

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Thursday, 5 February, 1981

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . .

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Montreal Trust Company and the Montreal Trust Company of Canada, praying for the passing of an Act respecting the Montreal Trust Company and the Montreal Trust Company of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS
AND TABLING OF REPORTS**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of reports which I wish to table at this time: The Annual Report of The Milk Control Board of Manitoba for the year October, 1979 to September, 1980; The Annual Report of The Manitoba Water Services Board, year ending March 31, 1980; The Annual Report of The Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation for the year ended March, 1980; the Annual Report of The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation for the year ended March, 1980; and the Report of the Manitoba Department of Agriculture for April 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980.

I may note, Mr. Speaker, that this year there has been a change that the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture is in both Metric and Imperial measure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANKLIN JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Department of Economic Development and Tourism, 1979-80.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report of Manitoba Data Services for the year ending March 31, 1980.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a report and a statement that I'd like

to make in relationship to it and copies for the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege this afternoon of tabling the report of the Building Standards Board with its recommendations on how certain apartment complexes should be upgraded to make them safer for occupants. As members of the House are aware, who asked me, a fire took a few minutes to destroy the Fairlane Meadows Building in Winnipeg. Subsequently, I appointed a special one-man inquiry to investigate the Fairlane Meadows fire. It was the third time in Manitoba's history that such action had been undertaken. That report by Hugh MacDermid was filed in the office of the Fire Commissioner in November and is available for the public to read. The Building Standards Board was then asked to review the MacDermid Report and recommend what action should be followed. I received the Board's report Monday afternoon of this week. On Tuesday morning my officials and I met with His Worship Mayor Bill Norrie of Winnipeg, Councillor Jim Ernst and city officials to discuss the recommendations of the Building Standards Board. After meeting with Mayor Norrie and the City of Winnipeg representatives two days ago I immediately set up a schedule of meetings with the mayors of the other towns and cities of Manitoba where structures similar to Fairlane Meadows are located. Tuesday evening, Wednesday afternoon and Wednesday evening my staff and I travelled through rural Manitoba to discuss the situation with Mayors of Portage la Prairie, Brandon, Virden, Altona and The Pas. The Mayor of Selkirk and myself met in Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, the municipal officials appreciate our efforts to inform them personally about the Building Standards Board Report and to learn that my department will co-operate with them in having the Board's recommendations implemented. The landlords of the apartment complexes, similar to Fairlane Meadows, will be contacted shortly and inspections of their buildings will be carried out. If upgrading work is required with the structure then tenants of that building will be so informed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Without having had the opportunity to peruse the report in detail it's somewhat difficult to comment on the specifics of the report. However, we do commend the Minister and his department for the quick and positive, as well as forceful, action that he has taken in regard to what is a very serious situation. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out that the same department, the same Minister, have had in their possession for several months, close to a year now or perhaps even over a year, a report on mine safety in this province and have been unable to bring forward the same type of forceful and immediate action to developing policy and developing programs to deal with that very serious situation. So while we commend him on the one hand we only want to use this incident as an example and point it back to the Minister and hope

that he would exercise his authority in such a way as to deal with a very serious situation that exists in Manitoba's mining industry currently.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge on a point of order.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There is an error in Hansard which I would like to have corrected, if I may. On Page 422 Hansard of the Meeting of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, I asked a question about people who stand on street corners and hand out tracts. I did not say and hand out trash, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I will listen to the tapes and if there's a correction to be made it will be made. Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood) introduced Bill No. 3, An Act to Amend the Legislative Assembly Act (2) (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne) introduced Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Garnishment Act; and Bill No. 10, The Builders' Liens Act.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James) introduced Bill No. 9, an Act to amend The Social Services Administration Act and to Repeal The Blind Persons' Allowances Act and The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Bill No. 14, the Honourable Member for Inkster. (Stand) Bill No. 15, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: I would like to have this matter stand please, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Mr. Speaker, in view of the decision by the City of Winnipeg Council to cancel plans, intentions pertaining to Sherbrook-McGregor crossing, in view of the fact that funds were allocated for that project, UTAP funds, a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs is can he advise whether those funds will be available for other alternative north-south corridors that may be determined as being preferable by the City of Winnipeg Council to that of the Sherbrook-McGregor?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will be aware, we allocated

a significant amount of the UTAP funds to the City of Winnipeg for construction of the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass some time ago. Because of the lack of decisions on the part of the city some time ago I advised the Mayor and the members of the official delegation in the City of Winnipeg administration that a decision had to be made relatively quickly, because if they decided not to pursue the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass, the federal-provincial agreement provides that some \$2.3 million in funds which have been allocated to the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass will have to be reallocated in order to be expended or drawn on prior to March 31 of this year. In meeting with the Mayor and the Board of Commissioners in the last few days they have assured me that they will be bringing to the Executive Policy Committee immediately a recommendation for reallocation of the funds, perhaps towards the purchase of buses which they do have in their capital budget, so that the \$2.3 million allocated in this fiscal year to the construction of the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass can be allocated to a new eligible project under the UTAP agreement.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise whether or not the same is true in respect to those funds that were to be allocated directly from the Provincial Government, the provincial allocation, whether those funds too, in addition to the federal funds, will be made available subject to the discussions to the other north-south corridors or other projects that may be determined upon in order to improve the transportation system within the city?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, unlike the previous government, we have not imposed conditions on the use of the block funding and the allocation of funds by the City of Winnipeg is completely their responsibility to handle themselves to meet the needs of the city.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the answer by the Minister or Urban Affairs simply indicates to me that the Minister of Urban Affairs is hiding something, and that he is not prepared to indicate the direction of his government in respect to urban affairs which we know has been a dismal failure in the past number of years.

Further to the Attorney-General, in view of the announcement by the Attorney-Generals of Saskatchewan and Alberta that they would not be laying charges pertaining to those driving while disqualified because of a Supreme Court decision, can the Attorney-General advise what is his position in respect to such offences in Manitoba? Is that case under review or will he be following the lead of Alberta and Saskatchewan?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, as a result of that decision all current prosecutions under Section 238 of the Criminal Code will be withdrawn and where appropriate proceedings will be commenced under The Highway Traffic Act. We are, at this very moment, consulting with other Attorney-Generals' Departments across the country to determine and ensure that a uniform application of the results of this decision will follow across the country.

There is some argument that can be made, Mr. Speaker, that the conviction should stand and that

those presently serving sentences should continue to serve them. It would appear, however, that at least the provinces of B.C., Alberta and Ontario are releasing prisoners currently held for convictions under Section 238 and no other offences and I expect perhaps before the end of the question period to be able to indicate, as a result of further information we obtain from other provinces, how we intend to handle that situation in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that with respect to the matters that my honourable friend is now referring to, that prosecutions under the Criminal Code — and the Criminal Code's section was meant to ameliorate a mandatory seven-day jail sentence for driving while disqualified in Manitoba as it then existed — in view of the fact that that mandatory jail sentence no longer exists, wouldn't the Attorney-General agree that prosecutions for this offence should be, under the existing section of the Manitoba law, 201(5) which he has referred to?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I think that it's a time-honoured tradition that questions of a legal nature should not be asked in this Chamber.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am not asking a question of a legal nature. I am asking him whether there is any impediment for the administration of justice to do what the Attorney-General just said that he was going to do, and that is, prosecute under The Highway Traffic Act rather than under the Criminal Code.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made that clear. That is what we intend to do, to prosecute under Section 201(1) of The Manitoba Highway Traffic Act.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that in 1959 the section of the Criminal Code, which was overturned by the Supreme Court of Canada yesterday, was challenged in the Manitoba Court of Appeal on exactly the same grounds and unanimously sustained by the Manitoba Court of Appeal in a case in which Joe Bellan was for the accused and I was associate counsel. Does it not indicate, Mr. Speaker, that there are cases in law, that if we allow the court, we are moving in an area where the Manitoba Court of Appeal holds one thing, the Supreme Court of Canada holds something else altogether?

MR. MERCIER: Yes, it does, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps it also indicates that the Honourable Member for Inkster should have been handling the appeal in the Supreme Court.

MR. GREEN: He should counsel and you would think that we could depend on the judges. Is it also significant, Mr. Speaker, that the head of the Manitoba Court at that time, which has now been reversed after 21 years, was Mr. Justice Tritschler.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Member for Inkster would agree that Mr. Justice Tritschler is a very well qualified, intelligent man.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs and I've ask the Minister if he can confirm that he has informed the Manitoba Metis Federation that he has decided to renege on a commitment by the previous Minister to provide corps funding for the Manitoba Metis Federation and as well he has informed them that this decision is a decision of a permanent nature and that the Provincial Government will no longer be providing any corps funding through the MMF.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I have notified the MMF that we will be not providing corps funding to them.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to the Minister. In light of the fact that the Minister has indicated in the past that any decision to continue or to discontinue such corps funding would be based in large part on the report of the so-called Manitoba Metis Advisory Committee, can the Minister table that report and direct our attention to any suggestion or any recommendation of that committee that would support or substantiate his decision to discontinue this important funding for the MMF?

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I have provided copies of the report to the members opposite, to their caucus room, if they wish a copy tabled in the House I can arrange to do that. The report of the Advisory Committee has been studied and has been taken into consideration with respect to the recommendations that were presented to Cabinet and subsequently passed.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I can assure the Minister that I have read the report in full and thank him for providing it to the caucus. I think it is a report of a public nature and should therefore be tabled in the House and make that suggestion to him. I would ask him in fact that if there was no recommendation to discontinue the corps funding, what criteria did the Minister use in coming to that decision? Was it in fact, as we had suggested last year, that it was some sort of a punishment for the MMF for having spoken to their rights on the lot of the Legislature a few years past?

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, it was in no way any sense of punishment, it was just using common sense.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Health and I gave him notice of this question; I hope he received the notice.

Referring to his news release of December 12, 1980, relative to Winnipeg hospital bed capacity to increase and, in particular, to the fourth paragraph

which reads: "However, a significant portion of the 817 bed total will be supplied by the opening of new or restored wings of at a number of hospitals, Mr. Sherman said. In this category are," — mentions several — "and the municipal hospitals". To what does that refer please, Mr. Speaker, specifically?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the honourable member for having given me notice of the question.

It refers, Mr. Speaker, to beds that were closed at the Municipal Hospitals last summer, at the time of the hospital service workers' strike and those that have not been reopened as yet in the wake of those closures. All but 27 of the beds that were closed at the Municipal hospitals at that time have been reopened; 27 remain closed at this point in time. The target date for reopening them is March 8th.

MRS. WESTBURY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the news release was headed "Bed Capacity to Increase". The beds were closed, as I understand, because of the nursing shortage. Is the Minister saying that the capacity is increasing when, in fact, these were beds that were closed due to a staff shortage? I wonder if he would be kind enough to explain that, because I find it hard to understand how that is increasing the capacity.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the statement that I made at the time was very carefully worded, I believe, to explain precisely and very candidly what was happening and the system that we have developed, in close consultation with health facility officials in the medical community during the fall, to improve the availability and supply of beds in Manitoba generally, Winnipeg representing a large portion of that challenge.

We announced at that time, having put the various proposals together, that the capacity of Winnipeg and Manitoba health facilities to supply needed beds would increase by, I think, a total of 817 beds in the course of the next 18 months. We are on target in that project.

The situation at the time, as the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge will recall, was one in which, due to a number of pressures, a number of chronic care long-stay patients were occupying acute care beds in hospitals and there was, indeed, great pressure on the acute care hospitals.

The planned reopening of beds that have been closed at the Municipals naturally was a component of any program that was designed to relieve that pressure and so the 27 beds referred to at the Municipal Hospitals were included in that overall spectrum.

The 817 beds represents an increased capacity to meet patient requirements over that capacity that existed in the city and in the province last September.

MRS. WESTBURY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand that it was very carefully worded and the wording is: "New and Restored Wings". In this category are the Municipal Hospitals and "restored" does not mean the same thing as "reopened", Mr. Speaker. I wonder, then, how many of these other beds that are

described in here of the 817, are already beds or wings, portions of wings, that have been reopened due to previous reductions in staff; and if, in fact, we're seeing a new policy whereby we reduce the number of beds in order to later announce an increase in capacity?

MR. SHERMAN: Not at all, Mr. Speaker, and I must challenge the honourable member's reference to the wording in that particulaqr statement. If she reads it I think she'll have to agree that that is not what is said. What is said, that the 817 are in addition to 71 beds that were restored to the system in November through a series of measures announced by the Minister at that time.

The restoration has to do with restorations of a series of wings or wards of hospitals; with the opening of special temporary personal care units, two of which have recently been opened and now are in operation; with the addition of facilities such as the McEwen facility at St. Boniface now open, a new facility; and with the addition of new personal care homes coming on stream this year.

The 27 beds at the Municipal Hospitals were in a category that was really a rather unique category within that whole spectrum because they represented beds that had been closed and were being reopened in their present form. The vast majority, 90 percent of the 817 total, are made up of beds that are either beds in new facilities or beds in wings and wards that have been renovated to meet specific needs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation. It is my understanding that last September the Minister was going to have a report prepared, a White Paper, in terms of specialized transportation relating to such things as transportation for handicapped people. I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether that White Paper has been prepared yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't recall the specific reference to a White Paper on transportation. What has been worked on and developed over the past several months is a position paper on Special Needs Transportation.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the Minister could tell us whether that position paper has been completed and made available to the concerned parties in this province.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the concerned parties of the province were part and parcel of the Committee which provided me with recommendations for policy formulation.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if the Minister wants to answer my question or not. I

assume that there is some sort of a written document came out of these meetings. Of the organizations that had some input into that document, have they now seen the completed document?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the organizations that were part and parcel of the formulation of that document did, in fact, to the best of my knowledge, see the report that came out of the meetings over summer.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could indicate, apparently at the same time there was some commitment to meet, to have a formal meeting in October of this year to discuss this position paper. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not that particular meeting will be held, or whether it will not be held, and I wonder if he could specifically check whether the Manitoba League for the Physically Handicapped, The Pas Division, has ever received a written document or written report on these specialized transportation needs.

MR. ORCHARD: If I might attempt to answer both questions, although I'm not certain to whom and to what meeting he's referring to, the liaison I've had with the Manitoba League of the Physically Handicapped has been with one gentleman, with whom I have had several telephone conversations, albeit not a formal meeting in my office.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to the new Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, and I welcome him to his new role. I wonder if the new Minister is sufficiently aware of the new rate increase package that was announced and whether or not he can confirm that the increases in the deductible on comprehensive claims will shift a large burden of costs, in excess of a million dollars, on motorists who have claims after March 31st.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that would be a very appropriate question for my honourable friend to ask the Chairman, or the General Manager, of Autopac when the corporation appears before the Committee which, I hope, will be very soon.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Possibly I should place this question to the former Minister since the new Minister isn't well aware of the impact of the rates that it will have on motorists in this province, following the 2 cent a gallon rebate that was taken away. I ask the Minister whether or not the doubling of comprehensive claims from \$25.00 to \$50.00 will not impact substantially on approximately 50,000 motorists, who would roughly be the category who will have claims in the next year, the amount of money which was not included in the rate increase package at all.

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend poses his question in such a way as to suggest that instructions for the setting of claims came from the

government, and my honourable friend knows better than that. I, again, ask him and invite him to pose his questions to the General Manager of the corporation when they appear before the Committee.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Minister then, since he disclaims all knowledge of what goes on in the corporation, I ask the Minister, was it not the government's direction to take away in excess of \$14 million in the last two years from the corporation, thus necessitating the type of increase that we've seen this year?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, that suggestion comes rather strange from a party that continues to bellow the length and breadth of this province that the price of gasoline should remain low and that no increases should be placed on the price of gasoline.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Wellington asked me two questions relating to discrimination by employment agencies. Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to him that this matter has been considered by the Human Rights Commission and I have received from them a draft letter which they are sending to all employment agencies in Manitoba, advising and reminding them of the specific legislation in Manitoba, Section 6(5) which specifically refers to employment agencies and discrimination, advising them that the intent of this section is designed to prevent discrimination by employment agencies and should complaints be registered with the commission, they will be pursued vigorously to ensure that there is compliance with the Act, and also forwarding copy of their employment advertising in pre-employment enquiry guidelines for the review of the employment agencies. They are hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that this will solve the problem that has been uncovered and are not, at this time, recommending any further action but it will be monitored very carefully.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the 1980 Throne Speech carried the important announcement that orthopaedic shoes will now be covered under Medicare, and since there are some 400 individuals and families affected, I'd like to ask the Minister of Health whether the details of the program have been worked out and whether the program is now in place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, obviously that's a program for 1981-82. We're working the details out and I'll be announcing them in due course in this Session.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could clarify that comment. It was my impression that the program would be implemented almost immediately and I have had enquiries from individuals and from members of different social agencies asking about when they can access that program. Is the Minister now telling us that it is not 1980-81 but that it is 1981-82?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has been a member of the government of this province, the past government of this province, he knows perfectly well that the Throne Speech opening a Session lays out, at least in highlight form, some of the programs being proposed for the coming fiscal and legislative year, that they will take effect as of April 1, 1981.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister this question. Since some people have put the question to me, there have been purchases made from the time, what appeared to be an instant announcement was made last December, in response partly, I think, to urgings from myself, I would ask the Minister whether anyone who has purchased orthopedic shoes since the first announcement in the Throne Speech, or in a period of the next few months, if they are to retain their receipts would they be eligible for reimbursement, or is it a case that they will not be covered until the Minister finally works out the details of the program and makes the announcement somewhere in 1981-82?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the interest in and relative pressure for coverage of orthopedic shoes, as an insured service in this province, pre-dates the assumption of office by this government by some number of years and certainly existed during the time when my honourable friend occupied one of the benches on this side of the House.

I might also say, although I hesitate to accuse him of cynicism, that I think that if he is, in his discussions with people who are enquiring about it, either avoiding meeting the issue of timing or failing to point out to them that in his knowledge of government, having been in this Chamber for 16 years, that government programs are announced for the forthcoming legislative year, not the past legislative year, then he is misleading those callers and I would ask him to co-operate with the government, as a good member of this Legislature, in ensuring that he doesn't so mislead them. I can't answer his question about pre-dating programs of that kind. I would think the answer would be, no. The money, that he and his colleagues and other members of this House voted the Department of Health for 1980-81, is spent. What we do in the future will be done on funds voted for 1981-82.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. A point of privilege?

MR. DOERN: The Minister is suggesting that I am attempting to make misleading comment, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is the Minister who is making the misleading comment since he tried to create the impression that they were responding to a program and that that program was going to be implemented immediately. Mr. Speaker, he is the one who is misleading the general public; he is the one who is trying to create the impression of action. What he is doing is stalling this problem for another year or two.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I've listened to the honourable member. I find he did not have a point of privilege.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the question that was posed only a few moments ago by the Member for St. George and the flippant response by the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, my question to the Minister is, by what realm of imagination can the Minister enjoy to suggest that the extracting of the revenues from 2 cents of gasoline tax and the transferring of that 2 cents in revenue over to the Consolidated Revenues of the Province of Manitoba, maintaining the gasoline tax as it was prior to the transfer, in what way did that reduce the price of gasoline in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, it did not. I did not say that it reduced the amount of tax but if we were to follow my honourable friend's suggestion, that tax, in order to continue to subsidize Autopac rates, would have had to increase and increase considerably. That's what my honourable friends are suggesting.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we know that the Minister is rather new to his department, not very familiar with the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, but is the Minister prepared to confirm that if the 2 cents of gasoline tax had been retained by Autopac that the recent announcement of increase by Autopac would not have exceeded 10 percent?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I point out to all honourable members that the question period is a time for seeking information, not for raising debatable points and I find the question raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to be out of order.

The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways. Last year I had asked him whether there had been approval given for a road between Highway No. 1 and Indian Reserves Nos. 39 and 40 at Shoal Lake and he indicated that he didn't know. I'm just wondering whether that approval has now been given.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHROEDER: I have a question to the Minister in charge of Autopac. Could he tell the House what the amount of gasoline tax was per gallon when that group came into power and what it is today?

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro. I'd like to know if the Minister has received a request from Alcan having to do with their aluminum

smelter requesting a firm assurance of supply of hydro-electric energy at a very reduced price for a period reported to be 50 years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, all these matters are presently under negotiation with the company.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask further of the same Minister whether the proposed feasibility study by Alcan is contingent upon receiving such an assurance of such a price and such a deal from Manitoba?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it's subject to any number of things.

MR. WALDING: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, assuming the reports to be true that a feasibility study is contingent upon that assurance, can the Minister tell us whether the matter is still under consideration by the government and when he expects a decision to be made in this matter?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to the member's question is that he shouldn't make that assumption.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a further question for the Honourable Minister of Health. I wonder if he would be kind enough to provide me with a copy of the statement from which he was reading earlier since it is in direct contradiction to the official news release dated December 12 from which I was obtaining my information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I will certainly do so, Mr. Speaker, and the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge will find that she then has a duplicate copy of that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the question, the response to which I received today from the Honourable Attorney-General relative to employment agencies, in light of that response I would ask whether it is the government's intention to take immediate action to have the Human Rights Commission press charges for contravention of The Human Rights Act against the offending employment agencies in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the information that I have, through a copy of a letter from the Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties, is that the names of the agencies surveyed have been kept confidential and will not be released, and therefore, they are simply unknown to the Commission.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, in light of that response, we would ask whether the Attorney-

General, using his very special status station in power, will express his interest to the Canadian Civil Liberties Association in this very important matter and ask for full disclosure and divulgence of that information and the identity of those agencies in order that the laws of Manitoba can be enforced. Will he, as the chief law officer of this province, take immediate steps to exercise his authority and his power to do that?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, certainly I, or the Human Rights Commission, could request that information from the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, but again I say they have apparently already indicated that they intended to keep this information confidential.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I have a two-prong question for the honourable member. Firstly, I would ask him whether there has been any progress with respect to the core area initiative and, in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I note that the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs travelled with the Mayor of this city to Ottawa last weekend and I'm sure he would wish to apprise us of any new information relative to that matter. I would also ask whether the government is satisfied, in the same area, the Core Area Initiative Program and agreement, with the boundaries that have been included in the memorandum for agreement. I would ask whether in this regard they will be pressing for a revision of the boundaries, a revision of the memorandum to exclude the east yards area of the city now owned by the Canadian National Railway?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is, yes; and the answer to the second question is, no.

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

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the honourable member if he would divulge what took place at the meeting in Ottawa last weekend and whether there is any new information relative to the Core Area Initiative Program that should be disclosed to this House?

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think as the Member for Wellington is well aware public submissions were requested and up to 150 submissions were submitted by members of the public and/or organizations. The Mayor, Mr. Axworthy and myself held a public hearing to receive public submissions last week and we received almost 60 submissions in a day-and-a-half of sittings. I was in Ottawa on Monday at a meeting of Ministers responsible for Human Rights Commissions and met in the evening with Mr. Axworthy and Mr. Norrie to review the status of the submissions that were made to review the comments that were made at our public hearings and to attempt to give some general direction to the federal, civic and provincial officials involved in the drafting of a DREE agreement. I expect that that will be taking all of this month and into March before it will be completed, Mr. Speaker. We are attempting through that agreement to deal with the general objectives set out in a memorandum

of understanding between the Mayor, Mr. Axworthy and myself and that is to deal with employment opportunities, with employment training, with new physical infrastructure in the city, and the host of other matters that have been raised with respect to the Core Area Initiatives. So I can't undertake at this time, Mr. Speaker, to present to the Member for Wellington a proposed draft agreement for the Core Area Initiatives but that work is well under way and I expect that we will be in a position certainly to make it public to the City of Winnipeg Council early in March. I hope we're not being optimistic but that it what we hope to be able to do as soon as the Mayor returns to the city, which I understand will be sometime in early March.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for question period having expired we'll proceed with Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would you call the resolution which stands in my name. Perhaps I can proceed with that first.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Attorney-General.
The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources

THAT during the present session of this Legislature the tabling of reports or periodical statements, which it is the duty of any officers or departments of the government or any corporate body to make to the House as ordered by any rules, orders and forms of proceeding of the House or by the Journals or Statutes of the Province of Manitoba, be extended to the 3rd day of March, 1981; and Notwithstanding Rule of the House No. 112, that the time limits respecting Private Bills under Rule of the House No. 105 for receiving Petitions for Private Bills be extended to the 3rd day of March, 1981; and that the time for presenting Private Bills to the House be extended to the 10th day of March, 1981.

MOTION presented.

MR. MERCIER: Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, the resolution is one that has been submitted to the Legislature before. The list of reports required by legislation indicates that many reports are required to be filed, for example within 15 days of the start of a session. With the December start of the session that we had obviously it is impossible for many of the reports to be filed so' in order to comply with the legislation of many departments' we are simply, by this resolution, establishing a fixed date for the filing of reports, etc. This has been done on numerous occasions before and I have discussed this with the Opposition House Leader, I believe during the December session.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Minister. Would he

indicate why it is that he is asking for something like 30 days instead of 15 days from the 3rd day of February. Why is it that it's necessary for him to go beyond the law as it is and, if the law is too harsh, then what can the Minister suggest in regard to changing the law?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there is no magic in the date. This merely follows a precedent that the Legislature approved, I believe it was in 1966 when the same sort of circumstances occurred.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister indicate whether in 1966 the request was made that the time be extended for a longer period than from 30 days, say, from the date of the commencement of that session. And the question carries with it the fact that we are already into Estimates and why is it that the House Leader has to ask for assistance to take it beyond 15 days even from the 3rd day of February?

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I don't have that precedent with me. I can indicate, for example, there's no intention — the Member for St. Johns, I suppose, always suspects some wrongdoing on the part of any motion or any action. I know that the Minister of Agriculture has just tabled, as he is well aware, all of his reports as he's presently doing his Estimates. There's no intent to attempt to use this resolution to circumvent the necessity of filing departmental reports that should be available for consideration of any departmental estimates. As I say, these have been filed by the Minister of Agriculture . . . was established as a result of a precedent of this Legislature and I believe in 1966 the Member for St. Johns was here. That's right in 1966, Mr. Speaker, the present Premier of the province, as House Leader then, I suppose extended the time then from . . . On that occasion, the House returned on the 19th day of January and the time was extended to the 15th day of February, so that it's approximately equal.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to get answers to the questions and in getting answers to the questions I received the gratuitous comment that I always suspect wrongdoing. Let me tell the Honourable the Attorney-General that I am finding sloppiness in the operations of this House by his government and by his leadership and not wrongdoing. When I suspect wrongdoing I say so, but when I find inadvertence, negligence, an obvious lack of knowledge or arrogance in the operation of this House, I draw it to his attention, and I did just the other day. So I'm not suspecting wrongdoing, Mr. Speaker, but I am suggesting to you that it should not be necessary to extend the time for the filing of reports to the 3rd day of March.

When the Honourable Premier was the House Leader back in 1966 he asked for an extension to February the 15th, Mr. Speaker. It's not a question of the time in which the Legislature commences that is bothersome, it's the time when the departments or the commissions are able to get their work done. If February 15 was good enough in 1966, I have to ask

the question, why isn't February 15 good enough in 1981? —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I had another gratuitous statement from the Attorney-General. He said to me just now, "You dummy, they came back January 19." —(Interjection)— I will not, Mr. Speaker, lower myself to his level and the Minister of Economic Affairs, who makes speeches from his seat and doesn't even answer in his own Estimates when there are questions asked of him, I say to the Honourable the Attorney-General . . . — (Interjection)— The House Leader, who is now making a speech again . . . Go ahead, say it.

MR. MERCIER: The House will be well rid of you.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, we now have the Attorney-General saying to me with the microphone closed, the House would be much better if it was rid of me, and that is a desire that he has and it is a desire that has been expressed by other members. I come back to the logic of what we're talking about. Not accusations, I said sloppiness. We had it last year, Mr. Speaker. Do you remember how we floundered around with bills and bills waiting until the Leader of the House was able to produce his work? We were here until the end of July because of the sloppiness of the government and of the Leader of the House in bringing in bills so late. We had it even, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— now in December when the announced intention — Mr. Speaker, are you going to let him keep talking from there? Mr. Speaker, are you going to let the Attorney-General . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please. I have allowed a great deal of latitude. I have allowed the Member for St. Johns to speak on more than one occasion on this resolution. However, the honourable member may continue. I find it very strange that he should ask questions and questions should be floating back and forth when it should be debate that we're in. The honourable member may continue with his remarks.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to you that it has been a tradition that members may ask questions of the mover of a motion before they speak. It's a tradition which I think precedes you and me in this House and that's exactly what I was doing. I asked questions in order to be able to deal with a subject matter and I'm now trying to deal with it, Mr. Speaker, and I only am speaking now on the only occasion on this resolution.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, that when it was announced by the First Minister that a session was being called for early in December, it was a statement made publicly in a news release and through the media that the intention was to be able to deal with the Throne Speech in December and to present a number of bills which were not dealt with in the last session. You know, Mr. Speaker, very well how many bills came in before February 3rd. I shouldn't say how many because only one did and that's another indication of the sloppiness of this government in dealing with the Business of the House and the arrogance of this government in making statements and ignoring them. I have to tell the Minister of Finance that he should take to heart the sloppiness that goes on because that prevents a proper orderly operation within the House.

Mr. Speaker, the specific matter I raised is still relevant. The date for the filing of reports in many cases, and we are all given this list at the beginning of every session, and I presume it's still in every desk, four pages long, provides that — let me just pick for an example a matter which apparently was filed today in the Agriculture Department — the annual report of the department to be tabled in Legislature, if in session, within 15 days of submission to the Lieutenant-Governor; if not in session, within 15 days of commencement of the next session. Mr. Speaker, how does that read? It means that if the Lieutenant-Governor has received it before the session has commenced, then it must be filed within 15 days of the commencement of the next session, which could be 60 days after it was submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor. But they say if it was submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor whilst the House is in session, they have 15 more days within which to distribute. That's very clear, Mr. Speaker. That doesn't put anybody in any sort of a difficulty, unless it is interpreted that the commencement of this session was December 12, I think it was, in December in any event. If that's the interpretation then there is default, then it would be necessary to bring a resolution to clear the default that was made and if this is the resolution, why are they asking for March 3 when all they needed was 15 days beyond the assumed date of the commencement of the session which I would accept as being February 3? Although, Mr. Speaker, we have before us a bill suggesting that we declare this session to have commenced on January 1, I think, of 1981.

The point I'm making, Mr. Speaker, is that the House Leader has brought in a resolution asking for much more time than he can justifiably require. I say again, that reports are dealt with during Estimates or in any other time and if they accepted the rule as it was, it means that it shall be filed within 15 days if the House is in session, within 15 days after submission to the Lieutenant-Governor. If reports had been made prior to, say, February 1st, then they still would have 15 days within which to file it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I was asking the question as to why they needed March 3rd — and he said in his very pleasant way of addressing me — that the 1966 session resumed on January 19, so they asked to February 15. There is no connection whatsoever the number of days between January 19 and February 15 that would relate to asking for dates from February 3 to March 3rd. The completion and printing of the reports has nothing whatsoever to do with the date that we came back to this Legislature. What they needed was the time that they may have precluded themselves from having because of that called in December. And had I received an answer, which was logical to me, that they wanted until February 15 as they required in 1966 or they wanted 15 days after February 3 which would still be consistent, I wouldn't be standing here and discussing it. But when the Attorney-General, the House Leader, schemes and says you — unfortunately I forget the appellation he used in addressing me although I'm sure it's on record. Instead of doing that he felt it necessary to attack me and insult me because of what I think is his inadequacy in the job and I don't think he was well

prepared. If we wants to rely on precedent let him have the precedent so he doesn't have to speak about routine things.

The reason I mention that, Mr. Speaker, is the general arrogance that is carried on on the assumption that whatever the government decides will automatically carry, and when it doesn't he uses his own means. Was it only yesterday that I heard him make the statement that was publicly rejected by the House Leader on this side, by the Opposition Leader. He's got to watch himself, Mr. Speaker, and do the business properly and make sure that if there is something that he needs the co-operation of the House from that he seeks co-operation and not assume it, and things would run more smoothly for him. And I say that to him, I suppose he wouldn't accept it from me but I'm suggesting to him, that I say it in the form of advice, that he would do better to be not humble but to be prepared to discuss things rather than to assume; to be prepared to ask rather than to demand; and to be prepared to respond rather than to insult. I would suggest that he has not yet justified why they need until March 3rd when, in the normal course if the session were called by the end of January, they would have had until February 15 anyway. If he had asked for 15 days from the date of the recommencement of the session, that is from February 3, there would not have been a problem. But he's not indicated what the problem is, all he's indicated is that Duff Roblin's House Leader at that time had to ask for this kind of extension to February 15 so he automatically asked for the extension to March 3rd. That's not a reason, that's not an explanation, Mr. Speaker, and when you thought I made more than one speech you were wrong in interpreting and enquiring as to what . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I think the honourable member has an understanding of the Rules of this Chamber and the only way that he can chastise the Speaker is by a motion. I would suggest the honourable member temper his words carefully.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear to you that I haven't the slightest intention of chastising you when I said that when you interpreted my remarks as being a speech rather than a question. When I feel I should chastise you you know I wouldn't hesitate to do so but I hadn't the slightest intention. I was just saying that I ask questions in order to get an explanation and I did not get an explanation of why all that time was needed; instead of that I got an insult and that's the point I was making, Mr Speaker. I don't doubt that you thought I was making a speech whereas I was asking a question. I was explaining why I was asking the question and the fact that I have not received a reply yet.

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

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I had anticipated participating in this debate right from the very start. Mr. Speaker, because I believe that there are a number of issues that must be addressed from the perspective of a new member in this House and I will get to that during the course of my remarks, but had I not anticipated originally participating in a

debate I surely would have been driven to my feet by the remarks from the members opposite in response to what appeared to be some very sensible and some very worthy questions from the Member for St. Johns. I would have been motivated, in the very least, by their antagonistic and their obviously sensitive reactions to the Member for St. Johns questions. I must point out, Mr. Speaker, for the record, although the Member for St. Johns has already done it, that those reactions, those insults and those slurs were hurled from their seats as is obvious, as is the practise that we have become used to in this House. But the question that must be addressed is why are they so sensitive to this particular issue? Why do they feel compelled to insult and to cast aspersions, in such a way, right from the very start in response to what were, to my way of thinking, non-antagonistic questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member we have a very specific subject matter before us and I wish the honourable member would confine his remarks to the subject matter of the resolution.

MR. COWAN: Well I thank you for your advice, Mr. Speaker, and I do intend to confine my remarks to the subject matter, in fact, though I had because the reason that we have to debate this particular issue right now is apparent from the reaction that we had just earlier from the members opposite, that it is a sloppy government. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the necessary resolution that has to be brought forward because of their inability to bring forward those reports as they should have been brought forward in the first place. They have had enough time, as a matter of fact they've had more than the usual amount of time to put those reports on the table before this House so that we could peruse it. So when I address the issue of their sensitivity to the matter I am in fact addressing the matter in itself.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution does not appear on first reading to be one of strong conscience or one which highlights philosophical or ideological differences and it's not, it is not that type of resolution. It should be debated solely on the merit of the resolution; that debate should be without malice and without the type of insults and the personal slurs that we have seen accompany the introduction of the resolution. It should be done in that way because we have a responsibility, as they have a responsibility — ours is opposition and theirs is government — to debate the resolutions and the motions that are put before this House. And they have displayed what I can only call heightened sensitivity to the questions that we have asked and to the debate that we have put forward on behalf of our caucus.

So we have to examine that reaction. We have to ask why are they so sensitive? They are so sensitive because they have cause to be because this resolution points out the very weakness which they claimed, when elected, was a weakness that was solely that of the New Democratic government, and that was an inability and a weakness to be able to govern. We have seen through this resolution that they are experiencing grave difficulties in that area and have seen from the past several sessions that

they are a sloppy government, it is well documented. So when they come forward to the House to ask us, in fact, to allow that sloppiness and to condone and endorse that sloppiness by passing this resolution, then I believe that we have two responsibilities. One, to examine the resolution in detail and to examine the motivations which we think might be behind that resolution; and the other is to put our feelings on the record.

So I think that their reaction in response to the Member for St. Johns was totally uncalled for and while it is apparent that they are sensitive to the subject, I can assure them that we are asking these questions and debating these issues because we feel this specific resolution is worthy of that sort of discussion in this House.

Now, I had intended to be brief from the start and I would have been much briefer had it not been for the interjections of the government members opposite during the beginning questions by my colleague, the Member for St. Johns. But I do want to ask the government, by way of my participation in this debate, if they can assure us that in fact we will have a department's report placed before us, and well before the Estimates of that department are begun. And I'm not talking about one day after the Estimates are started, I'm not talking about one day before the Estimates are started, we need those types of reports in order to examine the activities of the department over the past year so that we can in fact ask the type of intelligent and comprehensive questions which are expected of us by our electorate. We have that responsibility to the people who have elected us and as well, I believe, that they have the responsibility to provide us with the type of information which makes this a better House and makes this a more efficient House. And in fact, if we do have time to peruse those materials before we go into the Estimates, it will most likely shorten the amount of time which we have to spend in Estimates finding out answers which may have been contained in the documents before they came here.

Now I ask that question, even in the light of the assurances that the Minister has just given us, for this reason. The Minister has assured us that we will get those reports and he used as an example the fact that we had just today received the 1979-80 Annual Report of the Manitoba Department of Economic Development and Tourism. Why? I don't believe it should be necessary to remind him that we have already been into those Estimates for one day and therefore the report did not precede the Estimates but came after the Estimates had started.

He also used the example of the Manitoba Agriculture Annual Reports of 1979-80 which we just received today. We have not had an opportunity to go through and yet we will be in those Estimates very shortly. So I think that is unfair to the members of this side of the House who recognize the value of these reports. If the government does not recognize the value of these reports then I think it is incumbent upon those on this side to stand in their place and tell them that we do, that we need the reports and that we expect them before the Estimates have been proceeded with.

I only have to recall a discussion that the now Minister of Finance, and at that time he was the Minister of Natural Resources, and I had, during an

Estimates debate of his a couple of years ago, and at that time, as a new member, as I do today, I was relying fairly heavily on those materials and that information which was contained in the annual report — and I don't want to misquote the Minister and I'm certain that he will correct me if I, in fact, give the wrong impression — but at one point in the debate, and it was late in the evening so I don't remember it exactly but I do remember the broad statement that he made, was he remarked that we were using the annual reports quite extensively as a basis for our questioning and he suggested that it might be worthwhile to look into the annual reports in that use in the future.

Now I'm not suggesting that that is what they have done in this instance. As a matter of fact, I want the record to be very clear in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is what they have done; I don't contribute any ulterior motives to that government in this specific instance; I do not contribute any ulterior motives to the Minister. But I do make the point that it is a question that has to be asked from time to time and we must examine the motives of a government when it brings forwards any piece of legislation or any resolution.

So I think in this instance it is a matter of being unable to provide the reports to the House under the time limit which was provided for by the legislation, and I think that that may in fact be symptomatic of a general sloppiness which runs through their government and I think that there is probably good cause for that. I think they have so demoralized the Civil Service through the last three years of their administration that they are having difficulty running an efficient government. As a matter of fact we know that they are having that difficulty in providing an efficient and effective government for the people of this province.

But without wishing to dwell on that aspect of the argument, which I think is germane to what we are discussing today but which I do not believe to be the most important concept that is before us, I do wish to say that we recognize their sensitivity, that we recognize they are sensitive because they have cause to be sensitive and we recognize that they have run a haphazard, slipshod government for the past three years and this is just another symptom of that.

I believe that they will be able, with or without our support, to proceed with this motion and, with that belief hanging over me, I can only encourage them to listen to the remarks that those who have already spoken have made and perhaps those who will speak will make and to take to heart our concerns that we have those reports in front of us in enough time in order to prepare ourselves for the review of the Estimates of a particular department. Now why is it necessary to say that again?

Well, the Minister gave us two examples, one of Agriculture and one of Economic Development, both of which bring out the very point I'm trying to make, is that we did not have those reports in time enough to examine them before the Estimates. But if you will recall a statement that was made by the Member for Fort Rouge on the first day of the session when she said, or perhaps it was the second day, when she said that she was apprised by the government that the Department of Labour would have its Estimates before us right away; that the Department of Labour

would be able to go into its Estimates and they had in fact anticipated the Department of Labour bringing their Estimates forward right away. Well, if that's the case then we should have the Department of Labour's Annual Report before us now. We should have that on our table because they had anticipated going into it, therefore, the report must be done and, if the report is done, why isn't it before us right now? So I'm not contributing ulterior motives to anyone but I think that is an important question that must be answered.

They tell us that the report would have been done because they had anticipated bringing it forward. We don't have the report which can only mean, if one follows the logic, that the report is available and has not been presented to us. And I find that, Sir, to be a questionable practice, if that is indeed the practice they are following.

So I want that point to be made, that we do have legitimate reasons for concerns in this regard and I hope that they can provide us with the assurance and the commitment that we will not have to go into Estimates for even one minute without having had an opportunity to review the reports which are pertinent to that particular department. And I hope that in answer to our contributions to the debate, which I think were important and are necessary, they will be able to answer those sorts of questions.

I do not intend to prolong the matter, Mr. Speaker, but I want those to be on the record. I also want to say quite explicitly that I hope the example that they have provided us with, at the beginning of the debate on this particular issue, is not one which will be continued by them because I think it does a disservice to them as a government and a disservice to the people of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Economic Development and Tourism and the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the Committee to order and the question was the

speaking order. The Chair doesn't rule. I just try to go from side to side. The Member for Transcona had the floor yesterday and he has approximately 20 minutes to go, so I will start off with the Member for Transcona. Beyond that I just don't try to keep order as one side to the other. The Member for Inkster, I guess, is next in line, then the Member for Elmwood. Does that answer your question?

A MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you. Yesterday I was pointing out that this government has exerted no leadership on this department and has compounded that with bad management. It's inexcusable that in the time of our floundering economy and every indicator indicates that that's so. That this government has seen fit to not appoint a Deputy to replace the person who left some time ago, namely, Mr. Rogers, nor to replace Fil Filecchia, who left some time ago as well to go to Saskatchewan. (Interjection)— That's right.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): He didn't go to Saskatchewan.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, he left to go to the Province of Saskatchewan. I do not think he is in Manitoba right now but if the Minister says he's . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: He's lived where he's always lived.

MR. PARASIUK: Fine. The point is that he resigned and this government hasn't appointed a person to replace him, which shows the low priority that this government attaches to this particular portfolio. You know, possibly if there was some management by the government, we would have had a more systematic approach to economic development than has been presented to date.

This government doesn't have the capacity to develop a program of rational potash, mineral smelting and forestry expansion. To do that you have to develop a program whereby you put forward the province's interests first and you negotiate from that position rather than sending prospectuses around, as is the case with respect to the ManFor development, asking for bidders. The last time that was done, in a less subtle manner, was in 1966-65 when the Conservative Government put an ad in the paper saying, come and get it, with respect to forestry resources and we remember what happened at that time. Instead of developing a rational approach, we have left it open to the multinationals to come in because it's giveaway time as far as this government is concerned.

There are other alternatives that could have been developed as well that weren't mentioned by the Minister in his introductory comments. There is nothing substantive here regarding transportation improvement. We have railway lines in Western Canada; railway lines between Winnipeg and Thunder Bay that need improvement, that need upgrading. We, in Canada, need the construction of a great deal of rolling stock. I believe that the Province of

Manitoba, being located right in the centre of the country, is the ideal location for a steel plant with respect to providing steel for railway line upgrading. It's the ideal site for a steel plant with respect to providing the basic ingredient for the building of hopper cars, potash cars, cars rolling stock geared to carrying petroleum products. It's an insane situation that we have right there where, especially hopper cars, aren't built in western Canada. They're built in eastern Canada. That situation has to change. Now we are at a stage where Manitoba, I think, could put forward some very positive proposals, can do so in a manner where it says we will put up some money, we will undertake to be the catalyst, to be the entrepreneur, to ensure that that type of major development, which would re-establish a position for Winnipeg and Manitoba as a type of renewed gateway to the west, that that's the type of activity that should be undertaken rather than an ad campaign, rather than the type of campaign that we have with the City of Winnipeg where some \$400,000-plus is being spent developing Winnipeg and new west which hasn't resulted in very much at all. That type of advertising hasn't been accomplishing very much.

What we should be doing is, rather than spending money on that type of propaganda, we should be doing our homework and we haven't done our homework, especially in the area of transportation. The Federal Government in this last budget announced a \$4 billion western economic development fund. Now Manitoba, since we are the western province that is floundering especially under this government, we should be getting a huge share of that fund for economic development. But if we are going to get any of that money for economic development surely we will have to do our homework. We can't continue to rely on basically outside multinational thrusts with respect to how Manitoba should develop and that's what this government is relying on when it talks about mega projects.

So we have an opportunity in transportation. It's a substantive point. We should have some leverage with the federal government. We have to act as the catalyst and we aren't doing that.

Another area that we should be moving into very seriously is urban transportation. We have very little, if any, provincial investment in this area. We have Flyer buses but it's interesting to note that Flyer buses aren't sold in Manitoba. Right now we have a situation where Flyer's potential is with trolley buses, selling trolley buses to San Francisco, selling buses to cities elsewhere, and here we sit in Manitoba with a surplus of hydro electric capacity and we can't use the province in a creative manner, in a catalytic manner, in order to develop an urban transportation system based on hydro electric power, which is renewable, instead of depleting hydro carbons. This government backs away from that whole issue because it's too big for this government to deal with. It backs away from that type of question. It's a critical question for Manitoba. It's a critical question for Canada.

Surely we are at a stage right now where we should be substituting renewable hydro electric energy, where we can, for depleting hydro carbons. We can do it with respect to railway transportation

but again that's too big an issue for this government to tackle. It doesn't believe it has the capability. It doesn't want to build up the capability. It has neither the capability nor the will and both feed on each other.

We should be talking about electrifying railroads. We, in fact, in Manitoba again could show tremendous leadership there. The industrial impact of that would be tremendous. But we don't do that. We should be able to argue seriously with a government nationally, that there should be some national investments in this area as well, because surely from a Canadian perspective, it makes sense that wherever possible we should be saving our hydrocarbons for those areas where we can't substitute renewable hydroelectric energy. And the area that's critical in this respect surely is farm motive power. I cannot envisage hydroelectric or battery powered farm machinery that's movable — combines, tractors, swathers — that will have to rely on diesel fuel and gasoline. So we, as a nation, should be saving that type of fuel for that type of purpose, but we should be also showing some leadership in developing alternative modes of transportation and systems which utilize hydroelectric power. This government backs away from that; they assume that somehow that will be done by the private sector, that type of structural change within our economy, with respect to infrastructure which I say is primarily public not private, urban transit, transportation systems right across the country. That will not happen unless the public acts creatively and with ability and this government has backed away from that entire issue.

I'd like the Minister to tell me what the prospects for trolley buses are in Manitoba for Flyer buses. Very clear indications of this government missing an opportunity that it can create itself. You know, we talk about import substitution. We say that there is too much leakage in this economy, that what we spend in Manitoba leaks out of the economy because we've purchased too many things from outside Manitoba so it should be a strategy on our part to try and substitute imports. Flyer buses is an excellent case where we could be doing that and this government backs away from that area.

The same thing holds true with all the rolling stock in the CN yards right now, all the rolling stock in the CP yards, all of it purchased elsewhere, little, if none, economic spinoff here in Manitoba, tremendous possibilities. This government backs away from that area because it feels it doesn't have the competence to get into these areas. And the Minister, I forget what he is now, the Member for Lakeside, has said in the past that the reason why the Conservative Government doesn't get into these areas is that it feels it doesn't have the competence to do so. Surely, he said in the past the government could own certain industries, sure it could get involved but we don't think government has the competence. But the point is that if the government doesn't get into the area of urban transit, if it doesn't get into the area of intercity transit then the private sector won't at all.

So we need government and government isn't up to the challenge, and the industrial impact, the industrial spinoffs would be huge but this government doesn't want to undertake those types of tasks. It wants to, instead, develop a whole system

of grants many of which are given basically by DREE, not by this government but with this government putting up and recycling press release after press release. If you took DREE away from this government it would have no industrial program whatsoever that it could call its own. I find that quite ironic when you have the Premier always lambasting federal deficits, always lambasting federal spending and yet the Minister has said repeatedly, and this government has said repeatedly, we need DREE money, hopefully we'll sign a new agreement, hopefully we'll do something. My point is that those are only marginal changes that DREE wants to do. DREE unfortunately has not dealt with the major structural changes in Canada. It hasn't tackled any of the major problems, it basically is a sop to buy off regional grievances. It will not undertake huge fundamental projects that might change the structure of the Canadian economy to provide some benefit for Manitoba. So that's why Manitoba will have to take the lead, and in some instances, in many instances possibly, will have to act independent from DREE, will have to take on the challenge of the railways, will have to take on the challenge of urban transportation, but it doesn't. This government, as I said, doesn't have that capacity, doesn't have that inclination and nothing illustrates that more than the fact that after — what is it, nine months now, no Deputy appointed, I'm certain that Mr. Rogers must have given some notice when he was leaving. I cannot envisage a major private corporation operating in this manner without appointing a chief operating officer for ten months. That is most unbusinesslike, but it shows up an incompetent government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm almost, and I say that advisedly, almost feeling sorry for the Minister, because obviously what's going to happen during the next meetings of this committee, and I don't know how many meetings there are going to be, is that members of the Opposition, quite rightly, are going to be tearing strips off the Minister by degree and by the time the committee members are through, I'm quite sure that emotionally and physically the Minister will be unrecognizable. (Interjection)—Unrecognizable. He may even have a forced smile.

Mr. Chairman, I say I'm almost feeling sorry for the Minister, because I believe that everybody around this table knows that by and large, and I'm not saying totally — but certainly there could have been changes — but that by and large the difficulties that the Province of Manitoba find themselves in at the present time are not the sole doing of this Minister. Mr. Chairman, I'll go further. They're not the major doings of this Minister. They are not, I may even say the major doings of this government. Manitoba has some demographic and economic problems now that nobody could escape. The fact that nobody could escape them doesn't mean that something cannot be done about them, but I think that nobody could escape them. I would drop the word "almost" feeling sorry for the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister himself — well, for two major reasons, that the Minister himself, when he was in Opposition, resorted in the worst way to this type of unfair criticism, some of which is going to be heaped on him in the worst way. Mr. Chairman, I think that you will remember

that the former Premier of the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Schreyer, used to say almost regularly that we stand about in the middle, that we are fourth from the top, that we are fifth from the bottom, and who was the worst offender, Mr. Chairman, with regard to chastising the former Premier for using that kind of argument? When we said, Mr. Chairman, that the deficit of the Province of Manitoba is \$50 million or \$100 million, but the deficit of the Province of Ontario is 1 billion, 2 hundred million more than the entire budget of the Province of Ontario. Who was it, Mr. Chairman, who said, why are you talking about Ontario, why don't we discuss Manitoba? Mr. Chairman, you will find it in Hansard, time after time after time, that this Minister, who now has given us a speech loaded with comparative statistics, used to say that comparative statistics should not be quoted to the House; that we should look at Manitoba and Manitoba alone and see what is happening in this province.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is stewing in his own garlic sauce. It is not a question of unfair criticism. It is the fairest type of criticism because, Mr. Chairman, he is being judged by his own standards and, Mr. Chairman, he has picked it up. He really still is using those standards but can't publicly express them. He says, Mr. Chairman, that Manitoba is on the offensive but he acts more like Manitoba is offensive, because he, Mr. Chairman, has contributed more to the offensive looking picture of Manitoba than any other Minister in this government and in any other previous government and I say, Mr. Chairman, he has done that by using \$62,000 — in money matters it is now considered small, it never used to be considered small — \$62,000, to tell the people of Manitoba that what they see in front of their eyes is not true and that he, by spending \$62,000 is going to make a silk purse out of a pig's ear and you can't do it, Mr. Chairman. You cannot make a silk purse out of a pig's ear by spending \$62,000; you can't do it by spending \$620,000.

That's why, Mr. Chairman, I don't feel sorry for the Minister; two reasons. One, because by his own standards he stands condemned, not because he has created the problems that we are in, but because he chose to use that kind of criticism as being a fair standard for the Opposition. And secondly, Mr. Chairman, for this obnoxious, offensive, practice of spending the people's own money to further the interests of the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba. There can be no greater condemnation.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, why the Minister hasn't answered my letter. I sent him a letter with regard to this program; not I sent it, I delivered it to him, a handwritten letter approximately six weeks ago when he announced that he was going to do this thing and, Mr. Chairman, I tried to do it in a co-operative spirit and I will read the letter just to show you how co-operative I was, but I never got an answer. The Premier always says, why doesn't the Opposition help us a little bit? Well, Mr. Speaker, I offered my help. I said, "Dear Mr. Minister: I note that your government has now in its ultimate desperation resorted to using the taxpayers' money to exhort Manitobans to stay in Manitoba by conducting an advertising campaign. Apparently those leaving

Manitoba are not impressed with the fact that if they die here there will be no taxes on their estate. They evidently have come to the conclusion that if they live here they will have no estate. While this conduct on the part of the government, no doubt provides considerable political ammunition to the Opposition, I believe that it is also our duty to try to help you to keep our citizens here."

I offered help as I'm always trying to do; I did try to offer help. As the only Independent New Democrat in the Legislature I would like to do my part, my small part; I'm only one member. I offered the following suggestions for slogans to be used in the ad campaign. "Don't go, Julie, await the ides of October." Now there is some argument about the month. According to some of the New Democrats you could say, "Await the ides of March," but I think that October would be proper advertising. Then, Mr. Chairman, if that is not satisfactory, "Wait for a change." Why don't you put that in your ads? I mean, keep people in Manitoba. "Wait for a change, a new government is coming." I haven't seen those slogans in the \$62,000-ads, but they would do more to keep people in the Province of Manitoba than the advertisements that the Minister is using. The first suggestion may be a bit too subtle and perhaps erroneously predicts the date of the next election.

The last suggestion is much more direct. I hope you will find my suggestions useful. Well, apparently, Mr. Chairman, I received no reply. I've been watching the ads very carefully. I wonder if any of my colleagues have seen an ad, "Wait for a change; Stay in Manitoba; Don't leave, better things are going to happen". I think that the Minister is missing a bet because he could have had the assistance and a much more meaningful advertisement, Mr. Chairman, with respect to people staying in the province of Manitoba than the advertisements that he is using.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that I as a member of a government are not entirely vulnerable on this point, because every government, Mr. Chairman, sits around in a circle and they say, we're doing good things, we are wonderful. How is it that the people don't understand this? Obviously the message isn't coming out. I heard that kind of thing when I was a member of a government and I saw it in the Roblin administration, in the Weir administration and in the present Conservative administration, never quite so blatant as in the present Conservative administration. But I do think, Mr. Chairman, that I am entitled to somewhat dilute my own responsibility in that I can safely say without contradiction on the part of any of my colleagues and by demonstrable action that I never approved of it and never used it myself. That I never used information services; that I never had them churning out these ridiculous press releases; and I never used public moneys for the advertising of a political program or for the advertising of a political party. That, Mr. Chairman, is probably greater in condemnation than I can make because on the first runs I only condemned the Minister because of his double standard and I suppose that can be attributed to human frailty but on the second ground it's more serious. On the second ground it is a malicious, despicable use of public moneys and it is intended to make up for the shortcoming of the administration and on that particular area, Mr.

Chairman, has far more to with me not feeling sorry for the Minister than the fact that we have difficult economic circumstances in the Province of Manitoba because I happen to think that we would have difficult economic circumstances in the Province of Manitoba no matter who was the government.

I have not yet heard other than the critiques as to concrete programs for dealing with those circumstances. The Minister does not make a great change from this particular area, Mr. Chairman, when he starts referring to what has been done; when he starts referring to what is happening in the mining industry. He referred to some developments, Mr. Chairman. Would the Minister believe that in the eight years that he talked about when the New Democratic Party was in government and when he and his party were saying that nothing was happening, that the Falconbridge Mine was opened up, that the Centennial Mine at Hudson Bay was opened up, that the Tantalum Mine was opened up, that the Leaf Rapids Mine was opened up, that all of those mines were built during the period of the New Democratic Party administration. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, during that period we did more than build mines, we found the mine. The Trout Lake Mine was found during the period of the New Democratic Party administration and that's probably the biggest misrepresentation that has been made by the Conservative administration that there was somehow a diminution of mining activity and that there has now been an increase in mining activity. The mining production figures that the Minister of Mines presents have to do with the price of mineral products. There was no lack of mining production during those years. The exploration figures went somewhat up and down. But in the last year of our administration we had the highest mineral exploration that had yet been experienced in the Province of Manitoba and I notice that today the Conservatives are singing the same tune — the highest figures since the Province of Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that criticism is legitimate. I particularly feel that it's legitimate in the two areas that I've discussed, but eventually any government has got to get down to talking about what it's going to do. The Province of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, has some particular disadvantages. They talk about the west advancing and the east declining. We have the worst of both worlds. We have to pay our western brothers in Saskatchewan and Alberta for the increased price of oil and gas and we don't have what Ontario has, is the industrial base which is also suffering but which at least gives them some industrial advantage. So at the present time Ontario and Quebec have the industrial advantage and the population and the market; the provinces to the west of us have the resource advantages and we are paying both sides. We are paying the west for the resources and the east for the manufactured product and we are struggling with our limited agricultural, forestry and mining base and the manufacturing industry that we have. But as to the advantages, we happen to be, and the next government when it comes to power will find immediately that it has exactly the same problems. We happen to be in that condition. Now I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, that if we are to deal with these problems as deal with them we must, and I'm going to propose a five-point

program for dealing with them which can apply to the present government or a future government, and I'm not certain as to which one will be more willing and have the fortitude and the courage, because it will require some courage to proceed with them.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think we should stop talking about the great advantages on the part of the Province of Manitoba in the hope that saying then is going to attract people who are far more hard-nosed and are not sold by an advertising campaign and accept the fact that there are some severe problems that we have by virtue of the coincidence of not being the center of population and manufacturing and also not having the resource base which is to the immediate west of us. We cannot pretend that we're going to do what Alberta is doing, and we cannot pretend that we're going to do what Saskatchewan is doing and we cannot pretend that we're going to be able to do what Ontario does, No. 1.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I say that we have to accept these disadvantages and try to see what we can do about them. So we have to accept the fact that we have problems and not say that the economy is the fifth highest from the top. We have to accept the fact that these problems stem not merely from the existence of one government or another government but they stem from disadvantages, that's No. 2; we have problems, No. 1, we have disadvantages, No. 2.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, and I believe the Conservatives accept this although they try to hide it, we have to accept the fact that in Manitoba because of our problem, because of our disadvantages, there is a need for public investment. I believe that the Conservatives now recognize that there is a need for public investment, that they have in their view put the private sector on trial and it has been found wanting. In my view it's the Lyon administration that has been put on trial and it has been found wanting and that any notion that we are going to be able to deal with our problem simply by saying that if we reduce government spending and remove restrictions or impediments to the free play of private forces, that suddenly, despite the fact that our resource base is such that we pay for the main part of our energy to the west; that our population base makes us a difficult area for manufactured goods in terms of a market and that many of our manufactured goods therefore have to be imported — if we say that in spite of that that the private sector is going to come running to the Province of Manitoba, if only there is a government that says we are not going to interfere with you, surely, Mr. Chairman, the third part of the program should be to bury that concept as deep as you can bury it. I believe that the Conservatives while not saying so, have done so. Because I noticed in the Throne Speech they have said we are not going to sit back, and they've done something far more interesting. They have made the Minister of the Manitoba Development Corporation and the Minister of the mega — what do they call them, mega projects? Mega projects. He is the same Minister, Mr. Chairman, and that's not an accident. That's because the mega projects are going to be related to the use of the Manitoba Development Corporation in the long run or else, Mr. Chairman, some other form of infusion of moneys, incentives,

privileges, preferences or other such attractions to the private sector. That's the reason for it.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the third part of this program, and I believe that it is realized now by the Conservative Party, is that Manitoba is going to have to use its public strength, its public economy, for investment purposes. It's not a new thought. Who were the authors of the Manitoba Development Corporation? Was it Karl Marx? Was it Ed Schreyer? Was it Tommy Douglas? No. It was Duff Roblin, a Progressive Conservative.

And Duff Roblin — not that I would go for it, Mr. Chairman, we'll come to that in a moment. Simplot Chemical was built with public money. And I can name, as I have named, in this House, I think I named 200 corporations that were put on their feet by the public, and eventually you're going to be back to it. And that, Mr. Chairman, is the fourth part of my program.

It can go two ways. You can use public moneys to provide social assistance to needy industrialists like Simplot, CFI, or Sprague — what's the name of it, Columbia Forest Products, Dent's Foods, Family Farm. You know I haven't named a New Democratic Party project yet. Damascus Steel, I haven't named a New Democratic Party project yet. This was recognition by the Progressive Conservative government, that public investment was necessary. And you can do that, Mr. Chairman, and that is something which regrettably I say is tolerated, not only by Conservatives and Liberals but that New Democrats flirt with those ideas, and caused themselves a great deal of trouble between 1969 and 1973 for those flirtations.

Or, Mr. Chairman, you can do what business does and say yes, we're going to marshal public investment, and we're going to use public investment in the same way as businesses use public investment. Which, by the way, is the story, except for administrative failures, in connection with one of the biggest manufacturing industries in the Province of Manitoba, Versatile Manufacturing. That industry was saved by the public. My impression when we did it is that we would get one-third of it because I don't like to use the public moneys and have somebody else own it, I've never felt that way, I don't do that privately. When I put up money, I'm silly enough to think that I should be the owner. Unless I'm secured and get an interest rate which I'm investing in for that purpose, but that's the other alternative, Mr. Chairman.

And in that regard I think, Mr. Chairman, that I should refer to you an article by Jack McArthur. This is in the Winnipeg Free Press, "Chrysler Massey bail-out, taxpayers should be owners." Now this guy's not a communist. All he's saying is what every businessman says, and that's what he says. It's in the Winnipeg Free Press syndicated column. He says, if the public puts up money for Chrysler, they should be the owners of Chrysler. And they are putting up money for Chrysler now in such amounts as makes Saunders Aircraft look like a peanut factory. \$400 million loan guarantee, and Massey-Harris, that great bastion of free enterprise, the same thing, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the last point, and the most difficult point, and it's going to take some recognition, is that public investment will cost money. In the long run,

one would hope that the investments will be successful and that there will be a return. But that can't be guaranteed, it can't be guaranteed by the private sector who run around and get share capital, nor can it be guaranteed with the public sector. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this government is on the road to bankruptcy, that within three months, if a budget is delivered there will be a deficit of \$250 million or an increase in taxes. And a deficit of \$250 million is not merely a deficit, it is carrying charges of \$25 million a year minimum, for which you get nothing.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am closing my remarks by saying that whatever party does this, either way, and I have of course, the public way rather than the private way, but of the five points, there is only one that is a divergence. One will use the public money to help the private sector, the other will use the public money as businessmen would use it for the public. But which one, Mr. Chairman, will go to the taxpayers and say that every cent we spent, we're going to ask all of the people of the province of Manitoba to contribute to it and we're going to charge a tax for it, which is what Tommy Douglas had the courage to say in Saskatchewan and which some government should have the courage to say in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, we're trying to deal with a department here which is supposed to look at the realities of the economic situation in Manitoba and come up with some solutions. So what we're trying to do is look at the direction and the thrust of the government and the department and try to determine what practical programs they have to counter a very serious economic situation and I was trying to determine, by listening to the Minister the other day, what the government saw as the problem facing it today. And my conclusion, Mr. Chairman, was that the Minister himself is becoming paranoid about the situation in Manitoba. He said, for example, that there are negative influences in the economy in the province. I was looking for him to point out where the problem areas were, he sees some sort of plot. He sees the press and the Opposition as being two groups that are fanning the fires of discontent in the Province of Manitoba. I find that very peculiar. I find that a very unusual thesis, namely that everything is fine in the province, but it's the media and the NDP which is spreading doom and gloom. I have never considered the media as an adjunct of the New Democratic Party. Many times in my life, I suppose like many other politicians, I have thought that the media was critical of the government in power and they certainly took shots at our government and they continue to do the same and that is one of their functions.

It is certainly the function of the official Opposition to criticize the government. I don't know how many times I listened to the Opposition say to us when we were in power that they are not there to applaud the actions of the government. I don't know how many times I heard that said and I agreed, and it sunk in, that they were not there to cheer our programs, and no matter how good our programs were there were criticisms made, and the same holds true today and the same will hold true when our positions are reversed.

The fundamental question that we are dealing with I find rather peculiar. Instead of looking at the problems, we are listening to a Minister say that it is the Opposition that is creating the problems in the economy and it is the media which is creating the problems in the economy. His response to that problem, as he perceives it, is an advertising campaign to cheer everybody up and to put the lie to the Opposition and the media for what they are trying to foster. I say to the Minister that he is all wet, and I tell him that if he looks at the problems facing Manitoba today these are not creatures of the media's imagination or these are not falsehoods being perpetrated by the Opposition.

Now I am going to quote from the media, so I guess that's really a kind of a circular argument, because the Minister doesn't trust the media. I tell him that I have before me a whole bunch of clippings which come from a variety of sources; one of the most interesting in the Free Press on January 24th saying that Manitoba's economy slips below zero growth mark for the first time in 20 years and perhaps since the depression. One of the people quoted here is Ruben Bellan, who is I believe an independent Manitoba economist. Also quoted is my colleague from Brandon East, who made his remarks. He speaks as an economist, another independently-minded economist.

MR. STEEN: Under the direction of Cy Gonick?

MR. DOERN: No, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Brandon East certainly is not in tune with the former member from — where was he from?

A MEMBER: Crescentwood.

MR. DOERN: Crescentwood. Your illustrious predecessor, he was a bit further to the left.

Mr. Chairman, I look at another heading, Housing Starts in Manitoba Worst In Years, that's from a Canadian Press story from Canada Mortgage and Housing. I mean, is the Minister telling us that this is a figment of the imagination of the media or of the Manitoba New Democratic Party? Is he going to question these housing starts? Bleak Future for Tradesman, 4,000 construction workers are jobless, 30 percent of all unionized construction tradesmen in Manitoba are unemployed, and according to a spokesman from the construction labourers' union, he says some of his men are on welfare; some have left the province, and some are on unemployment insurance. Is the Minister going to question that? Is he going to say that those figures aren't true, or that these people are lying?

Headlines, Manitoba Builders Cautious — this comes from someone named Guy Hobman, the newly elected president of the Housing and Urban Development Association of Manitoba, and Housing Starts Hit 20 Year Low In The City, and Building Permits Drop. You look at the building permits in the City of Winnipeg as indicated in the paper a couple of days ago. They are off \$42 million, and the only category to record an increase was demolitions. That's a pretty sad state of affairs. Public buildings and theatres, which presumably is the government sector, is 21 percent down, so we have a province in which demolitions are up and construction is down. If you push that far enough I suppose it means the city is going backwards.

Mr. Chairman, that is the situation in Manitoba today. It's a sorry economic picture and the Minister's response is that he's going to have a series of ads to counter the doom and gloom. I am going to ask him later about on what basis he determined the need for that survey. I suppose one day he got up and looked in the mirror and said there is a lot of doom and gloom around and that it's time to do something about it, or was it that he determined from an examination of the political fortunes of the Progressive Conservative Party that they were sinking in the public mind and in the public eye and that it was not in response to a sorry economic picture because he says that isn't true. He says that it is the false rumours and the false statements of the media and the Opposition parties which is the problem. He will correct that with advertising. I say if he was a good Minister and a good government he would be trying to counter the poor economic situation. What he is really trying to counter, Mr. Chairman, is the poor image of the Conservative Party of Manitoba. We know what the polls say about that, and we know what people think, and we know that the public of Manitoba blames the present administration for the sorry picture in the Province of Manitoba today.

Mr. Chairman, we also know what the Premier said about this kind of advertising. We have listened to him in the House time and time again go on about federal advertising. We know that the First Minister has said that the kind of money spent on the kind of advertising put out by the Federal Government on the Constitution is a complete waste of taxpayers' funds and it's an abuse of government. He doesn't like image advertising. He doesn't think that the Federal Government should do this sort of thing and yet within months or weeks of his statement, this Minister announces that he is going to do some image advertising; he is going to cheer people up. They are going to take impartial testimonies from people. Of course what the Minister didn't tell us was that all the people in the ads were real. We know they are all real. We know that what we see on TV is people saying that they think Manitoba is a nice place, but I wonder if he had gone into a supermarket or into Polo Park or somewhere like that and taken a cross-section of opinion. I wonder whether the people would have said the same, or did they get bunch of people, get a whole series of comments and then select advertisements and statements which they thought would cheer people up, because I can tell you a lot of people are unhappy about the economic situation in Manitoba and I can tell you that the majority of Manitobans puts the finger of blame onto the Conservative Party of Manitoba, because the Conservative Party of Manitoba is not a fatalistic thing. It is not just helpless in the face of national or international conditions. There are certain things that this government can do; there are certain things that any administration can do; there is a certain amount of room in which to maneuver; and what we're getting is we're getting paranoid responses and we're getting advertising campaigns.

We've heard this sort of thing before, Mr. Chairman. For the first three years of the Lyon administration, the word was "monitor". That's all we heard in the House. Whenever we said anything, they

said we are monitoring that situation and they sat back and watched the economy go down the drain, and they saw people leaving and they saw things going down the tube. So now they finally come up with a response after three years of careful monitoring and studying, and the response is image advertising.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the problem is real. We are in an economic slump and the Conservative solution is to substitute advertising for monitoring which is a complete failure of being able to recognize the problem. They don't recognize what the problem is and so they are responding in a false way. They don't know what the problem is, so they don't know what the solution is. They think the problem is the Opposition talking. Is the Minister serious? Would he really want to argue that if the Opposition said nothing that the problems would go away? Is that his position? That the problems are in the mind of the Opposition, that the problems are not in the economy or in society today?

The Minister made a prediction last June. I'm looking at a headline here from the Tribune in June, 1980, "Building slump may end soon." The Minister predicted that the construction slump should ease this year as the oversupply of office and commercial space begins to decline. Then he said at the end that, "The slow growth in the construction sector is largely attributable to the general economic slowdown both in Canada and the U.S., the record high level of interest rates, a decline in housing construction and deferral of projects related to Hydro developments." Was the Minister saying that he can't do anything about any of these things? Is he saying that that's it? I mean isn't it partly the result of a government policy as to whether housing starts will be high or low?

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): We saw what they were when you had them high.

MR. DOERN: Yes, and isn't it also a fact that the decision to proceed with Hydro is a provincial government decision? Isn't that also something within the hands of the provincial government? That the Minister just can't sit back and sort of cry out against his fate; that there is room for maneuver there; that the government's response shouldn't be that Manitoba has serious economic problems and we will advertise them away. We will simply start talking in a positive manner. Cheerful Charlie advertising will do it. We'll have smiles on our faces and everything will be all right. That is not a program, Mr. Chairman, that is the absence of a program that this government has.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 4:30 p.m. having arrived, I move that committee rise for Private Members' Hour.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 9 of the Main Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Resolution No. 7. Item under discussion is Clause 1(b) Planning and Management, (1) Salaries.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday when we left off we had made some opening remarks and we were discussing the whole area dealing with the Planning and Management.

I would like to now turn to some more specific questions and I want to take this opportunity to thank the Minister for bringing forward his Annual Reports from the department with respect to the year ending March 30, 1980. You will note, Mr. Chairman, in the Annual Report that you have, the department went to some length and the Minister went to some length to deal with statistics, farm cash, income and expense statistics dealing with the years '78 and '79, Mr. Chairman, and those statistics were as given, as shown in the Annual Report, the source of the statistics were given as Statistics Canada, although the '79 figures reportedly so are preliminary estimates.

You will recall as well, Mr. Chairman, that yesterday during my opening remarks I dealt with statistics of farm income and the like and this section in the Annual Report deals in the general administration area and general administration area is the Minister's office, Management Services and Computer Services and Analysis. I want to get more specific, Mr. Chairman, with respect to statistics. Last December, Mr. Chairman, I rose in this House and I asked the Minister the source of his statistics with respect to the income figures that he released in October. The Minister indicated that the statistics he quoted were from Statistics Canada. Mr. Chairman, I want the minister to tell me where are the statistics that he has quoted from when he quoted the 1980 Farm Cash Income Report of October 16 and 1980 net farm income to set new records of October 31. Where can one locate the figures that he quoted of \$410 million as being the best ever farmers earnings expected to reach \$410 million, Agriculture, Jim Downey announced, and also the earlier figure of October 16 where he said that realized net income in Manitoba after all operating costs are deducted will be higher this year than in '79. Stats Canada agricultural statistics show the 1980 estimate is \$348 million and that \$348 million on October 16 was increased to \$410 million on October 31. I want to ask the Minister specifically where those figures come from, which document?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be more appropriate if I were to deal with the more general questions in summing up my estimates following on the Minister's Salary because if we look at the Estimate Book we're dealing with salaries under Planning and Management, not statistics. I would like to help clear the member's mind if that is a major concern to him; the first release he is referring to was released by the Information Services of the government not directly from my office, the first release that he's referring to. Any discrepancy from the . . . there are two things basically happened. One is that the . . . and I have to also reiterate that they were projected figures which came from Stats Canada, they used a different formula than the year prior. The reason for the change from what Stats Canada put forward in figures as compared to what

ours were is the fact that Stats Canada did not add the projected payout of crop insurance or a provincial program such as that and that increased the amount, so that was the discrepancy which the member referred to. So I would hope that would clear it up. I do not think that to sit here and to debate projected figures which I don't think at this particular time when we're debating the specifics of Planning and Management salaries, that they're relevant to this particular case, and so I would let the member know that I would be prepared to fully respond in my summation of the comments that I will be making following the Estimates and I think he should understand that's a reasonable approach, that we are dealing with specifics at this particular time. The more general statements of projected incomes which he has referred to will in fact be dealt with following in my closing remarks. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is now indicating that it is not right to discuss these statistics. It appears that the Minister does not want to discuss these figures and he talks about this is a bad area to discuss because if we are dealing with Planning and Management, Mr. Chairman. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, those figures that he released led to some very, what one could say, very mistaken decisions made by industry officials who wanted to plan on the basis of what they expected agricultural incomes to be in Manitoba in the forthcoming year. Yet this minister, Mr. Chairman, now . . . What did he say, Mr. Chairman? He said No. 1, those figures were not released by his office; they were released by Information Services, Mr. Chairman. Does the Minister now say that he did not approve the release of those figures? It is quoted as he giving those figures. I want to ask the Minister specifically, did you or did you not approve the release that was issued in your name? You are quoted as giving those statistics. I want to know whether you released them or not. You're now trying to fudge. Mr. Chairman, not only that. Last December this Minister got up in this House and said if there is any difference in the numbers that were released they're the fault of Statistics Canada, Mr. Chairman. What is he saying today? He's saying something different, Mr. Chairman. I think the Minister should explain how did he arrive at those figures and should tell us, how did he arrive at those income figures? And I think in terms of Planning and Management, it is very clear, Mr. Chairman, that farmers, that agri-business, that industry officials want some kind of guidance from this government and this Minister which they really haven't received as to what the projections, what the state of farm economy is in Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister owes an explanation. He's trying to pass it off as some innocuous statement, Mr. Chairman. If he would have made one statement, one could have taken it for granted but he didn't; he did it two times in a period of two weeks and he increased those figures twice. I want to know where those figures come from, Mr. Chairman. I want some answers to the questions and the comments that he raised. He can't slough it off now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I acknowledge the Honourable Member for St. George. Might I just point out that

the item under discussion is Planning and Management and I would believe that the Planning and Management is for the Department of Agriculture under whose Estimates we're on and really the planning of other industries, other than the Department of Agriculture, would not really be the topic for discussion.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to appeal to you. Sir, to listen to the argument I have to put. Are you suggesting that industry, the farm chemical industry, the farm fertilizer industry, the farm machinery industry, rural businesses, do not depend on the incomes of farmers? Are you suggesting that those industries are not intent on planning what they should be purchasing, what kind of machinery they should be building for the coming year as to what kind of an economy the state of agriculture will be in Manitoba.

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

MR. DOWNEY: I think so, Mr. Chairman, I think the member has every right to challenge me as a Minister and as a member of government, but I do not think it's in the best interest of the committee for him to challenge your interpretation and I think it is not in good taste for this committee to stand for that kind of criticism of your judgment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: on the point of order, I really didn't accept the words from the Honourable Member for St. George as a point of criticism. I think it was just as a matter of explanation on my remarks and I accepted him in that regard. But again I would repeat that it is Planning and Management under the Department of Agriculture. I had allowed the previous discussion because I thought that there would be some preamble that was part of a preamble in this questioning.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, you're absolutely right. I am not challenging your remarks at all, Sir. Who I am challenging is the Minister of Agriculture. He puts out. Mr. Chairman, you have received a copy, you should take a look at that Annual Report, Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Agriculture Annual Report, Year '79-80. What is the first area that we are dealing with? We're dealing with farm incomes, Mr. Chairman — reorganization, first the reorganization, the Executive Directors of the department, the Executive Section — this is the area of the department which deals with the Executive Branch of the Department of Agriculture, Management Services and the like. Mr. Chairman, those figures, I want to ask the Minister and he has not replied. He can stall all he likes. I want to know first of all whether he approved the release of those two press releases that he now says came from Information Services quoting James Downey, Minister of Agriculture, announcing them. Did he approve those releases?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) — pass — the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, it appears that the Minister of Agriculture does not wish to answer. He's

afraid to stand up to his responsibility of the release of those figures. Either he did or he didn't. It's a very simple question, Mr. Chairman. It isn't a very hard question to answer whether he . . . —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is the Minister can answer; we are dealing with the administration of his department, Mr. Chairman. If the Minister can't even come up with some answers do you expect him to answer when he replies on his salary? He's not prepared to reply. If he's not prepared to reply now I venture to say that he will not reply then, Mr. Chairman. I want to know, Mr. Chairman, where did he receive those figures from Statistics Canada. I want this Minister to produce the catalogue, the page or whatever documents he's got to show me that those came from Statistics Canada, because he made those statements, and farmers and industry officials took those statements verbatim. I am told, Mr. Chairman, that some industry, and I will repeat it, what I said yesterday, some industries geared up to manufacture farm equipment on the basis of those figures, Mr. Chairman, they were doing some planning.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, they were led down the garden path. O—(Interjection)— Yes, in October, Mr. Chairman, the rains came. On October 31st, the rains came, the Member for Rock Lake said. The rains.

Mr. Chairman, this Minister had better own up to those figures because there is no doubt that his credibility is at stake. He has, and I want him to challenge me, I want him to show me where I am wrong and I am prepared to back off, Mr. Chairman, in terms of those figures. But I would want a reasonable, at least an explanation of some kind.

He now came out today and said, look, we made some of our own calculations. If that's what was done, let him say so. Let's hear what he has to say in terms of those calculations. How did they arrive at them? How did we work on them? And you know, where do we go? But I'd like to hear from the Minister.

Mr. Chairman, if the Minister didn't approve the press release, who did? And who is responsible in preparing it? Was it his Deputy? Was it the Assistant Deputy in charge of administration? Who prepared the statistics that he released to the farmers, the industry, the people of Manitoba on the agricultural income for 1980? You know, somebody had to put this thing together. I'd like to hear this Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I acknowledge the next speaker, the type of questioning that is going on at this time possibly might be better brought up under Clause 4, Agriculture Production Division, under the item (g) Communications Branch. I've been trying to follow the discussion and the Minister has not refused to answer at this time, but I would suggest that maybe that might be the best place to bring it under discussion, and it will be allowed under (g) Communications Branch.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we can leave it till then. Maybe the Minister will have a change of heart. But if you look at the outline — and I only use that on my discussions as compared to the way the presentation of the annual report has occurred, Mr. Chairman. The annual report pretty well follows the

outline of the estimates in terms of the various departments and branches of the Department of Agriculture. If you look at the agricultural report you will deal with Management Services, you will deal with Research, it follows in the way that the estimates are laid out for us. I don't mind. I can make a then. But if you look at the two and compare them, the layout is the same, virtually the same, and where do the statistics on income come? Right at the beginning, sir, right under Management Services, right under the Executive Directors of the department. They fall right within that section of the Annual Report and when you compare the layout in terms of presentation of the Annual Report and the Estimates I would have to say, Mr. Chairman, if you look at them, they almost follow as the saying is *mutatis mutandis*, the same way.

That's the only reason that I've raised these comments because that's when they come out. I could, if you wish, sir, leave them for another time, but I've only used that format so that I don't get into an argument later on, indicating that look, you had a chance to discuss it on a previous section and you missed it and I'm following the format of both the Report and the Estimates. And where do they come in the annual report? Right at the beginning under Management Services, General Administration section, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not about to limit any of the discussion at all and when the time comes you would certainly be allowed to bring it up for discussion at that time.

MR. URUSKI: So where, Mr. Chairman, are you indicating that this should be discussed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I was trying to follow the debate quite closely and it was under what I would consider Communications where there was a misunderstanding on Communications and I was suggesting that under Item (g) Communications Branch. The Minister has suggested another item. I am not sure, I'm looking for a little direction mainly because I'm not that well versed on Agriculture. I'm trying to follow the procedure by what I see in the book.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I indicated earlier, I did make a statement on it and said I would fully explain it. I felt I've already explained it today. I think the Member for St. George is trying to blow up something that is really not here because we're just talking of projected figures that aren't in any way, as far as the department are concerned or the management of the ongoing operations, anything to do with the specific details that we're dealing with. I said I would deal with it in my Minister's Salary in my remarks at that time. If he wants to be stubborn or belligerent or whatever and stick to it at this time I'm quite prepared to listen to him, but I do think, I have said I would deal with it, I have explained what the difficulties are, they are projections, and I think if we were to get on with doing this, at any point if he wants to continue debating it would be fine, but more appropriately as I suggested, in the closing remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: You see, Mr. Chairman, we do have a problem and a disagreement. You would like to pick a section further on, and I'm amenable to that, but the Minister is not amenable to that. He would like to discuss it on his Salary when the detailed seeking of information cannot be sought, Mr. Chairman, the officials will be out of the House. The officials who were responsible for preparing those estimates will be away. It will be the Minister and I, and then it will be simply an argument that the Minister would like to put forward, simply an argument of your figures against mine, Mr. Chairman. It's not his figures against mine, Mr. Chairman; I want to know the development of those figures, who developed them, where they got them, because, Mr. Chairman, we can go right into it if he wishes to discuss it. I will point out the case to you, Mr. Chairman, so that you would know exactly what has happened, and I will start from the beginning.

Mr. Chairman, on October 16th of 1980 the Minister of Agriculture — and I will read the entire press release that he issued for the record, sir, to know what figures he did use, or at least that he was quoted as using. He indicated, Mr. Chairman, that the 1980 estimate of realized net farm income is \$348 million compared — that's right, it's an estimate, Mr. Chairman, that's what we are talking about — compared with \$341.1 million in 1979. In a recent release the '79 figure was inadvertently transposed so that it wrongly showed \$431.8 million. Gross farm income also is up in 1980, standing at an estimated 1.430 billion, compared with 1.3175 billion in 1979. While operating costs were also higher, 1.82 billion this year compared with 975.7 million in '79, net farm income was still able to show an increase over 1979. That's the point he was making, Mr. Chairman. Sales of farm stored grain in the first half of 1980 helped boost both gross and net farm incomes for the year. Manitoba agricultural officials indicate that there have been changes since StatsCan figures were released and they anticipate that the final 1980 farm income figures could be higher than currently projected. That's StatsCan figures.

And then when he used the realized net farm income of October 16th, two weeks later he issued another press release, Mr. Chairman, and what did this press release indicate? It indicated Manitoba's net farm income picture for 1980, is expected to be the best ever with farmers' earnings expected to reach 410 million after expenses, Agriculture Minister Jim Downey has announced. And the title of it is, 1980 Net Farm Income to Set New Records. We'll likely exceed 1979 levels by 20.1 percent. As the Minister says, they were just estimates. But let's look at the figures that were quoted, Mr. Chairman. When he compared the expenses of 1980 and 1979, he indicated that the 1980 expenses were 1.430 billion, while when we look at the StatsCan figures of farm operating expenses from '78 to '81, for 1980 the farm expenses are shown as to roughly — okay, there are two — he used 1.400.8 million and the expenses that were used in the StatsCan, there was a \$30 million difference in terms of the gross income. And in '79, Mr. Chairman, he used the figure 1.317.5 million, which was the same as in the July report of StatsCanada. So those figures are basically the same. Except the net farm income that he quoted is

up 30 million from the StatsCan figure of the July report. So this is where he got the 30 million. Those are his figures but not StatsCanada figures.

Now let's look at the expense side. Mr. Chairman, for '79 he quoted an expense figure of 975.7, same as the July report, as shown. And for 1980 he quoted a figure of 1,000,082,000, same figure as the July report. The only difference, Mr. Chairman, was the income figure, the \$30 million difference. So there's been a change from the figures that were presented by Stats Canada.

Now let's go to the end of October where he used, to 1980, Mr. Chairman, the figures that he used, the October 31st figures, he used as an income figures to reach \$1.476 billion and the StatsCan figure for July of 1980 was one billion, 383.9. This is where the difference in figures comes in and we want to know who changed the figures and where do those figures come. The expense figures and everything else was the same as presented by Stats Canada and they were estimates, Mr. Chairman, so somebody had to change the figures. Somebody had to make a change, but, Mr. Chairman, the figure that Stats Canada gives for 1980 is a realized net income of not 410 million as the Minister shows but a realized net income of 279 million, Mr. Chairman. Even if they used the more optimistic figures of the July report of \$318 million that Stats Canada showed, which was a decline from '79, it's still a \$90 million of net income difference, Mr. Chairman. Where do those figures come from? It's 25 percent in income difference.

You know you could say that if you were out four or five percent we could be talking to the wind. The Minister could tell us, look, we're only out a few percentage points, you're out in left field Mr. Chairman. The fact of the matter is, we're out 25 percent. If we use the figures that they use in terms of expenses and income based on the July farm outlook Canada Statistics, we're out 90 million bucks, Mr. Chairman. \$90 million on a \$300 million income figure, you figure it out yourself, what that kind of figure represents. That is a myth, a gross misrepresentation of the facts, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has doctored up the figures.

So he wants to get into an argument, Mr. Chairman, he has presented a picture of false hope to the industry, to the economy of Manitoba. A false hope. Mr. Chairman, that can only lead to a government, can only point to a government, and a Minister who really doesn't know what is happening, is prepared to mislead the public of Manitoba, is prepared not to come clean with the farmers of Manitoba. He is telling them, look, fellows, you are better off than you think you are. That's what he's really saying to the farmers of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers of Manitoba are not that stupid. Mr. Chairman, they are in a desperate position, but the words of hope that this Minister has given to the agricultural sector in Manitoba, and it relates to the entire rural community, is that there is a boom because of the vast increase, when actually the reverse is true.

But we want to know where those figures came from. If the Minister now is prepared to say that, look, we made some kind of projections. That's fine, I want to hear it. I want to hear what kind of an explanation he has. Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Let me tell the Member for St. George that I have promised I would wind up with this part in my concluding remarks, but I think it would be better to set the record straight right at this particular time. I do have to stand up in defence of the farmers of Manitoba when the Member for St. George refers to them as being stupid. Now that to me is not to be tolerated. The Member for St. George says the farmers of Manitoba are stupid. I cannot stand here or sit here and take that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for St. George on a point of order.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated I have said that the farmers of Manitoba are stupid. I said the farmers of Manitoba are not stupid, it's the Minister who is stupid in terms of the remarks that he has made.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

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

MR. ENNS: I can't tolerate my colleague, my Minister of Agriculture being called stupid by the Member for St. George.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I do apologize for that kind of terminology being used in the committee. I think that this Chamber deserves more parliamentary-type language than that, and that was the point I was raising, as well as the Member for St. George referring to the outstanding citizens of the farm community in such a way.

I would like to make a point and I will make this, Mr. Chairman, very plain, that the press release that he refers to of October 16 did not come out under my name. It came out from Information Services and it states right in it, which he is misleading again this Committee, it says that Stats Canada statistics show, it did not come out from under my name. When he refers to the end of October press release, or the change, Mr. Chairman, that comes from what Stats Canada said the income figures would be, with the addition was the projected crop insurance payout which Stats Canada did not take into account and that was added on. There is no secret that the initial estimated payout would be in the neighbourhood of \$100 million and that was added to the figures. Today it has been reduced somewhat. He used the figure of 90 million. I am sure that he read press reports that didn't come out under my name, but he read press reports in the front page of the Free Press, those kind of figures, if he wants to do his statistical research and do it properly, instead of trying to mislead the Committee.

I am saying, Mr. Chairman, they were projected figures. I can explain them; I will explain them; I think I have explained them; and I think we would be best advised for the best interests of the public's money

in debating the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture if we got on with that debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Okay, let's deal with what he has said, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, he has said that the October 16 release was not issued under his name. That is correct, Mr. Chairman, that's correct, but it was a release. The agricultural officials, is he not the Minister of Agriculture? But you see, that's not where the problem occurred on October 16. That was just the beginning. There was a \$30 million increase over the estimated income figures, so then they knew, Mr. Chairman, if the difference in income was crop insurance payouts, let's deal with that, because, Mr. Chairman, as he said, that was the mistake or the error was the crop insurance payout. Now if they knew that the crop insurance payout would be less, Mr. Chairman, why then two weeks later did the Minister indicate that the income would be even higher than the October 16 figures? They were up by \$90 million or up by 60 million of the ones that were released on October 16, which he indicates were not released by him, of which I presume he is responsible for.

But not only that, Mr. Chairman, they knew that the crop insurance payouts would not be as high certainly by that point in time, because they already knew by November and the Minister announced it — I will deal with that, Mr. Chairman — the Minister announced that the drought aid bill would already be 50 percent less than estimated. So they knew, they had to know that the crop insurance payout would not be quite as high, so let the Minister not indicate, not get up in this House, and tell me that at the end of October we already didn't know what the payouts would be when they were already talking about the drought bill being 50 percent less than estimated, \$20 million that's what the Minister talked about. Mr. Chairman, that's who the Minister has indicated and he indicated on the 5th of November, Mr. Chairman, to the Winnipeg Free Press, so he knew then. Now let's find out where those figures came from, how did he arrive at those figures. If he suggests that those figures were not released under his name, under whose name were they released, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) pass — the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, it appears that the Minister will not answer, but is he now prepared to at least admit that he released the figures of an additional \$90 million over the projected income.

You see, Mr. Chairman, what I'm interested in is that the Stats Canada figures have been doctored. They used the same expenses, they used all the same figures that Stats Canada put out in July, but they changed the income figure by \$90 million, Mr. Chairman. You know, the Minister can dodge that all he wants; he has led industry officials, farmers, on a course of indicating that the economy will be better than it's been and he has misled them, Mr. Chairman.

If he now says that he did not prepare those figures, whose head is on the chopping block? Who's

going to be the scapegoat for producing those figures, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister? Who is he going to fire? Who is he going to fire? Is he going to fire the Director of News Services for making an error? But the problem is, Mr. Chairman, is that under his name the error tripled, because under the October 16th issue there was a \$30 million difference, but it worsened, Mr. Chairman, under his signature. Jim Downey announced \$410 million, it was even better than October 16th. So who is going to be fired now, Mr. Chairman? The Minister obviously.

I said that yesterday to the Premier, if the Minister doesn't know, we could have forgiven him for Year One and Year Two but, Mr. Chairman, Year Three and Year Four, his time is up, so what is he doing? When we've had general declines of farm income in rural Manitoba over the whole three years of agriculture in Manitoba under the Conservative regime, what is he prepared to do? He's prepared to doctor the books, Mr. Chairman. He has doctored the books, Mr. Chairman, to make things look better than they are, to bring about false hopes, Mr. Chairman, because there were false hopes.

I want some of the members to at least defend this Minister, but I don't think anybody is prepared to. They're pretty well ashamed to defend the types of figures and the announcement that he has made, Mr. Chairman. That's what this Minister has done — falsified the figures, cooked the books, because they are desperate, Mr. Chairman, there's going to be an election. —(Interjection)— Yes, the Minister of Government Services indicates — I don't know what he wants. He wants to at least give people the impression that what I have said is untrue. If it is untrue, please I'm waiting for the Minister to get up and tell us.

Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister of Agriculture is prepared to now table the documents where he reworked the figures that he doctored up. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, he hasn't shown this Committee or anyone how he came up with the analysis, because when he talked about crop insurance, Mr. Chairman, it's not believable. The fact of the matter is it's not believable. When he spoke that it was the crop insurance payouts were used in these figures, when we knew already in November he talked about half of the drought aid program not being used, Mr. Chairman. So they knew that the expenditures weren't that high. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, that's the point, where are they better? Whose figures are you using? You got up in the House in December, Mr. Chairman, and I asked you not on one occasion, I asked you on several occasions, and what did the Minister say? He said if there's any error in the figures that's Stats Canada's fault, that's their responsibility. So who did he shove it on? On Stats Canada. Now he shoves it on Information Services, and who's he going to blame in the third instance, Mr. Chairman? The Minister better come clean, indicate —(Interjection)— Yes, maybe he'd like to blame the Opposition for cooking his books and cooking his statistics. Isn't that nice, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister should, let him bring out how they've arrived the figures. If they only redid the income figures, why did they accept Stats Canada expense figures, Mr. Chairman? Why did

they accept the inventory changes and the like, Mr. Chairman? Why did they accept practically all the figures that they quoted from Stats Canada except one — the realized net income, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister, he can get up in this House all he wants and indicate that I'm dragging out a red herring, Mr. Chairman. He has, Mr. Chairman, led industry officials, the farming community, into a sense of false hope and total inaccuracy, Mr. Chairman, and I would say that industry officials in the province who looked at those figures and then came to the realization that the Minister was wrong because of other figures that they could have received and figures that Stats Canada gave.

Mr. Chairman, originally I didn't believe that that was the case so what did I do? I called Stats Canada. I called them in Ottawa just to make sure that the questions that I was raising weren't going to be misleading, that maybe I had my figures wrong. Mr. Chairman, I received a letter from the Farm Income and Prices Section of Agricultural Statistics Division of Stats Canada, Mr. Chairman. I have a letter on file and I have the documents that they put out for the period, and in my discussion on the telephone, the statistician indicated that the figures that we put out are here, and he sent them to me, and I have the figures here, and he said if there are other figures someone else had to bring them forward, that was their own calculation. That's fine, Mr. Chairman. If the department made their own calculation let's see, but you see the problem is that they used everything else of Statistics Canada except one figure. That's the problem.

The Minister got up last December and said that if there's any problems with those figures that I gave, they were the problems of Statistics Canada. He hasn't come clean, Mr. Chairman, because he's trying to beat around the bush; he's trying to pawn off responsibility onto someone else that is his and of his own doing. Talk about political tinkering, Mr. Chairman, this Minister has falsified records.

Mr. Chairman, you know if somebody in the Accounting Branch were to falsify records, Mr. Chairman, they would have been fired long ago, and this Minister can sit here and indicate yes, well it's okay if I tinkered with income statements, it didn't mean anything. But, Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister doesn't realize it meant more to industry, to small businesses in rural Manitoba on the figures that he's presented, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) pass — the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, okay I'll leave that for now. Since the Minister does not want to answer I'll leave that; he doesn't want to deal with the question.

Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate in terms of his staff in the department, if he has — I'm sure the staff has — the numbers of directors, and his Deputy and Assistant Deputy Ministers that are there presently and how many were there in the department when they took office? Could he give me those figures?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I can't immediately give how many were when I was in office, but they are the same as the estimates, or the numbers we

are dealing are the same as last year in this particular appropriation.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I know they are the same as last year. Mr. Chairman, can the Minister provide those figures? I am sure the staff has those figures in terms of — it would be a matter of memories in terms of — I don't want the names, Mr. Chairman. I am not after the names, I am really after the numbers of directors and Assistant Deputy Ministers and the like and how they have changed if he has those numbers.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I can provide those for the member but I haven't got them at my fingertips right now.

MR. URUSKI: I am assuming that it will not be difficult for the Minister after we come back after supper at 8 o'clock to have those figures. I would hope that he would be able to have them then. Do I understand that is a possibility, Mr. Chairman? At 8 o'clock, will that be a problem for the Minister to have them, at 8 o'clock?

MR. DOWNEY: You'll have it tomorrow.

MR. URUSKI: That's fine.

MR. DOWNEY: Or as soon as they are available.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that's the way it's been for a couple of years. We asked for a number of items, and I haven't gone into that, a number of items that the Minister promised to bring forward to the members of this committee. Mr. Chairman, there were questions and if the Minister wants me to get into that I will but he hasn't lived up to the commitments that he made to members of the committee even going back a couple of years if I check the record. I started checking last year's record and there is a number of pieces of information that the Minister promised to bring forward and did not, Mr. Chairman, so I don't want to let him off the hook in terms of the numbers that I would like him to present for us. Is there a problem?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on those numbers, I think I can have them provided by this evening, I'll do my best. If not, tomorrow morning.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In dealing with the area of Planning and Management, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister, in the Annual Report there is a section in terms of where the Minister in his goals for program development indicated a section dealing with development of an infrastructure that offers greater freedom for producers to expand their production and markets, Mr. Chairman. I would like the Minister to outline for us what moves they made in this area and what is the Minister and really talking about in terms of development of an infrastructure? What is he talking about? Is he talking about the rapeseed home study with respect to the whole matter of rapeseed? What other areas are they really . . . what kind of an infrastructure are they really talking about for producers to expand their production and markets, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not just clear on what the member is referring to but I thought we could probably deal with that in the marketing division when we get to discussing that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not that I want to take any of the questions or answers, I thought that the question really was referring to sort of a general outlook rather than specifically in Clause 6.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Under the heading in the Annual Report of Program Development, Mr. Chairman, and that deals with the Minister's office and general administration, where we are generally discussing, other than the Minister's salary, there is a paragraph, and I'll read it to him, amongst other paragraphs. I'll read to him. "Manitoba agriculture program activity is developed in consultation with producers, researchers, and agribusiness. Programs and policies have been set within four principle guidelines. These guidelines established in August of 1978 are" — and I'll give the one that I'm — because I basically don't disagree with any of the other guidelines but I would like a bit more understanding and a bit more explanation as to how his government and his department views. "Development of an infrastructure that offers greater freedom for producers to expand their production and markets." I would like the Minister to elaborate and if he could indicate what kind of a thrust that has been and how has that been achieved in terms of two and a half years, because obviously it was August of 1978 when those kind of guidelines were brought in as a general thrust of the new government in terms of agriculture policy. I would like to see and ask the Minister what areas are we talking about; what areas have we dealt with and how those policies — and when he explains them, then I'll have a better idea — have led to the greater freedom for producers to expand production and markets.

MR. DOWNEY: If the member is concerned about the type of program, I have indicated in my opening statement as of yesterday in a general way the type of work that I think we can do to enlarge on in a broad statement, enlarge on the work that is being done or could be done to develop markets for agricultural commodities in Manitoba. I will make available, I have them at my desk and I have them for committee members, copies of a report done by Dr. Gilson on the basic framework and I will distribute those or have them distributed now if one of the members would get the copies for me. But as a basic example that I can use that we have been working towards and that is the development of the processing plant and the work that's being done in research to help promote such a plant to crush the products grown in Manitoba to be processed in Manitoba whether it be sunflowers or whether it be rapeseed by contract; that type of work, and I think that is being demonstrated with the development of the new crushing plant and processing plant at Harrowby, Manitoba, with the contracting, I say with the contracting of, I think of some 2,000 or 3,000 additional producers in that area that is going to be serviced by that plant. So I think it is being demonstrated there that there is a tremendous

increase in economic development in Manitoba as well as in the western or eastern side of Saskatchewan with some of the policies and some of the developments that have taken place.

I could be critical at this time but I think in the best interests of not getting into a harangue with the Member for St. George, because I would like to reserve this debate until the Member for Brandon East is here, unlike some of the developments that we saw take place during their time in government when it came to promoting crushing plants for farmers in Manitoba. We lost in fact several years and several millions of dollars through their dogmatic approach to the whole marketing and movement of product and processing. I guess I could refer to it as the Kraft plant, but as I say I would like to have the Member for Brandon East here so he could get the full benefit of the things that I have to say.

But to get back to basic question, the report that I am about to distribute has not been adopted but it has got some basic working guidelines that we will be looking at and be prepared to discuss in the coming weeks on the development of an export or in fact a domestic marketing instrument that would help the producers in Manitoba, and I do have copies that I will distribute to the members opposite. That is some of the work that is being done and I think it is an appropriate time to assess the report and to look at new and other ways of supporting the farmers in Manitoba.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Certainly I welcome the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture in this area. I am just not sure how the Minister can interpret or at least explain the word greater freedom in terms of producers to expand their production and markets. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, the construction of a — and he has given us one example of a rapeseed crushing plant in Manitoba — gives a greater opportunity for an expansion of existing markets, Mr. Chairman, and that is the third Tory policy in Agriculture. One can probably put it half way in between if one wants to discuss it but certainly the greater freedom for producers, Mr. Chairman, I want to know how that policy has assisted hog producers in terms of gaining a better income, which really in our society is one way of measuring as to how farmers operate, whether they stay in business and really how free they are, Mr. Chairman. With respect to cattle, with respect to the beef industry, what kind of freedoms has the Minister and his government developed for the beef industry now faced with some decline in prices, hopefully in a short run, but in the short run, Mr. Chairman, that possibly there may be call, Mr. Chairman, if it's prolonged for some income stabilization. It seems to me that the stabilization plan that was in effect has now been thrown out the window like the baby with the bath water and there is no avenue of stabilization. He planned that the Minister is now going to Ottawa and saying we should have stabilization — he's thrown one out, Mr. Chairman. How has the greater freedoms . . .

The other point that I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman, if you recall in 1979, I believe it was 1979, 1978 or 1979 when the Conservatives brought in the amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act and the Minister indicated — that dealt with the hens and chickens situation where the Minister said these chicken and eggs —(Interjection)— and the

Minister indicated that this amendment would bring more freedom to producers in the egg business, Mr. Chairman. While the Minister kept saying freedom, what did his department say under his name, Mr. Chairman? The amendments also introduced production controls for layer pullets and laying hens. How do those statements, Mr. Chairman, follow in such great contradiction to what the Minister tried to let the public of Manitoba believe that he was doing something great to deregulate the industry when in fact it was admitted by his own department that they were controls?

In the other area of freedom, Mr. Chairman, freedom in terms of the poultry industry, the turkey producers, now the turkey producers of Manitoba — and it was under his greatest insistence that when he signed the chicken broiler marketing agreement that it be open, that Manitoba be open to expansion of markets and it would only be signed that there would be a guarantee that producers could look forward to an expansion in markets. What happened in the turkey industry, Mr. Chairman? That same Minister who went out and said that we should have more freedom in terms of production rights agreed, he agreed, by his non-interference that population should be taken into account in setting national quotas in the poultry market, with great implications, Mr. Chairman, on the industry, especially on the Province of Manitoba, which province in this country has historically been an exporting province in terms of its commodities. It was welcomed, Mr. Chairman, by the Province of Alberta who he was really building up, because the Province of Alberta threatened to get out of national marketing if they didn't get a bigger slice, Mr. Chairman, and it just fell right into the hands of the Province of Ontario and Quebec. We have it now, Mr. Chairman, we have the treasuries of Ontario and Quebec, and I hope the Minister — I will question him on it later — will deal with the area, and I'm raising it now so he'd know that we will want some information on what kind of programming goes on in terms of assistance to hog producers and cattle producers in Ontario and Quebec, and what impact it really will have should this province ultimately go into a national marketing agreement. Because Mr. Chairman, there is no way that we will be able to sustain production and markets in Manitoba with what is going on in eastern Canada.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lac du Bonnet raised it as well. It has great implications and has been raised by the hog producers themselves on the processing industry in our province with respect to the numbers of hogs that have to be shipped out of this province every week, that the packing houses are not picking them up for some reason, Mr. Chairman. For some reason the packing houses aren't picking up, what is it, close to 2,000 hogs a week? 5,000 hogs a week, Mr. Chairman, the Minister puts up his hand. So that is of great long-term importance, I believe, to the producers what the government's position is with respect to that industry.

That's the kind of information that we would like to have from the Minister, how he has dealt with, how his government has brought about a greater freedom for producers to expand their production and markets. There is no argument, and one can

indicate, one of the areas that they have embarked on, I want to give the Minister credit in the one area, and that's dealing with the Agro Manitoba agreements in terms of looking at some specific crop areas and doing and assisting in much needed research, but that certainly, Mr. Chairman, does not ultimately or at the present time guarantee or assist farmers as to what their income situation is going to be, and that's really what it's all about. How free are the farmers of Manitoba when they are faced with huge interest rates, with a huge debt load, high energy costs and the like. How are they going to survive and what freedoms have they got by the policies of this government?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) pass — The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (PETE) ADAM: Just the one comment on that particular reference in the Annual Report 1979 where it does say Greater Freedom for Producers to Expand their Production in the Markets, and I think the connotation there, the wording, the word "freedom" is not the proper word that should have been used, it should have been opportunity. That would have been a better word to put in that particular area. Greater opportunity for producers to expand their production in markets, but the Conservatives and the government is so hung up on that word "freedom", which sometimes their ideas just work in the opposite direction, and we have evidence of that.

What's happening in the province today, many of their policies don't act to give more freedom to people, but rather to restrict their options. We have a classic example on the land-lease program. It's a classic example right there where producers were taken, one freedom was removed from them and it is now compulsory if they want to own land that they have to buy it. They have to pay for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) pass — The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Could the Minister indicate, in terms of the department, what work is being done with respect to the — he may want to discuss it elsewhere, expansion of markets in the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, I'm interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We are now under Private Members' Hour. The first item of business on today's agenda is Resolution No. 1.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — RECOVERY OF ONE DEFAULTED PAY PERIOD

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Rouge that:

WHEREAS a problem exists whereby employees have difficulty in recovering wages from employers who become bankrupt or insolvent;

AND WHEREAS the employees are unable to take practical steps to protect themselves from the loss of these wages;

AND WHEREAS it is in the general interests of society that employees do not experience undue hardship and loss because of having worked without receiving their pay;

AND WHEREAS there presently exists within the public realm a readily available administrative mechanism whereby employees can be offered reasonable protection at a minimum of cost;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the government consider the advisability of taking such procedures as would enable employees to recover one defaulted pay period as a compensable claim from the Workmen's Compensation fund, and that the fund be able to recover any payment from the defaulting employer.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to express my appreciation to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge for being a seconder for this motion. I did have another seconder who is not present here today' but I do want to express my appreciation to the honourable member, particularly, Mr. Speaker, because I acknowledged last year that I would not second her motions except on procedural matters because I felt that to do so would be to some way harm my New Democratic Party colleagues. The situation has changed whereby, Mr. Speaker, I now realize that the solicitude that I had does not go in both directions and therefore I have indicated to my friend that I will second motions that she makes which I either agree with or have no substantial objection to, so that they can be debated on the floor. I believe that she has given me that courtesy and I want to acknowledge that she has been the bigger person of the two of us in this particular exchange, and I say that without hesitation. (Interjection)— I knew you would agree with that. Oh, the next one. I never would expect, Mr. Speaker, somebody to second something which they disagree with. I find it unusual that people will not second something which they do agree with because of the person who happens to be moving it.

I heard words from the Leader of the Opposition not more than a month ago, where he said that the government was to be condemned because they refused an amendment because of the person who was making it, which happened to be the Member for St. Johns. I also heard the Member for St. Johns say that he wants the widest discussion on certain questions involving the Constitution, so I think, Mr. Speaker, it's worthwhile to indicate to you that the Member for Fort Rouge has my appreciation for the

accommodation which she has made for me in this respect and I expect, Mr. Speaker, that she is fully in accord with the resolution that I am proposing because with all due modesty, I think it is a good resolution. I don't think it's the end-all, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is a bigger improvement, and I have to say this as criticism of myself and my colleagues, a bigger improvement than anything we were able to think of when we were in the government.

Because, Mr. Speaker, I really believe, even though I think that the Conservatives are wrong, and I think that I do as much as anybody in this House to show how wrong they are, I believe I do it as effectively. I don't believe that they want employees to lose wages that they have worked for. I believe that they think that sometimes the remedies that are proposed will hurt other people, but I don't think that they want employees to lose wages. I propose this resolution with the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that everybody in this House accepts the fact that it is the most pathetic experience, and I am one, Mr. Speaker, who is more acquainted with it than most members of this Chamber because the people come to me, and have come to me for the last 25 years with the fact that they have worked a week, that they have been virtually under the command, reasonable command in some cases, unreasonable in other cases, and bidding of another human being and have devoted their labour to that person for a period of two weeks and at the end of that two weeks when they were promised a payment, they got an NSF cheque.

Mr. Speaker, I had one yesterday. This particular case wouldn't happen to apply to him, but I had one yesterday, and I can assure you that I have had them through the ages, and therefore nobody can look with anything but good on the motivation of the previous Minister of Labour, the Member for Transcona, who said that he was going to solve this problem by seeing to it that the employer, if he had property, would be required to have that property go first to the employees and then to a person who happened to advance money on that property, that the employees would be a creditor prior to a secured mortgagee. And I was one of the people who voted for that because I was perplexed with the problem. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the people who voted against removing it last year because nobody had found another solution, but that doesn't mean, Mr. Speaker, that that particular solution wasn't fraught with difficulty, because it did, in the last analysis, make somebody responsible for wages who was an innocent party, and just so innocent is not so far-fetched, Mr. Speaker.

A client in my constituency, in the Inkster constituency, who could sell his house to a builder for \$50,000 and take back a mortgage for 45 and hope to live on the principal and interest in semi-retirement, that builder — or it doesn't even have to be a builder, it could be somebody who then sells it to a builder, it doesn't even have to be the person he sold it to — could then hire 50 employees, miss out one payment of wages, and my client's rights under the house that they sold are extinguished, because the wages come before the mortgage. And somebody say, well, it'll never happen. I said, well what do you do when it does happen, because it's not far-fetched. (Interjection)— My friend says it

doesn't happen. I'm worried because it can happen.

MR. DESJARDINS: I said why do you worry if it's not going to happen then?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my friend says, why do I worry when it's not going to happen, because I say that it very reasonably could happen. That's exactly what I heard. —(Interjection)— He will explain it to me after.

It is the same thing, Mr. Speaker, as if a couple who had a fund of money and wanted to advance it, an elderly couple, and advanced it on the security of a mortgage and then the same thing happened to that person. Now I know that many people think, if a guy owns money on a mortgage, he's got a big building and that the building is what is attached but that's not the way it was worded. And despite the fact that it didn't create what I consider to be real problems in the years, it wasn't a good solution if a better one comes along. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what is staring us in the face is a better solution, much better from every point of view, because even when it's the mortgages it doesn't work fast, you have to sell the house, you have to get your recovery after the house is sold, or the property, and it could take months, it could take years. The solution that is suggested here, Mr. Speaker, in my view, the beauty of it is that it doesn't add to the bureaucracy and anything that doesn't add to the bureaucracy and works, is something that should be looked at very carefully.

The Workmen's Compensation Board covers, virtually, 80 to 90 percent of the employees in the Province of Manitoba. They are all presently on rolls. No new lists have to be made. All of it is now assembled. As a matter of fact the Workmen's Compensation Board has been used, that is administrative agency, where they are not on the roll. That is with regard to the compensation per victims of criminal offences. But in this case, Mr. Speaker, virtually 80 percent of the people would be covered and I say that the ones that are defaulting — and the interesting thing is that somebody from the Labour Department told me that we are talking about figures which are probably less than \$25,000 a year — which wouldn't even affect the premiums because it's within the plus or minus area of the millions that are disbursed. But if someone says that the employer should not have to subsidize the defaulting employee, Mr. Speaker, that can be handled within this resolution and probably is right, it shouldn't be the employers, it should be all of us and therefore, the amount could be charged every year out of provincial revenues to the Workmen's Compensation Board on the basis of payment of.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this would be an easy system. The worker who was not paid goes over to the Workmen's Compensation Board, the same as if he injured himself; he files a claim, the Workmen's Compensation Board, having the records or having them available to them, pays the claim and then if there is recovery, it's the Workmen's Compensation Board who should recover.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I consider this particular mechanism to be so useful and to be able to operate so expeditiously, that I wouldn't limit it to Manitoba and the bureaucracy would be even less. It should be

payable under, not Workmen's Compensation but Unemployment Insurance. Two weeks, or one pay period unworked should be payable under Unemployment Insurance and then it would apply to everybody in Canada. But the way of starting it, Mr. Speaker, — and I can't propose it for Canada but I can propose it for the consideration of the government here — is to do it through the Province of Manitoba.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have put in a feature which I think should be there — I say one pay period — or at least the moment that the person knows that he is not being paid, because if a person gets paid on a Thursday for a week which ended on a Friday, then he should be able to claim for every day that he worked — not merely for the loss of pay but for also the loss between the date of the pay period and the date that he does get paid — from the Workmen's Compensation Board. But, Mr. Speaker, he should not get more. I mean, I'm not saying that he shouldn't be able to get more from his employer, but an employee should not — and I say that he hurts himself, he hurts his family and he hurts us generally — if he continues to work when he knows that his employer is not paying him and therefore, there should be something in this form of relief, which operates as an immediate remedy to the state when they find out that an employer has got people on the payroll and is using their services and is not paying them. That's why I stipulate one pay period, Mr. Speaker, because I don't want employees to continue to work for an employer who ceases to pay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose this for the consideration of the government. I cannot word this resolution except in an abstract form because I do not happen to have a message from His Honour to do so. But I strongly urge the members of this House, including the members of the New Democratic Party and the members of the government, to not wait long, because the difficulty that we are talking about occurs; and although it may occur in small numbers, the hurt and the impact to the person that it does occur, is very very weighty and we should be thinking of that impact. It's himself or herself and their children and the debts that they have to pay, and I sometimes have difficulty with my Conservative friends, particularly the rural ones, when we talk about urban workers and urban poverty as distinct from rural poverty.

Urban poverty and urban problems with respect to income, are far more serious than rural ones. The fact is that most urban pay cheques are disbursed before they are received, that everybody is living on the next pay cheque, and if the next pay cheque is not there they cannot pay their rent, they cannot pay for their accounts, they cannot pay their utilities and they cannot pay other things. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that a great many more urban people have such problems than have rural people — and I'm not saying that because I would have any less sympathy for rural problems — but the rural farmer who doesn't get this year's crop, he has a very serious problem, I'm not saying that he doesn't, but it generally does not involve him being evicted from his flat or thrown out of his home. Somehow he's able to maintain himself until the next year. I'm not saying that he has it easy but the intensity of the problem, there is no comparison.

To have to live with the hope that my pay the next two weeks will pay for the bills that are outstanding today and if it doesn't happen, those bills remain unpaid, is a situation in which numerous urban employees find themselves in and that's what happens when he loses his pay cheque and that's why we in society, should say that we consider one pay cheque as compensable. We don't say that the rest should not be recovered but we urge the employee to tell us immediately that he is working for someone who does not honour his pay cheque. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would urge strongly upon all of the members of the Chamber, that they adopt this resolution because I feel that it is an improvement over the one that we had previously and it is an immense improvement over nothing, which is what we have now. I mean, my criticism of the Minister last year is that he came in and talked about the problem, repealed the legislation and didn't put anything in. So right now there is virtually no protection and I think there should be speedy protection.

I think that the Minister, who I'm sorry is not here, should be acting on this immediately and I believe that he can administrate it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First I would like to address some of my comments to some of the thoughts that were put forward by the Member for Inkster in regard to the motivation of the government last year, to bring in the type of amendments which they brought forward, which in fact as he has so aptly demonstrated, does remove any sort of protection from working people, in the event of a closure of a business because they are insolvent or unable economically to continue their operation.

When he says that the Conservatives don't want employees to lose their wages, he is absolutely correct. Nobody in their right mind wants anybody to lose their wages. Nobody wants to see that happen. But that was not the choice that confronted the Conservatives last year. The choice that confronted them last year was one of priority. If somebody is going to lose money, whom should that be? Should it be the wage earner who has wages owing to them or should it be the financiers and the financial backers, who have money owing to them for having forwarded the money in the first place? And when they made that choice, they in fact said that the wage earner should have a lower priority than should others involved in the promotion of that enterprise.

I also have to address my remarks to the concept of innocent third parties being hurt and he says in fact that could have happened under the legislation as was developed by the New Democratic Party and perhaps it could. But the fact is, that we have challenged the Attorney-General. We have challenged anyone to bring forward one concrete example of that having happened. Now that does not address the issue that the Member for Inkster brought forward and you will note that he could not bring forward a concrete example of that having happened. He could say that in fact it may happen and because it might happen, he is concerned. Well,

I share that concern with him and I think the point is a valid point and I would suggest that the legislation, as it was, could have been reviewed in order to take that into account and would not have stripped the workers of their priority, so we're both in agreement. He says that we're in agreement and we are in agreement on the —(Interjection)— yes, he did and he spoke against it and very ably so and he said much the same things that he's saying today. But the fact is, that the Tories voted for it and they brought it forward and I don't think we should let them escape out from under that action.

So there is good reason for the resolution which the Member for Inkster has brought forward. It is because of the ill-advised actions of a callous government that wants to place, and goes about placing, corporations, money lenders, banks and financiers, before the interests of the working people who labour for a wage. We had that argument last year. I think the argument was valid then. I think the argument is valid this year. The fact is, that is why the Member for Inkster has chosen, or at least without trying to impute motives onto him, that is why I believe that the Member for Inkster has brought forward this resolution.

We should not be surprised, by the way, at the posture of the Conservative Government. It's ideologically consistent with those who have always favoured those who make interest over those who make goods; who have always favoured those who work with money over those who work with their hands and with their minds. So it is not ideologically consistent. We are not surprised and we do commend any effort which is brought forward in an attempt to reverse the type of ill-advised and ill-considered decision that they made last year.

While the amendments to The Payment of Wages Act and The Real Property Act last year were a disappointment to the members on this side and to the Member for Inkster, they were no surprise. And it is those amendments that have brought us to where we are today, to this resolution that attempts to undo the damage that they had done in those amendments.

For the record, I think it is important to support the intent and commend the purpose of the resolution which the Member for Inkster has brought forward. And I think we can endorse fully the first three suppositions of his amendment as stated in the first three Whereases — excuse me, of his resolution. No. 1, there is a problem that exists currently, where workers may have a difficulty in recovering their wages. There's no doubt about that. I don't even think the Tories would argue with that particular supposition. No. 2, employees are often unable to take practical steps to protect themselves in this type of a circumstance, again is a truism. There can be very little doubt as to that being a fact. And No. 3, that it is in the general interest of society that employees do not experience undue hardships such as losing their wages, again is a point that we can support wholeheartedly. However, the 4th Whereas we have to reserve judgment on. I think that it may in fact be accurate and that is saying that there is a readily available administrative mechanism whereby employees can be offered reasonable protection at a minimum of cost, but it does need further study. I'm afraid that it may oversimplify what

is a very complex concept and that is the concept of the Worker's Compensation Fund.

As to the Be It Resolved in that it attempts to deal with the problems created by the Tory government during the last session we can support the intent. However, we believe that the solution as outlined in this resolution may create new problems of its own and we do feel that changes in a resolution are necessary and we'll bring them forward by way of amendment at the appropriate time. But before doing that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the specifics of the resolution.

The Member for Inkster addressed the issue of a specific period of time for which an employee can recover defaulted wages and it is our belief as the New Democratic Party caucus that period of time is put forward by him and you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that it is one week's pay period is too limiting and in fact too restricting. It's unfair to limit the employees to a recovery period of only one week's pay. Excuse me, I'm sorry, the Member for Inkster has corrected me — one pay period, because it builds an inequity into the system. If a worker is paid monthly they in fact are entitled to a month's lost wages. If a worker is paid weekly then they are entitled only to a week's lost wages. So one worker in fact would be entitled to four times the lost wages as another worker who may in fact work in the same firm under different jobs and in different occupational classifications and they would be entitled, as the resolution reads now, to unequal protection under the law — one receiving possibly four times as much protection, possibly longer, although I would not imagine that to be the case very often, than another who would be receiving only one week's protection and that could be possibly less if they were paid on a daily basis, although I think that is also highly unlikely.

So we cannot accept it because of this obvious inequity which is built into the resolution. We reject it because it is unfair to the employees. We reject that specified time period. But our objections go further than that. They go beyond the obvious weakness of being unfair to the employees. It is also unfair to the employer. And let me explain, Mr. Speaker. As it stands, it forces an employee to make an extremely difficult choice after one pay period of lost wages — that may be one week, it may be four weeks, we don't know. It will differ according to the different jobs.

As it stood before last year's changes, the amendments that were brought forward by the Conservative government, an employee could carry, and that's what they're doing when they decide to work for a period of time without receiving their full wages or any wages at all, to carry an employer being relatively assured of having priority access to wages owing to them.

As it stands now, employees might be reluctant with the present legislation without this resolution, employees might in fact be reluctant to carry an employer at all because they are not assured of any protection under the law and they know that in fact they may come to get their wages after a certain period of time and not be able to obtain them. So it is unfair now. I believe that while the Member for Inkster's resolution addresses the situation partly, it does not go far enough and in fact builds in an

inequity that works against the employer and the employee.

Often an employee will choose, in a very conscious way, to carry an employer because they believe that employer may be experiencing temporary, and that's an important factor, temporary economic difficulties. So put yourself in the place of an employee. The owner of the business or the supervisor comes up to you and says, "Look, we're having some temporary economic difficulties, will you take half pay this week or will you forgo your cheque this week?" Now the employee has to make the decision. If they do not accept those conditions then they in fact may be forcing their employer out of business and losing their job. So their job is on the line. If an employee decides to make that decision then they should be afforded some protection under the law. So in fact by what has been accomplished by the Tories and what is suggested by the Member for Inkster that option would be restricted and limited for them.

So we will want to suggest changes to that by way of amendment which I assure the Member for Inkster do not or not intended at least in any way to work against the principle of his resolution or to in fact dilute it but are basically a straightforward attempt to clarify what we believe may be a problem. It may be an obvious inequity that is built in by the resolution.

We're also concerned, Mr. Speaker, that making the Worker's Compensation Fund responsible for defaulted wages may create problems and as the Member for Inkster has indicated, it is not a major problem right now but I will use the same argument that he used in regard to third party liability. It may be a major problem in the future and the fact that it may be a major problem in the future concerns me as does the fact that an innocent third party may be effected by the legislation as it stood before, concerned him. And we are concerned that as the resolution stands now it could in fact effect the integrity of the Worker's Compensation Fund. So while we support the concept of a fund and we believe that it should be financed through the employer contributions that can be collected without creating another large bureaucracy, they can be collected as part of a general tax or general revenues which are collected now, and a certain percentage of them can be directed specifically to a fund which will pay workers defaulted wages in the case of an employer becoming insolvent. So it may necessitate more of a bureaucracy than the Member of Inkster had anticipated but I don't think that it would necessitate that much more of a bureaucracy if we were able to use the existing system and we have done in the past.

The Member for Inkster will remember that when we talked about the concept of a community adjustment fund for mining communities, that we took a certain percentage of the revenues, the taxes that were collected from the mining companies and said that particular percentage will be directed into a fund which will be used in fact to alleviate some of the economic misfortunes that may be created by the closure of a mine in a one-industry town, or in any town. So we have an example, a precedent for that type of a tacking on to existing revenues, a

specific purpose for a percentage of those taxes. It could as well be collected as part of an individual assessment. Now that would have to create another bureaucracy and I'm not so certain that is what we want. But not having access to the research departments of the government and not having the experience of many members of this House, I can only suggest that what we should do is look at both of those options and one may appear to be so much better than the other that there is no question as to which option we choose, but I think we should look at both of them. That money however it is collected would then be specifically directed to a fund, to a debt repayment fund, just as the Member for Inkster has suggested it should be. And that fund itself could be administered by any one of a number of government bodies or agencies. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it might well be administered by the Worker's Compensation Board and that would in fact mean that there would be no increased bureaucracy or at least to any significant degree — they may have to from time to time employ extra help to make certain that the money is funnelled correctly but we do believe that there are any number of government agencies that in fact could administer that fund and don't want to see at this point the administration of that fund restricted to one body without the type of study and review which would be necessary to determine the best mechanism for administering a fund of that sort.

Now having given this qualified support to the Member for Inkster's resolution that's before us, I want to put on the record that the New Democratic Party caucus intends to pursue this matter further through amendments to the appropriate legislation because we believe that is as well a workable solution — that in fact takes nothing away from the concept that the Member for Inkster has put before us. But we do not want our qualified support of that particular resolution to, in the future, be interpreted as any rejection of a bill which we had put forward or the first reading of the bill that we put forward earlier which is intended to deal with this matter. We believe that the Member for Inkster's solution with the changes that we think are necessary is in fact a reasonable way and we think that it would be workable with those specific changes. As well we believe that the legislative approach which we have given notice of intending to pursue is a reasonable solution also and will in fact be a workable solution. We reject the government's opinion which they stated last year that because certain court decisions were made that we must strip all employees of any protection whatsoever. We reject that categorically.

So having said that and having tried to give some reason and some explanation for the amendments that we make, I move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, that Resolution No. 1 be amended by deleting all the words following the word "recover" in the third line of the resolved portion of the resolution and substituting thereof the words "Defaulted wages for a period not exceeding two months from a government administered fund which would be financed by employer contributions and would be administered by an appropriate government body or agency", and I have copies of that for the next speaker if they would wish to review it before speaking. So to put the matter in perspective the "Therefore be it resolved" would now read:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the government considers the advisability of taking such procedures as would enable employees to recover defaulted wages for a period not exceeding two months from a government administered fund which would be financed by employer contributions and would be administered by an appropriate government body or agency."

And we believe, Sir, that addresses the mess that had been created by the Tory government during the last session and in fact will provide workers with the necessary protection that is to my way of thinking coming to them as a matter of course.

QUESTION put on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to join in on the discussion regarding the Member for Inkster's resolution and the one that's been amended by the Member for Churchill and I'd like to start by saying that the Member for Churchill said that every member in this House wants to see employees have due wages that are due to that employee coming to that employee and paid to that employee when a business goes out of business.

The Member for Inkster in his remarks made reference to the numbers of employees that he has encountered over the past many years that have been paid by NSF cheques and that for 25 years or so that he has acted as legal counsel to people that have been caught by accepting a cheque that they thought was good and bona fide and then found out later to their own suffering that cheque didn't have sufficient funds that they'd received for payment of services.

The Member for Churchill thought that the original resolution was a little bit restrictive. I would say on behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly that nobody wants to see anyone go without receiving a due pay cheque for services from any business regardless of why the business goes out of business, whether it's a voluntary retirement of that business or whether it goes out of business for lack of sufficient funds.

But I would also like to remind the members opposite that the false protection and the false area of security, which many Manitobans find themselves in regarding this particular subject, is due mainly to legislation which they introduced back in 1975 which was The Payment of Wages Act. That The Payment of Wages Act doesn't account for and protect the people to the extent that they, I believe, led the people to believe that that legislation was going to protect men and women who are working within this province.

The Member for Churchill made reference to court decisions and to the fact that our Minister of Labour last year referred to certain court decisions. The courts have interpreted the laws of Canada and it is not our government which has determined that the federal law takes priority over Manitoba's own Payment of Wages legislation, Mr. Speaker, and the courts in Manitoba and particularly in the Province of British Columbia have determined that The Payment of Wages Act doesn't take priority over the federal law and that no amount of tinkering or complaining

or political posturing will change that fact of life, Mr. Speaker.

The members opposite have tried to score political points in the past by telling people in the Province of Manitoba for the past six years that their legislation of 1975, The Payment of Wages Act, was a bill that did provide for protection for these employees, but obviously we have found out over the past six years, Mr. Speaker, that it doesn't and that there is no provincial jurisdiction in Canada which we can guarantee wages as the number one priority, as it affects such matters, not even in the Province of Saskatchewan which does have an NDP government, Mr. Speaker. Other provinces have legislation which is very similar to the one that was enacted in 1975 by members opposite and not one has been able to designate wages as the number one priority, Mr. Speaker.

The Supreme Court of Canada ruled on a British Columbia case, and I want to mention this again and even though the Member for Inkster may disagree with it, said that registered mortgages have priority over payment of wages, and that the Manitoba Court of Appeal referred to the Supreme Court decision when it ruled that wage earners do not rank in priority over a registered mortgage.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba's Payment of Wages Act was patterned after that legislation that was introduced in the Province of British Columbia and it was introduced by an NDP government within that province of BC.

Mr. Speaker, the highest courts of our country have ruled that registered mortgages come before claims of workers; so much for the legislation which was passed some six years when it comes to protecting our workers.

The NDP legislation, Mr. Speaker, may have looked good on paper six years ago when it was introduced in this Legislature, but that's about the only place that it's looked good. The NDP never gave any real protection for the working men and women of our province with that legislation when it comes to the payment of wages. No matter what the legislation we might want to pass, under The Payment of Wages Act the simple truth is that the federal legislation takes precedence.

For example, consider The Federal Bank Act. Banks can lend money to employers and use goods as security. Once the bank registers those goods as security, The Bank Act provides that the bank has priority over the rights in respect to such property and also over the claims of any unpaid vendors or any unpaid employees that might have moneys owing to them in the form of wages from the employer.

I want to refer to a Court of Queen's Bench decision involving The Payment of Wages Act, Mr. Speaker, and this one was one that Chief Justice Dewar said, and I quote Chief Justice Dewar where he said, "In my view the Provincial Legislature intended to create only a priority for the lien over rights it had powers to effect." These, Mr. Speaker, do not include properties confirmed by Section 89 of Part 1 of The Bank Act. This is our real problem, is dealing with The Bank Act and mortgages. Even if we were otherwise, and in conflict, can be said to exist between the priority provisions of the two statutes, and those two statutes are The Bank Act and The Payment of Wages Act, the provisions of The Bank Act must prevail. The highest courts have

cleared stated that the Manitoba Legislature doesn't have the authority to give wage earners the number one priority through The Payment of Wages Act which was introduced, as I said, Mr. Speaker, back in 1975.

That's the background to the present legislation and I suppose to the resolution that now stands before us introduced by the Member for Inkster, and I am sure that all members, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, realize that the problem that the Member for Inkster is hoping to correct by his resolution, but I don't think that's the method of correcting the situation by the resolution that he has proposed. However, the Minister of Labour and Manpower from our government hasn't been sitting idle as of late. He is concerned about the defect of the NDP legislation of 1975 and by doing so he has asked the Labour Management Review Committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Cam MacLean to study the situation and to bring forward a possible means of rectifying the situation.

The MacLean Committee has been doing that and the Minister of Labour and Manpower expects a proposal shortly, the proposal that will be considered by both Labour and Management. Mr. Speaker, this is the responsible way to act in regard to this particular problem which all members of the House are aware of and do know that exists without partisan politics interfering in the welfare of lives of working men and women within our province and it will hopefully provide some real protection for these people in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to members on my side of the House that we defeat this amendment to the original resolution and when the amendment is defeated, then I would at that time like to introduce an amendment of my own.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think I started my remarks on the resolution by saying that I really believed that the Conservatives are interested in employees getting their wages. I am somehow shook in that belief. You have before you an abstract — a resolution drawn in the abstract, saying that you consider the advisability of a certain means of doing something. As anybody with a parliamentary knowledge, Mr. Speaker, is aware it doesn't commit the government to anything, and the Member for Crescentwood says that the way of dealing with these things are by having committees and labour — Labour and Management present something. Mr. Speaker, in the meantime businesses all over the Province of Manitoba are going broke. You can read it in the papers everyday. I tried to deal with this matter, Mr. Speaker, in a moderate way, but when I hear what the Member for Crescentwood says it makes my blood boil and I say to him, he's going to wait for the Labour Management Committee and that's the proper way of dealing with it.

Mr. Speaker, we referred problems, that was the style of the former Minister of Labour, Dr. Baizley, now the Chairman of the Labour Board. Everytime a problem came up he referred it to the Labour Management Committee and the Labour Management Committee is generally composed of people adverse in interest, Mr. Speaker, on many of

the issues that are presented for them. It used to be called the Woods Committee. Is it still the Woods Committee?

Mr. Speaker, the Woods Committee was a petrified forest. For years nothing happened in the area of labour management relations because it was referred to the Woods Committee. Do the members of the Legislative Assembly and does the Minister not have any role in speaking for the people of the Province of Manitoba? And what is wrong, Mr. Speaker? A member from the government side, who has indicated to the House that he's been instructed by the Minister of Labour, is going to introduce an amendment; in his remarks he says that this is not the way of dealing with it, but he doesn't say anything, Mr. Speaker, is wrong with it. Nothing is wrong with it. I would even be prepared to say, Mr. Speaker, that with the new words which ask to consider the advisability, and I suppose those words are still there, which talks about two months, and I don't happen to agree with the Member for Churchill. I don't want the worker carrying his employer for two months. Some employers are not in business more than two months. You are liable to pick up an employer's total payroll on the basis of a fact of a worker carrying the employer, and I want the state to know when an employer stops paying wages. I agree, and that's why this thing is a consideration motion, I agree that a person should not lose money that he didn't know he was going to lose.

In other words, if one pay period ends on Wednesday and payday comes on Saturday, he should be paid right up to Saturday at the very least. But I don't agree that there is inequity about one week's pay and four weeks' pay because I am talking about 100 percent of the pay that's lost, and that could be one week and it could be three weeks, but the moment the worker starts to carry his employer we are creating a situation which is undesirable and I don't want the employee contributing to that undesirable situation.

The notion that somehow I am going to help him out and that I am going to carry him and I am going to lend him money and that he will stay in business is something that I would not wish to promote, Mr. Speaker, or encourage or in any way acquiesce in or make possible by having the state pick up those wages, but I would still be willing to consider it. Even if I disagree with it I would be willing to consider it. Show me that it means something. But the Conservative government says this is not a good idea.

Mr. Speaker, what's wrong with it? Why do we have to refer it to the Woods Committee? Why can't we refer, if you do want to refer something to the Woods Committee, why can't the government say we will pass this resolution, we'll refer it to the Woods Committee? Why don't they say we will pass this resolution. It doesn't bind us to anything. We will send it to the Woods Committee and the Woods Committee will tell us what they think of it? But we are not going to wait for the Woods Committee to see to it that employees who are losing their wages because of bankruptcies and insolvencies, do not get paid.

Mr. Speaker, the big advantage of what is being proposed here as against what was in the other legislation, which I said that I was for and I voted against the repeal of it, and I consider the repeal to

have been a mistake, the big advantage is the speed in which a person gets his wages, because even if he comes before mortgages, if there is no building, if there is no property, there is nothing to come before.

This resolution as put with the amendment, without the amendment, and without what appears is going to be a hatchet job in terms of voting against this by the Conservative Party, this resolution would mean that a worker would get paid if his employer had nothing, if there was no mortgage, if there was no property, but not if he was carrying that employer.

Mr. Speaker, I am astonished because I really thought that I got to the floor with an olive branch; that despite the fact that I felt that the Conservatives had let employees down last year by stripping them of perhaps what they say and what may even be inadequate protection, that they would be willing to say quickly that they are in favour of some protection. Are they concerned, Mr. Speaker? Do we have this kind of paranoia in the House? Because even this first amendment, Mr. Speaker, — there is nothing in this first amendment that isn't embodied in the resolution. It's to consider the advisability, but there are some people who won't pass something because it's moved by one person; another group over there won't pass something because it's by the New Democrats, or not moved by the government. They think that's good politics, Mr. Speaker. That's fine, but I tell you that the people of the Province of Manitoba won't think it's good politics and if the Conservatives, who are already in great trouble, one must never underestimate the stupidity of the Opposition — when I say Opposition I'm talking about those over there, the people that you are opposed to — and the speech that has been made by the Member for Crescentwood indicates that the opposition to this particular resolution is based not on any fundamental ground. The member got up, Mr. Speaker, he didn't mention the resolution. He mentioned The Mortgages Act. He didn't mention the resolution. He talked about the inequities about The Mortgage Act. Then he said this resolution is not the way to deal with it, so let's defeat the amendment, which really I feel, contains words that I would have a taste to not have, but it doesn't undo anything, it's still a consideration of the advisability. The Conservative Government would have been well advised, Mr. Speaker, to say as the First Minister has been in the habit of saying, we want your help, we want your assistance, we want you to be a good Opposition. This was one moment, Mr. Speaker, for them to have got up, to be gracious, to say we still think that last year's thing was worthless, but we see that you are now at least willing to talk sense; that this resolution is in abstract form; it tells us to consider the advisability of something; we want you to know that expeditiously this is going to be done; it's not going to be adjourned until the next Private Members' Hour. We are immediately — as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, even from the point of view of trying to be subjectively conservative, they could say we have been considering this all along and therefore we have no objection to considering it more and despite the fact that the Member for Inkster has made a resolution and the New Democrats have been yelling, we want you to know that we've already been doing it and therefore, let's pass this resolution and get onto the next order of business. But they didn't do that; Mr. Speaker. —

(Interjection)— They didn't do that. Well, they could have done it. They could have done it.

They say they're going to reject this and amend the resolution. Why? Why? Only one reason, Mr. Speaker. They want to say that we did not do this as a result of New Democratic Party prodding. We did not do this as a result of any problems on our part. We had this in mind before this resolution was presented and we are dealing with it. They could have said that in their speech. I remember the present Deputy Premier, the Member for Riel, who moved the resolution on this side of the House that native Indians be eligible for election on school boards. The member got up, said, we have been considering this, we think it's a good idea, we're going to do it. Fifty-seven members got up and voted in favour of the resolution — I don't know if there were 57 of us in the House, but everybody in the House voted in favour of the resolution and that was it. And the kind of thing that has been proposed, Mr. Speaker, by the Member for Crescentwood, just indicates possibly that I was too generous in saying that they really want to deal with this problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could move that we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the agreement of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed) The hour being 5:30 . . . The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources that the House do now adjourn and resume in Committee of Supply at 8:00 o'clock.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning (Friday).