as other forms of pipe.

The person the Minister referred to also suggested — and this question is to the Minister of Labour — also suggested that the reason that the city was not following up on the study was that they did not have

an electron microscope in order to perform asbestos sampling. I understand that the Department of Labour has such a microscope in regard to testing for asbestos in the workplace and in samples from schools.

I would ask the Minister of Labour if he is prepared to contact the individual mentioned in regard to the city and suggest that they might be able to use the electron microscope of the province, on whatever basis he would seek, so that they may indeed follow up this testing as well as follow up testing which I hope will be undertaken in regard to asbestos contamination from other water systems throughout smaller communities in the province. I'd ask him if he can make that commitment to the House so that we can rest assured that at least the testing is undergoing.

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

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, the equipment that we now have in place was being used very extensively by ourselves, but I see no problem in contacting the particular people in mind and seeing what type of arrangement could be worked out.

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

**MRS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister responsible for Autopac. In view of the fact that Autopac has failed in its attempt through the courts to reduce a claim because the victim was not wearing a seat belt, will the Minister be recommending to the government that they change their position in regard to seat belt legislation?

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

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, without being evasive with the answer, but that question has been already asked in this Chamber and I've answered that question.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Labour and I have to tell my friend from Rock Lake, it's an original blockbuster, not a pre-arranged blockbuster. I would like to ask the Minister of Labour whether he can assure the House that there will be a full enquiry by the Fire Commissioner's Office in relation to the Holiday Inn fire, especially in view of the locked fire exit, the 15-minute delay of fire trucks, and the fact that there was no alarm sounded in the hotel.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I think the investigation that is presently taking place will determine whether in fact appropriate doors were inappropriately locked, whether the alarm system

was in fact working properly, or when the fire trucks arrived. All those items and others will be determined through the investigation that is now taking place and I would suggest to the Member for Elmwood that he not precisely say that much attention to what is being recorded at this moment until the investigation is declared whether in fact those facts are facts.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the Minister whether there are regular inspections made of Winnipeg hotels by the city of Winnipeg departments and the Fire Commissioner's Office.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice. I, off the top of my head, would rather not say just what the fire inspection routine is for hotels in the city.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Acting Attorney-General or to the First Minister, who would be familiar with the procedure. Could he ensure that there will in fact be an inquest held on this matter in view of the fatality, in view of the 1.3 million reported damage, in view of the alleged arson, and because of the fact that this was a national political convention which will be of some interest to people across Canada in terms of the unfortunate fire.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to take that as notice. There was a time, of course, prior to legislative amendments that were made some time in the middle 70s, when as a matter of course an inquest would have occurred into that kind of a fatality without the intervention of the Attorney-General or anyone else. Amendments were made in the 70s to try to cut down on the numbers of inquests, with the result that from time to time we now hear in this House requests that inquests be held, whereas previously they were held automatically. Without commenting on whether that legislation should be looked at again or not, I'll be happy to take the question for notice. Hearsay, and it's only hearsay, and I will have to have it confirmed by the appropriate authorities, but hearsay is to the effect that the Chief Medical Examiner has indicated an inquest would be called, but I will double check that out.

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

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health. Over a month ago, I asked the Minister if he was investigating charges made to him formally in a letter by a chiropractor where the chiropractor charged that he had referred patients with broken limbs to a hospital and the patient was refused treatment because the patients had been referred to the hospital by the chiropractor. Has the Minister completed his investigation of those charges?

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the complaints or the allegations referred to by the Honourable Member for Transcona were conveyed to the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Commission assured me that they were undertaking an investigation of the situation and would report back to me in detail. I do not have that report yet and I will enquire later today as to the status of it.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Transcona also asked me a few days ago, a couple of weeks ago, about the possible use of depo-provera, which is an approved drug but restricted to use in the treatment of cancer and other critical illnesses, and whether or not that drug was being used as a contraceptive in any of our mental hospitals or the Manitoba School for the Retarded.

I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that is not the case, that my officials, having made enquiries, have found no one that is prescribed the drug as a contraceptive, that physicians seem to be aware of the dangers and avoid using the drug and that it's not used in either Brandon or Selkirk Mental Health Centres or in the Manitoba School at Portage. However, I would add, Mr. Speaker, that it's possible, of course, to use a drug for other than approved purposes and it may be that — and I emphasize the "may" — it may be that some physicians in private practice have prescribed it as a contraceptive. There would be no way of checking that out in ultimate definitive terms unless there was a complete canvas of all physicians undertaken, Mr. Speaker. But I think the honourable member's concern, arising out of a report from Ontario, was that it might be in use in our provincial institutions and the answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no such use.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I'd like to thank the Minister for his answer. I was concerned as to whether in fact people were being prescribed this drug and who weren't aware of its consequences and were in no position to withhold consent. I would ask the Minister as a follow-up, however, whether he would ask the College of Physicians and Surgeons to look into this matter in that the reports out of Ontario indicate that the institutions themselves weren't prescribing the drug but that physicians were prescribing the drug for uses other than that allowed for or prescribed under the, I think, The Canadian Drug Act or The Safety Act, and that there was a fair amount of discretion allowed physicians, and I'm wondering then, given the seriousness of this matter, whether the Minister would ask the College of Physicians and Surgeons to take a look at this matter as well?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, I can do that, Mr. Speaker. I would repeat that the Chief Provincial Psychiatrist and Assistant Deputy Minister responsible for our mental health institutions advises me that it is not used in any of those provincial institutions, and I assume that means that it's not used either by the institutional staff or by any private physicians prescribing to persons in those institutions. But I can re-check that point.

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

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Education and is relative to a matter I brought to his attention on July 4. I would ask whether he has had the opportunity now to discuss the matter of the eviction of families with school children on condominium conversions as provided for by Bill 83, with the Minister of Consumer Affairs responsible for that bill, and can he advise of whether there will be amendments restricting such eviction in the case of families with school children?

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

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I have to inform the honourable member that I have not been able to have those conversations with my colleague as yet, and I would that we'd be able to have those conversations very soon.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd ask whether the Minister can advise the House at this juncture whether he will be supporting those provisions that will allow the eviction of families with school children on application for condominium conversion, or whether or not he will uphold the rights of those families and the children to remain within their communities and within the context of the school system in their neighbourhood? Can he advise us what his position will be in that regard?

**MR. COSENS:** Not at this time, Mr. Speaker. I would like to pursue the matter further with my colleague.

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

**MR. CORRIN:** My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister of Consumer Affairs responsible for Bill 83.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are no provisions for collective bargaining in Bill 83 and in view of the fact that many tenants are dealing with very large rental agencies or very large development companies that own their premises, we would ask whether the Minister will make an amendment to the Act in order to provide equitable bargaining . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Order please. Questions of that nature do not fall within the purview of the question period.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** Yes, I'd ask, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister feels that tenants within the province should have the right to bargain collectively with landlords with respect to rent increases.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I again refer the member to Citation 360 of Beauchesne.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet. The Honourable Member for Wellington on a point of order.

**MR. CORRIN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I would note that the question I addressed respecting the government's position on the subject of collective bargaining is clearly a matter of governmental policy and obviously of some immediate import, Mr. Speaker. So I would ask you to reconsider your ruling.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. To the honourable member, if he would read Citation 360(1) it says: "Some further limitations seem to be generally understood. A question may not ask a solution of a legal question such as the interpretation of a statute."

If the honourable member cares to read his rules, he will find out.

The Honourable Member for Wellington on a point of order.

**MR. CORRIN:** No, Mr. Speaker, I'm taking your advice and I'm rephrasing the question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member has had three questions already.

**MR. CORRIN:** No, Mr. Speaker, with respect to . . .

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

**MR. CORRIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we'd ask whether the government has formulated a policy with respect to the subject of whether or not tenants should be allowed collective bargaining with respect to arbitration of rent increases. Could the government advise us whether such a policy has been established and whether they will consider doing that?

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the Minister wanted to reply to that question. I'm willing to yield the floor if he so wishes to do that.

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

**MR. JORGENSON:** I'm sorry, I didn't get the honourable member's question. I wonder if he'd mind repeating it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, as a courtesy I sat down because I thought I saw the Minister wanting to respond to the previous question. If he wishes to, I'm prepared to yield the floor.

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

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister responsible for Autopac and I'd like to ask him, if his statement to the House followed the ruling in early

July — this is regarding seat belt legislation, the ruling by court in early July — to the effect that they would not allow Autopac's claim because I've been listening to questions and haven't heard that one in this recent past. So would he mind telling us if it was within the past week.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the substance of my reply to that question that was earlier asked was essentially that we should not be asking Autopac to do, through the means of court action, what we are not prepared to do legislatively in this Chamber. I so advised Autopac of that feeling in terms of general direction that is given to a Crown corporation from time to time, by the Minister responsible for that organization.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister. I'm asking him if he would confirm that in spite of the fact that the general manager of Autopac has said that Autopac will be claiming, would be trying through the courts to reduce the size of claims for victims who are not wearing seat belts, the Minister, the government has instructed Autopac that they are not to pursue those claims. Is that what the Minister has just told us?

**MR. ENNS:** No, Mr. Speaker, precisely the opposite is the case. The court has instructed or has told Autopac that in the absence of compulsory seat belt legislation, they declined or ruled against Autopac in their position that they had taken before the courts. I believe that the courts ruled correctly in the absence of legislation in this field.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he would care to reply to a question I put to him about a week or 10 days ago having to do with his policy on allocations of feed supplies or hay permits in the Netley Marsh area. He took that question as notice about 10 days ago, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the process of a draw system is how the hay is being allocated in that particular area.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if he would look into that particular area and provide us with an answer, because it's my understanding that only one person has been given the whole acreage in that whole marsh, in the Netley March area, and that most people did not have an opportunity to make application.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I will further check on that for the member, but at this particular point that is the information that I have received and I will further check into it.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, will you first of all proceed with the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the First Minister on Page 6.

## RESOLUTION — CONSTITUTION

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition,

THAT we, the members of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, in session assembled and on behalf of the people of Manitoba, wish to extend our warm best wishes to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, on the occasion of her birthday; and

THAT we wish Her Majesty many years of health and happiness in which to continue her high and devoted service to the people of the Commonwealth.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, it's a particular pleasure to move the adoption of the motion standing in my name to recognize the birthday this month of Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother. The occasion is made the more memorable by reason of the fact that this is Her Majesty's 80th birthday, and as we understand it, celebrations are taking place in London on or about July 15 and it would be our hope that this resolution of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba could be amongst those tributes and felicitations that would be sent to Her Majesty from all parts of the Commonwealth. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that honourable members will recognize that the Queen Mother has been tireless in carrying out the duties of the wife, first of all, of the heir presumptive to the Throne, then of the Queen Consort, and latterly, of the Mother of her present Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II.

She has given her life to serving the wide community of the Commonwealth. Indeed, she was the first Royal Consort to visit our province when she accompanied King George VI on his visit to Manitoba in 1939. On that occasion, she won the hearts of Manitobans who met her. I remember quite well as a young boy going to see Her Majesty the Queen, and King George VI when they attended a church service in Portage la Prairie in the spring of 1939 and what a great thrill it was to see Her Majesty and His Majesty, King George VI on that occasion.

It is therefore, Sir, with a great deal of pleasure and pride, seconded by my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, that I move the adoption of this motion.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to be able to second the motion and to associate the opposition with the motion to the Queen Mother, expressing to

her health and happiness in which to continue her high and devoted service to the people of the Commonwealth. I recall, too, although quite young, the first occasion of her visit to Canada as Consort to King George VI. I think due to that visit to Canada and into Manitoba, the Queen Mother has a particular attachment, an attachment to Canadians and to Manitobans, due to the warmth and the outgoing nature of the Queen Mother as was expressed during that very first trip to Canada. Certainly she has conducted herself well in representing the institution of the monarchy over the years and as Queen Mother to the present Queen. She has represented the monarchy with dignity and with a great sense of purpose and contribution.

So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in seconding the motion of health and happiness to the Queen Mother on the time of her 80th birthday.

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

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with a great deal of pleasure that I join with other members of this House on behalf of the Liberal Party in paying honour and tribute to this very beloved royal personage. I was not a resident of Canada in 1939 when Her Majesty and His Majesty, King George VI, came to this country, but throughout my childhood and young womanhood I was aware and admiring of the facts that Their Majesties and their two daughters, then Princess Elizabeth and the Princess Margaret, stood shoulder-to-shoulder with the people of Britain and the people of the Commonwealth in the terrible days of World War II. Although Her Majesty, the Queen Mother, was born and raised as a commoner, she has indeed become a very beloved royal person.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. PETER FOX:** Mr. Speaker, I do not get into very many debates very often, but in this instance I do wish to contribute a few words because one of the earliest impressions I had as a new Canadian was that in 1939 I had the opportunity as a school pupil to attend and watch the parade as the Queen Mother went by. Of course, since then, as a member of this House, I had the opportunity to represent this province at one of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conferences and that was my second opportunity to meet with the Queen Mother herself when she hosted a dinner in London.

So, therefore, I wanted to say that I, too, would like to join with those who are offering congratulations at this time to a lady who I have admired a very very long time.

The other thing I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, is that when one reaches 80, one really doesn't look forward with the same view towards birthdays, because I have a father who is 84 now and he says every day is a new pleasure, a new joy, because they are numbered from now on in. Consequently, I would like to say to the Queen Mother in our felicitations to

her that I do wish that she has many more happy days.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health, 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 SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** This committee will come to order. Supplementary Supply, Resolution No. 1: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding 175,000 for Attorney-General, General Administration 175,000, (b) Planning and Management, (2) Other Expenditures 175,000—pass — the Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, this is just general increased requirements in the Attorney-General's Department. It comes under General Administration 175,000.00. I haven't any further explanation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 1—pass; Resolution No. 2: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding 28,600,000 for Finance, Enabling Vote — Tax Credit Reform 28,600,000—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, there are several outstanding matters, as I recall it, dealing with this item. The first is, of course, the comment that once again the government is staying with the Property Tax Credit Plan, in spite of the Minister's violent objection to it in years gone by. Nevertheless, it's a recognition only that he has not been able to find any improvement to that plan from the standpoint of its objectives and that only, of course, is credit to those who devised it originally.

I'd like to ask the Minister what progress is being made on the study which is presumably ongoing in regard to education financing and I would like to know who is involved in that, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution No. 2 — the Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education has been preparing some background information. At this point, there hasn't been a chief person appointed to undertake it. I cannot advise the member at this point in time whether that person will be someone from within the community at large or whether it will be from some location in the government service. But in the meantime, the background research information is being prepared

by the Department of Education and the economics group in the Department of Finance has done some preliminary work on it, as well. This will be provided as background information for the individual or the small group that will finally do the study and the recommendations to government. As we indicated, at the time of the Budget speech, the objective is to have this in hand before the next fiscal year, certainly, and hopefully before the next calendar year.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I admit that I am surprised by this response, since I had the impression, which I believe I got from the Minister of Education, that the study is in hand and that there will be a report before the end of this calendar year. Now I thought it was just that clearly stated by the Minister of Education, so I'm beginning to be a little concerned, since I think a study would be valuable to make sure which Minister is responsible to see this study being carried on. Because if it falls between the two Ministers, it may never get proper consideration. Now I understand from the Minister of Finance that they have research people in the two departments, who are preparing background material. Are they also starting to study various alternative proposals or is it that the government is looking for one single expert, or a committee of experts that will be reviewing the background material some day?

Mr. Chairman, we're into July. It's very unusual for studies of this to start taking place before, I would say, September at the earliest, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Finance back in 1976 was so quick to say that he knows that there are adjustments that could be made and should be made, I'm wondering how long this study will continue, or whether indeed, Mr. Chairman, it is possible that it will just fall by the wayside. So I'd like to know which Minister is directly responsible for this? If it's a committee of Ministers, which one of them is still the chairman or organizer of the committee and is there consideration being given to whether or not there would be a form of a Royal Commission, where hearings will be invited and heard?

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Albert Driedger (Emerson):** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, it's under the leadership of the Minister of Education. The two departments have been doing some of the background research work in preparation for the study. We don't foresee any difficulties in having it completed by the time indicated and I'm sure that in due course the members will be advised or the public will be advised, generally — it may not be during the period of the sitting of the Legislature — will be advised of the person or people who will be formally heading it up. But to repeat, I don't foresee any difficulty in completing the required homework to get the recommendation to government in the time period indicated.

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

**MR. PETER FOX:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have a specific question. Possibly it's because I haven't been able to interpret what the Minister has said, but I've had constituents ask me when they are going to get replies to those that have written in to the Minister in respect to the ad that he has, where it says: I'd like to know more about Manitoba's White Paper Reforms; please send a brochure. I've had a number of constituents indicate they've had no reply to those requests. Now can the Minister inform us what is available and when those constituents can expect to get the further information?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, I indicated to the House that the material had gone to the printers. I haven't enquired as to when it will specifically be ready but I presume it will be ready within the next week or two.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAM USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, some time ago, we spent some time on discussing the government's new interpretation with respect to eligibility on the part of a spouse for tax credit benefits and, as I recall it, the Minister did not give us, at that time at least, a final definitive policy position of the government and perhaps this is the time that he might further illuminate for us, so we know exactly where the government stands on that issue.

I believe that that was an unfair interpretation, given the history of the tax credit program. If it was done for convenience sake, it was done at some sacrifice to many thousands of people in Manitoba and I would simply ask the Minister whether he was in a position now to tell us what the government's final position is.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, for the period from hereon in, for 1980 on, there is no problem. That is clarified now and for the years two previous, where there was a problem. In that case we're going to provide legislation so that those cases where people had to pay the tax will be free from it, so it will clear the matter up and the legislation will be clarified and there will be no contradiction or doubt about and the intention is to do that. I presume it's probably in The Income Tax Act that's coming before the . . . It's one of the last bills here and we'll clarify that.

**MR. USKIW:** Just to make certain that I understand the Minister, is the Minister suggesting then with respect to new legislation or the new policy, that they will then continue on henceforth with the revised position, but that they will bring forward retroactive legislation with respect to the last two years.

**MR. CRAIK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's essentially the case. It will be a combined family income from hereon in and there will be retroactive legislation to relieve those who got trapped in the last two years.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 2. The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know from the Honourable the Minister, when he presented his Budget Address I inferred from the wording of the address that the change in classification — that's not the correct word — the change in calculation in relating to the cash credit plans were contingent upon a new definition which had to be agreed to by the federal government. What I inferred from what was said was that there was no concurrence by the government at that time, and I also assume that if there was no concurrence then it wouldn't work, it couldn't be done. Now would the Minister update us on the situation in that regard?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, I can clarify that. The federal government has at this point, concurred in our request and will be proceeding with the changes required on the federal income tax form to accommodate the new definition of income. That has been clarified and accepted by the federal government.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, then it does mean — and I have a form in my desk — but it does mean that this radical change will overall reduce the moneys otherwise payable to persons who claimed under the old definition and for example, now people who buy RRSPs will have that amount deducted from their income for the calculation of the tax and therefore certain people will be losers, others will be winners, because of the fact that net income and income — and taxable income I believe — are differently defined. Could the Minister clarify just what the impact is on individuals because of the change which he said he now has agreement to?

**MR. CRAIK:** In overall terms, the total amount paid under the old cost of living tax credit program, as has been stated here a number of times, is reduced. It goes down by — I think the figure is around 19 million — there is added back in programs that are covered though, about 29 million, so through the new program there's a net increase of around 10 million per year. As a result, of course, as has already been indicated, there will be this reduction. Therefore, there will, as the member points out, there will be losers and there will be winners. The winners generally are the low income earners with children and those particularly who are single-parent families and so on. The losers will be scattered all over the map and it's hard to define a group.

I would say you could start out with the families where there are secondary and tertiary income earners who might be a group. We have covered off the areas where we could identify, such as certain senior citizen groups and others, either by way of the increases in the pension support programs and the definition change in those eligible for pension support and others, when it was possible to identify where there may be an impact.

Beyond that, I suppose, one of the most evident groups are those that take advantage of tax laws and take advantage of shelter programs. They will be losers, Mr. Chairman, because — they won't all be losers. There will be a large segment of them will be

losers. There won't be as many losers as there ought to be because we couldn't convince the federal government that we ought to drop all forms of shelter in definition of income for tax credits, which we would much have preferred to do. But there is no classification in the federal income tax form that makes that provision. The closest we could come to it was the one used for the child tax credit. We have the indication from the federal government that they will re-examine this, not for our purposes alone, but for purposes of tax credits where they may arise across the country. And if they do do that redefinition, that will solve that part of the problem.

But even as it stands, there will be a large number where you have secondary and tertiary income earners. For instance, you have people who are in a fairly high income bracket, for one reason or another may have their spouse assigned some income and may be receiving interest off bonds or deposits or coupon credits off stocks and one thing and another that provides a small income. It's not intended as a family support-type of an income, but is intended to spread the income in around the family. Well, now with the combined income definition, those kinds of problems will be avoided. They won't all be avoided, but on the combined income basis they will be substantially reduced so that members, particularly members opposite who are basking in the opposition and making an income other than their MLA indemnity, will probably get caught more severely than those in government side.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated when the White Paper on taxation credits came in, the old program was leaking like a sieve and this is one of the prime example areas of where it wasn't delivering support where I think it was intended to deliver at the time it was brought in. The years of experience and the evolution that took place in the program, brought about anomalies that I don't think would have been allowed in the first place had there been a knowledge of the fact that they were there. They were just too numerous. Many of those have been cut off, in effect, and the finances, the money, shifted into areas where there is a greater need.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister suggests that there are winners and losers with his new program and there's no question that that is true. The point that we quarrel with, Mr. Chairman, is that there are losers within low-income categories. The logic of transferring wealth in my mind has always been transferring wealth from people that are at the top income brackets in favour of people at the bottom end or the medium end, if you like, and the bottom end. What we have here is a transfer of wealth taking place through a tax credit program from a person earning several thousand dollars or 10,000 to a person earning 5,000 or 6,000.00. The Minister smiled at us at the time of debate of his budget when he said, well, you know, this should be your philosophy, why are you objecting? Well, we are objecting precisely for the reason that the transfers are taking place from the wrong people.

The government has established a record of yielding tax points to people at the very top of the

income tax situation or of income, that is, both in the personal and corporate level. They have yielded on the question of estate taxes, which is a wealth tax. They've yielded on the question of mining taxes, which was related to production and wealth of the mining company. But here we find that we are now going to be socialists. We're going to recognize that there is a need to even out income by taking money away from people that are raising families that may be earning 10,000, 12,000, 15,000 and transferring that wealth to people that are earning 4,000, 5,000 or 6,000, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps with large families, people earning more than that. But it seems to me the transfer is within the same poverty circle, or a large measure of it is, and that's what we object to. I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that it's logical.

I couldn't find anyone that would agree with the idea that there should be a reduction of tax credit benefits to a person that earns 10 or 12,000, that has one or two children in favour of someone that is earning 6,000 or 7,000.00. You know, I don't know the logic of that. If one was to bring in tax measures, new tax measures, from the sort of broader tax base that the province has in favour of those new programs, the SAFER Program, the enlarged SAFER Program and the CRISP Program which are good programs then, of course, that would be in fact a progressive measure in taxation policy. But this is not, Mr. Chairman, this is robbing the poor to give to the poorer and that's really what's taking place in good measure and that is the reason for objection. —(Interjection)— Yes, that's right.

The Member for St. Johns points out, when you add 100 on the minimum end of your tax credit on property, you are assuring the person, no matter how wealthy, that they are getting at least 100 more. With respect to most people, you will find that they are not getting 1 more, they are getting 1 or 2 less or 20 less. Yes, other than people at the very bottom. I can read out thousands of examples. There's no magic to it; it's a matter of arithmetic, Mr. Chairman, to prove that point that most — many people — I shouldn't say most, perhaps that's exaggerating, but I would venture to say that hundreds of thousands of tax filers are going to find that they have less money after they have been told that there is 100 increase in the program.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Resolution No. 2—pass; Resolution No. 3—Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding 225,000 for Community Services and Corrections, Rehabilitative Services, 225,000; Item (c) Rehabilitation Services to the Disabled, (4) External Agencies, 225,000—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I'd like to get clarification from the Minister of Finance why none of the funds that supposedly were earmarked for Day Care and Lunch and After Four Programs, which are clearly within the Department of Community Services, why that's not shown in the Supplementary Estimates but rather are shown as part of a tax reform package, when in fact that programming money has nothing whatever to do with the tax reform package, but rather should be an input of funds to programs.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** At the time, Mr. Chairman, that the program was brought in, the administrative mechanism was still in the period of structuring. The program will — the member is correct — be delivered through Community Services. At that time it was brought in though, it was still, as I say, in the period of being structured, and as a result was shown under this vote. But it is included in the larger amount under the Tax Credit Reform Enabling Vote which will be transferable for delivery through the Community Services.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I'd like to point out to the Minister and to the rest of the members of the House a very big problem that exists with this confusion surrounding the budget provisions for supposedly 4 million for Day Care, Lunch and After Four. That provision was not developed by the Department of Community Services, it was developed by staff in the Department of Finance without any consultation, it would seem now with Community Services people. As a result, people in Winnipeg and in Manitoba generally have been phoning the Day Care Co-ordinator — she's an acting Day Care Co-ordinator — asking for specifics about the Lunch and After Four Program and about the Day Care Program. The one that hit me were the number of calls I received from people saying that they have been trying to get information on the Lunch and After Four Program.

It's the Earl Grey Parent Council in particular that has run into tremendous problems. They tried to get information about the program expansion from the acting Day Care Co-ordinator before the end of June while the children were still in school, while the parents were still around. They had organized themselves into a group; I think they had at least 17 places committed for a lunch or a Noon and After Four Program. They wanted to get organized; they wanted to get the funding clarified. They wanted to get the rules, the criteria established, and they wanted to set up that program for September 1.

They knew that in order to do that, it would be best to try and talk to the parents and the children before the school term ended in June, do the planning and the organization over the summer, and be ready to start September 1st. They had been told by the acting Day Care Co-ordinator, "Call me back September 1st." We've received no guidelines; we don't know what the program is about. The Minister is going to go on holidays afterwards. We really won't have anything to say until September 1st. Well, at that stage it will be too late. The school term will have started already. That's the tragedy of this type of programming done by the seat of the pants without effective planning, without effective consultation with local groups. So what we have is a paper program that doesn't exist in reality and we've got frustrated parents who can't partake of a program.

So supposedly 4 million was allocated but it is very much a shell game. That 4 million will definitely not be spent. We've been told that already. Something in the order of 1 million may be spent but even at that, the way things are going right now, it would appear that not even that 1 million will be spent, that the

program will not be effectively planned, that it won't be established, that the criteria don't exist right now and the parents have nothing to tie into. And it's the parents who realize that that type of leadtime is required. My criticism is with this government for announcing something, putting ads in the paper, telling everyone what a great set of programs they've introduced in the budget, and then never being in a position to respond to the general population when that general population makes specific requests in answer to a lot of advertising conducted by this government.

And that's a sham, if that happens; we're wasting a lot of taxpayers' money advertising programs that don't exist. And the Minister is the one whose done the advertising and yet if he is a concerned parent, who wanted to get a Lunch and After Four Program going, as is implied in the budget, if he wanted to do that, if he got fellow parents in his own area — and he's been involved with school boards before, so he'd recognize that some leadtime is required — if he tried to do that now, if he tried to do that in a month, he couldn't do it, and that's the tragedy.

Parents are told the programs exist for their benefit. They're told publicly in public statements by the government. They're told in public advertising by the government, at taxpayers' expense and when they phone up the people responsible, they are told that the program doesn't exist and to call back some time in September or later. That is completely wrong, it is a ridiculous situation and it reflects the general malaise that exists with this government. They have denuded the Civil Service of most of the program advocates, most of the quality people within the Civil Service, and they are now left with people who cannot really do very much programming when the government decides, for political reasons, or for reasons of political expediency, to launch a program. It hasn't happened. This government hasn't taken the lead and we have a problem there. And I don't know what we can do as a Legislature to try and impress this fact upon the government, so that they will be in a position to respond to parent groups, to be in a position to respond to public groups, that respond to their own ads.

It seems rather strange that they would advertise and yet not be in a position to respond to the people when these people do contact the government asking for information, wanting to get ahead, and they can't do it. And those people are very frustrated and they feel that they have been deceived by this government, and I think they are right.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the member is getting pretty thorny in his remarks. Nobody is being deceived in the programs, the programs are coming along about on schedule. I think we'd have been open for more criticism if we had not advertised, because it is an application-type program. The detailed information that goes out in the brochure will cover pretty well all the areas that are required to be covered. There have been some minor changes being considered in the SAFER Program, to improve the benefits under the SAFER Program, and I expect that there will be some changes in that area, but the information will be available to people for the purpose of the September availability of the programs and having heard from people who have

an interest in it and are responding, they'll be advised of those programs.

As I say, I think there would have been legitimate criticism that could have been directed toward the government, on an application-type program, if in fact we had said nothing and then said on September 1, well come and get us, that type of approach, then, of course, we could have been criticized for not making people aware of the programs. So, you know, the government in undertaking a significant new direction, a program which we believe is going to deliver substantial new benefits to those in need, there are bound to be some administrative wrinkles that have to be worked out in the early stages. But at this point in time, it appears that things are about on schedule, that it will be operating well within the time-frame indicated.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution No. 3—pass; Resolution No. 4, resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding 2 million, for Natural Resources, Forestry 2 million, (e) Forest Protection, Item (3) Forest Fire Suppression 2 million—pass; Resolution No. 4—pass; Resolution No. 5, resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty, a further sum not exceeding 95,000 for Salary and Representation Allowance Increases, Salary and Representation Allowance Increases in the Several Departments of Government—pass; — the Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to continue the discussion that was cut short by the Minister of Consumer Affairs' rather cursory neglect to answer my questions during today's question period. Mr. Chairman, as some members will remember, I asked the Honourable Minister whether or not he was going to make provision in Bill No. 83, in order to afford tenants the right to deal collectively through perhaps a bargaining agent, with their landlords. I did that, Mr. Chairman, because it has come to my attention that, and I suppose it is a matter of common knowledge, that contemporary practice is such that most owners of large apartment blocks delegate their responsibility to land rental firms, firms which undertake to manage the enterprise for the owner, for some fees. It occurred to us, Mr. Chairman, that it is absolutely impossible in the context of contemporary business practice in this area for one tenant to effectively bargain with respect to rents and I'm giving — I want the point to be made, Mr. Chairman, that we are talking about a situation only where the landlord or his agent or her agent would submit to arbitration, which the Minister says will be the only access to the arbitration process.

We're trying to provide a mechanism, Mr. Chairman, whereby the bargaining process is made more fair and more equitable.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** If I could interrupt just for a moment, please? I would have believed — now I'm going to allow the honourable member to continue. The item under discussion itself is Salary and Representation Allowance Increases in the Several Departments of Government, the actual increase in salaries. I realize that it allows a great deal of latitude.

**MR. CORRIN:** The Minister's compensation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I realize that, you know, and I'm kind of looking for some guidance, if this is the manner in which things are to be run, then I'll throw it open. —(Interjection)— Well, the ones who have all the knowledge are the ones that I'm asking.

If the Honourable Minister is speaking on a point of order, the honourable member has the floor but . . .

**MR. CRAIK:** I'm sorry, I'm speaking on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think that this item perhaps, despite the fact that there is a lot of repetition going on, that it is a wide-open item.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I will be guided by the committee.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** I was noting, Mr. Chairman, that the landlord currently has a considerable advantage in setting rents, because it is only the landlord or his agent, Mr. Chairman, that has knowledge of the overhead relative to all the units. It's only the landlord who knows what rentals are being charged against all the suites in a particular block. So what we're suggesting is that it is unfair for the Minister to put the tenant in the position where he or she must argue his or her case in the absence of that sort of knowledge. We're suggesting in the contemporary context it is impossible for a tenant to make an effective argument unless that tenant is armed with information relative to all the premises within that particular block.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we're all aware that there are some very very large apartment developments within the city of Winnipeg. I daresay that in the East Kildonan area, for instance, or the Fort Rouge area, there are probably blocks where there are quite literally several hundred units under one management control.

Mr. Chairman, if anything effective is going to be done with respect to the rights of tenants pursuant to Bill No. 83 — and it's a very vapid sort of a right, or a very vapid sort of relief that has been provided to the tenant with respect to rent increases — but if anything effective was to be done, even within the context of the present bill, we submit that it would be absolutely imperative that tenants be given the right to deal through a bargaining agent so that the tenants' case is put forward in the context of the entire block, so that when the arbitration proceeds, if the landlord does not object to such proceedings, if it should proceed, the tenant would be assured that access would be given to all the information that is pertinent and relevant.

You know, it's absolutely unfair, Mr. Chairman. It would be, I suppose, analogous to a situation where each employee in a very large enterprise had to deal individually with respect to his or her wages and benefits with the employer, unaware of what other employers were receiving by way of pensions benefits, unaware of what sort of vacations they were being given, unaware of what sort of salaries they were receiving, and what sort of increments they were receiving. So we are saying that if anything effective is to be done, clearly there has to be

provision for collective bargaining in the context of landlord and tenant relations, and we are saying that now within the context of the bill as it is now written.

I am not talking about reinstating rent regulations, I am talking about the arbitration process, however tenuous and ephemeral that might be. I am talking about amendments that would facilitate tenants' rights within the context of the present Bill. —(Interjection)— We are dealing with all the bills and I don't want to digress, but I am advised by members on this side that when my honourable friends were in opposition they took advantage of this particular bill to debate many different things, many diverse subjects, which they thought were relevant.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** The member is now citing past experience here to wander widely on this bill. While it is recognizably an open topic, the member is dealing in detail with a bill, Bill No. 83. Bill 83 is before the House and I think that in that case, while there is a wide general topic here, if we are dealing specifically about a bill, Mr. Chairman, it should be dealt with when the bill is up for this discussion here either in Committee or in Second Reading.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member on the same point of order.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the manner in which this particular Minister has chosen to deal with a very important piece of legislation, and I think that goes to the Minister's salary insofar as it reflects on his capacity as a Minister, and it certainly reflects on the government's general policy with respect to this very important matter.

Mr. Chairman, on that basis, clearly it is within the latitude of these proceedings that we be enabled to debate that very general subject matter. Mr. Chairman, I note that it would all be unnecessary if the Minister would, as he had often indicated to us, have tabled Bill 83 before this House much earlier in this session and perhaps prior to his estimates being reviewed, but he chose, Mr. Chairman, after some two years of intransigence in this regard, because, Mr. Chairman, he announced decontrols and he announced that the government would be going into the decontrol process . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. I would recommend to the honourable members that there is a great deal of latitude allowed in the discussion under Resolution No. 5. Specific items, I would believe, if they are specific to a particular bill that is going through the Legislature, would be out of order at this time. I will allow the latitude that I have allowed in the past. I hope the honourable members would not take advantage of the latitude that I have allowed.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** We thank you, Mr. Chairman, for whatever latitude you have allowed and I would note that we will try and deal more exclusively with the

Minister's role in this important matter, in order that we can stay within the confines of his salary and his responsibility for this very important policy area.

Mr. Chairman, I want to share with members a letter that we received and the government received through the office of the Minister of Consumer Affairs. It's signed by Mr. David H. Johnston, who lives at Suite 107-1281 Grant, which I think is in the Honourable Member for River Heights constituency. It goes as follows and it's re the removal of rent control. He says, "Please be advised of the following horrifying and ridiculous actions due to your abolishment of rent controls as of June 30th, 1980. After over six years of faithful tenancy in an apartment block, I have now been advised by a new yearly lease that my rent is being increased 62 per month, not 62 per year but 62 per month, which represents an increase of almost 27 percent", and he in brackets puts "(26.7 percent). This is the thanks I get for being a good tenant, due to your department and government rent control removal. Please do not mention Bill 83 to me. Also please do not mention monitoring or the strange method of arbitration. The agency performing this deed is Globe General Agencies. Yours truly."

Another letter we have received and has been sent to the Honourable Minister from the same block, 1281 Grant Avenue. Another gentleman by the name of Fred W. Coleman, who indicates that he is a low income tenant and he indicates that he has received notice of what he calls "a whopping 64 increase" to come up soon, and this will be 64 per month, and he wants to know whether the department of the Honourable Minister is going to institute any sort of control over what he calls a kind of piracy. He says, "Upon the next election, I predict a tremendous shift of power to a party having a lot more conscience than your party has shown to the breadwinners, workers in Friendly Manitoba". He has highlighted "Friendly Manitoba", and we all know what sort of irony is meant.

Mr. Chairman, there is very little reason to believe that this Minister has given any consideration to how the decontrol mechanism he has provided is going to affect people. There is very little reason to believe that he has ever given consideration to the Fred Colemans and David Johnstons of this world. I want to note, Mr. Chairman, because the record should note that these are not constituents in Wellington. These are not inner city working class people. These, Mr. Chairman, are constituents in River Heights.

Mr. Chairman, there's something very wrong when a government who prides itself on sound management principle, and adherence to that sort of policy and approach to government, brings in legislation such as we have reviewed in the context of Bill 83. There's something very much the matter, because, Mr. Chairman, the government has done absolutely nothing to protect the tenant from usurious and unjustified increases on the part of landlords. And we don't understand, Mr. Chairman, why the Minister is proving to be so adamant, so completely resistant to the request, not only of members on this side of the House but the blandishments of his own caucus. We can't understand why, in the face of, I think now, the rump group has grown to some five members, why in light of the fact that five members of his own caucus have

seen fit to approach him with respect to this important matter, why he still stands in the House and refuses to moderate his position.

Mr. Chairman, it's clear that although we feel that the members, or certainly the majority of the government caucus members who have addressed this issue don't go quite far enough, we can't understand why the Minister is not willing to at least accommodate the practical concerns of his own caucus mates. Because, Mr. Chairman, surely, it's becoming obvious that this is not a matter of political dogma and philosophy. It's obviously, to some extent, a matter of approach. It's a matter of sound administrative principle. I think you, Mr. Chairman, suggested that you'd like to see the bill revised in such a way in order to assure that tenants who are the subject of an increase in excess of 10 percent would have at least access to automatic and compulsory arbitration. You indicated that, Mr. Chairman. Surely, Mr. Chairman, nobody would construe that as being anything but a halfway house. That's a measure, Mr. Chairman, which obviously the Minister, if he was at all concerned with what was happening to tenants across the city, I think would eagerly accept and embrace. But no, Mr. Chairman, we have the Minister rising day after day and indicate that he is intent solely on taking the government out of rent control. He doesn't care how he is going to do that, how he is going to affect that process, Mr. Chairman, he's simply going to do it and the devil be damned. The public be damned, everybody be damned, if they don't accept his format and his approach.

Mr. Chairman, one wonders, one really wonders whether that Minister is at all attuned to what is going on around him. If it were a politically partisan issue, as I said earlier, and I don't want to be repetitive, one could appreciate and understand his position, but it's gone beyond that. It's transcended the political bounds of this House. It's an issue in River Heights; I presume it's an issue in Radisson, as well as an issue in Wellington and Rossmere. So it's affecting inner city and suburban constituents to an equal extent.

We had information, as a matter of fact, ironically, Mr. Chairman, in the rent monitoring reports, we had verification that the tenants who were hit the hardest in the first two phases of rent decontrol were the tenants who were living in the higher rental units. It was those tenants that received increases that ranged between 10 and 30 percent. It's fairly evident, Mr. Chairman, that a lot of landlords were applying the ability to pay principle because I simply can't believe that there should be that sort of disproportionate correlation as between low rental units or middle rental units and high rental units. It seems to me that, given the fact that percentage-wise the landlord stands to yield a much higher return on a high rental unit — obviously 10 percent of a high rent is a lot more than 10 percent of a lower rent — it seems to me somewhat amazing that it was exactly those units that saw the highest percentage increases. That's where you see the 22 percent, the 26 percent and, as I said before, the 30 percent.

Mr. Chairman, if — and this is going to become a problem — the members opposite see themselves as being representatives of the middle classes, people I

would describe as being the upper middle classes of Manitoba Society, then what are they going to say in defence of their actions with respect to decontrol of the high rental units? The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that it was the constituents, the tenants living in River Heights and Crescentwood, along Wellington Crescent and in Tuxedo, that were hit the hardest, and what are we going to do about that?

Frankly, I would think that they should be entitled to some protection, too. I don't mind saying that I think that everybody should have some basic protection from arbitrary rental shelter increases. It seems to me that simply too much is at stake. The Minister, I think, at some point or other in this lengthy debate, has suggested that if a tenant doesn't like it, he or she can pick up his family and furnishings and move to another comparable unit, and the Minister has said if such a unit isn't available at a better rate that he will start the monitoring process and the compulsory arbitration process, but, Mr. Chairman, let's be realistic. Even for a family living in a Tuxedo area high rental apartment unit, moving a family is quite a burden. That is quite a responsibility and quite a hardship. It's not that simple to pick two or three kids out of their school and away from their community club and their friends and suddenly just move off to another community or district. It's not so simple to say that they can find an easily available comparable accommodation in the same community within the periphery or the range of the same school and community club catchment area. It's not that easy, Mr. Chairman. I think anybody who has had the experience of having to move in those circumstances will agree with me. It's one thing to suggest it and another thing to do it. In the implementation, it's very difficult.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we should be considering long and hard what we are doing with respect not only to lower rental units, we should also address ourselves to the plight of the high rental person. As I have often said, Mr. Chairman, and I believe it is true, there are many people in our society who choose to allocate a higher proportion of their income to shelter. They do that, Mr. Chairman, as my father did it. They do it because they believe they are giving their children an opportunity towards advancement. My father, Mr. Chairman, although he only ran a service station in St. Boniface, decided to live in a home in River Heights, and he paid higher taxes and he paid a disproportionate amount of his income towards a mortgage. That was his business, Mr. Chairman. He made a decision on how he would allocate his income, limited as it was. Mr. Chairman, I don't see why the government can't appreciate that. To simply say that because somebody has decided to live in a unit that, for instance, is over 400 a month and therefore not within the rent control scheme a year or two ago is, I think, philosophically unrealistic in a sense that the government fails to realize — and they are the ones who are committed to individual freedom — that people can do that without necessarily being so affluent as to be able to sustain any increases in costs of living, and I think we should respect that.

There are other people who choose to go the other way. I have a client right now who is moving from south River Heights to my constituency, and they are

doing that because they couldn't find proper instruction in Portuguese tradition, culture and language, and they find that sort of private schooling facility in my constituency, so they decided, because they regard that as being very significant and important, to move from River Heights to the inner city, and I can respect that, Mr. Chairman. That was their value judgment. They can afford to live in River Heights; they decided to move the other way. Mr. Chairman, I think that members opposite should be more than concerned about people who are on the other end of the rental spectrum, as well.

Today, Mr. Chairman, and on July 4th, as I indicated earlier in today's Session, I had presented to the House concerns I have about the provisions in this bill and the policy that the government seemingly has set respecting the eviction of families with school-aged children.

I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, that there seems to be a desire on the part of the government — and there is a manifest desire on the part of the government — to allow landlords, upon converting apartment units to condominium use, to evict families with school children during the school year. Mr. Chairman, I can't for the life of me, understand why the government would want to move in that regressive direction. I can't understand — and the Minister of Education is obviously grappling with the problem because he keeps taking it as notice day after day — I can't understand why the government would not want to assure the right of those children to complete their year in the school which they are currently attending. I can't understand why they would afford that protection with respect to tenants, to all other tenants, and not to tenants whose premises are the subject of conversion. Again, we get into a real quandary, an area of some seeming irrationality.

If the government is going to be consistent, they should withdraw the other provision as well. Why should tenants normally have that protection but not tenants whose premises are being converted? I just don't understand that. What's good for one tenant should be good for all. So we deplore that revision of the legislation, Mr. Chairman, and we think that the members opposite should do so as well. We think that the Minister of Education should be forthcoming and should talk about sound educational policies and should indicate that it is not the policy of the government to dislocate children from their schools during the school year. As I said earlier, it's not just a question of dislocating children from the schools, but also from the community as a whole and their activities in community clubs and so on.

So, Mr. Chairman, we're not very satisfied with the manner in which the governments and the Minister are dealing with this very important matter. He seems to be behaving like the proverbial ostrich in his zeal to fulfill his doctrinaire rejection of rent control. He seems to be throwing out the baby with the bath. He doesn't seem to care who is trodden upon in his rush to reject the rent stabilization legislation.

Mr. Chairman, some members opposite — I don't want to infer things from their comments — but some have been very very open and very candid in their remarks in this regard. Some of the members — and I think they were being somewhat charitable

frankly — have indicated that the government may have made a mistake in appointing a non-urban Minister to handle this very important matter. They've indicated that they personally have reservations about the Minister's appreciation of the problem, that the Minister perhaps is rooted in a very different sort of market milieu, presumably we have a much more stable market in the Morris constituency, and seemingly is unable to appreciate the exigencies of contemporary landlord-tenant relations.

Now, that, Mr. Chairman, is the — as I say — the charitable approach. Those who would be more critical — and I presume those who did not prefer those sorts of observations might be more critical, Mr. Chairman — probably would feel as I do, as members on this side do, that the Minister simply is behaving in a negligent and callous manner. He doesn't seem to have a grasp of the significance of what he's doing. He's rushing headlong. One wonders, as a matter of fact, why the decontrol mechanism, as it is, couldn't have been the subject of an all-committee review last summer, interessionally, Mr. Chairman.

One wonders then whether the positions of my honourable friend's caucus as well as members on this side of the House mightn't have been taken into consideration and whether, in light of that information, the Minister responsible for landlord and tenant relations mightn't have addressed the problem in a more humane and logical manner.

So, Mr. Chairman, we're proceeding rather blindly with the Minister refusing to set any sort of guidelines, refusing to be moved by the blandishments and criticisms of members, not only on this side but on his own side, seemingly totally inconsiderate of the public and the significance of what he is doing. And, Mr. Chairman, we're wondering whether or not we can expect any effective revision of this particular approaching bill. The Minister keeps telling us that he has under consideration ways by which he can improve the bill but he's not forthcoming, Mr. Chairman, in how that might be accomplished.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have also asked the Minister questions, and I wish he was here, Mr. Chairman, because he should now be in a position to address this problem. I've asked him how he will facilitate rent monitoring in the context of Bill 83; and I've asked him that, Mr. Chairman, because during the question period I have on occasion — I think two occasions in the past two weeks — asked him what is to happen with the current staff at the Rent Stabilization office. Mr. Chairman, in 1977 there were 40 employees in that office. I am told, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is correct and accurate information, I am told by the Manitoba Government Employees' Association that it is their understanding that only some 6 members of that staff complement are assured of being retained in government employment.

Mr. Chairman, there is some concern as to where these people will go. I've asked MGEA whether they can advise and I've asked the Minister and he was unable to provide any enlightenment in this regard, Mr. Chairman. It is his wont to stonewall questions in this respect. I asked the MGEA whether these people will be transferred into the Rentalsman's office and,

Mr. Chairman, they didn't know. They said that they hoped that would be the case because these people have special skills and they felt that it was quite important that people with special skills in the rent monitoring area be retained by the government.

But there has been to date, Mr. Chairman, no clear indication by the Minister or by the government to MGEA or the employees that such will be the case and that, Mr. Chairman, is very important. It is very important because the Minister cannot fulfill his commitment to intervene — and now I'm talking about the provisions of Bill 83 that allow the Minister to monitor rents and intervene in situations where he deems rent increases to be excessive — there will be no bureaucratic capacity, Mr. Chairman, to cope or deal with that sort of obligation. So what purpose is that sort of provision in the Act, if the Minister simply has vitiated its foundation by letting go all the employees with rent monitoring skills? This is what is taking place, Mr. Chairman, and this is what is actually happening.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know why members on that side, and perhaps they have, perhaps they are equally concerned and perhaps that was a subject raised by caucus members when they met with the Minister yesterday, but I don't understand how they feel, that that can be consistent with sound management principle. I mean, is it not absurd to pass implementary-style legislation, enabling legislation, and at the same time to remove from the Civil Service all the people who have skill and qualification to do the rent monitoring work pursuant to this section. It makes no sense, Mr. Chairman, and yet that, Mr. Chairman, is what is taking place.

Mr. Chairman, I've asked the Honourable Attorney-General to establish and look into whether or not it is not true that certain provisions of this legislation have been deemed unconstitutional and ultra vires in other provinces — and I'm referring now, Mr. Chairman, specifically to Section 23 of the bill — and I have asked the Attorney-General to enquire as to whether it's possible for the Minister to make provision for eviction, summary eviction, on the order of the Rentalsman or the arbitration board alone. Because in doing so, Mr. Chairman, you have a situation where you are denying the tenant his or her legal recourse to a hearing in a court.

It's one thing to allow the Rentalsman to arbitrate a dispute and in a case of mutual consent, to determine what is a fair increase in rent. But, Mr. Chairman, surely it's another thing to allow the Rentalsman to evict a tenant. Surely that's a matter for a judge and for legal consideration. The Rentalsman is not a judge. Is the Rentalsman going to be able to review all the precedents? Is the Rentalsman going to set his office up as an appeal court for the province of Manitoba?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The member has five minutes.

**MR. CORRIN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, clearly it's not the case that the Rentalsman is going to be able to function as the high Court of Appeal of the province. So, Mr. Chairman, the decisions of the Courts of Appeal in British Columbia and Ontario have relevance, because they said that no province could usurp the jurisdiction of the civil courts and federally-appointed

judges in this regard. They said that it was clearly a matter within the sole purview of the federally appointed judiciary. Mr. Chairman, even if those two Courts of Appeal were wrong, it makes good sense. I mean, what they've said still seems to make good sense. Why should we set up administrative tribunals as final arbiters of law? That's simply, again, inconsistent with certain fundamental views on human freedom and civil liberties, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, this Minister seemingly is wholly unconscious of the fact that the legislation and policy which is presented in this bill is simply inconsistent and out of step with contemporary reality. The bill is rife with questionable policy positions. The bill is wholly inadequate as a vehicle to address the important matter that it purports to govern.

So, Mr. Chairman, we would call on all members to consider this bill very seriously and if not publicly criticize some of its provisions, at least privately involve the Minister in discussion relative to detailed scrutiny of the contents of the bill. That I think, Mr. Chairman, is an obligation that each member of this House has, regardless of whether that member is a member of this side or that side, regardless of the socioeconomic nature of the constituency represented by that member.

So, Mr. Chairman, we would ask members to continue to work to reform this particular piece of legislation or, I suppose, at best have it repealed in order that the entire matter can be the subject of comprehensive review. And that, Mr. Chairman, has never been done. We've never had a comprehensive study done with respect to the subject matter of rent control. So I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your attention and I address all members to this important problem.

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

**MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, a couple of brief questions. One, we have already passed authorization or a recommendation to the House that we allow 182,000 to increase our indemnities by 3,200.00. So I was out by 800 in what was anticipated. But perhaps the Minister can give me the gazintas on this item, where he has 95,000.00. I figure that's about 5,000 a Minister. Perhaps the Minister can indicate at this time what the intention of the government is. It's regrettable; I don't want to be out of order, Mr. Chairman, but it's usual that they introduce legislation and ask for the money to pay for it afterwards, but we haven't seen the bill for raising the indemnities. I know that we don't need a bill to raise the Minister's salary. I don't know if we need a bill to raise the Leader of the Opposition's salary. Nevertheless, perhaps the Minister can give us at this time what the intention of the government is vis-a-vis the Minister's. He has already indicated they're raising the indemnities of the Legislative Assembly people by 3,200 in indemnity and in allowances, and this is an authorization for them to raise the salary of the Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition roughly 5,000 plus, so perhaps he could tell us just exactly what the intention of the government is.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, I think the member is probably correct there, or approximately correct, that the provision is made here that will allow for that and, in the case of the Leader of the Opposition, we are advised by Legislative Counsel that the provision would have to be made in this item as well. But essentially, I think the member's speculation is probably fairly accurate.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, I had asked the Minister if he would give me what goes into that. I think there are 17 Ministers, are there not? So I want to know how this 95,000 is going to be allocated. If there are 17, I think it's 5,000 and something, but how many Ministers are there, and of course there is one Leader of the Opposition, regardless of what some people might say. So perhaps the Minister could tell us just what specifically the intention of the government is. It's 15,600 at the minute. So there must be a line which says that when this is authorized that the Minister's salaries will be 20,000 or 21,000.00.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, I'll have to check and see if any of the provisions of Bill 48 are contained in the 95,000 indicated here.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a few words in respect to this section, and I know this is a section and an appropriation which we all find difficult to speak to because it does involve our own areas of remuneration. What does concern me, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that there has been a double standard that has been applied throughout. I remember during the process of the health workers stoppage the Minister of Health indicated that Manitobans would have to become accustomed to being overworked and underpaid. We recall, a couple of years ago, the Minister of Cultural Affairs, who then was the Minister of Labour, referring to people having become spoiled, and of course we have heard over the past three years the repeated references of the First Minister to the necessity of belt tightening on the part of all Manitobans, so that, Mr. Chairman, there has been a constant and steady theme, a theme that some must, in fact, expect less.

Mr. Chairman, we recall during the 1978 session the cost-of-living adjustment was deleted as this government, in the first flush of success after the 1977 election, wanted to symbolically demonstrate that, indeed, members of the Legislature were going to participate in this grand effort at restraint, and there was, Mr. Chairman, the effort to grandstand, I suggest with due consideration, that members of the Legislature were going to share in this great restraint process.

Mr. Chairman, my calculation is, insofar as Cabinet Ministers and myself, as Leader of the Opposition, that as a result of the adjustments that will take place this year — and the Minister of Finance can correct later if I am incorrect — it will involve an additional 600 re the constituency office payment, 5,000 in respect to the increase to members of the Executive Council, etc., a further 4,000 adjustment insofar as members of the Legislature are concerned,

2,500 by way of that adjustment proposed by Justice Hall, plus a further 1,500 which is the automatic click-in pertaining to the cost of living. We are looking, Mr. Chairman, at an adjustment of 9,500 to 10,000, something in that area, 9,500 to 10,000 increase in remuneration for Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition insofar as 1980 is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I do have to ask where is that being overworked and underpaid reference to the health care workers in Manitoba; who is being spoiled in references to those that are on minimum wage, and when the Member for Logan and the Member for Churchill and others, the Member for Kildonan, were seeking adjustments in respect to minimum wage to those that are at the lowest income level within the Manitoba community?

Mr. Chairman, I had thought that a number of years ago we had developed a very fine principle. That fine principle was that our salaries would be adjusted year by year, relating to the cost of living, and cost of living in relationship to the average industrial wage in the province of Manitoba. We held to that principle from about 1972-73 when that principle was translated into statute, right on up to the present time, a principle that reflected the fact that insofar as ourselves are concerned as representatives of constituents, that our own living remuneration ought not to increase at a rate faster than the rate of inflation, and secondly, Mr. Chairman, that our wage level should not reach a point that that gulf between the average Manitoban, as expressed through the average industrial wage and ourselves, be widened and widened and widened to further levels. Because, Mr. Chairman, we represent, as a whole, not the very wealthiest in our society, not those at the upper income level in our society are not the principal ones that we represent, what we represent is the average Manitoban, the average worker, the average farmer, the average businessman or woman, the average person that is seeking and striving to enjoy a livelihood in the province of Manitoba. In basic thrust, Mr. Chairman, it is that group, that vast majority of Manitobans, we must ensure that we maintain a constant relationship to.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned, we as frail human beings, that we, in our representation, we maintain that type of contact. Mr. Chairman, I have never felt comfortable on the fact that if we continue to widen that gulf that we will ensure maintaining that form of contact and relationship with the average Manitoban. It was that philosophy that was expressed in 1970, 1972 and 1973 that insured that that provision in respect to cost of living was inserted in The Legislative Assembly Act. —(Interjection)— 1974? Fine. That principle was inserted. During the period 1969 to 1977 there was no adjustment insofar as the salaries of Cabinet Ministers were concerned, and oh, I remember it often being said that then Premier Schreyer was the lowest paid premier in the Dominion of Canada, but Mr. Chairman, as a colleague says behind, he was also the best. You don't measure quality by way of moneys received. But I don't believe, Mr. Chairman, that there was anything wrong in that.

The Minister of Health has been quite prepared to accept the fact that health care workers in Manitoba

continue to enjoy salary levels that are 9th and 10th in Canada. The principle that was applied to health care workers in Manitoba wasn't the same principle that he felt it was important to suggest ought to be applied insofar as doctors. The Minister of Health said that they should be brought up to No. 5.

I think the principle that was applied towards health care workers, that what makes us, as legislators, as members of Executive Council, feel that we should be in a different position than those that we have imposed budgetary restrictions upon, limitations upon during the past three years, that we have told that they should tighten their belt or we have told that they are spoiled rotten, or we have told that they had better become accustomed to being overworked and underpaid, Mr. Chairman, I want to say on my own part, and I think members of the Executive Council would have to agree, I don't think that we are underpaid. You consider the indemnity that is received by members of the Legislature; the present payment that is given to members of Executive Council; the 40 per diem to those members of Executive Council living outside the city of Winnipeg, it comes to about 5,000 a year; a very lucrative pension plan we have, Mr. Chairman, I don't think anybody can dispute that we have, I think, just about as lucrative a pension plan as you will find anywhere, in public or private enterprise; a car, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we're hard done by. And thus, I do think, Mr. Chairman, there is no need for this item of 95,000.00.

If there is the feeling that some sort of adjustment must be made, then make it in accordance to the cost of living formula. That is the reluctant concession that I think could be suggested at this point. Restore the moneys that were lost because of the sham in 1978, the sham of freezing the cost of living adjustment for members of the Legislature. Return to members that moneys they should have received except for that sham in 1978. Continue on with the cost of living formula, as per the legislation that was passed in 1974. Mr. Chairman, I do not really believe that there is a member in this House that ought to feel that they are being underpaid under those circumstances, and if we do, as was suggested earlier, we must become accustomed maybe to feeling a little underpaid. But I don't think that there is a member that ought to feel that they are being underpaid under those circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express concern about this amount; express opposition to this amount. I know there will be further opportunity pertaining to the bill, but I would not want this item to pass by without speaking to it. To do otherwise, I believe, would be to imply consent and concurrence with this item at this stage. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not intend for one to imply concurrence with the item included in the Supplementary Estimates pertaining to salary and representation of allowances.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 5 — the Honourable Minister.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, to get back to the Member for Winnipeg Centre, the provision here is 19 times 5 and the amount comes from basically the recommendations contained in the Commission Study and the provision under Bill 48 for inclusion of

the Leader of the Opposition at the rate of Ministers, and it isn't 19 times 5, it is Premier 10; Ministers, 5 times 16; and Leader of the Opposition 5, for a total of 95.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, whilst the Minister for Community Services is here, I would like to take the opportunity of asking him whether he has considered participating in the debates on The Parents Maintenance Act and The Family Maintenance Act, and will he be making that contribution?

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

**HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James):** Mr. Chairman, I still haven't seen Hansard to see what the contribution from the Member for Wellington was.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I want to take the opportunity to make some comments relating to a speech made by the Minister of Education, and I assume that if he is interested or if someone is interested in informing him, he could read my comments in Hansard. They don't take long to make, but it is just a matter of amusement to me that when we were debating the educational bill, and some of us were insisting that a bill dealing with the Department of Education and the education of the children of this province should have some sort of philosophy, should have some concept of what the government wishes to do in the field of education, and some of us were critical of the fact that there is nothing in the bill to indicate that indeed there was any philosophic approach to education, and that the Conservative Party was substantially silent on the entire question. We challenged that of the Minister of Education.

Well, that was done, Mr. Chairman. But when he closed debate, he referred to the fact that he has looked at some of the acts that were passed by the honourable gentlemen opposite, meaning, Mr. Chairman, the New Democratic Government, that he said and I quote now from Page 5209, "The City of Winnipeg Act that deals with half the population of this province, where is the philosophy there? Where is the great philosophical statement in The City of Winnipeg Act?"

Mr. Chairman, I couldn't help but rise to debate, because if ever there was an act full of philosophic content, it was The City of Winnipeg Act, and for the Minister of Education, who didn't have to know what was there, to say there is nothing there indicates a complete ignorance, and I just couldn't let that go by, Mr. Chairman.

Those of us — and the Minister of Education is not one — who were here during the time and who lived in Greater Winnipeg during the time were very much aware that the big contest, the big discussion and debate that went on related to philosophy absolutely. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of the fact that the Minister of Government Services is here in order to remind him,

and he probably hasn't forgotten, that he stood here and he gave credit to the government of that time for bringing in a bill which he said they didn't have the guts to do, and that is to unify the City of Winnipeg. Indeed, it was because of the political aspect and the philosophic aspect that we were involved into the change into one city, of a city with a number of suburbs surrounding it.

So let me just refer to some of these, so that on the record the Minister of Education could learn a little bit that the concept of one city; the single member wards; the fact that there was small wards; the whole idea of community committees; the need to present the budgets to the community committees at that level; all the zoning and planning procedures which created difficulties, Mr. Chairman, because there was a strong effort made to bring in public input into zoning and planning considerations, were all part of a philosophic approach. The environmental reports that were required in the Act all were based on a philosophic approach, and for a Minister of the Crown not to have any real knowledge as to the need to present legislation on the basis of what one believes is a pity, and I mention that only because I just felt I had to get it on the record.

Mr. Chairman, there is another item I would like to address to the Minister of Finance and that is whether he has now had an opportunity to speak to the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro to ascertain whether or not he could let us have a copy of the Letter of Intent dealing with the Mandan Project and the prior agreements that have been prepared.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, no, I haven't. I have sent the message over to them by way of my office; I haven't spoken to them.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering if the Minister could take a short cut instead of sending messages. He can't help but see the Chairman of Hydro seated in front of him between the two of us, and surely there could be a much quicker way of ascertaining whether Hydro would be upset or concerned if the government did indeed let us have a copy of the Letter of Intent concerning the Mandan Project. Nevertheless, he operates his department as he sees fit, but, Mr. Chairman, I would think that the person who occupies the office right next door to him and the person who sits opposite him at the very moment should be readily available with whom to discuss what I would think would be routine and quickly disposed of.

Mr. Chairman, I have another point of two, but the Member for Inkster has indicated he wants to speak, and I will certainly give him the opportunity.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Member for St. Johns because the discussion is to the same point that I wanted to speak. I don't wish to interrupt him, but I don't want to leave the point.

Several weeks ago I asked the Minister whether or not it was not a fact that he, as Minister, became through the government directly involved in the negotiations with regard to this agreement. That being the case, that the agreement that was arrived at is not something that represents a clinical Hydro approach but represents a government approach, and if it is a government approach and involves government agreement which he himself negotiated, it seems to me that it doesn't have the kind of character which would say that this is something internal to Manitoba Hydro. It was not internal to Manitoba Hydro. It was a government negotiated document and the Minister, I asked him whether he was the head of the negotiating team and whether he had not replaced Ross Nugent as head of the negotiating team and he didn't like the nomenclature head of the team but also did not deny that the government was, through himself, directly involved in the negotiations and that we have a right to know, as has been the Minister's own position, just what the government's position was and what government input was with regard to these negotiations and the subsequent agreement. It is a government agreement. It is similar in that respect to the negotiations that took place with regard to the Northern Flood Committee, that the government was admittedly — not admittedly, but I go further, I say necessarily — involved in the negotiations and took positions with regard to the negotiations, because we could not give Hydro the right to negotiate social and economic conditions in northern Manitoba insofar as the future is concerned.

I would think, Mr. Chairman, that the same applies to this agreement and I don't know that a great deal turns on it, but surely the government can't suggest that this was an arm's length agreement arrived at between the Hydro Board and the Utility to the south, rather that it is a government document which the Minister should have no difficulty in producing.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is any disagreement on this point. I would point out, the other day when the Member for St. Johns asked for a copy of the agreement, I suppose I could as easily have said to file an Order for Return for it, and by the time it arrived I could have indicated whether the Hydro felt that it was a sort of thing that they should table. The only reason I can think that they may not want to is simply their understanding with the other utility, but they will need to check that out and, if they are satisfied with it, I don't think there is any problems.

I want to indicate to the House what the procedure is, because I did imply it the other day, ultimately that agreement has to be approved by Order-in-Council. The agreement that emerges out of the Letters of Intent and the study and all the rest of it eventually has to come to a head by an agreement that is approved by the government. So it is fine to say that it should be arm's length and it doesn't appear to be, what really is the mechanism is that the negotiation is carried on directly by the Hydro officials, but before signing the Letter of Intent with them, naturally we were asked and, in fact, I think asked them to show it to us before they signed it,

because did it mean that if the Letter of Intent came to its ultimate conclusion and brought an agreement that came before the government, did the government have any option to negotiate any aspect of that agreement? The answer was no, the government would really have no option because the thing would be so far down the line at that point in time that the government had no option. The answer is simply, that being the case, we have to be involved, at this point in time, to ensure that what we foresee coming into the agreement is known at this point in time, if we have any reservations about any of the contents of the Letter of Intent. From that point of view, the government looked at it and passed on its comments to the Hydro.

We weren't directly involved in the negotiations as a government. I think the government should be involved in extra-provincial negotiations. I think that time will come when the public interest is best served on things extra-provincial, for matters that are extra-provincial, for the government to be directly involved. As a matter of fact, the Act that is coming before the Legislature, The Energy Authority Act, will make that provision for the government to be involved on extra-provincial agreements and, if necessary, in the negotiations. I think the public interest is best served, but we are not talking about that, we are talking about this particular one. In this one, the negotiations were 99 percent Hydro with the review by the government, the Department of Energy and Mines. We have a regular committee that meets and discusses this and the other; I say other because there is more than one, but primarily the Western Power Grid Studies that are going on, and these things do get discussed jointly between the Hydro staff and the Energy and Mines staff, and periodically myself sitting in.

That is the procedure and one which, I think, is in the public interest. But again coming back to the one in question being raised here, it is primarily an agreement negotiated by the Hydro staff, approved ultimately by the Board and leading up to an agreement if it's successful, sometime further, months down the line, an agreement which has to be approved by the government of Manitoba.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to raise another point that's related to Hydro and that is that at the last meeting of the Public Utilities Committee on Friday, June 13th, we received information that we had not had before, and that relates back a year, Mr. Chairman, to when this government and this Minister came from the Legislature and said that because of Hydro's low surface position or reserve position, and because of the great cost of repayment of borrowing in foreign exchange because of increases in foreign exchange rates, that it was, in the government's opinion, necessary to freeze the rates, and the government then brought in legislation to freeze the rates.

They gave us information then, Mr. Chairman, which was a projection made by Manitoba Hydro which, as I recall it, indicated that they expected to have reserves at the end of that five-year period — I think by the end of 1983 — that would produce 120

million for reserves at 1983. We said, and after inquiries last year in the committee questioning Dr. Wedepohl and questioning Mr. McKean, it came about that the projections were already out of date and that indeed it was already known that the surplus in 1979 would be substantially more than projected and that, as one carried forward over that five-year period, the surplus would end up at a higher figure than had been projected. We fought the Hydro freeze, not on the base of the freeze but because we said it was a hoax, because we said it was unnecessary. It wouldn't be necessary that Hydro, from its income, would be able to handle the increased cost and that it was not necessary for the taxpayers of Manitoba to subsidize Hydro's operations. —(Interjection)— And the point made by the Member for Inkster is not that the bill froze anything; what the bill did was just make a contribution of the taxpayers' dollars to Hydro.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, we had that debate and I think we presented our point of view and the government prevailed, as indeed it should, it was the majority. Well now we've found, Mr. Chairman, that the projection was substantially increased, that the new projections made this last short time were so much greater than in the first year, 1980 year, the total reserves would be some 140 million. Mr. Chairman, that's a remarkably large figure. 140 million this year compared with last year's projection of 120 at the end of the five year period, and if one carried it forward, just this present projection, it would bring us into some 280 million at the end of 1983.

It was then that we were questioning the Chairman of Hydro, who is here in this Chamber in another capacity, that of Deputy Minister of Finance. We pressed him as to when it was that Hydro would feel so comfortable that it would feel secure in its borrowing policies, and he said that when the ratio was somewhere, 90/10 between borrowing and equity, that that would be a figure that would be acceptable, which would amount to somewhere in the neighbourhood of 240 million and I point out, Mr. Chairman, that that is projected to be in 1982.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time and because the revenues of Hydro are so much greater than last year's projection on which the whole legislation was based, at the present time the freeze is meaningless, as it was last year, because Hydro wouldn't dare raise rates in view of its profits; shouldn't dare raise rates in view of its profits because, Mr. Chairman, Hydro is not allowed to make a profit. All it's allowed to do is to put in surplus moneys into a reserve and it would be ludicrous for Hydro to raise rates when the reserve is growing at a rapid rate. But concurrently, the Manitoba taxpayer is paying very substantial moneys out of tax revenues into Hydro in that Hydro debt is being partially subsidized by the Manitoba taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, this is a really wrong situation. Last year on the basis of projections which we knew then were absolutely pessimistic, the government went ahead and imposed on the Manitoba taxpayer an additional burden of taxation or, put it the other way, an increased deficit. This government, which decrys deficits so much, created a greater deficit because of the undertaking to subsidize Hydro. So firstly, they are subsidizing Hydro out of the taxpayers' money

and, by subsidizing Hydro, they are, of course, subsidizing the users of Hydro, many of whom don't pay any taxes at all in Manitoba; many of whom are people outside of the province to whom Hydro exports power; many of whom are possibly, I can't give figures on that but corporate industry within Manitoba which for various reasons is paying low taxation, and now we find the taxpayer is subsidizing Hydro.

Hydro has had no occasion to even consider raising rates and, as was pointed out by the Member for Inkster while I was speaking earlier, there is no prohibition on Hydro to raise rates in the legislation and now we find two things. The Hydro ratepayer is paying more than he need pay on the basis of the substantial reserves which are accumulating more rapidly than they were expected to accumulate. And secondly, the Manitoba taxpayer is subsidizing Hydro's operations and we can't say the Manitoba taxpayer is subsidizing rates; they are not subsidizing the rate payer one bit. They are just exelcerating at a tremendous rate, an unexpected rate. They are exelcerating the reserves that are growing within Hydro.

Mr. Chairman, I do have to comment that last year's surplus water in some way assisted in the reserve growing. I must also comment that this year's drought might have some impact on the availability of the head of water for future years but, Mr. Chairman, there is no indication from the projections that there will be any diminution of any substantial means over the next number of years. So the hoax or fraud, or what ever you'd call what they did last year, is being shown that way even more so this year and Manitobans are being taxed both ways.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a matter that should be considered by Hydro, and all I could get out of the Chairman of Hydro was a promise that it would be considered, I think he said next September or October. Now the extent to which Hydro will make that decision, the extent to which this government will try to impose its wishes for political purposes has yet to be seen.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's an awful pity that with wrong projections for last year and very conservative projections that were made last year and proven to be wrong and possibly this year, that there ought to be real consideration being given to reducing the input by taxpayers, the imposition on the taxpayer to subsidize Hydro, or a reduction of rates.

The only other thing I must comment on, Mr. Chairman, is that I was glad to see that Mr. McKean, who gave the information last year, is still employed by Hydro, and I say that advisably, Mr. Chairman, because of the Minister's record.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, just let me say that the Member for St. Johns refers to a hoax and a fraud and when anybody has got as much poison in his soul as he has, you can understand why he'd refer to it in those terms. Anybody who has to pour out so much poison out of his soul, and if he can do it in a personal way he likes that even better, but that's his nature and we are use to it so we'll accept it as it is and let the history speak for itself.

I would think that there would be a high degree and high measure satisfaction taken out of the fact that this year being a drought year with reduced revenues to the utility — some estimates in the range of 60 million less than they might have had, had they had a good or average year — that there would be a fair amount of satisfaction taken out of the fact that this was happening; some satisfaction taken out of the fact that the projections that were given by Hydro last year were perhaps on the conservative side and that the utility's position looks fairly secure. The cost to the taxpayers as a result of the rate freeze cost some 36 million to 37 million last year. The current year it will be in the order of 16 million. Next year they are going to back up around 33 million by the looks of it at this point in time. It doesn't take very long to discover that the rate freeze that was brought about by the resumption of the foreign currency obligations to the province has been a dramatic benefit to the entire aim and objective of doing so, namely to bring about a degree of security for the utility and stability to the ratepayer, and the development of an industrial development policy for the economic development people, who can sell it to the community at large and bring in the attraction of industry and jobs that we want to bring in, in Manitoba. All of those aspects, I would think, would be recognized by a less poisonous soul than the Member for St. John. There are so many good things coming out of it that can be embraced by almost every member of this House that I would think that perhaps we would see it happen periodically.

Mr. Chairman, the reserves that are accumulating in Hydro bring about a degree of comfort that was not there even 12 months ago. We could have been . . . I happen to have more confidence in Mr. McKean's abilities, in his projections than the Member for St. Johns has, who tries to put him down on one hand and bless him on the other hand, by making some snide remark about the Minister and his relationship to him. I happen to take a fair degree of confidence and satisfaction in the fact that Mr. McKean is there and does bring a strong steady hand to the financial operations of the utility and periodically presents this kind of information. I point out also that he was available freely and openly to present this information. That has not always been the case, as I have pointed out on another occasion.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I point out to you that the people of Manitoba can take some comfort in the overall performance of the utility. The government made the decision to stabilize the rates. If they had not moved, the member across the way says it would have happened anyway, why would the utility Hydro not have done the same thing as Telephones did and went to the PUB for a rate increase if they so wanted, if the foreign debts had been left there? They would have been fully responsible in doing so. I think they would have been obligated, as a responsible board, in asking for a rate increase over a year ago, 18 months ago, and that was at the time when the decision was made. I think we would have seen already rates, whether they were justified or not, being perhaps 10 or 15 percent or more higher than they are right now all ready, and I say whether or not they were justified, because maybe it will show that they didn't need it, but at that time that was not

the indication, so I can say that it has cost the taxpayers some money, the insurance program, which is really basically what the rate freeze is. An insurance program against the ups and downs of the foreign currency obligations has cost the taxpayers money but they have gotten it back through the stabilized rates in Hydro, the stabilized rates that are still going to be there some years from now.

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

**MR. BOYCE:** It's on a different subject, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I acknowledged the first person to rise.

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Winnipeg Centre waived in my favour because I wanted to respond to the Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Finance wants to speak from his chair, or does he want to stand?

**MR. CRAIK:** If I want to stand up, I'll ask for it. I don't need your invitation.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Finance knows the rules; that if one wants to speak, one stands and asks for the floor. I commend him for that.

**MR. CRAIK:** None of us are as smart as you.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** You may recall the other day, he said he didn't want me to be his teacher but I certainly had to teach him on Friday how to do his own work, or was it Saturday? Friday.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Minister and anybody else who cares to hear that I am extremely pleased with the progress of Hydro. I have been pleased with Hydro all along, and I think that the input into Hydro has been substantial over the years. It is probably the largest corporation that has been publicly owned in the province and has been successful all along, and I have great respect for its employees and its senior staff, more than the Minister of Finance has shown in relation to a gentleman named Gunter whom he cross-examined the other day, and in relation to a gentleman named Bateman, who had a great deal to do with helping Hydro grow, and of course, to a gentleman named Cass-Beggs, who, himself, made a big input.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased of the progress in Hydro, but I must admit, Mr. Chairman, I do have the additional pleasure of knowing that what we said last year is being proven to be correct, because that means then that with what we knew last year, we could indicate the facts that have now come out. And for the record, Mr. Chairman, I've got the two sheets. I have the projection which was prepared by Hydro, I think the date, it looks to me like February 22, 1979, and I have the figure that is June 17, 1980, and I'll just read the figures, just for the record, Mr. Chairman, under reserved provision, and I might comment, for some peculiar reason, the last year's

figures showed a cumulative reserve, and this year they didn't. And I don't know why not. But I had to add it in in order to be able to arrive at a comparable line for total reserves.

Well, the reserve provision, Mr. Chairman, for 1979, as predicted last year, was a reduction of 10.1 million. This year they turned out to be, and this is my note, based on what we were told, 96 million. For 1980, the projection had been a reduction of 30 million and is now in excess of 45.6 million. In last year's statement, the reserve provision at the end of 1981 was 8.3 million, and on this year's statement, the reserve is 53.2 million. In last year's statement, the 1982 projection for reserve provision was, well, I have a bit of a conflict here between a figure of 7.5 or 8.6, I'm not sure just which is correct; I believe it's 7.5 is correct, yes, that's right. This year's projection for 1982 is 47.3 million and last year's projection for 1983 was 2.3 million, and now the current projection is 40.2 million.

Mr. Chairman, there's a tremendous sum of money difference there. Let me just indicate to you the difference in projections of total reserves in this current statement: That the actual 1980 would bring the total reserves to 140 million; the financial plan, 1981, 193 million; financial plan 1982, 240 million; financial plan 1983, 280 million. That's big money, and I'm proud of it. I'm proud that Hydro can be producing that kind of power and I take no small measure of pride.

Mr. Chairman, yes, it's been pointed out by the Member for Inkster that the production is all production that was planned for during the years prior to 1977. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance is . . . You see, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has such selective hearings that he didn't hear me. I said that I believed there was no additional hydro production provided for since 1977. That goes away back to 1902. I wonder if the Minister could realize that. As far as I know, the provision for production of hydro power as of today was all planned prior to 1977; I believe that's correct.

Mr. Chairman, I just comment to you that the Minister of Finance, who reacts and always has reacted defensively by attacking, has now got a new expression for me, a poisoned soul. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, how many people in his constituency and how many people in my constituency would know what he's talking about, except that his hate comes across; a poisoned soul, Mr. Chairman, when I spoke about the fact that we were right last year in predicting an increase of reserves that made it unnecessary to go through the whole mechanism last year of what they called rate stabilization because we said it wouldn't be necessary, this year it's been proven not to be necessary. That's what I said, Mr. Chairman, and I said that they're taxing people to subsidize Hydro and they haven't lowered the rates. And that's correct, Mr. Chairman. That, to him, means a soul which is poisoned. Mr. Chairman, one wonders about the mind of a person who finds it necessary to respond as he did, and he says that I'm typical my way, he, too, has shown that kind of attitude which does nothing to add to the level of debate or dignity of this House, or of the position he occupies. Mr. Chairman, I would think that since I occupied the same position, I know of no person who occupied it before me or since me who has

really shamed the position at all really, but certainly as did the present Minister.

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

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, the expression I believe goes that Irishmen enter where fools fear to tread. But I have a couple of questions to ask, just so that I have the information correct. The First Minister's salary is going up an additional 10,000, which is over a 60 percent increase, the Ministers' salaries are going up over 5,000, which is over a 30 percent increase, and our salaries are going up some 4,000, which is about a 20 percent increase.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a couple of comments at this time. I always found it ludicrous, Mr. Chairman, that Ministers of the Crown are required to accept the heat of administering large departments; in fact I think pretty well everyone is getting 15,600 and I think, I don't know what SO-IIs and SO-VIs get now but the Ministers put their jobs on the line every four years and they were getting 15,600 as compared between, I would imagine in today's dollars, between 40,000 and 60,000 for senior administrators within the Civil Service. So the need for it, Mr. Chairman, I can see that. I don't believe in social advance by tearing people down, but nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, it should be put on the record that if history teaches us anything, it's the spread between the bottom and the top that causes the problem.

As the Leader of the Opposition said earlier, to give the health workers an 11 percent increase and increase the First Minister's salary by 64 percent, and the MLAs 20 percent, that shows you the difference between 11 percent, 20 percent, 64 percent. I think it's an attitudinal thing of the government, Mr. Chairman. But here is the Member for Inkster said, the final court of appeal is the electorate. They will judge whether this is good, bad or indifferent.

But I just wanted to mention, relative to this item, I think the Minister should take a note, if he would, that in Bill 48, which is up for consideration before the House, Mr. Chairman, when Cabinet was preparing that particular bill, I don't think that they took into consideration officers of the House; that if there is a need for raising the First Minister's salaries and the Executive Council's and members of the House, per se, that they should also include in Bill 48, which I couldn't find, some adjustment to the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Whips and the other officers of the House which have a stipend which is in the Legislative Assembly Act. I see no . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. I would think that the debate is becoming very, very interesting and I would ask the honourable members to please allow the member standing in his place to speak without interruption.

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** Your attention, Mr. Chairman, may be construed as a conflict of interest, but nevertheless in perusing the bill, Mr. Chairman, I find no reference to officers of the House such as yourself, Mr. Chairman, or the Speaker, or the

Whips, who I understand are given a remuneration. So perhaps, I imagine it wouldn't be necessary to bring in another supplementary supply, that the money can be found for an adjustment on the same scale as the other adjustments are being made to these officers of the House.

But Mr. Chairman, I just want to, for the sake of emphasis, mention that briefly once more, that the First Minister's salary, and in relative terms, I'm not going to vote against it, I think that in relative terms the person who is ultimately responsible for the administration of a billion dollar corporation, to have a salary of somewhere between 50,000 and 60,000 a year, when you take into consideration all the perks, cars, and all the rest of it, and people shouldn't forget that when they're thinking about MLA's salaries. My pension, I believe is something like 800 a month; I don't know what the present worth of 800 a month for the rest of my life is worth in present dollars. It's worth a lot of money, so when people talk about only 26,000 plus the indemnity of 51,000 for the First Minister, 44,600 for Ministers and 24,000 for MLAs, the present net worth of the pension I think has to be taken into consideration also. But for gosh sakes, Mr. Chairman, when we're talking to other people on the scale in our society when we're dealing with people who have to live, I don't deny these people the money, but what I say is that other people have to be looked at more equitably, and to continually spread it between the top and the bottom, Lord love us, if we learned anything from history, we can see that this is what causes problems. And here in this present consideration, we have a manifestation of the priority of how the government sees things, 64 percent, 30 percent and 20 percent, and 11 percent for health workers.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution No. 5—pass — the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm somewhat disappointed that the First Minister is not here for this part of the debate, although I recognize that it's the Minister of Finance that has to have these funds approved. The point I'm making, however, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that these estimates on this resolution are indicating a very vast change in government policy with respect to pay scale, with respect to the question of restraint and with respect to their public pronouncements over the last three years as to what the people of Manitoba should expect from this government.

I can't quarrel with the final totals, Mr. Chairman, because I recognize that they are probably comparable. I can't quarrel with that. I am sure they are comparable with the private sector; I am sure they are comparable with other provinces of a similar size, whatever, maybe even lower, I wouldn't even want to argue that point. But, Mr. Chairman, what I do argue is the fact that this government had lead the people of Manitoba to believe very consistently and very harshly through their actions, Mr. Chairman, that people of Manitoba have to expect to have less, to expect less, to live on less. They have to tighten their belts, that has been the philosophy. It was a seige mentality with respect to the expenditures of money, public money, through the government that has been sustained over the last three years. They

have oversold the idea that we have got to cut everything back.

In light of that, I don't know the logic of the size of increase that they have proposed for the Cabinet and for the Premier, and for the Leader of the Opposition; I include them all, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure there is logic in doing what is being proposed here, except that one wants to conform with other jurisdictions and perhaps to conform with private companies who employ executive officers and so on.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that from 1969 to 1977 there wasn't one penny of increase to the members of the Executive Council. The fact remains, despite the arguments of my friends opposite, that the public has to function with less money, that last year there were significant increases for members of the Executive Council, not all members of the Executive Council, but for the first time last year members who were to that point in time denied the right of living allowances were allowed to . . . In fact, there was a measure brought in to provide for living allowances on a per diem basis for the Cabinet Ministers. That is right, rural members. Mr. Chairman, that amounts to a 5,000 increase roughly, more or less. That is for an MLA, that is what it works out to. I am sure the members opposite appreciate the point I am making. I am not arguing against it, I am just illustrating, Mr. Chairman, the scenario of events that has taken place. A substantial increase for a number of Cabinet Ministers last year, another large increase this year. You know, when you look at it all, the Member for Winnipeg Centre is right, it is a range of from 20 to 60 percent in increases for all members of this House, depending on where they sit and the positions they hold.

We just had a strike in the province of Manitoba of the health workers, where the government of Manitoba has held the lid on that particular component of our economy for the last three years, to the point where the top blew off, Mr. Chairman, and people were just refusing to work another day under those restraint conditions. There was a prolonged period of suffering and inconvenience for many Manitobans who were in those institutions during that period of time, all in the name of prudence, all in the name of not spending beyond one's means. So I have a problem, Mr. Chairman, in understanding how the government is able to justify, in light of all of their posturing, these kinds of increases for Cabinet, notwithstanding the fact that they are probably conforming to other jurisdictions.

The fact is that the whole government's policy is non-conforming in Canada, Mr. Chairman. The government of Manitoba is a throw-back government of Canada with respect to their policy, their ideology; it is a dating back situation to the philosophies of Conservatives in the 1930s. That is what we have had here for three years, and so for members opposite to argue that it is reasonable for us to try to update our particular salaries so that we would conform with Ontario or with Quebec or with the Maritimes or with Saskatchewan, all those governments have not retrenched, Mr. Chairman, to the extent that the Manitoba Government has and to the extent that they have imposed tremendous amount of pain and suffering on the people of

Manitoba in that retrenchment over the last three years. So it doesn't follow that you have to upgrade your salaries to the other provinces, because you have asked your people to suffer more than other provinces have asked their people to suffer in a period of restraint, Mr. Chairman.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the government ought to cut its cloth according to its advice, for its own purposes as well as for the purposes of the public.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, I will only comment on one of the member's figures. He refers here to, I think, a 60 percent increase. It seems to me it is 5 over a former 15. If he is talking about Cabinet, Cabinet indemnity is increased from, according to this provision, the provision for it is that it raises 5 over 15.5 or 15.6, whatever it is now currently at, which is roughly a 33 percent amount, divided by the 13 years . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

**MR. USKIW:** The member will know what I did say, I made reference to a range of increases from 20 to 60 percent, the latter being the Premier's increase.

**MR. CRAIK:** Let me finish, Mr. Chairman. What we are providing for here is 5 over what was formerly 15.6, which gives you around 30 to 33 percent spread over 13 years, since 1967. Is anybody suggesting that anybody else in society would have gone along with 33 divided by 13, which is probably a compound rate of somewhere between 1-1/2 and 2 percent since the last time it was changed?

Mr. Chairman, I don't point it out to justify the increase. I think the report that has been given by the Justice that looked at it dealt with the thing in an objective way and what is being provided for is roughly what was recommended. I don't try and justify it, I simply do question some of the percentages and growth figures that are being bandied around. That is the problem. There is always this tendency to over-exaggerate in every which direction, but if you want to do that, then look at the rate of change spread over the time period since the last change, and it works out to a growth rate of about 2 percent during a period when the inflation rate probably ranged between 7 and 10 percent.

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

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, I think it was the Member for Lac du Bonnet who was using the figures that I had used, and I was only using the figures that the Minister of Finance had given us, and he said that the increase for the First Minister was 10,000, and it comes to 60.240963 percent. It was 60.240936, or 63, excuse me, I transposed those last numbers, so maybe the Minister of Finance would take exception to that.

But just in correcting that, I would once again while I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I didn't get an

acknowledgment from the Minister of Finance, whether they would give consideration to bringing in an amendment to Bill 48 to take into consideration those other officers of the Legislative Assembly, who should have their stipend adjusted in keeping with the percentages being allowed in other areas.

I realize the Minister of Finance doesn't have to answer, but I wonder if the government would consider that, because they have been frozen also.

**MR. CRAIK:** I think, Mr. Chairman, that should be dealt with when Bill 48 is before the House.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out to the Minister of Finance that if he checks the figures that he will find that a range of percentages is very close to the target. There is no point in arguing about it, they speak for themselves.

What I would like to question though, Mr. Chairman, or raise as a new issue, and perhaps the Minister of Government Services will want to take this one on, and that is that I would like to know what it is that the staff members of this Assembly are being paid, on what basis, and whether or not they receive overtime allowances for the time that they are putting in, on an hourly basis, in this Assembly during sessional periods.

My impression is that they are not paid for those extra hours, those extra services, and given the fact that sessions of the Legislature have become longer and longer over the years, I really believe that if my assumptions are correct, that there ought to be an item in here to cover for overtime salaries for those servants who service the members during the course of the session, Mr. Chairman, for their overtime.

Perhaps the Minister would want to clarify it for the benefit of the members.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, there is a split jurisdiction if you like. The Board of Internal Economy has certain jurisdiction over some aspects of that staff, if you are making references to the staff that is for instance involved with Hansard and the production of Hansard, or some of the additional attendants that are with the House come under the more direct purview of the Speaker for instance, as do others come under the more direct purview of the Clerk of the Assembly.

I think the points that the honourable member raises perhaps contain some validity in the sense that the length of the sessions are expanding. I think traditionally perhaps and I would have to . . . I don't know this, but I think traditionally, perhaps, when the sessions were shorter that compensations in terms of time were built into the times and the demand on their times when the session was not sitting. I think that is a matter of a personnel situation that indeed ought to be looked at from time to time, particularly when adjustments in general salary levels are being made for any or all of us that are working in this environment.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I recognize that salary adjustments are negotiated for the bulk of the Civil Service, but I do believe that for others, and in particular for those that are closely involved with the operations of the Assembly, that there are many hours that are unrecognized perhaps and not paid for, and that I believe that given the fact that government is becoming more and more complex and takes much longer, the process on behalf of the people of Manitoba, that it is only logical that we ought to update our thinking in that regard and pay people what they deserve and what they earn, Mr. Chairman. I don't believe we should expect services on the basis of their goodwill and good intention, but rather that they ought to be recognized for the service they are performing and that we shouldn't expect it in any other way.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Minister of Finance that the calculation comes out to about 64 percent of a salary increase for the Premier of our province, and about 32 percent, a shade over 32 percent for the Cabinet Ministers.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 5—pass; Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a certain sum not exceeding 95,000 . . . The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to take a moment, if I may, now that the First Minister is here to address myself to the question of a Legislative Counsel. We have three Legislative Counsels, the senior of course being Mr. Tallin, whose work I have grown to admire a great deal and respect. It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, this year I think is an exceptional year by the amount of legislation we've had, but in every year, I believe, that they are very hard worked, the three of them. I find that more this year than other years, and possibly because of the overload, that private members' and opposition members' legislation is shunted to the side, and again I don't say it with any criticism to Mr. Tallin and his staff, but I'm wondering if it isn't time for the government to give consideration to providing a person who would be a Legislative Counsel or someone somewhat versed in that work which is a specialized work, to increase the service that may be offered to the Members of the Legislature in that department.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, the comments of the Member for St. Johns with respect to the senior Legislative Counsel, Mr. Tallin, are of course, I'm sure, shared by all members in the House. He is renowned, I think throughout Canada, for the kind of work that he does for this Chamber and we are fortunate indeed to have him. His suggestion about additional staffing with particular emphasis on one of the staff being assigned particularly for private members' purposes, and so on, is well worth considering and I'll be happy to discuss that with the Attorney-General and the Legislative Counsel to see if it could be carried further. It ties in to some extent with the suggestion we had earlier today from the Member for Inkster that we should have a kind of legislative ombudsman, if that's not an inaccurate

term, to look at some matters that might otherwise slip through in drafting. But the suggestion is worthwhile and I'll all I can undertake is that we'll take a look at it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, before the Minister of Finance again accuses me of exaggeration, I want to correct a statement that I made just a few moments ago when I indicated that the increased salary for the Premier is a 64 percent increase; it is actually 60.24 percent.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, with respect to the point that I raised earlier and with respect to the point that's raised by the Member for St. Johns, I do think that sometimes civil rights provisions, and provisions that deal with regulations, and provisions that deal with government powers that aren't absolutely necessary with regard to seizures, etc., are things that could be watched by people having particular reference to that matter, which may not be the fact with the Legislative Counsel.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that the provision that we were dealing with yesterday and today is not something that came out of bureaucratic provision. I believe that the Attorney-General indicated earlier in the year that he intended to make such a provision and did in fact make one, and I wouldn't want that in this case the bureaucracy to be the one who takes the brunt of that particular regulation. I think that a person schooled in civil liberties, etc., would have warned the Minister of it, or could have warned the Minister of it, but I just don't think he appreciated what he was doing. It's not that some bureaucrat didn't appreciate it; in this case it's something the Minister didn't appreciate. I don't think that anybody should suggest that kind of thing is something that slipped in. It was put in with knowledge and intent by the Minister, and which he gave notice of during the Rossmere Election.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution No. 5 — Resolved that there be granted . . . The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** The First Minister is in the House and since I raised that percentage, I wanted the First Minister, rather than read Hansard, I will repeat the remark that I made: I said, I don't deny the First Minister the increase, and I think in relative terms perhaps he is still underpaid. I had raised the point because of the difference between the increases which were granted to all of us in the House and that which has been granted to the health care worker.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, one of things of which I am most proud is that in the years from 1969 to 1979 — 1977 excuse me, maybe I'm wishing it was till 1979 — the fact is that between the years of

1969 to 1977, I believe that the government in power showed less concern to the income of legislators and Ministers than they showed to other people in society. I know that we have been criticized for it and I know that criticism has come from people of all political persuasions, but if it needs saying, Mr. Chairman, I tell you that it is one of the things of which I am most proud, and to his credit — (Interjection)— well, Mr. Chairman, the member says that it is easy for a fat cat lawyer to say that, and I will acknowledge that my capacity to earn income is probably higher because of my profession than is the capacity of others but the fact is, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that any of the Ministers during my regime, or very few, suffered a loss in income by virtue of being Ministers of the Crown. I do not believe that the Ministers of the Crown today suffer a loss of income by virtue of their being a Minister of the Crown, and I do not think that members of the Legislature suffer a loss of income by virtue of being members of the Legislature. But to the credit of the former Premier of this province, Ed Schreyer, who I regard more as a populist than I do as can be labelled in any other way, he, to my mind, was proud of the fact that he was the lowest paid Premier in Canada, and I do not fault him for it because despite the fact that he was the lowest paid Premier in Canada, he was not suffering and none of us are suffering by virtue of legislative office.

I say that, Mr. Chairman, because I intend to speak on the bill and I intend to make my remarks with regard to these increases on the bill and I do not wish silence or acquiescence on my part at the present time during the estimates to be an indication that I do not have some serious misgivings and objections to what is being done with regard to salary increases.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution No. 5—pass — The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions pertaining to the Assessment Branch and the . . .

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

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report same and asks 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 Springfield, report of Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, it would be our intention to resume consideration of the Supply bills that are before us now, when we reconvene at 8:00 o'clock. There are four Supply bills that are before us now. We'll proceed with them as far as we can proceed and then I will be calling second readings of bills that are on the Order Paper. —(Interjection)— No, there will be no committee tonight; we'll be in the House tonight.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I presume that when the House Leader is announcing things that we can ask him questions, that was always the procedure before he closes the House, because my impression is that you cannot get very far in Supply, so I gather that we will be in the bills that are on second reading.

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

**MR. JORGENSON:** What I think I said was that we'd be considering those bills as far as we can proceed with them and then I will be calling legislation following that.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I draw to the Acting House Leader's attention the fact that we were in committee and have not completed the resolution, so I assume we'll go back into committee.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour being 5:30, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock tonight.