



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



Vol. XXVI No. 39

2:30 p.m. Wednesday, May 10, 1978

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, May 10, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 23 pupils of Grade 9 standing from the Ethelbert School under the direction of Miss Martinot. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Roblin.

We also have 27 pupils of Grade 11 standing from the M.C.I. Collegiate in Gretna under the direction of Mr. Voth. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

We have 30 students of Grade 9 standing from the McKenzie Junior High under the direction of Mr. Manuel Boguski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dauphin.

We have 40 students of Grade 11 standing from St. Claude Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Chaplan. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Government House Leader. On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Mistik Creek Logging Company Annual Report ending March 31st, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion. . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East) introduced Bill No. 12, An Act respecting The City of Brandon .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Communications and Telephone Service, to ask the Honourable Minister if he can advise the House whether any progress is being made as between Canada and Manitoba to ensure that the agreement entered into by both jurisdictions 18 months ago or so is being respected. The agreement I refer to is the one that has both levels of government agreeing as to the method by which cablevision service and licensing problems shall be regulated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, the matter to which the Leader of the Opposition refers is one that's under very active consideration at the present time. There does appear to be some difference of interpretation between the Federal Government as represented by the Minister of Communications and the CRTC. We are attempting at this stage, Mr. Speaker, to resolve those differences so that we may proceed as rapidly as possible with the business relating to the extension of cablevision in western Manitoba.

MR. SCHREYER: With respect to those approximately 30 Manitoba communities who are awaiting cablevision service and which have reasonable prospect of receiving same but are being forced to wait because of some regulatory problem, can the Minister confirm that the problem is not any doing of the Province of Manitoba or of the Ministry of Communications in Ottawa?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is asking, I think, for really an opinion here. It would be certainly one that I would be able to give, that the present government is not in any way impeding the provision of this service. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, we are doing what we can to ensure that the terms of the Canada-Manitoba Agreement are respected and observed and that any temporary impediments to the provision of these cablevision services in western Manitoba

will not be such as to delay the projected date; that is the service to commence some time in the fall of this year.

MR. SCHREYER: I might say, to the pleasant surprise of the Minister, that I concur fully that the problem is not one of his doing or of the Province of Manitoba's, or even the doing of the Ministry of Communications. Then given that there seems to be some disregard of this Canada-Manitoba Agreement being shown by the Canadian Radio Television Commission, can the Minister indicate what specific course of action he is aware of is being taken by either of the two levels of government to resolve this problem?

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that we have had over the past six months an opportunity to discuss this problem with the Minister of Communications, and as to the most recent action, I can tell the Leader of the Opposition that I have, today, dispatched a message to the Minister of Communications pointing out again the difficulty that is being experienced by the apparent different interpretation of the terms of the Canada-Manitoba Agreement and suggesting that we would appreciate her actions to resolve this difference as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance. I wonder if he could tell me whether the funds he announced would be extended or expanded for student employment whether that's limited to the private sector only?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, the funds to be extended would be primarily for the private sector Youth Employment Program, and there may be other minor variations to it that are included in the program before it's completed, but primarily the reference was to the private sector Youth Employment Program.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that we know there are thousands of students who will not be able to get employment, is the government reconsidering its financing, and will consider making funds available to hospitals, to parks and recreation boards, municipalities and school boards so that they can hire students to do absolutely necessary and vital work which otherwise wouldn't be done? I'm thinking of the swimming pools in the cities, for example, where they need lifeguards, attendants at playgrounds. These are programs that in the past were supported through government funding, and is the government going to reconsider its position of funding those?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is not, in the works consideration of direct funding to the municipalities and the school boards with regard to programs. There are, however, some programs being carried on by those two sectors, to what extent they are providing jobs and numbers of jobs, I am not in a position to be able to answer that question. I indicated yesterday that we expect the program which we have founded will likely produce more jobs than we initially anticipated, and we have indicated that there is not an upper limit to that program, and we are at this point in the position of having to assess it and assess it that it's being quite successful. And also once it's under full operation by mid-summer, have the people who have been distributed throughout the province through the Minister of Education, do a complete assessment on the effectiveness of the program so we can have it under review for next year.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Speaker, assessments and reviews take time. It's now well into May. Is the Minister then saying that if municipalities, school boards, hospitals, etc., that in the past received financial support from the province, if they want to maintain the level of services in the field of recreation or maintenance of their facilities that they had in the past, they're simply going to have to again look to the local taxpayer and not look to the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that they're not getting some level of support from the province. What my answer to the member's question was that we don't anticipate any changes with regard to employment grant programs that encompass the school boards and municipalities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a diminution in the amount available to the various agencies that I have mentioned, so that I have to repeat to the Minister of Finance when he says he's not sure, I can tell him of the level of funding announced by the government to date other than the private sector. There's no way that these agencies can, in fact, provide the service and so I am asking whether the government will now, quickly, re-evaluate and consider seriously making funds available in addition to that in the private sector, to the public sector, the public sector being the various levels of government and hospitals and other institutions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, first of all I'd like to raise a matter of privilege. It appears that some time yesterday, the Minister of Northern Affairs made an announcement outside of the House in regard to a northern youth employment program, and I went to Information Services this morning — they didn't have any copies of that release that was made to the radios and to the newspapers yesterday. And of course, Mr. Speaker, by doing that the member does not give the opposition any chance to comment on his announcement and raise the fact that the funding is actually a reduction over last year's funding, or to raise the fact that nothing is being done to create adult employment in northern Manitoba.

That matter of privilege having been stated, I would like to address a question now to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I wonder if the Northern Affairs Minister could tell us what exactly is the reduction in the funding for the Youth Corps Program this year as opposed to last year, and is the Minister anticipating any program to put the parents of these youths in northern Manitoba back to work since the Minister has managed to get them out of work?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to take the word of the Member for The Pas that I have technically done something wrong. I will check this, and if I have, I am prepared in this House to apologize to him, the Leader of the Opposition and others. There has been a program worked out; the Federal Government will be contributing this year \$500,000 whereas last year they contributed \$600,000.00. This year, on this particular portion of youth employment in northern Manitoba, it will be \$300,000 by the Provincial Government, and last year it was \$425,000.00. There are additional funds being made available through the Department of Education for youth employment in northern Manitoba.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could tell us, with the \$125,000 reduction in the program, which communities will not receive a youth employment program this summer? Which northern communities will go without a program this summer?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there will be any particular communities that will not be given the opportunity to participate in this particular program. I appreciate what the Member for The Pas is attempting to establish but I think with the funds available and monitored, and implemented properly, that all communities will be able to participate in this particular youth employment program.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, a question again to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that he made a statement to the reporter for the Canadian Native News Service, that Minago contractors never made a profit; I wonder if he could confirm that as reported in that News Services report.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was phoned by the particular News Service from Ottawa, and they quoted some unusual figures that apparently had come from the Member for The Pas, and I don't doubt them being unusual; I hear rather unusual things coming from him. Some of the figures that they quoted, I couldn't particularly accept. I said to them that if the government had not put in over \$300,000 in the second last year and over \$400,000 in last year, if the Provincial Government had not put those types of moneys which are close to three-quarters of a million dollars into the Minago operation, that that particular operation would have been \$660,000 in the hole.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question which I would direct to the Minister of Finance in the absence of the Minister of Education on the question of the provincial education grants to school divisions. Last year the Minister of Education indicated that the accelerated grant would be based upon a reduction in the people-teacher ratio, I believe one to eighteen in elementary schools. Considering that some school divisions, particularly that of St. James-Assiniboia, are eliminating a number of teachers which will have an obvious effect upon that student-pupil ratio, is the province prepared to monitor and determine whether in fact that no longer fits those guidelines, and therefore would affect the ability of that school division to apply for the grants from the Provincial Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll have to take the question as notice for the Minister of Education and inasmuch as his estimates are before the House, I would assume that it could be dealt with there.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for taking the question as notice and I'll pursue

it though. I would like then to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation in terms of the announcement which he made outside the House yesterday, concerning the improvement in the water safety programs in the Province of Manitoba. At the same time when those issues were raised with him last week, he indicated that he would be prepared to provide to the members of this House, the studies or observations made by his department that indicate why the reduction should be made, and I gather from his announcement made outside the House that he has now received new studies. I wonder if he would be prepared to table both those reports, a study of his own department showing why the reductions were made and the reports he received from the Red Cross showing why the reductions in fact were not necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I met with the people from the Red Cross. They presented a report to me dealing with their concerns. We looked at them; we reviewed our figures compared to theirs; they noted that several of the lakes in question had been dropped last year and areas such as Paint Lake up at Thompson which is fairly heavily used did not have lifeguards. I have reviewed that myself with departmental staff and, as a result, we have indicated to the Red Cross that we will be asking for more lifeguards, the exact amount will be around 70, and we will be requesting that of them very shortly, as soon as we've gone through it at the departmental level.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, a supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Again, I can only welcome the action by the Minister caused I think by some pressure from members opposite but I would ask him this: considering the major discrepancy that appears between the studies of safety done by his department and those done by private sources, particularly the Red Cross or other safety organizations, is he prepared to do a serious re-examination of the way in which his department examines the safety problems in the provincial parks and perhaps convene a different mechanism, perhaps an advisory council of safety organizations in the province, so that he can receive the right advice right from the start and not have to go back and retract himself?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have been looking at different aspects of this. I should point out to the member that a province such as Saskatchewan, I understand since 1975, has embarked upon a public awareness program educating the parents of young children as well as the adults to exercise caution on the lakes. They have moved away from this type of a system so I will be looking at the whole situation with an eye to providing proper public dialogue and also providing public information and encouraging people to make sure that they do look after their children on the lakes. So I'm checking into the matter to see what other provinces are doing but in the meantime, to ensure public safety at our lakes, we decided to take this course of action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister responsible for the Telephone System and Manitoba Data Services, can the Minister confirm reports that Manitoba Data Services and the Manitoba Telephone System have both been instructed or advised by the government to desist from any further servicing of the computer requirements of a number of Crown agencies such as Hydro, the Health Services Commission, Liquor Control Commission, etc., and that therefore each of these Crown agencies will be returning to a situation of proliferation of different data processing capability fragmented each one from the other.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, we have been examining the role of the Manitoba Data Service and in respect to certain immediate decisions that were having to be made by MDS, we have issued some directives and Natural Resources. Is the Minister in a position today to answer my question of Monday in connection with crop damage to farmers in the R.M.s referred to?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MACMASTER: I would like to assure the Honourable Member for Selkirk that I am working on it and I hope to have a specific answer by the end of this week. I don't see any great difficulty in it. I don't have the figures in front of me but I think it's close, that in the previous year there was approximately 45 or 50 claims; last year — and I'm guessing — there were 440 so it's taken a great deal of time and the money did run out.

The Member for Selkirk asked the other day, Mr. Speaker, also in conjunction with this, if we were budgeting in our Estimates. I don't think that has ever been the process of specifically budgeting for crop depredation. What you do is take the revenue from the sale of the Wild Rice certificates and at the end of the year it's a similar process to your forest firefighting procedure, that you assess what you have, you use what you need and then we are cost-sharing with the Federal Government. I think it

will bear out to be true that in the last several years we've had to go back to the Federal Government for additional funds. I know in the last two years, the records indicate that I have seen that we have been able to get additional funds from the Federal Government.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm still reeling from the statement made by the Minister but my question is to the . . . Well, possibly I'll just ask a supplementary question to the Minister for Northern Affairs. Is he suggesting that in some way fees will be paid into the general revenues of the province and he can then use that money, without further authority, for the purpose he outlined to us before?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: It is just simply my understanding. I'll clarify it if there's technically something wrong with what I said but it's my understanding you don't budget for those particular funds.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could the Honourable Minister make inquiries as to how he gets authority to spend that kind of money other than by special warrant. I'll let that drop, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address my question to the Minister of Health. I'd like to know whether there is an agreement extant, be it oral, written, or an exchange of letters between the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Manitoba Medical Association resulting from the latest concluded negotiations regarding fees, and are there terms of reference regarding the work of the Consultative Committee which we referred to the other day?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of my honourable friend's question is, no, not to my knowledge, there is no such agreement extant. There may be one that has been drafted and proposed by one side or the other, but nothing is extant in the true sense of the term because nothing has been approved or signed, and I'm not sure one has even been drafted yet; I will investigate that.

On the second part of his question, yes, terms of reference for the Consultative Committee are being put together; they have been proposed in at least general outline to me as the Minister and it will be possible very shortly to confirm to the honourable member what those specific terms of reference are.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Has the freeze on the construction of nursing homes been lifted?

MR. SHERMAN: No, not in a general sense, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary question to the Minister responsible for Housing. Has the freeze on the Critical Home Repair Program been lifted?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman keeps using the word freeze. The Critical Home Repair Program is in this condition: we are not accepting any applications unless they are extreme emergency, and we are examining them when we get them. The Critical Home Repair Program will continue after we have caught up with the applications we have on hand, or get close to it.

MR. PARASIUK: I assume from that answer the freeze hasn't been lifted and that people phoning in have been told that that program is frozen. My final supplementary is to the Minister of Finance who has reported to the Legislature on the level of employment and unemployment. Would he consider removing the freezes on nursing homes, on the Critical Home Repair Program, and would he consider accelerating Public Works projects in the light of a technical report from D.I. MacDonald, the Chief Commissioner of the City of Winnipeg, who recommends accelerating Public Works projects which are needed in order to deal with the unemployment problem; and secondly, to prevent the loss, and I quote, "of skilled tradesmen from the province."?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in his supplementary question he mentioned again the freeze on Critical Home Repair, and would it be taken off. Mr. Speaker, the question keeps coming up from the opposition, and quite frankly, I'd really like to let them know that the problem is not one that was caused basically by their government or our government, it's a problem that has come up that we have to overcome. Mr. Speaker, just to answer the honourable gentleman's question, we had a Critical Home Repair Program, we came in with what we call the Outside Paint Program, and when

people called the man to inspect the outside painting he found the eaves were rotting and what-have-you. If the painter said, "I can't fix that," and they said, "Where do I get that fixed?" — they said, "Critical Home Repair." So we had more Critical Home Repair.

We then came in with the Inside Paint Program. When inspectors went out and half the plaster was gone, they said, "We can't paint that," and they said, "Where do I get that fixed?" — they said, "Critical Home Repair." Mr. Speaker, we ended up with a backlog of applications that were higher than has been recommended by MHRC at any time — to the honourable gentlemen opposite, they have reports in their hands — the most we can handle in a year is probably about 3,500 to 4,000 and we had 5,000 on file. We're working it down; it's a problem that I'm not blaming anybody for, but it's there and we're trying to solve it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Labour inform when the freeze on minimum wages will be taken off, on what date?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): There hasn't been a freeze on the minimum wage, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOX: Possibly she doesn't call it a freeze, but if you don't raise it, that's a freeze. The cost of living is going up; can she indicate what amount is being considered by the Review Committee?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, that's a policy of the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Northern Affairs, with respect to the problem as I understand it, a number of individual farmers are incurring some loss in crop values as a result of the wild game birds, ducks and geese, to be specific, that are causing damage on the periphery of the Oak Hammock Marsh project, which is, I believe, a Federal-Provincial project. The Minister indicates that there is a certain fund which, if not depleted, the moneys will go to the compensation of the individual farmers of that area. May I ask the Minister if he will check to ensure as to whether the procedure ought not to be, once determined by an independent appraisal that there has been damage in fact caused by the lowland birds, that compensation will be made regardless of whether or not there are any moneys left in that special fund? In light of the fact that I am advised that officials of the Crown have acknowledged obligation and then followed up subsequently by saying that there were no funds available, I ask the Minister if he will ensure that once an obligation is acknowledged that the funds will be made available by whatever means.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: I appreciate the question, Mr. Speaker; there is a possibility that in attempting to answer the method in which they would be paid, or the consideration under which they are hopefully going to be paid, that I might have erred in the technicalities of explanation. I intend to have a full explanation on the moneys available and the total situation within a couple of days for you. I promised this to the Member for Selkirk; I also appreciate the fact that the Member for Selkirk came over and specifically talked to me about the problem that you have raised. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Tourism. In view of the investigation that he is doing regarding the Whiteshell development, I believe that given the amount of time that he has had to work at this that he should be able to answer this question with a simple yes or no. Have the senior staff, by way of written memos advised his department strongly against this condominium development in the Big Whiteshell Lake on the basis that the lake was now over-crowded and would be adversely affected environmentally by this proposed condominium development? Can he answer this, yes or no?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to clean this whole thing up, we are finalizing the report, and I hope to make it very very shortly.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that one of the major tools for a member of the Legislature to have in order to do his job effectively is to get information, and since the Minister is obviously stonewalling on this, I wish to prove this fact . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. —(Interjection)— Are you asking a question?

MR. BOSTROM: I'm speaking on a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, please identify your point of privilege.

MR. BOSTROM: My point of privilege is that we are being denied, as an opposition group, and as an individual member of the Legislature I am personally being denied information that is readily at the fingertips of the Minister. Just by way of proof, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table one of these memos, which is available to me — I managed to get a copy of this memo, and I'm sure it's available to the Honourable Minister — and this is a copy of a memo which I referred to in my initial question to the Minister, and the Minister refused to answer that simple question yes or no, which I can only assume means that he is attempting to hold back and stonewall information that should be readily available to members of this Legislature. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The member had no point of privilege. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister confirm, that with the elimination of the Career Planning Branch in her Department of Labour, that the Affirmative Action Program has been transferred from the Department of Labour to the Civil Service Commission, and can she advise whether groups affected, including the Manitoba League for the Physically Handicapped were consulted prior to the move, prior to the transfer of that program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, that will come up in my Estimates, but I would like to assure the Member for Brandon East that there isn't any curtailment in offering help to the handicapped or the women under that department. It isn't under the Department of Labour, incidentally, it's the Civil Service, and it is being handled very capably and continuing.

MR. EVANS: I thank the Minister for her answer. I did suggest in my question that it had been transferred to the Civil Service Commission, and my question now then is that since the program is still operative, can the Minister advise as to who will carry out this program, not the names of individuals, but what expertise exists within the Civil Service to carry out the Affirmative Action Program, because my understanding is that the expertise that did exist has been fired?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, the people that were in the former program did a very good job, they set up seminars, etc. But then, after they had completed that, it is now the work of the personnel in the hiring in the Civil Service to carry on and find the jobs for these different groups of people.

MR. EVANS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Well, can the Honourable Minister advise the House whether there is a group within the Civil Service Commission staff, whether there is a special group or whether there is a number of people whose responsibility it is to help disadvantaged people such as the physically handicapped in this province, to help them find jobs within the Civil Service or wherever? Is there a specific group within the Civil Service Commission now?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the personnel director is looking after it, with a group of people under him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Attorney-General. In view of the fact that we are proceeding well along the road of Estimates, and in view of the fact that there is a great deal of interest in family law in the province; expectation as to intended changes in family law; could the Attorney-General please advise the House when he intends to introduce his Bill on Family Law?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, if I may quote the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, the answer is, "Soon".

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I was asked on May 5th whether or not my department would be appealing the decision relating to the use of a breathalyzer — the decision that was made by His Honour Judge Baryluk who decided that the breathalyzer in question was not an approved machine, Mr. Speaker, I can advise that the department will be appealing that decision.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would call second reading of Bill No. 11 standing in the name of the Minister of Labour.

GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 11 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE RETAIL BUSINESSES HOLIDAY CLOSING ACT

HON. NORMA L. PRICE presented Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Retail Businesses Holiday Closing Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I would now like to introduce, for second reading, Bill No. 11, which proposes to amend The Retail Businesses Holiday Closing Act, which first came into force on June of last year. When the Act was being considered, prior to being passed last year, interested parties as well as members of the opposition at that time, expressed a number of concerns about several provisions in the Act and made some proposals to improve it. Many of these concerns and proposals were well-founded and based on economic and social realities but were, for the most part, ignored by the government of that time.

The proposed amendments before you reflect some of the concerns expressed at that time. They could not be considered major amendments, since they do not detract from the basic intent of the Act, but I believe they will clarify and improve the legislation.

As the Act now stands, a person operating a retail business establishment may elect to remain open for business on a Sunday, if he closes his store on a Saturday. We support the concept of having one day of partial economic rest, that is a day of pause and a day for family life, or if one so chooses a day for religious observance. However, with the option clause, we question whether the concept of having one day of partial economic rest can be preserved. Potentially, with this kind of option clause, Sunday could become just like any other day of commercial activity, if stores chose to experiment with remaining open on Sundays rather than on Saturdays. Our society and the traditional pattern of our holiday schedule is such that Sunday is the most practical day of partial economic rest.

It is therefore being proposed, that Section 4 of the Act be deleted so as to remove the option of a store closing on a Saturday so as to be able to remain open for business on the Sunday. This would preserve the principle of having one day of partial economic rest, and would insure that the store closing day was a common one in respect of all retail stores.

It would also remove the possibility of Sunday becoming a day of commercial activity just like any other day.

Two further proposed amendments relate to clause (d) of Section 5 of the Act, which generally exempts small stores from the requirement to close on Sundays and holidays; more specifically, that provision stipulates that retail stores with less than four persons employed at all times for the sale of goods and services are exempt from the store closing requirement. This provision is nebulous as well as too restrictive. The reference to the number of persons employed at all times is far from clear. Does it mean the number of persons on the store's payroll, or does it mean the number of persons working on the holiday. Certainly it could be interpreted to mean the number of persons on the payroll of the store rather than the number of persons employed on the holiday. This, we believe, is too restrictive and therefore we propose to make it clear that it refers to the number of persons who work on the holiday and not to the total number of persons who are on the payroll, or who work in the store at one time or another.

The provision is also too restrictive as well as unrealistic considering the operating realities of today's smaller retail business establishments. This is particularly so if the exemption only applies to stores with three or fewer persons on their payroll. In today's world of very large and medium sized chain stores a small independent retail store employing more than three persons is not uncommon. To survive in a competitive economic environment these smaller stores, which provide a convenience to the public, must remain open for long hours for six or seven days a week. In fact, to survive and make a decent living, operators of these stores are often very dependent on Sunday and holiday business. Because of the long hours they must remain open for business many of these stores employ a number of persons who work only a few hours each day or during the busier periods on weekends. Consequently such a small store may very well have more than three persons on their payroll. Also it is quite conceivable that even a family undertaking may have more than three family members working in a store. Given these realities, exempting only stores with three or fewer persons employed at all times, is considered too restrictive and harsh. It is therefore proposed that Section 5(d) be amended so as to exempt from the store-closing requirement all retail stores employing less than five persons on the holiday for the sale of goods and services. This will make it clear that the exemption is in respect of the number of persons who are employed on the holiday, and not the

number of persons on the payroll of the store. It will also make the provision a little less restrictive by allowing stores with less than five persons, rather than with less than four persons employed for the sale of goods and services, to remain open on holidays.

Stores of this size should be classified as small retail stores and be allowed to remain open on holidays. Larger and medium sized stores would likely still be required to close.

These proposed amendments, I believe, will clarify and improve the Act without affecting its general intent. I therefore commend them for your approval.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Honourable Minister would agree to a few questions. —(Interjection)— Well, one at a time. Mr. Speaker, the first question that I would like to direct to the Honourable Minister is to clarify that this amendment will be limited to (a) an employer, regardless of the number of outlets that employer may have. In other words, if there's an owner of an operation which has two outlets, let's say in two parts of Winnipeg, that the regulation will apply — the four people will be the total employees working on that day and not per outlet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: It would be per outlet.

MR. CHERNIACK: Then, Mr. Speaker, is it correct to assume that any chain, like Safeway, providing it does not have more than four people working at any time on Sunday will be permitted to operate?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he is getting very close to debating rather than asking questions of clarification.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I am asking questions of the Minister. She has a right not to reply, but I don't think I was debating it. I was asking her for an interpretation of her legislation. Do you feel I have no right to ask her that legislation or may I proceed?

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the honourable member that he may be giving up his right to debate in the House.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I suppose in the end it would be a question of a ruling as to whether or not I'm speaking. I was asking a question of the Minister, which I agree she has a right to refuse to answer. I was not entering into a debate, and may I proceed with my question?

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question was, is it then conceivable under the proposed legislation that Safeway stores may open all their outlets seven days a week providing that on Sunday they do not have more than four employees in the premises at any one time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: As long as they live up to the amendments that we have in this Act.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask another question of the Minister. In speaking of partial economic rest, is the Minister concerned about the commercial activity in society, or is she concerned about the activity of any individual who may wish to work six days a week rather than seven?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, our rules do provide that if any honourable member wants a clarification on a particular point that has been raised during the introduction of the bill that is one thing, but then to proceed to debate the various clauses of the bill I think is more appropriately left to the committee stage, and my honourable friend should know that. —(Interjection)— Well, he's asking questions relating not on points of clarification. What the honourable member's asking are questions that are more appropriate for the committee stage, and I trust that he can contain his impatience long enough to get to committee so that and, if he wants to get it to committee in that great a hurry then he knows what he can go, but I think it is inappropriate for the honourable member to be asking that type of question at this stage of our proceedings.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: I would remind the Honourable the House Leader that the Minister has the right to refuse to answer questions. I am not in a hurry. I can wait till next year or five years from now to deal with this matter in committee, but I do point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable House Leader obviously did not hear my question because clearly it was a question and designed for clarification of the statement which she made as to the intent of the legislation.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I think she already had the opportunity not to reply to the question, and I only rise to point out that I was asking a question in accordance with the rules in my opinion. I would request the Honourable the House Leader who, I believe, tries to be fair, that he read what I asked today and in the next day or two to inform me of the extent to which he feels I went beyond the expected rule, and if the Minister wishes to reply, by all means I'd be glad to hear her reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: I would like to ask a question of clarification, because I didn't hear or understand the reply of the Minister of Labour to my colleague, the Member for St. Johns. Precisely, does the legislation which she's now introducing refer to the number of employees on the payroll at any one time in the store — in the retail outlet — or does it apply to the number of employees on the payroll during that day? In other words, could you have four people work in the morning shift and another four in the afternoon, or is it the same four?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Again, Mr. Speaker, those questions are quite appropriate for the committee when we reach the committee stage. I don't know why my honourable friends are so impatient that they must get all this information at the present time. They've an opportunity to debate this bill, and when it passes then it can go to the committee, and all the questions that they want answered will be answered there. But it has not been a practice of this House. As a matter of fact, during the consideration of the Rules Committee, we attempted to discourage that kind of questioning during the course of Second Reading, because there is somewhat of a line to be drawn as to what constitutes questioning of the Minister and making a speech. And if my honourable friends persist in the line of talking that they're continuing now, then they could be considered to have made a contribution to the speech, and denied an opportunity to make a contribution at the proper time. If my honourable friend wants to make a speech now, he's perfectly free to do so.

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

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We are going to debate this bill in principle and if we're not clear what the principle is, and that's why the questions are being asked, to clarify what the Minister of Labour said in her remarks, then how can we debate the principle of the bill. I think that the Honourable Member for St. Johns was correct and so is the Honourable Member for Brandon East, in asking for clarification of what the principle is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. It's common practice that during the course of the debate on Second Reading, my honourable friends do ask a series of questions and when the Minister closes debate on Second Reading, she undertakes to answer those questions. That has been the normal practice, and I don't know why we have to deviate from that practice at this particular time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of order.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would be inclined to go along with the House Leader, but I think that if these questions are asked — I think, inadvertently, the Minister brought that upon herself by the way she introduced this thing. During the introduction, you're supposed to talk about the principle of it without going into details to the section, and I think this is what brought this thing about, and that should be done for both sides in Third Reading, or in Committee, I should say.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: I'd like to speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I agree detailed questions and clarification should be left to the Committee stage, but I am asking one question and it's a fundamental question, and it will relate to the contribution made on this side to this particular bill. Because one of the key points of the bill is a number, that is why we're trying to get clarification of how that number is interpreted so it is a very key question of principle. It's not a question of detail, it's a question of principle and therefore I think it's appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to ask that question, one question, on a matter, that actually gets at the heart of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I think it's pretty clear. I'm sorry that it didn't get conveyed to the Member for Brandon East and I'll be glad to send him over a copy of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. JORGENSON: Please call Bill No. 14 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Peina.

BILL NO. 14 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE INCOME TAX ACT (MANITOBA)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. DON ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's indeed a pleasure to speak this afternoon on Bill No. 14 - An Act to amend The Income Tax Act of Manitoba.

For my farmer friends opposite who comment that it's raining, small wonders.

Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to speak to Bill 14, because Bill 14 represents certain measures in taxation for the Province of Manitoba that the taxpayers of this province have been waiting for, for some eight years, you know the previous administration were left waiting. I'm in full agreement with the amendments to the Income Tax Act in some of their ramifications, Mr. Speaker, for the individual taxpayers of the province, for the small business sector, small business corporations in the province. I think it's also important that Bill 14 also has solved at least one anomaly in the taxation system that developed whether it was to the knowledge of former ND Finance Ministers or not, this bill does attempt to remedy that anomaly.

Over the past debate on this bill, we've heard some varying opinions, most of the varying opinions have come from honourable members opposite. We hear especially from the Honourable Member for Inkster, some interesting twists that he would like to put into to build the debate on Bill No. 14 and some of its long run implications to the province. He picks this particular bill and some of the amendments that are contained within it for tax relief for individual taxpayers in the province, he picks these apart as being of varying degrees of harm to the province. And that I find to be rather an interesting statement from the Member for Inkster who, some five short months ago in the mini-session, indicated to the House that he was part of one of the strongest oppositions ever elected in this province and probably indeed in the country. One of the most experienced and one of the strongest oppositions that have ever faced a government. Well, I find those comments quite interesting and I would offer some advice to members opposite that if they are the strongest opposition that has ever been fielded in this province, then they should attempt to get their act together, because if they are the strongest opposition, they've been going this way on certain measures and going that way on other measures they haven't really got their act together.

In various Estimate debates, they saw fit to chastise some of our Ministers for what they describe as being a total lack of direction in the department that they're holding; that there's no direction in the departments; they are carrying on helter-skelter; there's no ways, means. This is some of their fierce opposition that they're bringing out, that's pointing out where we don't have a game plan, we're not projecting a department five years ahead, and in showing what we're going to be doing. And then we consider Bill No. 14 An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, wherein we have measures which, when the Progressive Conservative Party was sitting in opposition some two years ago, one year ago, last spring at this time, they were chastising the government, the ND government of the day, to provide tax relief, that it was tax relief that was needed to stimulate the growth in the province.

We developed, the Progressive Conservative Party developed that particular theme of tax relief to get the private sector going in this province. We promoted that during the election campaign, and we promoted it obviously quite well because we had some 49 percent of the population agree with us on October 11th, that yes, this is what the province needs to stimulate future growth, to stimulate the long-run development of the province, and in the mini-session after October 24th, we undertook several tax measures which carried forward promises made during the election campaign, statements made while our party was in opposition in the previous session under the ND government. And here we are bringing Bill 14, an Act which is going to provide a certain amount of tax relief to every taxpayer in the province. Every personal income tax return filed in this province is going to pay less income tax in 1978 than they did in 1977 — every taxpayer. All small corporate businesses are going to pay less tax in 1978 than they did in 1977, and here we have a comprehensive plan projected into the future which is laying out the guidelines that we are setting down to develop jobs, develop industry, to develop the province. It's a long-run plan. And what do we hear from the wailing members opposite? Oh, no, it won't work; it won't work; you haven't got a long-range plan.

In the Finance Department we have a long-range plan; it's going to work for the province. And what do we hear from the members opposite? Well, just because you've got a long-range plan that doesn't mean it's going to work. Get your act together; what do you want? We've got a plan, in

Finance, in the fiscal policies of this province; it's going to work; we're providing you with a long-range plan. Accept it, fellows, because you're going to have to live with it for the next several elections. —(Interjections)—

The Member for Ste. Rose is, if I might quote the Member for St. Boniface, pretty cocky about calling an election right now. If I were sitting in the rural riding he's sitting in, I wouldn't want an election right now. He'd be thumped out on his rear end — fast.

Now, in the course of debate over Bill 14, I listened with considerable interest to the Member for St. Johns. The Member for St. Johns garbled at quite great length over our tax cuts; he was nattering about this and nattering about that and the whole gist of his debate — if I followed it correctly — was that we were ending up carrying out Conservative dogma by giving huge tax cuts to the rich and nothing to the poor. He was developing, as usual, in the short time that I've watched the Member for St. Johns in action in the Legislature, his twisted system of class warfare — the rich versus the poor; that they're the champions of every poor person in the province and Conservatives are money-hungry, grabbing people who will take the last dollar from anyone they can get it from, poor or rich, that doesn't matter. Well, he can promote his riots on the street and hang up his red posters whenever he gets the chance, but the true facts are in the figures presented by my colleague, the Member for St. James, in describing the tax relief available through our tax cut proposed in Bill 14 to a family in the income class of \$10,000 a year, married with two dependents. Now the Member for St. Johns makes no end of chat, chatter maybe we could say, that the saving to the man at \$10,000 is only \$13.00 per year — \$13.00 per year — it's peanuts. Look at the man who's making \$30,000, he saves \$117 per year — giving to the rich and taking from the poor. Well, okay, what he fails to recognize and give any credit to at all is the fact that because of indexing and other things which we have never hidden, that that man on \$10,000 income this year receives a total tax saving over 1977 of \$69.00. The most important concept of the \$69.00 is the fact that it does represent 24.2 percent of the tax he paid in 1977.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's a federal program.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, the Member for St. Boniface garbles like the Member for St. Johns does — it's a federal program.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, does the person earning \$10,000 really care where it comes from? If he got tax relief, it's tax relief; he's got the dollars in his pocket.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, don't take the credit for it, it's federal.

MR. ORCHARD: Now, the Member for St. Boniface, he mentions "don't take credit for it", that we're doing something wrong for taking credit for it.

MR. ORCHARD: We spelled it out in every document that's been presented to this Legislature, to the press, where the tax savings came from. We made no bones about the fact that it was indexing and cost of living. Let's refer to the 1977 Manitoba Budget Address where the former member for Seven Oaks — and I will quote a paragraph, "As a result of this budget and combining all the new measures, including tax credits and indexing of provincial income tax base, Manitoba tax filers can expect to pay about \$44 million less in provincial income taxes for 1977." You took the credit then and you didn't think it was a bad idea.

MR. DESJARDINS: Not on a bill; not on a bill.

MR. ORCHARD: What's the matter with you now, don't you like to see a person on this side of the House taking the same kind of credit for indexing and cost of living allowance?

MR. DESJARDINS: Not on a bill. You're talking about a bill now, not about a Budget Speech.

MR. ORCHARD: It's the same dollar. The poor person in this province is getting it and he's got it to spend.

MR. DESJARDINS: You'll get yours.

MR. ORCHARD: If you don't like it, stand up and say it.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. Mr. Speaker, yes, I don't like it and I'd like to stand up. My honourable friend has challenged me to stand up and speak if I didn't like it and I don't like it at all. Because I think, Mr. Speaker, I think, Mr. Speaker, that these promises were made . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member should know that the rules of this House allow that the person that is recognized by the Speaker is the one that has the floor for debate. When the Member for St. Boniface is recognized by the Speaker, then he can have his time for

debate.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order then.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member for St. Boniface a point of order? The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It would appear that the length of time in this Assembly and the membership of various political parties doesn't teach the Member for St. Boniface when he can or cannot take up the challenge of debate. I thought it was normal, and I've only been an MLA for six months, that the challenge to debate would be taken up after the member who offered the challenge has finished his debate. I thought it was common courtesy, but obviously 15 years in the House doesn't teach anybody that.

I seem to have forgotten where I was, Mr. Speaker; I'll have to recoup here. Okay, the point that the Member for St. Johns was making is that there is \$13.00 for the poor person of the province and there's \$117 for the \$30,000 income person in the province, but the percentages speak for themselves in terms of percentage tax reduction, percentage of savings, in 1978 versus 1977 taxes paid. The man earning \$10,000 this year will pay 24.2 percent less in taxes, Mr. Speaker; the man earning \$30,000 will pay 8.2 percent less tax dollars in 1978. So, once again we have followed the course of developing a progressive tax system whereby we have given a greater measure of tax relief to lower income people in the Province of Manitoba, and I think the Minister of Finance has done a commendable job.

Now, the Member for St. Johns — and I'm sorry he left — also chastized us for various aspects; it's the old twisted class warfare that he would like to bring the province into. But you know, he left some unanswered questions — I find it a little hard to interpret what he's saying. He's saying that a \$13 tax saving is eaten up four times by the increase in bus fares, etc., etc., and he goes through a number of examples where other costs have overtaken the tax credit. Well, my basic question would be to the Member for St. Johns, if he were in the House — and I'm sure he would have an answer — where would the taxpayer of Manitoba who received the \$13 tax credit from our administration, where would that individual be had the ND Party stayed in power? With their methods of spending, their lack of fiscal control, he would have been paying more taxes and greater costs in the Province of Manitoba, because they were willing to pump the well dry. No fiscal controls — and all I can say for the taxpayers of Manitoba, is thank heaven the Progressive Conservatives formed the government of Manitoba on October 11th rather than returning an ND government.

As a result of the fiscal restraint that we put into place, we've already saved considerable dollars of a very, very large deficit in this province, a deficit of \$181 million — our restraint program from October 11th on contributed significantly to reducing that deficit. Now, if our honourable friends opposite had remained in power, would they have brought to bear the same kind of restraint measures? I think we know the answer to that, fellows. No, they wouldn't have. They don't have the constitutional fortitude to say "no" to anybody in this province, hence the reason for \$181 million deficit, even after six months of fiscal restraint imposed by our government. I think it would be fairly obvious to the taxpayers of Manitoba that under an ND government today they would not enjoy the tax relief that they have enjoyed from our government, from our change in government.

Now, the Member for Inkster also made a lengthy contribution to the debate on Bill 14. He says that — and I'll just quote by paraphrasing the man — he says that our measures in Bill 14 are going to do the province the greatest economic harm of any measure that any government could do to the Province of Manitoba, the greatest economic harm. I find that a rather interesting comment, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House are doing the province the greatest amount of economic harm. How are we doing them the greatest amount of economic harm? By showing responsible, fiscal restraint in government spending, a budgetary increase of some 3 percent? That hasn't been equalled in a total of eight years of ND administration; there was never a budget increase as small as 3 percent. How is that fiscal restraint by government harming the province? I can't see it, and I would guarantee that that same 49 percent of the people who voiced their opinion on October 11th can't see it either. I think they agree with the fact that our fiscal restraint is needed in this province, and those 49 percent are still there, and they're still waiting, and they're still pleased with the measures of fiscal restraint that we've brought into this province.

I also cannot understand how the Member for Inkster can come to the conclusion that we are doing the province great economic harm. How? By attracting new business to the province? — (Interjection) — The Member for Burrows says, "Like which?" Obviously he doesn't read the papers or listen to the news or anything. I would suggest that in my constituency in the Town of Morden, we have a plant being constructed this summer by Tupperware, which will employ some 150 people. Now, that's new industry that came to this province. And all I can say is, thank heaven we changed the government in October of 1977 and got rid of the ND government, because Tupperware had two choices in western Canada to locate a plant; they could locate it in Manitoba or they could locate it in Alberta, and I'll bet my bottom dollar, had we not changed the government, that they'd be locating right now in Alberta at the loss of 150 jobs to this province. That's what the ND government would have given us; 150 jobs to Alberta. A Progressive Conservative government in Manitoba, with our policies of encouragement of business and our progressive tax policies, have gotten a new industry to come into my constituency and I will say that it's going to be one of many that will locate in this

province with the change in government.

Now, they also say that we're doing — the Member for Inkster says that we're doing the province the greatest amount of economic harm. Well, maybe he's got a twisted idea of what economic harm is; by restraining the growth in government, we're doing the province economic harm. Well, once again, all I would ask of the Member for Inkster is to ask the average taxpayer on the street what he thinks of restraining growth in government and the Civil Service, whether he thought it was a necessary method or not. I maintain that he might find out that there might be 51 percent or 55 percent of the taxpayers of the province agree with the program that we've instituted of restraint in government growth.

He also says that we're promoting a system of the greatest economic harm in the Province of Manitoba by — as he would have us believe — measures such as provided in Bill No. 14, the bills and measures that we are taking right now to change the taxation system of the province. Now, once again I have to disagree with him, and it's unfortunate, but he is dealing with one little measure out of a package of proposals that we've made in tax changes and he says that's going to do the greatest amount of harm to the province. Well, I can't see it, because changing the tax system, making it more competitive with our neighbours to the east, to the west, to the south, we are now in a position where we can safely say, Mr. Speaker, that we have attracted new industry to Manitoba. As I mentioned, Tupperware is locating in Morden instead of going to Alberta. A change in the attitude and the tax system of this province encouraged them to locate here instead of in Alberta.

So, our tax policies are going to lead to the growth in the private sector, and in the growth in the private sector — I think I can quite openly say that we on this side of the House, the Progressive Conservative party, have very very selfish motives in seeing growth of the private sector. Because in growth of the private sector, Mr. Speaker, we believe that more industry will locate and create more jobs, more jobs in this province, which is something that our ND government and our ND friends over here fail to realize. More jobs in the Province of Manitoba means more taxpayers, which means a bigger tax base, which means the government collects more money from people working and creating and involved and employed in industry which are doing the province some good. And that is why we are selfishly going along our merry way and developing a tax system and an economic environment that will encourage the private sector to develop business here, to locate business here, and to expand business here, because we want the jobs, because we want to collect the income tax revenue from the people that are put to work at those new jobs. That's a selfish motive, and I'm glad that we have those selfish motives.

The Member for Inkster made another very interesting statement, very interesting statement. He said that Bill No. 14 was a declaration of dependency, a declaration of dependency by the Conservative party on the private sector. Well, you know, I just hate to disagree with such a learned man, or such an apparently learned man. What we have is not a declaration of dependency in Bill 14, but what we have for each and every taxpayer in the Province of Manitoba, a declaration of independency. A declaration of independency which says, no longer will the taxpayers of Manitoba have to cringe, have to cringe under the burden of a socialist government in this province. A socialist government which would pump the well dry, would drain the last drop of blood out of the taxpayer, take it because we need it to build our bureaucracy and our little empires. Take it away from the taxpayer; he doesn't know how to spend the money; we do. We, as government, the ND party, knows how to spend the money better than the man that earned it, better than the taxpayer of this province. So, I say that our tax measures are a declaration of independency, independency from the burden of a socialist taxation system. And who better, Mr. Speaker, in this province, who better, should we declare our declaration of dependency on than the working people, the taxpayers of this province, those people who are employed at meaningful jobs in meaningful industry. I can't think of a better group of people to stake the future of Manitoba on.

Now the Member for Inkster has . . . By golly, I have a bulletin, Mr. Speaker. In further answer to the Member for Burrows, private enterprise is moving ahead in Portage la Prairie. We have a 64-room hotel to start construction at the end of this month, and I would suspect the creation of some 20 jobs. That, gentlemen opposite, is what happens in a province when you get a government in power which respects the ability of the private enterprise to create jobs, create business, and create wealth for the province, in the replacement of a socialist government which believes only government ownership can create the wealth of the provinces, only the government is responsible enough to handle the tax dollars. That's what we get; we get new jobs in private industry, and isn't that a horrible situation?

Now, the Member for Inkster also made quite a few remarks on Bill 14, and he tore into Bill 14 on the basis that it was going to do economic harm to the province, the greatest economic harm to the province.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I would permit a question from the Honourable Member for Burrows after I have finished. I would not care to allot any time to his questions at this time. Write your question down, though, Member for Burrows; I wouldn't want you to forget it.

Now, the Member for Inkster also mentioned that Bill 14 as an individual item was just going to do horrendous harm to the province, and it was a terrible measure. Well, the Member for Inkster . . . I've only been here six short months, and just actually a lot shorter months in the Chamber here, and

already I can see where the Member for Inkster cleverly isolates a given fact, builds up his own set of facts and figures to back it up, and completely forgets about the total intent of the measure, the overall global view of the measure; he tears it apart individually, and he does a fairly successful job if you believe all the premises and all the conditions and little throw-ins that he has in, irregardless of the facts — like, you just have to believe what the Member for Inkster says. But he says that Bill 14 is going to do great economic harm by itself, that we shouldn't have reduced the personal income tax to the people of the province, that we shouldn't have given those dollars back to the small corporate business of the province; it's going to do the province economic harm.

Well, I maintain that the Member for Inkster is considering Bill 14 sort of like one would consider a meal and let's consider a meal where you've got one ounce of meat on the plate. Well, the Member for Inkster would take that and he would say, "That's no meal; a person would starve on ounce of meat — no good — one ounce of meat by itself, it's a waste of money; it's not going to do the person any good," just as Bill 14, which he tore apart the other day, by itself is not going to do any good. But what the Honourable Member for Inkster casually fails to bring into view is that Bill 14 is a part of a comprehensive tax package developed by the Minister of Finance and the Progressive Conservative Party to get Manitoba rolling. In other words, it's like having eight one-ounce pieces of meat put on the plate, eight ounces of meat in one-ounce chunks makes a meal. By themselves they don't. But the Member for Inkster he'll just talk about one one-ounce piece of meat at a time and he'll tear it down individually. He won't dare deal with the total package because he knows that's a meal and he knows in the case of our tax program that the total package of tax relief will work, will make the province grow and is going to increase our tax revenues by having more people at work at the end of four years than any measure the ND would have introduced.

Now, I would like the members opposite to refresh their memories because they do need their memories refreshed very regularly, they have that forgetful air about them. But I'd like to point out that in conjunction with Bill 14, I want to point out that Bill 14 is one eight-ounce piece of meat from the whole meal. Bill 14 provides us with personal income tax reduction and it provides small business tax reduction and it removes the necessity of the Department of Finance writing out a series of cheques every year to pay, I believe it's the cost of living allowance to inmates of penitentiaries. Those are the three major areas in Bill 14.

But I want to point out to my honourable friends opposite that it's part of the total package, part of the total package that we, on this side of the House, are developing to stimulate the business community, the private sector in this province and he only mentioned succession duties. We dealt with those in the mini-session. They removed the very harsh penalty that succession duties represent — and I can speak personally — in the farming community, in deaths in the farming community, the succession duty was a heavy burden and it was a burden that the ND party, despite all their claims at being the friends of the family farm, wanted to keep on the family farms of this province to destroy them so they could get the land into the state farm policy. They didn't consider the implications; they wanted succession duties so they could own the land, so they could have everybody under the Big Thumb.

Another tax that we eliminated as part of our total tax package represented by Bill 14 was the elimination of the Gift Tax in this province. Oh, horror, horror, horror, from the members opposite. How could we do such a thing? We're giving money to the rich. Little did they realize that the gift tax, in view of inflation and land values was the only sane method of making an economical transfer of the family farm unit from father to son so that the son wouldn't go broke and have to sell his land to the state farm program. They didn't realize that because they wanted to own the land. They didn't care about the family farm then. —(Interjection)— Oh, they probably realized it. I submit to corrections by my honourable colleagues. They knew what they were doing, you bet they did. They knew what they were doing. That's why they don't want to see our comprehensive tax package.

We removed the Mineral Acreage Tax in the mini-session. Now the one that really appeals to the small business community, and bear in mind members opposite, that the small business community of this province provides the majority of employment, the majority of gainful employment. Now, I happen to agree with members on this side of the House that working in the private sector is more creative than working for the government where you are spending taxpayers' dollars to get paid. I believe the private sector, in working and creating jobs, is doing a better job than the government sector and what did we do to help the small business sector of this province? Well, we increased the taxable limit of the corporate capital tax. And why did we do it? We did it to remove the onerous burden of a nuisance tax on 70 percent — mark that gentlemen — 70 percent of the small business corporations in this province by raising the limit from \$100,000 to \$500,000. Seventy percent of the small businesses in this province no longer pay the corporate capital tax. What did it mean in terms of revenue? A 13 percent reduction in the revenue collected on that tax. Now, if that isn't progressive reform to the taxation system to the betterment of the private enterprise system in this province, then ND members opposite show me one that's better. And that is a step that our government has taken in view and in recognition that true gainful employment comes from the private sector in this province.

We've taken, in this session, selective fuel taxes so that no longer can a tandem axle farm truck, for instance as a small example, have to burn clear diesel. He can now burn purple diesel and not pay the road tax as a normal farming operation. That is excellent taxation improvement because we recognize the importance of the agricultural economy in creating wealth and jobs for this province. We're taking away an onerous little tax and a complete anomaly of the tax system that our honourable friends opposite were quizzed on. Some five consecutive years it was brought to their attention in ND Cabinet, it was brought to their attention that the Motor Fuel Tax Act should be changed so that

tandem diesel farm trucks could burn purple diesel and what did they do about it? Nothing — in complete agreement with their do-nothing farm policy. Oh, except, pardon me, members of the House, except for their State Farm Program. That was their contribution to the farming enterprise of the province.

Now there's another thing that we did, is we took a selective sales tax reduction on mobile homes. Now, why did we ever do such a thing like that? After all, who buys mobile homes in the province? I think if we take a survey we'll find that it isn't the rich that buy very many mobile homes. We'll find that the majority of mobile homes are bought by the lower income people in this province. And what did we do as a government responsive to their needs and their financial distress? We reduced the sales tax on mobile homes, a measure that our ND friends opposite could never see, could never see while they were in power. That's too remote a thing to do. Help the poor by reducing tax on their housing? No, no, no, we won't do that. But we, as a Progressive Conservative government responsive to the needs of the lower income people in this province reduced the sales tax on mobile homes.

Now, we also, in combination with the Federal Government, reduced the sales tax for six months, a measure that will provide considerable tax relief. But I think that that is a point in time taxation relief, the major ones are as I have mentioned: the corporate and personal income tax reductions, succession duty and gift tax relief, mineral acreage tax, corporate capital tax, the selective fuel tax adjustment, the steam heat adjustment tax, the selective sales tax removal on mobile homes. Those are the ones, members opposite, that mean the most to the most people of the province and particularly mean a lot to the lower income people of this province.

Now, you know, I don't expect for one minute, I don't expect for one minute that any of the ND Party members opposite would agree with even one of our tax measures. I wouldn't expect them to agree with one of our tax measures, at least not in the confines of the House. If you ask them privately, if you ask them privately, they might agree with it but not publicly because that might spoil their image of being the champions of the lower income people of the province. It might hurt their image so we're not going to see them agree with any of the tax measures that we have brought in to date in the two sessions that we've been here and that we will bring in in the future sessions.

But I am glad that they don't agree with this, Mr. Speaker, because that disagreement with tax measures which are going to stimulate the private sector of this province are the very things that we, as Progressive Conservative members of this Assembly, base our declaration — if we want to follow the Member for Inkster — our declaration of dependency on the free enterprise system and we are openly admitting that we believe that the private sector of this province needs a tax system which will make them competitive with other jurisdictions to our neighbouring sides, we agree with that 100 percent because we want to see development of private industry in this province. We want to see people in this province capable of earning increased incomes and not having to give it away to the ND government, as it were, and removing the incentive to perform better, to work harder, to earn more, that their taxation policies would force upon us as individual taxpayers in Manitoba. But that's where the disagreement comes in basic political philosophy.

We believe in the free enterprise system, in the private sector, we believe in it. The ND Party doesn't believe in it. They believe in one thing: they believe in government ownership and control of every system in the province which has to do with production, distribution and services. They want them all under their control so they can build their individual empires and control and run the province. That's what they want and had they gotten another four years, they would have been well on their way.

I can only mention a few things: the State Farm Program in Agriculture — that venerable help to the young farmer. What is it? It's the thumb control on the basic production input of farming to get control of agriculture. What did they do? They moved into the seed business industry with McKenzie Seeds; they moved into the plane business; they took over all kinds of businesses. They took over all kinds of businesses. They want to attempt to be Big Brothers to everyone; they want to mean something to everybody; they want to do something for everybody but above all, members of the Assembly, what they wanted to do was control everyone, everyone in this province, and they wanted to build their little empires based on an ever-rising taxation system and an ever-rising dependency on the government to do everything for everybody. And that is not the system we adhere to and that is why we are on this side of the House and that is why 49 percent of the people of Manitoba adhere to our philosophy and they will in the next election and the next election and the next election.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just have a question to the Honourable Member for Pembina. The honourable member made reference to the location or the announcement by Tupperware of their plans to locate in Manitoba. I do have a very distinct recollection of that announcement having been made but I do not recall Tupperware indicating that the reason for locating in Winkler is because of the tax legislation brought in by this government. Does the honourable member have some evidence to substantiate that, that that is the reason why Tupperware located in Manitoba?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to attempt to answer that question for the Member for Burrows. No. 1, the Tupperware plant is not locating at Winkler; it's locating at Morden. Morden is in the southern part of Manitoba, an agricultural community. I realize that you have never had any

experience in the agricultural community of Manitoba but it's in the southern part of Manitoba. Now, what I indicated, what I indicated and obviously the Member for Burrows did not have his thinking cap on, what I indicated — (Interjection) — The Member for St. Boniface keeps on interrupting me and I cannot keep my train of thought to answer the question. He is always interrupting and he is destroying my line of thought. How can I answer the Member for Burrows with the Member for St. Boniface barking from his seat? Barking from his seat, as usual.

The Member for Burrows posed a very important question. Now, the Member for Burrows — and I believe I have it correct — he asked: Do I have any evidence that Tupperware located in Manitoba because of the tax reduction program which we have instituted in the province? I'm sorry, I must have that question wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up. If he has leave of the House. Order please. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to participate in this debate, especially after some of the statements that were just made and furthermore, I'd like to go on the ground rules laid out by the member that just finished speaking. That is, I'd like to look at the total package and the overall views of the whole situation that's happening here in Manitoba. I think that this is what he was suggesting that we should do and therefore we will.

Now, you know, when a member that's not dry behind the ears yet is going to come in and make a statement that he's going to be here, and the government will be here for many many more years, well, that's fine, but I certainly don't have to stand here and let somebody else from another side tell me what I believe because I can speak for myself. I don't need anybody else to put words in my mouth and to tell me that I don't believe in free enterprise, I don't believe in this and I don't believe in that. My honourable friend was defending a government, the PC government. He told us how great they were, what their aim was. Of course, he ridiculed the stand that we take and we wanted to control everything, we were not interested in people and all we wanted to do was to start a class war. That's exactly what you were doing. But, you know, it always takes two to start a war — to fight a war, and when you talk about the class and talking about the people — my honourable friend's talking about the people — that's the first time he talked about the people — he didn't in his speech at all. He talked about free enterprise and he talked about corporation, but he never talked about the people at all, and this is what I want to talk about — the people — the broken promises of this government, who claim that they're going to be in forever.

All right, let me quote from a newspaper during the election then. This is, "Lyon says NDP bullying old people. The NDP is trying to frighten them into voting NDP by claiming a Tory Government will end many present programs," he told about 400 people at a south-western Manitoba PC rally in Brandon School. "This is a reprehensible kind of campaign because a Conservative administration won't take away anything." Need I say any more, Mr. Speaker, about that?

All right, let us look at the total package, and let us look about this ounce of meat on the plate. Let us look about that. We'll play his game. I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, that if it's right to say that the people don't care where it comes out, where the money — (Interjection) — Why don't you shut up? Why don't you shut up? — (Interjection) — The what? Oh yes, yes. — (Interjection) — Would you get out of the gutter and stand up on your own two feet, and then tell us how great — when I'm finished you can participate. You can tell us about the great job you're doing as the Minister without Portfolio in charge of questions and insulting people. You can do that. But, in the meantime, if you're not interested in listening in talking about people, well then, you can do what you want — you can leave this House. I won't miss you a damn bit!

Mr. Speaker, we'll talk about the restraint. We'll talk about this ounce of meat that we were talking about and we'll look at the overall — at the people.

First of all, the promises. My honourable friend says that they've cut taxes and that nobody will admit that they'll go along — I would like to have no taxes at all. That might come as a surprise to you, but I'd like to see the government not taxing anybody at all. But I think that taxes are needed especially in a country such as Canada to see that the underprivileged, those that were not born with a silver spoon in their mouth, those who were born crippled, those who were born retarded, and now my old friend will point at me — maybe I'm one of them — but anyway these kind of people, they need a little bit of help. And I think that in a country as rich as Canada we should be able to give it to them.

And now, what did the restraint bring? First of all, the restraint — will I ever get the answer as to what restraint is for all the people of Manitoba. You know what restraint is? That reminds me of a family that says, "We haven't got enough revenue. We'll have to cut off certain things." But the old man would keep on with his booze, with his golf, and so on, but he would cut down on the milk, you know, on certain things of his children. What kind of a family — oh, my honourable friend wants to protest, "This is awful." But that's exactly what's happening now.

You know, there's a certain person who said that the people of Manitoba were spoiled rotten. This is a fellow that certainly was born with a silver spoon in his mouth — a millionaire father, and who was doing very, very well and now he is saying, "You know, the people are spoiled rotten. What about the restraint? It's time we make a sacrifice." But I challenge you. What people around the people that you are representing all the time — the people around \$30,000 and so on revenue a year — what are they going without? They don't even notice it, it is so little, if anything. What is anyone in this House — on

this side as well as this side, going without? You know, you are saying that people will leave Manitoba. So they won't leave. So they'll have more profit. You take it away from the poor, and if that's class warfare that's exactly what you're doing. First of all, you talk about a tax, you cut the tax to give this tax, this \$13.00 to the people getting \$10,000 revenue. This \$13.00 — what do you do? Where do you get it from?—(Interjection)— I say, you, I didn't say the Federal Government. I said you. The bill that we have in front of us is not like a Budget Speech. It's not saying what the total cost will be. It is saying what this will do for the people. And it's \$13.00, not \$69.00. First of all, you cut down on grants to municipalities so, therefore, those who have a home, they have a home, they can afford a home on that, they will pay more taxes. I got my tax bill yesterday and it's a hell of a lot more than it was last year, I can tell you that. And one of the reasons is the grants that you've cut on the municipality, although you have three or four different councillors who were representing the City of Winnipeg, were harping and were saying that they weren't getting enough going to the — from the Municipal Government. But now this is all right because it's the word of this great word that's enshrined, and it's cut in stone, and it's "restraint", and you're not even supposed to ask questions. It's restraint. In the name of restraint, cut the grants to municipalities.

And that's where the municipalities, my friend wanted to talk about the deal — all right, you put in an ounce of meat with this bill, on the plate, but you took out an ounce by the grants, the extra bills that they're paying the municipalities — extra bus fares and that kind of thing. Now, my friend laughs because he doesn't have to care. He never takes the bus. I don't think he knows there's a door on the bus. He can laugh. And all of us here can laugh at these people, but that's exactly what's happening.

And then what else did we do — what else did we do? You know, we're talking about corporation, but we don't care if the nurses are leaving. The nurses are not productive because they can only be paid by taxes. There's no other way. In Manitoba they're paid by taxes to have a service. Of course the Department of Health is not productive. They can't show you all kind of profit for social development. They can't show you all kinds of programs that they have will bring in a fortune. But it has to be done if you have any heart and if you're human, and if you're looking at the people and if you're not just thinking of corporation, but individuals. And that is exactly the point that we're trying to bring home to these people.

Then what else is happening? You cut down the same people that are talking about restraint, and there was another lawyer — I'm not going to name him — the Attorney-General's got him on one of his boards, an important board. He met one of my friends and my friend asked him, "How are you making out?" He said, "I had a lot of fun tonight." He said, "What did you do this afternoon, what did you do?" And he says, "I was with another friend of mine. We were in front of the Legislative Building seeing the people come out with their heads down and showing a lot of concern." He said, "Did we enjoy it! You know, it was funny!" And my friend asked him, he said, "What, you laughed at that?" "Well, not really, but, you know, you'd understand if you'd have seen them." You know, that's the kind of thing that they like. This person didn't make any sacrifices at all. Not a bit.

And then the same kind of people are saying, "Cut down." You know, they're going to give you \$13.00 and they stand up in the House and make the kind of speech that we heard this afternoon, and the same kind of people recommend to this government the kind of recommendation that the Minister will not see, will not let us see, the recommendation that — the newspaper found out — it was, cut down on the supplement to the elderly. It's only \$70.00 a year. It's only \$70.00 a year from the old people so it doesn't mean very much. Give them \$13.00 and brag, but take \$70.00 off, and that's the kind of thing. Now what kind of situation do we have in hospitals now? —(Interjection)— That's right. That's another thing. I think that we have to be careful and that this was done without all the bragging. This was done in past years. We were careful but now, when the Minister of Health says you are on a global budget, that means here's the money — you provide, and then leave me alone. That's what it means. But then he plays God. Whenever there's something — well, I'm not happy with this. I will judge. I will judge. I will decide. Is there an appeal to anybody? They can appeal to me. They can appeal to me. And of course these people are trying to save money. So the first thing you know you're going to be on two meals a day. That's one of the things. Then you cut down. I'm not going to make a big thing out of this but you're going to cut down on changing the sheets. Instead of having so many times a week you'll have it once or twice less, and those are the things that you are doing. That's taking that ounce. That's taking that ounce. I don't want to hear from my honourable friend. This is my honourable friend. That's my honourable friend who says in this House, there are no poor. The poor can't go to university — they won't go anyway. So you know, with one stroke on the pen he just makes them disappear and says they can't afford it anyway, and that's the kind of reasoning that we have, so the less I hear from that honourable member the better I'll like it, Mr. Speaker, because he doesn't understand at all.

And these are the kind of abuse and these are the kind of things that we're having here. They don't care about the people that are leaving. They don't care. They think about corporation. When are you going to stand on your own two feet and say, in a civilized country. . . All right, we want everybody to make a lot of money, but in a civilized country the first thing we will do is we will take care of our poor. We will take care of our handicapped. We will take care of those that were not given the help — needless to say they weren't born with a silver spoon in their mouth either, and we're going to take care of them. So therefore this kind of thing, you know, that's the reason to cut anything — it's restraint. But to this day I'd like to know, I'd like to know what Mr. Newman, who said that we were so spoiled rotten, what he is doing. You know, they say industry, you've got to prove industry, they've got to give them more, more profit. That's the big thing, more profit. That's why you have restraint. . . This is why you put these people on two meals a day. This is why they can change their sheets once or

twice a week instead of three or four times, and then this is why they have trouble getting the bandages. This is why you are closing after saying that we need personal care homes, and this is the kind of economy that we're going to have. This is how we're going to save money. We're cutting down 10 percent as we heard on home care. Doctors who have released patients to go back home thinking that they're going to have home care now find that their patients are not on home care. The best programs that we ever had, this is what we're cancelling and, you know, this is the price that we're getting. So when he talks about a complete meal, and he's talking about this one ounce of meat, this is one ounce of meat, and you've taken the other seven ounces of meat. There's nothing left.

And you can laugh because you don't give a damn about people. As long as you're comfortable and have your big farm, and as long as the people have, to leave them \$600,000, because, you know, they're the only one that will profit by the succession duty. This is all right. And then you talk about class. It's just like my honourable friend said, "Don't rock the boat. I'm happy. Everything's going well. Why should you rock the boat?" Of course those that are living well — you know, the millionaires and those that have all kinds of money can talk about restraint.

My honourable friend sitting in front of me can talk about restraint because it doesn't mean a damn thing to him. He'll still have his bottle of Crown Royal — I will have mine too. We're not going to suffer, but he is going to take it away. The same fellow that was talking about lunch after schools when he was sitting out there and chastising me for that —(Interjection)—

MR. BLAKE: How come you're over on that side if people believe all those things?

MR. DESJARDINS: If I believe all that? Because I found the kind of people that do believe in people and knew I believed in people and tried to help me. They're not perfect. But they're trying to help people. What are you saying?

MR. BLAKE: They believe in some of the things he was telling you. They told you that on October 11th.

MR. DESJARDINS: What? Oh, so there was an election lost. I'll tell you something because, you know, it's going to bring you down and it's going to disappoint you, but don't get so damn cocky. You didn't win the election; we lost the election. You didn't win the election because you don't win an election and we're not going to win the next one — you're going to lose it. So don't worry about it. You know, there's one thing that you do better than us; you've done a better job of P.R. — you scare the hell out of the people of this province by all kinds of rumors. You make commitments to get the liberal-minded people and you've satisfied only one group — the real right-wing Conservative — the people that are deciding on your policies that were predetermined before the Task Force — and these are the kind of people.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member will have 25 minutes when this item next comes up in debate. The hour being 4:30 we now go to Private Members' Hour.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

ORDER FOR RETURN — DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the Member for Brandon East has one minute left.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Historians will record that this government and this Minister without Portfolio has pulled off one of the biggest snow jobs in the history of the government of this province to date. A public relations stunt pulled off in the name of government economy, it is part and parcel of the Conservative Party propaganda position that it is going to bring about efficiency to government and eliminate waste. But, Mr. Speaker, the truth is that it has become clear that what we are seeing are actions to reduce services to people, not the elimination of fat, but recommendations to reduce the benefits for people in all facets of government programming, and therefore a reduction in the quality of life of people in our province.

Mr. Speaker, the implementation of these Task Force recommendations will take the process of reduction of services to people to an intolerable degree, and as my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, has suggested, the people will not forget and they will ensure that the Conservative Party of this province loses the next election. Thank you.

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

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few remarks on the Task Force, because I think a lot of us read so much about the Task Force, and heard so much about it, that we could hardly wait to get our hands on it, and then when it finally came out, and I read the recommendations in Public Works and read the First Volume of Outline, I must say it was a sad disappointment that the report did not live up to its advance billing. And we know, of course, that this was a pet scheme of the

Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Task Force, because he talked about this kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, for several years when he was Leader of the Official Opposition. He always promised, that what he would do would be to develop new programs without taxation; that he wouldn't have to raise taxes; that he wouldn't have to pay for new programs; all he would do would be to eliminate the waste and the inefficiency that was existing.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, I think that when we look at the way that the Task Force has operated under the Minister, and under the First Minister in particular, we can see that it really amounts to nothing more than a smoke screen, that the conclusions were handed to the members of the Task Force, that they knew what conclusions and what recommendations they should arrive at. And we asked the Minister — maybe he's going out to get the papers right now — but we asked the Minister for the background papers, we asked him for the logic behind the various conclusions and recommendations, so that we can see how they were arrived at.

Now, I can give you a couple of specific examples from the Department of Public Works that simply don't make sense. A line appears on Page 130 of Volume 2, saying that employee housing should be eliminated as far as possible, and adequate charges made for the remainder. So there is the whole statement on employee housing, that it should be eliminated, but the logic — the problems — the difficulties — the arguments in favour of eliminating it are not given. And this is why we are asking the Minister whether he would provide us with this.

Now, they then give us another example that they wind up with on Page 132, that we had some discussion of in the Department of Public Works, and it simply says that the Provincial Garage appears to be redundant. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, we had a debate on that, and if you read the Task Force Report, what it recommends in effect, is that people should be paid to drive their own vehicles, and I tried to point out to the Minister of Public Works, and I now point out to the Minister responsible for the Task Force, that if you adopt that kind of a policy, eliminating government vehicles, you can, in fact, cut the size of the fleet. But the result is it will cost the taxpayers, to cut the fleet by approximately a quarter, it will cost them a half a million dollars per year, because you will pay that premium to individual civil servants because it is cheaper and more efficient to operate the government fleet than to pay individuals to operate their own cars after a certain break-even point.

Mr. Speaker, one of the recommendations that the Minister came up with here, that sounded very impressive, was called zero budgeting, and again we're handed a concept and we're not really given sufficient information on how this would operate. Now apparently the Carter administration in Georgia were one of the foremost advocates of zero budgeting, and people I know who are chartered accountants tell me that the Georgia administration was a bust in terms of all this fanfare about zero budgeting, so I think it probably amounted to nothing more than a trend in government, which was seized on by the Minister without Portfolio and by his colleagues. I mean, can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, an annual debate taking place in Cabinet where each Minister comes in and attempts to justify his entire program piece by piece; the Minister of Education coming into the Cabinet room and saying, "Gentlemen, I believe that we should have an elementary education system in Manitoba," and then he has to argue from square one as to why there should be this kind of a system. Is that really necessary? Are Cabinet meetings going to consist of months of meetings whereby one Minister is justifying a system of public education, another Minister is justifying, say, the use of public hospitals — is that what the Cabinet is going to spend its time doing? I would assume that if zero budgeting were implemented that what they would actually be doing would be to reproduce massive photostats of the year previous, and distribute them around the Cabinet table, so that everybody could then read the previous debate. Otherwise the Ministers would have to invent fresh new arguments in favour of why their particular department should be in operation. So I say that the suggestion of zero budgeting is really a farce, and that the Minister who provides us with what he considers to be a new concept is really, in fact, providing us with an argument for endless reams of paper work, reproductions of old arguments, or he's asking Ministers to go and make up new arguments in favour of old established programs, and I just cited the example, I don't know if the Minister heard me, of elementary education. Does he really expect the Minister of Education to come in and start explaining to his colleagues why there should be a system of universal education, why there should be, say, Grades 1 to 12, and then to provide new arguments, or does he want documentation — a couple of hundred pages from last year — distributed around the table? I wish the Minister would explain that at some point. I wish he would explain how zero budgeting would work as he conceives it, because you know it sounds managerial, and it sounds businesslike, but I say that it is, in fact, folly and nothing more.

Now one interesting thing — I don't know whether the Minister has answered this question or not — as to whether the great writer and philosopher of the Conservative Party of Manitoba, David Young, was involved in the Task Force? He wasn't involved in the Task Force. Well I'll save my comments for him on another occasion, Mr. Speaker, because David Young was a fellow I went to university with and I remember him well — English Honours, majored in Literature and in Poetry, and now he's creating novels and fiction for the Conservative Party upon which they act. I don't know whether he had a hand in writing the report for the honourable member. I don't know if the honourable member knows who David Young is, or if he has ever met him, and was he wearing a mask at the time? —(Interjection)— No, all right. Well, he was spouting poetry, he was at a poetry reading undoubtedly held in River Heights. —(Interjections)— I am getting some rather interesting comments from my colleagues, but I won't repeat them, Mr. Speaker, or you might fall out of your chair.

Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting points that we haven't been able to establish is, and we would

need the background documentation to see this, is to see the relationship between Operation Productivity and the Task Force Report. I asked the Honourable Minister about this a couple of months ago, in fact, I guess it wasn't quite that long ago, and he wasn't aware of the fact that Gordon Holland, who was I believe one of the main people in Operation Productivity, the man who ran Management Committee, the head of the MTS, and now a key chairman in the Task Force, he indicated that there was a lot of work that wasn't done —(Interjection)— Yes, he was on this too, but he was on Operation Productivity, and he said that Operation Productivity really was the basis of the Task Force Report, that they were able to draw on the earlier studies and the earlier efforts of Operation Productivity. It would be very interesting, indeed, to see that, because what Mr. Holland was saying, in effect, that the Task Force Report was a rehash of Operation Productivity, and that Operation Productivity had been recycled and presented in a new form.

So I say that when we get these figures about how it only cost \$8,000 to come up with this report, whereas Operation Productivity cost \$500,000, I think the difference probably was in printing new covers and a new index for the old report. And then the Minister presents it afresh and argued that he had, in fact, provided us with a new report. —(Interjection)— You get what you pay for.

Then, we find out a few days later, this was again in April, that what the Minister did was he got together with Conrad Riley and they took the structure of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce and followed that, that there is a remarkable coincidence . . . —(Interjection)— It's a good bank. My colleague from Seven Oaks undoubtedly banks there, and I bank there, and I feel comfortable about going across the street to deal with them, but I don't know how the Minister responsible for the Task Force feels about that bank, or the Member for Minnedosa feels about that bank. But here, I think, it was clearly established in the press that they simply followed the new corporate structure of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce. So that is the contribution of my honourable friend — government is banking — he tells us, it's just like a big bank. Manitoba government can be operated the way the Imperial Bank of Commerce is operated in Canada; you can have senior vice-presidents; instead of having a vice-president for marketing you can have a Minister responsible for policy development; instead of having a vice-president for international banking, you would have someone responsible for intergovernmental fiscal relations; instead of having a vice-president for loans and investments, you would have somebody responsible for Crown corporations. So this is the model that the Minister gives us, the Manitoba Government as a bank.

Well, you know, that's one of the problems. We have some people who see government as small business and then we have other Ministers who see government as farming, and so on and so on, and you know, Mr. Speaker, there is a considerable difference between government and business. And that is why a lot of businessmen do not make good politicians, or do not make good Ministers, there's no necessary correlation. —(Interjection)— That's right — it applies to every profession, but the correlation between running, say, a hotel and running a government department is not precise, it's not precise at all.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that I would like to know is whether one of the reasons that the Minister is withholding this information from us is because there's a political section in there. Because we know that there was a political section in Operation Productivity, that there was a working paper called Financial Management and Planned Program Budgeting which tried to outline a strategy for dealing with the various constituencies — attempted to look at the various constituencies from solid to marginal and then tried to grade programs in accordance with political impact, and then tried to recommend programs so that they would hit in a way that would re-elect the government, and I believe that that was contained in Operation Productivity.

Well, the Minister shakes his head, but I have a copy of a Treasury Board working paper, which I have been told was a part of that. Maybe it wasn't contained in there, maybe it was a side study that went hand in hand. Maybe the members now have additional studies that complement the Task Force report.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I could stand reading the Minutes of the present Management Committee or the future Treasury Board; they're giving us semantic changes and so on. I think it would be too difficult for us to tolerate. The First Minister would come in and all eyes would turn to him and say, "How do we vote, sir?" and he'd say, "I'm against this," and they'd say, "Right on, we're against it, too." I mean, that's the kind of government we have; we have a bunch of people running scared; we have a bunch of "yes" men sitting opposite us who are following their great wise leader, because he won the election. I mean anybody who wins the election must be a genius, so therefore they're willing to follow him. Well, you know our leader lost the election, Mr. Speaker, and I'm willing to follow him, because I know that he will lead us through the wilderness and back to the promised land in a couple of years.

Mr. Speaker, I'm running out of time, I would simply attempt to conclude on this particular point, that what is happening in effect, is that the Minister has led a study group, which is a smoke screen for a bunch of predetermined policies, and what they are attempting to do is to break down and destroy ultimately our public institutions in this province. They are running down our hospitals; they are running down our educational system; they are running down the Civil Service; they are enforcing hardship on our cultural institutions like the art galleries and so on and they are probably going to run down our parks and our recreation facilities. I mean, everything that is public is regarded as bad.

But the corollary is very interesting, and that is that someone in the private sector will benefit from this; somebody out there will pick up the slack, it will be a case of contracting out, it will be a case of

some businessmen capitalizing on say, the fact that these institutions are being run down.

Mr. Speaker, if I could summarize in a short story from the former leader of the New Democratic Party, Tommy Douglas, I would say that their ultimate aim is contained in this story. It's what the elephant said when he danced among the chickens, "Every man for himself." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I introduced this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I called the Task Force a farce; I said it was a sham, a scapegoat, and a trial balloon, and I have no reason to apologize at this time or to change my thinking on that, because, Sir, all indications are that that's exactly what it is. Now the Minister responsible chastised me at the time — that was the highlight of his speech when he followed me — he said that I wasn't fair, that my resolution was a sham because I knew that they weren't going to give us the information, but I wanted to introduce the question of the Task Force so I can criticize it. Well, he's absolutely right; there was no doubt, it was obvious, by the way that they behaved that they had no intention of giving us the information. Mr. Speaker, I don't think we should be chastised because we want to do our work as members of the opposition; this is exactly our role, and I think it has been quite obvious now what this Task Force is all about. It was announced as the biggest single project — or call it what you may — that would be brought in, and during the campaign that was the main thing, they were going to study everything.

You would think, Mr. Speaker, if that was the case, then the members on the other side of the House would be eagerly waiting for the result, and in the meantime you can understand that they would freeze certain things or do just the minimum until they found out the place where the administration was supposed to be mostly bad administration, or mismanagement on our part when we formed the government. That was going to be pointed out by the Task Force and they were going to bring all these changes and that would result in lowering the taxes and so on.

Mr. Speaker, the best example for instance, the Minister of Education — we're going through his estimates now — and he has announced that there will be an increase at the University, that was recommended by the Task Force; he didn't know about it, he was one of the Ministers that said, "I haven't even read it, I haven't seen it." You know, Mr. Speaker, just think for a minute, if you were responsible for the department, wouldn't you eagerly wait for the Task Force, not only that, but wouldn't you go to the Minister responsible and say, "Well let me see what they said about my department?" Isn't this obvious — isn't this obvious? For instance if you were the Minister of Health and responsible for social programs, and you knew so little about it when you took over the department, wouldn't you say, "Well, you know, I'd like to get the information; I'd like to know what this is?" But no, they haven't even read the darn thing, Mr. Speaker. Now isn't it obvious that this is what they're going to do; use it as a scapegoat, scare the people and then say, "Well, we won't be so bad."

We were told today that they were planning things so well; there is no planning at all on that side. One minute they say, "We're going to cut the lifeguards," and two days after they're not going to cut the lifeguards, they're going to have more lifeguards. You know, this is just it. It's hit and miss. And then see the public reaction, what the public will stand for. That's exactly what it is and more so in Health, in Health. You know, you're going to put people on a global budget, that means, well, all right, you're responsible but then you can pick and choose and you can make sure that you are associating yourself with the winners and then you can get away from the losers. And you're going to be good people. This is a PR government. They are selling themselves, this is all they're doing and they're trying to do this with the Task Force and it hasn't worked at all.

They had a special session that they were doing some of the things before the Task Force said anything at all. We saw it today on a previous bill that to save \$13.00 because they said that in the campaign, they will take maybe a couple of hundred, or maybe three or four hundred dollars away in services that they were giving. This is the kind of thing that we're told was the great thing of this Task Force. It's a rehash from a Conservative document that was brought in before. Mr. Olin, as it was pointed out and as I pointed out when I introduced this resolution, makes no bones about it.

But the main concern that I have, Mr. Speaker, is that we place a certain group of people — I criticized the makeup of the Task Force, not the individuals. They're no better; they're not worse. I'm not going to fall on my knees because they are all successful people financially. If you had a representative group, they would be in the same percentage of good people, bad, honest and so on. I've got nothing against them but I don't worship at their shrine either.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that I didn't like the makeup and I didn't like the idea when we were not allowed to see what these people are saying, the advice that they are giving the elected representatives. You know, you have an idea what kind of people they are by the recommendations that they make and, furthermore, some of these people have come to me and have said, "Well, not only are our terms of reference those that were publicized, but we were told, for instance, in the Department of Health, you're going to knock off \$20 million. Where do we start?" I was told that by one of the members. Other members told me that our recommendations, fine, we don't agree with some of the things that are in the Task Force.

One person with a co-chairman and a civil servant who will go along with him, I would imagine, where does he get off by selecting what he wants and nothing else and saying, "This is it." The other meers of Cabinet don't even know and what concerns me the most, Mr. Speaker, is that we place

people like this in a position; we make a big thing out of saying, "Well, we're saving, it doesn't cost us any money, they're working for nothing."

But, Sir, look at what's happening in this real democracy in the States, where the people in these corporations, or these kinds of people that are dealing with government and so on, would pay a fortune to have somebody lobby, to be able to lobby, and would wine and dine people. These people don't have to do that because they are right in; it's an in-house document. These documents that they worked, these reports of these sub-committees, we were told that this is an in-house document. The Minister responsible said that — an in-house document; they are in-house, and I say, Sir, that this is dangerous for the democratic form of government if that is going to be the case, because there is no doubt that there's a conflict of interest. You can't tell me that these people that are getting the revenue are not concerned with their taxes. Don't tell me that this is not the case, Mr. Speaker. Now, I think that it was obvious that the report was predetermined in large part, not everything.

Now the main thing was supposed to be reorganization, but you don't have a Task Force of a certain class of people that's going to tell you what the reorganization is all about. Reorganization, no matter who or what Party, reorganization is something for the government of the day — those that will govern — to decide because it's a question of priority, it only makes sense. If you're not going to have any social planning, you don't need planners; sure you can say that this is just a fad, it's bad planning, because we don't want any more programs than that. You're right, so you can fire a bunch of civil servants.

If you've got a group of people who are not that interested in consumer protection, for instance they would decide not to have such a department; there is no point. If they don't want any co-op's, if they're not interested in co-op's, fine, let's not have any department, but you don't need anybody — just tell people what you want, give me your list of priorities, get efficiency experts if that's the case and they will tell you what this is all about. You don't just get a bunch of your supporters, your back room people, and then decide, well this is what we want.

There are certain good suggestions in the reorganization, I would think, but I don't think that you would have to study very long to find out about these things. For instance, they were talking about the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Well it's obvious they don't need it; they don't need it now because the thing is by pressure, you know, you let the Commission that was supposed to be independent, not to introduce partisan politics — and you say set up the list, tell us what you really need. And this was in a period of restraint also, and we announced that five-year program because we had to, because the service — you cannot say until these people are satisfied that they've made enough profit and they'll want to stay in Manitoba. In the meantime, you will not give the service to these people, for instance, who need home care or who might need other services; those people can't wait. And that is the thing the people from across do not understand; they feel that the main thing that you have to do is profit, profit, profit incorporation and, you know, at least if they would say, "We will do that." But at least there's a bottom line; everybody in Manitoba will be assured of at least that — that security — but that is not the case.

As I have said, and nobody has pointed this thing out since I have been challenging everybody in the House since the start of this session, restraint is for who? Restraint is for who? You know, those that talk about restraint are not being restrained. They are talking about restraint because they want to make more profit and the people who are restrained, are certainly not advocating restraint, not at all. So if it's not ready-made by these people, a class distinction already, then there is no such thing. They accuse us of wanting to start that; this is exactly what it is — it is a group of people in the \$30,000 and that's the real cheapskates at the bottom of that list — but these people and a bunch of millionaires in the corporation and so on, who are saying, "We've got to make more money, that's the system; we've got to make more money." So the nurses go — you don't care if you lose one of those guys, but the nurses — the people of Manitoba pay to educate these nurses and now they are leaving. Just a couple of years ago, a few years ago, the Minister was tearing his hair out because we didn't have any nurses; there was a — and I'm talking about Mr. Buck Whitney, who was the Minister of Health at the time — and he had a committee to preserve, to get these nurses, and we finally start paying them. When we took over the government we started paying them instead of using them for cheap labour and working nights and so on when they were going through school, and they are staying now — now they are pushed out of the country, but nobody says anything about that. And who trained these nurses? The people of Manitoba, for that. But you see, Sir, you can't show a big dollar sign and say, this is what the nurse, this is what this hospital did; this is what they produce and this is the profit that they're making for free enterprise. They are only going along giving a service to the people of Manitoba, a service that is needed.

And my example a while ago when I talked about the family — can you see a father calling his wife and his children and saying, "Well, all right, I've lost my job," or "I've been demoted and we haven't got as much revenue, so there ought to be restraint," but then he would keep the same booze, he would keep playing golf just as much, but the kids might be cut down. They might have milk only once a day or something. That seems exaggerated but that's exactly what is being done, Mr. Speaker, it is exactly the case, the restraint, and I challenge the people here today that tell me what people are doing for restraint. The restraint is imposed on a certain class in society and they are the people that, keep the people producing, you know.

And not long ago I was discussing with somebody the question of unemployment and he said, "That's the damned best thing that happened to this country. You know, the unions were being too smart, too many strikes and so on, and from now on if they have a hard time getting a job, we'll get them for what we want, and then we'll start making money." And that is the attitude that we're — I'm

not saying that this is what they want, but I'm saying that this is an attitude, that we're always ready, and it's natural. You know, restraint means something else, but I am asking you, I am begging you to give me an example of what you — any member in this House — really did for this restraint, to stop this restraint. What you really did. And if you can't give me that, how should we, and I include myself, have the guts to go on and say, "Okay, two meals a day on weekends, we're going to take this thing out, cut Home Care," — oh, they're little things, they're little things they're exaggerating. But if you say to a hospital, "You've got to live within a certain budget," what do you think they are going to do? Do you think these administrators and these boards, who aren't the type of people that — do you think that they lied and they cheated for all these years? You know who set up these things? It was under the former government the same as with us, it was the Manitoba Health Services Commission who looked at everything line by line, then they put them on global budget, and there will always be some kind of waste, there always will be — we are human beings. But are you going to throw the baby with the bathwater because of that? Are you going to punish a certain segment of the society because of that? And if it's going to be tough, it should be tough for all of us. The people should be getting less profit and they should be glad to do it. But you know, we say now, this is not the way it works, this is not the way it works, the people will go to greener pasture. And so therefore they are graduating. We go ahead, we work on this brain drain, we get medical people that come in to be trained here from the Third World, from developing nations, they don't go back because it's too good here, and that's a brain drain. And we forget that we're part of a family, the family of the whole world, and that there is no point that there should be just a privileged class in society.

I'm not suggesting communism, I'm not suggesting everybody should be paid the same, I'm saying at least put — (Interjection) — I beg your pardon? No, oh, you see, Sir, you read Hansard and see where my honourable friend said I'm awfully close, because I dare say that we have a responsibility and I dare say that everybody should, if there's trouble in the land, everybody should pay the same as the family. Not the old man getting his booze and playing golf and cutting down on the milk that he has for the kids. But they can't understand that. And if we say that, we're preaching revolution. You know, it's exactly like my honourable friend said, "Don't rock the boat; I'm happy." It's always like that. You know, you're not jealous, you don't — you're not jealous of the guy that's here or there, no. You are working, and if you're satisfied, well then, that's it.

Now, Sir, I think that was the main reason — we would like to get this information; I mean, if there is more, if I'm mistaken and if there is more, I would like to see those documents. I'm interested enough, I'm vain enough to think that maybe I might be back on this side of the House one of these days and I might be asked to run a department again. All right, I'm not holding my breath, but that's a possibility, and who knows? And I would like to know, I would like to profit by the mistakes I've made, I would like to discuss this with my honourable friend. But he shakes his head and he says, "No." But, well, you know, you're so smart. Well, all right, you're smart, that's probably why they put you in charge of it, because you're so clever. You know, they're using you, they're standing you in the back, they're going to use you, and then when you'll be gone, they'll do two things, they'll get rid of you, because there's no love lost, and then you'll have your day. So, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Oh, they don't like that. What's that? They don't like that. They start their wars but they don't like that, if we mention it. I say this is my honourable friend, who I thought was the most humane of the bunch, who out there was way to the left of the then Minister of Health who happened to be sitting where he is. And he was chastised, I mean we weren't doing enough for the meals after schools, and this kind of thing, and I have no reason to think that he wasn't sincere. But all of a sudden he's forgotten that because he got caught in this thing of restraint at all costs. Well, Mr. Speaker, I see you're getting impatient, so my time is pretty well up, and I know they won't change their minds, but nevertheless I think that if they were convinced that this was a good resolution, they would not try to hide them and we would be able to study these things together, to all profit by the mistakes if they're that bad.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Can I ask the honourable member a question? I wonder if the honourable member has read the editorial of the Manitoba Co-operator dated April 13, since he put his resolution in?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I didn't know those kind of questions after a speech were for clarification. I say to my honourable friend I have no idea what that editorial says; maybe he'll send it to me if it's germane to the discussion.

QUESTION put, MOTION declared lost.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. Order please. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Axworthy, Bostrom, Boyce, Cherniack, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins.

Wednesday, May 10, 1978

Doern, Evans, Fox, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Malinowski, Miller, Parasiuk, Pawley, Uruski, Walding.

NAYS: Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Craik, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Ferguson, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Kovnats, Lyon, MacMaster, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, Spivak, Wilson.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 20, Nays 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Motion lost.
We will now deal with the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Brandon East. Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that the Clerk has brought to my attention Rule No. 22(3): "During the Private Members' Hour, no request shall be made by a member to allow a matter to stand and no motion to adjourn will be entertained with respect to Private Members' Resolutions."

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, are you addressing me on that?

MR. SPEAKER: I am seeking . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Are you drawing this to my attention, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, this is an Order for Return, Mr. Speaker. I asked it to stand at the request of the Minister of Finance. Now I'm prepared to go ahead with it but he wanted time on it. Let the House Leader deal with it.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I think that rule does apply in the event that a resolution has not been introduced and this Resolution has not been introduced. Now the Clerk probably will know the rules better than I will and I wonder if it would be appropriate to allow this matter to stand. I wonder if the Member for Fort Rouge would want to use up the four minutes that he has left on the other resolution or whether honourable members would prefer . . . Or would it be preferable that we call it 5:30?

MR. SPEAKER: There's been a motion by the Honourable Government House Leader, seconded by . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Are we therefore in effect reverting to the position we were just before you called my Order for Return and the House Leader is therefore recommending to you that you call it 5:30 so that there's no problem?

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