

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Tuesday, 31 March, 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 . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notice of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance and further to the questions posed to the Minister of Economic Development yesterday.

In view of the fact that the Statistics Canada figures released this past Friday indicate Manitoba has the second worst record vis-a-vis provinces by way of intended investment in 1981, second only to Prince Edward Island, being the only province in a worse position; can the Minister advise what programs he intends to introduce as Minister of Finance in order to turn around what is obviously going to be a lack of progress in 1981 unless there are positive steps on the part of this government to bring a turnaround in the economy?

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

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that I'm beginning to wonder about some of the statistical information that's being provided. The honourable members are aware of the adjustments that are being made in some of the figures coming out, and so I think the projections especially are open to some question, and in addition to that of course, we have seen the situation where a week ago when the Federal Minister Jean-Jacques Blais came into town and said that he felt that Statistics Canada information was wrong concerning population and when the final figures came in he expected that they would show an increase of some 20,000.

However, I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the policies that this government has been following for the past three years are the sort of policies that are going to lead to steady solid development in this province, the types of projects that are under serious consideration at the moment — Alcan, the Potash development, Western Power Grid, expansion of the Forestry operation at The Pas. Those are the sorts of solid developments that this government is working for, Mr. Speaker, and if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is expecting that we'll come in with a \$100 million make-work program, we do not advocate that, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, further by way of supplementary to the Minister. In view of the Minister's statement challenging the accuracy of StatsCan statistics and suggesting that adjustments likely to be in order, the Minister acknowledged that indeed last year, the StatsCan figures that were released pertain to capital expenditure by province and private sector expenditure by way of province and each case was overly generous and the result was that rather than Manitoba experiencing growth as was projected by StatsCan last year, that indeed the net result was economic decline and the figures were too generous.

Mr. Speaker, further by way of question then to the Minister. Can the Minister assure us that this government will have some program beyond quadrupling the advertising program, the Stay in Manitoba Option Program to propose to Manitobans during this Session to turn around the economy?

**MR. RANMSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition says I challenged the figures. I simply said I think there is some question and I quoted the Federal Minister who's responsible because he questioned the statistics and said that he thought that they were wrong.

Now the honourable member refers to information for 1980 which is now showing lower percentages than the figures for 1979. The reason being, Mr. Speaker, that they have adjusted upwards the information for 1979 and that automatically results in a lower percentage of increase for 1980 because the base is smaller and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition should be aware of that. If he wants to look at the things that are really happening in this province, the standard of living that people have in this province, the opportunity that people have for employment in this province, is far better today than when those members opposite were in government.

In three years, the last three years of their administration, Mr. Speaker, 10,000 new jobs in this province, 7,000 of those in the public sector, supported directly by taxpayers' dollars. In the last three years, the first three years of our administration, there were over 30,000 jobs in this province and only 2,000 of those supported directly by the taxpayers, and he wants to know what kind of programs we're going to implement?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. May I point out to all members that this is a period for seeking information rather than getting into a debate. We have ample opportunity for debate in the Chamber on other occasions.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to also question either the Minister of Finance or perhaps the Premier about the investment trends in this province as well and I would remind the honourable members across the way that these figures are supplied by business corporations in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Finance or perhaps the Premier, why is it that public

investment in the Province of Manitoba will be increasing in current dollars — not in constant dollars but in current dollars — at a faster rate than private investment in 1981? To wit: Public investment is expected to increase by 9.6 percent this year, whereas private investment will only increase by 5.1 percent and therefore, the percentage of total investment by the public sector will increase over last year. I ask that of either the Premier or the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. If the honourable member would like an answer to his question?

The Honourable Member of Finance.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I seem to detect some unhappiness in the Member for Brandon East's tone, that the public sector should be spending another 9.8 percent. He does not seem to be aware, Mr. Speaker, of the interest rate situation that prevails in Canada now and has prevailed over the past year to or so and that the investment intentions that were expressed late last year to Statistics Canada have been altered as a consequence of the very high interest rates which the private sector is facing, Mr. Speaker, and that is a very simple explanation and a factual explanation for what is happening with respect to private investment in this province. But bear in mind that when one or two of the major developments go ahead, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are going to be faced with percentage increases in investment like they've never seen in this province before.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, my question regarding private investment as a share of the percentage of total investment emanates from this Budget document which honourable members opposite seem to make a great deal about, that is, the percentage of private investment as a percentage of total investment in this province. I will not demean public investment, as members opposite might try to do, nor will I demean jobs in the public sector as members opposite will do.

My next question, Mr. Speaker, is with regard to investment in manufacturing. Mr. Speaker, investment in manufacturing in this province in 1981 will not increase in real terms. There are no signs of expansion in the manufacturing sector. I asked the Premier . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Inkster. (Interjection)— Does the honourable member have a question?

The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a question.

**MR. EVANS:** I asked the Premier what, if anything, he can do as the First Minister, what can the Premier do, what will the Premier of this province do, if anything, to ensure that manufacturing is going to grow again in the Province of Manitoba? What are we going to do to make up for the Maple Leaf Mills that are disappearing in our midst or the Swifts Canadian? What are we going to do? What answers does this government have?

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

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, I can understand how my honourable friend the Member for Brandon East is concerned. I know the province and the people of Brandon know the province too, Mr. Speaker, and they don't see much of their Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand my honourable friend's consternation about manufacturing figures. I can understand my honourable friend's consternation about manufacturing real output in Manitoba, because my honourable friends will say that black is white and up is down and round is square, because in the last three years of their administration manufacturing real output constant dollars decreased by 8 percent a year from 1975 to 1977.

Now, for my honourable friend to stand up in the House here today and say what are we doing, because manufacturing output has increased in Manitoba and every year that we've been in government puts, I suggest, the proper colour on the tactics and the questions and the statistics, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Brandon East uses in this House constantly.

I merely remind him that the Leader of the Socialist Party in Ontario is a man by the name of Cassidy. Mr. Cassidy found out that talking doom and gloom lost him 14 seats. The Member for Brandon East is now going to become, Hop Along Cassidy, and we're happy to see him do it.

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

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask — (Interjection)— a supplementary. I would like to ask . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The question period is for the purpose of seeking information.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I have operated under the assumption that my honourable friend, being an economist, was aware of the footnotes that have been applied to the statistics on population in Manitoba for some time, namely, to the effect that in the census of 1976 it was estimated that the population of Manitoba was underestimated by a factor of either 4,000 to 18,000 people in this province. That is why this government and the people who advise us from time to time have said all through the piece that the figures with respect to population in this province can't be taken as accurate and that is why I presume the Federal Minister, Mr. Jean-Jacques Blais, when he was here very recently, indicated that he expected to see an increase shown in the population of Manitoba by virtue of the census that will be underway in 1981.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I remind my honourable friend opposite that if he is now saying, contrary to what he said seven years ago, that growth or decrease in population is not an indication of economic growth in the province, because that is what he said when he was sitting on this side of the House when there was a minor drop in population back in the early 1970s, he said that was not an indicator of economic growth. What was he able to point to at that time? He was able to point to the Province of Saskatchewan where from 1968 on they

lost about 50,000 in population and didn't start coming back until the mid-Seventies. If my honourable friend is trying to say, Mr. Speaker, that loss or gain within the margin of error of 1,500 or 2,000 people is all of a sudden an indicator of economic activity, then he better go back to his books, he better go back to his own speeches and find out what the truth is.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want the responses of the New Democrats to go outside of Hansard. They refer to the fact that they'd rather be "Hop Along" than hobbling along.

Now may I ask the First Minister a question, Mr. Speaker? —(Interjection)— I'm on our side.

I would like to ask the First Minister whether he'll permit the Minister of Finance to present the Budget at this Session of the Legislature.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, in the ordinary course of events, the date for the Budget, as the Minister of Finance has already announced, will be made known to the House in due course.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would answer the question: Notwithstanding that the date has been announced, will the First Minister assure the House that the financial position of the Province of Manitoba will be available to the people of this province before they go to the polls?

Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that as far as the Progressives are concerned, we will be ready in either event. But I would like the First Minister to advise us, notwithstanding the fact that a date has been set, will the financial position, by means of the formal presentation of a Budget, be available to the people of the Province of Manitoba before they go to the polls?

**MR. LYON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, may I say first of all, because there appears to be a misunderstanding on the part of the Member for Inkster, no date has been announced as yet for the Budget by the Minister of Finance. That will be announced when it's set, in due course. I say to the honourable member as well, without in any way emulating what happened when he was in government, when the financial position of the province was kept cloistered from the people of Manitoba, when the then Minister of Finance announced a deficit of \$25 million, which turned out to be on current account, \$125 million, this government has initiated quarterly reporting for the people of Manitoba, the shareholders of this province, so that they know what the current position of the Province of Manitoba is, something that my honourable friends opposite were asked to do in 1976, 1977 and never did.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the truth falls on shallow ears, but I merely remind my honourable friends opposite of their rather dismal record in terms of public information on the finances of the province.

Now coming to the second portion of my honourable friend's question, the date of the Budget

will be announced in due course and when that date is announced, it will be fulfilled.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I note that the honourable member says that the date will be announced in due course and when the date is announced, it will be fulfilled. I therefore take it that the question is still equivocal. May I ask the First Minister if he means by financial sound planning, the example of the Progressive Conservative Government in Alberta, which has now announced a budgetary deficit, \$593 million ahead of expenditures which were announced in their Budget of last year.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I can't speak for the Province of Alberta anymore than I can for the Province of Saskatchewan. I can speak for the Province of Manitoba and I can say that the doctrine and the principles that we introduced into public accountability for the financing of this province have stood this province in good stead, and the quarterly reports that my honourable friend receives are something that was never received before and they are an update for all of the people of Manitoba in order to see what the current fiscal and financial position of the province is. It's something, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friends had the opportunity to do, were asked to do and refused to do, at the same time saying that they were the ones who believed in freedom of information for the public on all other matters except their nefarious conduct of public affairs.

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

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether or not he can quantify the capital expenditures that would be required, both public and private, to offset the numerous bankruptcies and plant closures that have taken place in Manitoba over the last three years. Given the fact, Mr. Speaker, that only \$137 million is forecast in new plant expansion for manufacturing purposes, I would like the First Minister to indicate what he is going to do to stimulate that figure in order to bring it back to a realistic level.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I think my honourable friend, the Member for Brokenhead would be the first to acknowledge — Lac du Bonnet, pardon me, I go back, that was not meant as a pun, that was the name of the old seat and that's a well-known name in Manitoba — it's not meant as any reflection on the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet whatsoever, but when I look at him I think of Brokenhead, in a jovial way.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will recall that from the first pronouncements that we have been making as a government of this province, we have asked the Federal Government that the provinces be consulted more on monetary matters in this country because, of course, they bear upon the fiscal matters for which we have primary

responsibility in this province. Prominent among those monetary items in Canada today, and I know it's a matter that has engaged the concern of all members of the House, is the high rate of the interest rates in Canada today. Interest rates in Canada and the United States are at all-time highs.

I think that in fairness my honourable friend would have to admit that the interest rate phenomenon that the country is facing today, while the provinces might try to wish it away, it is something over which we have no constitutional or other jurisdictional control and that one factor as much as anything, particularly with small and medium-sized business in Manitoba and in all other parts of Canada, is causing there to be a drying up of capital investment in small and medium-sized businesses and in other enterprises as well, and is acting as a brake generally on the economy.

I wish I could stand in this House, Mr. Speaker, and say that this government has an answer to it. I honestly can't say that and being fair to my honourable friend I know that he can't stand in the House and say that he has an answer to it.

I do make the suggestion that it's a culmination in some ways of a series of bad policies that we've had at the national level, where for reasons that sometimes escape our understanding, they have felt that over a continuous period they could spend more of the national wealth of the country than the people could produce and that is one of the prices that we're having to pay today.

But I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to working with my honourable friends and with the Government of Canada in trying to see what can be done about that policy that is besetting all business in Canada, in the United States, indeed in the western world where it applies. I think that we could give serious consideration to that, not in the sense necessarily of trying to in a partisan way blacken the record of the Liberal administration in Ottawa, but rather to show historically how this has come about so that business people throughout this country will benefit from the lessons that can be learned from that last 10-year period of overexpenditure in this country.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I realize the very nature of certain questions dictate sometimes long answers and some short answers. The questions are for the purpose of seeking information.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a supplementary.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The First Minister is a second front bench member today who alluded to the fact that interest rates are contributing significantly to the decline of Manitoba's economy. During the course of the debate of the Department of Finance, we spent some time trying to find out from the Government of Manitoba just what their policy is on interest rates and whether or not they would be willing to undertake a major ministerial confrontation with the Government of Canada on that very question in order to alleviate the situation to the point where we could get an expansion of capital expenditures throughout the country that would result in new jobs created in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

I ask the First Minister why, rather than spending all of his time on the constitutional issue, why he isn't

demanding a meeting on the economy and on the question of interest rates so that we can get this province back on its feet, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I can't expect nor would I expect my honourable friend to keep abreast of all the speeches and letters that the government and its members make, or indeed of the proceedings of the First Ministers, the ten Provincial Premiers of this country, because in this very Chamber in August of 1980, we issued a unanimous call to the Prime Minister of Canada — Manitoba was a signatory to this call — that he convene at once an Economic Conference in Canada to discuss interest rates, inflation, the state of employment in the country and how the economy could be best aided and abetted to the extent that government can by concerted action between the Federal and Provincial Governments.

Mr. Speaker, I accept, even though it isn't accurate, the suggestion that I have been spending a fair amount of time on the Constitution and, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Premiers who have been spending a fair amount of time on the Constitution today have perhaps some little reason for being thankful that they have spent that time on the Constitution, because we're beginning to see the light now in terms of the federal case falling apart, but that's another matter.

All I can say to my honourable friend is this, that the Constitution is fundamentally important to this country, and I make no apologies to him or to any other person in Manitoba or Canada for the amount of time that has to be spent on it, but I do say that concurrently we are not nearly so obsessed with the Constitution in this government or in the other Provincial Governments that we are not able to deal with the other financial fiscal matters of this country which deserve attention. One would wish that that were the case with the Federal Government but it appears not to be so. So my honourable friend can direct, if he will, his darts to the Federal Government, but they fall short of the mark if they're sent in this House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a final supplementary.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the First Minister concede that it probably might be worthwhile for his Minister of Finance, along with other Ministers of Finance from the other provinces, to look at suggestions that have been made by a number of learned people throughout the country having to do with short-term or short-run exchange controls and exchange for a lower interest rate in Canada?

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that I advised the honourable member when we were discussing our Estimates that the Finance Ministers in the provinces have asked for the opportunity to meet with the Federal Government, the Federal Minister, they asked to meet in February and the Federal Government was unwilling to meet at that time.

I also expressed to him the belief that the provinces did not feel, certainly not our province,

that we had the answers to the fiscal and the monetary problems that the country was facing but that we wanted an opportunity to speak with the Federal Minister and with the Governor of the Bank of Canada so that we could make certain that they understood the kind of impact that their policies in the present situation was having upon Manitoba in our case and, of course, the other provinces in their cases and we would be able to examine a range of opportunities, some put forward by the provinces, some put forward by the Federal Government. Until we are able to bring about that kind of co-operation with the Federal Government, then I don't think that we're going to be able to make much progress or see much progress made on those matters that are within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Environment. In view of the Minister's overruling of the decision pertaining to Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, the decision of the Clean Environment Commission, can the Minister advise whether or not he will table all documentation pertaining to background material received by him from his department as well as brief submissions by Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, the union and all other affected bodies within this Chamber, so that we can scrutinize them and those that are concerned, particularly in the Flin Flon area, will know upon what basis the Minister made his determination to overrule the decision by the Clean Environment Commission?

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

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition is referring to the fact that I varied an Order of the Clean Environment Commission, not overruled an Order. In the discussion yesterday, certainly it was brought out that that kind of information, the information submitted by the Union, Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting and various other interested parties, including submissions from my department were all made at a public hearing and they are a matter of public record and in fact, I am sure that members of his caucus currently are in possession of all that information.

I repeat what I said yesterday that the information, upon which I made my decision, was provided for me strictly by senior staff members of my department. I did not at any time discuss the matter with the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company and any internal briefings that I received from my department are meant to be internal briefings and are not a matter that is normally provided for the House.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, then is the Minister acknowledging that his decision to alter the decision by the Clean Environment Commission was done without any additional information, without any extra input, except that material which has already been made public, that he has indeed received no further

information from within his department, any other expertise beyond that which has been made by the Clean Environment Commission and upon which the Clean Environment Commission had arrived at a decision?

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

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm all of the things that the Leader of the Opposition has indicated. What I can confirm is what I did confirm yesterday, that the decision was not a matter of saying that the standards ought not to be met. The decision was based on the fact that there was not sufficient information available on the economic consequences of meeting the decision immediately. Therefore, the varied Order calls for a certain period of time in which the company is required to provide the economic data — I believe it's September 1st of 1982 — of the consequences of meeting the various ground level concentrations.

I repeat that the total emission standards have not been varied, that we are requiring the company to provide us with certain information in the interim and also that there will be ongoing monitoring of any possible effects of the order so that we will have the information required in order to ensure compliance with the guidelines that have been proposed by the Clean Environment Commission by 1984.

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

**MR. DAVID BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he could tell the House if he has received confirmation from the Canadian Wheat Board that they have abandoned their Market Assurance Plan that was being offered to the farmers of the country.

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

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, I am aware of news reports that have indicated that they have abandoned the proposal to introduce a Market Assurance Program this coming year. I would expect to have more details on the decision later on today.

**MR. BLAKE:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture could advise the House if he has forwarded any recommendations to the Federal Minister of Agriculture in connection with the Market Assurance Plan.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am preparing a telex to communicate to the Federal Government indicating to them that the real issue and the difficulties within the farm community, as well as the high cost of production, and the fact that we have a transportation system in this country that has not been working as adequately as it should have been, it's been pointed out over the last few years, and I would propose, Mr. Speaker, that they get on with resolving the real issues that are before the agricultural community.

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

**MR. BLAKE:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister would confirm that it was the Private Members' Resolution brought in by the Honourable Member for Gladstone that brought about the scuttling of this report.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure in addition to the communication on the transportation, some of the other ideas that have come forward from the members on this side — and it's been some of the recommendations from the farm community — that there should be an expansion of the interest-free, farm-advance payment which would do the same kind of thing that the farm community would expect out of MAP if there were inventories carried over; that the interest-free loan could be extended to other grains and allow the farm community the cash flow that they need if they had inventories remaining on the farms. Plus, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the resolution introduced by the Member for Minnedosa, as well as the other opposition that came from within the farm community, had a lot to do with getting the message through to the Federal Government.

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

**MS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Attorney-General and refers to the Playgreen Inn in Norway House. I wonder if the Minister can confirm that the Liquor Control Board has been receiving continuing complaints about the beverage room practices there, and particularly about the serving of liquor to already intoxicated persons, and unsanitary and inadequate washroom facilities.

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

**HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice and enquire from the Liquor Control Commission as to whether or not they have received any complaints.

**MS. WESTBURY:** In taking the question as notice, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister will ascertain the last time that a Liquor Control Inspector called at the Playground, Playgreen Inn and —(Interjection)— I know it's a Conservative establishment and that's why I call it the playground — Playgreen Inn and what his findings were, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. MERCIER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will enquire into that.

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

**MR. VIC SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder whether he could comment on the following paragraph from the Star and Times in Swan River: "The P.C. Party believes that the Constitution should be brought back to Canada with an acceptable amending formula, then the provinces and Federal Government could agree on a Charter of Rights. We

want the Charter of Rights to protect Canadians' right to own property." Could the First Minister comment on that paragraph?

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I don't make it a habit of commenting on newspaper extracts that I haven't seen. If my honourable friend wants to shoot it across, I'll be happy to take a look at it. I presume it may have been, but one can't tell about the veracity of these things, it may have been a comment by a Federal Conservative whose policy on the Charter of Rights is different from the established policy of this government, which I'm sure will be the policy that garners the support of the vast majority of the people in this House.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I'd be glad to shoot a copy over to the First Minister because apparently there are some shallow ears over on the other side. If the First Minister was told that this happened to come from the pen of one of his own Ministers, would he then have any comments on this particular paragraph?

**MR. LYON:** No, Mr. Speaker, it would just indicate the wisdom of what I've said before, that it's usually wrong to comment on something until you've seen it.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of the Environment and follows upon the questions by my Leader previously. I'd ask the Minister if he would be prepared to table or provide to the Opposition two very specific documents which should be part of the public domain and that is the appeal by Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, which was made to him in respect to the Order, and also the variance on the Order which he says he has written, because we have not seen a copy of either one of those which are essential to the discussion of this particular matter.

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

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I must admit to a little confusion. Firstly, last evening when I asked the member opposite if I could borrow his copy of the amended order he said that he had one and he was going to share it with me but he didn't have the use of a photocopier, and I couldn't contact my secretary at the time to find out where mine was filed, so I gave him the information to the best of my recollection. Now, I'm not sure if he's telling me now that he doesn't have that copy that he said last evening he had, and if so, certainly it's a matter of public record.

**MR. COWAN:** To correct the Minister's misimpression of the conversation, I just checked with my seatmate who was here at the time, he asked for a copy of the Order, not a copy of the amended Order. He may have intended to ask for the amended Order, but he in fact did ask for a copy of the Order, which is public information. I have not seen a copy of the amended order, nor do I think the

public have been able to review it. So I will take as an invitation from the Minister's answer, that he is going to provide us with both a copy of the appeal from Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting and a copy of the varied Order as he has determined it should be amended.

I would also ask the Minister if he is prepared to provide to us copies of the minutes of the committee which was set up in 1973, which was supposed to meet at least biannually, which was supposed to determine ways and means of accomplishing better emission controls at the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting complex in Flin Flon and which should have provided some insight as to how that could be accomplished — insight which would then in fact not have made it necessary for the Minister to amend the Order to wait for further information in 1984.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, since the member is referring to something that long predates my involvement with the portfolio, I'll have to look into the matter.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for question period has expired.

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

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 32.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

### BILL NO. 32 THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1981

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 32 — the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I adjourn this debate, on behalf of my colleague, the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, the election's in the bag, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Government House Leader on a point of order.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I note the paper bag the Member for Elmwood for has with him, and I think as you're well aware, Mr. Speaker, producing exhibits into the Chamber is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I would ask that the exhibit be removed from the Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, if I cannot exhibit the 1981 Conservative election kit, I certainly can

describe it because I have obtained a copy of what is being distributed to members of the Tory team and I certainly will describe what they have in their kit and consequently what their tactic will be in the next Provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to begin by saying that the manner in which the government responds to questions from the official Opposition, is really an indication of the manner in which the government will fight the next election, and I think today we had a first class exhibition of that when my colleague, the Honourable Member for Brandon East, rose and asked a series of economic questions only to be met with some vagaries, first of all by the Minister of Finance and stonewalling, as one of my colleagues suggests, and then was met by some humorous jibes by the Premier, in an attempt to discredit the Member for Brandon East. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in that regard that that gentleman knows more about economics and he's forgotten more about economics, forgotten more than all the members of the government benches in total.

Mr. Speaker, on that side there isn't one person, one person who could really say, in any way, shape, or form, that he understands economics, and when I hear this continual abuse of an economist and a statistician, I find that hard to stomach. All we have on the other side are a number of members who can add and subtract. In fact all that they do, most of the time, Mr. Speaker, is subtract, because the economy is going down the tube and the figures are getting worse, so there is very little positive, it's simply monitoring a steady deterioration of the economy. When it comes to statistics, Mr. Speaker, we have Ministers who can't even pronounce the word let alone understand that particular field.

Mr. Speaker, the technique that the government uses is quite obvious. We listened yesterday to the Minister of Highways who spent his time, once again, attempting to prod the New Democratic Party into releasing their election platform. Mr. Speaker, I didn't know that it was incumbent on the Opposition to put their election platform on the table prior to the election, and I don't know where their platform is. They certainly have not presented the people of Manitoba with their election platform. Mr. Speaker, when they are prepared to put their platform down, I think on that occasion, we will be able and we will be willing to put our platform down.

In the meantime all we are seeing on the opposition on the government side is a sorry performance because of the fact that they no longer can defend their economic record. So they have decided to adopt that old posture of the best defense is an offense and they are attempting to smear the Opposition, they are attempting to set up a smoke screen and they are not defending what is in effect indefensible, namely their own record.

The issues of the day are clearly outlined, Mr. Speaker, in a booklet prepared by my colleague on the decline of the Manitoba economy under the Conservative Government, and I recommend it to members of the government who haven't studied the statistics and the charts in that particular booklet. It's no wonder that we don't have in that particular document anything that can be defended. I just want to cite a few examples. There is, Mr. Speaker, a chart on economic growth and the figures are given

in real domestic product from Statistics Canada — well in this case, Conference Board in Canada as the source — indicated by my honourable colleague. Well, the Minister of Economic Development doesn't like that, but when we give our statistics we give the sources; when the government gives theirs, I don't what the source is. I don't know what the basis of it is. I don't know who the Minister of Finance was quoting today when he reeled off some stats. But the Conference Board in Canada examined real economic growth in the province for the seven years of our government and came up with a figure of some 4 percent in Manitoba and some 5 percent in Canada. But in the last three years, the Conservative administration has .2 percent, a fifth of one percent is the real growth in the economy compared to 2.2 percent.

Mr. Speaker, if I might mention the ratios, it strikes me that in the Seventies, when our government was in power, we were about 80 percent of the national average. Now we are less than 10 percent. Then you go to economic growth and there again you see 4 percent economic growth during our period in office compared to their .2 percent. Manufacturing was almost 6 percent during the New Democratic years and 1.5 percent over the past three years.

Mr. Speaker, housing starts are down, retail sales are down, unemployment is up, personal disposable income is a half of what it was. (Interjection)— Well, do you have the book, are you following me in the book? I am quoting from Chart 6 which is giving the rate percentage of the labour force unemployed and it's 5.8 percent during the last couple of years compared to 5 percent.

So I see the Minister of Finance is now reading that and he agrees. I take his silence as tantamount to concurrence, or no objection, or no refutation at this time.

Mr. Speaker, employment is a problem, and the last chart is the one that I find the most sickening of all and that is the population growth in Manitoba, and that really is the concern. You can look, Mr. Speaker, at the years from 1970 to 1977, and every year there are gains in population. In 1978 there was a gain under the Conservatives, but 1979 and 1980, we're into a negative growth rate. Mr. Speaker, that to me is the most serious chart and the most serious statistic that we can throw at the government and it's based on all the others. This is not an isolated statistic. It's because of all the other problems, that people are throwing up their hands and moving out west, and that is the challenge that this party will attempt to rise to and to beat and solve, Mr. Speaker, because the government has created the problem, and I tell you that when our government comes in, we will have to clean up the Conservative mess and that is going to be the number one problem that we have to deal with.

Mr. Speaker, the problems are there and I want to indicate how I think the government is going to attempt to confront those problems, and I regret that I am unable to give you a graphic illustration, because the Attorney-General was fearful of whether I might pull a rabbit out of that bag, or what might come out of that bag. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what's in that bag. I will tell you what's in it, since I can't show you what's in it. There's a cigar in there, there's a can of red paint, and there is a paint brush,

and there is a set of instructions —(Interjection)— red paint and, Mr. Speaker, here are the instructions that are being distributed to members opposite so they can go out on the hustings and counter or divert or set up something to take people's minds off the real issues of the day.

Mr. Speaker, here are the instructions. It says, "when the New Democrats raise economic issues, number one: Light the constitutional cigar and blow smoke across the issue." So that's step number one, the Constitution, that's something to keep people's minds off the real basic issues of the economy and the performance of the Progressive Conservative Party; set up a smoke screen.

My friend from Rock Lake says I am talking about the Prime Minister and he is partly right, both the Prime Minister and the Premier of Manitoba are trying to do the same thing. They are both masking the real problems and the real issues of the economy today. Neither one, neither one is tackling the problems. I'm sure my honourable friend for Inkster would agree, that the issues of the economy are not being confronted by the government in Manitoba.

(Interjection)— Okay, he concurs entirely and of course he has a slightly different position on the Constitution. He would also say that's a real issue, but I say that I believe that that issue is being used to mask the basic fundamental issues of the economy. So, Mr. Speaker, I say that is the first thing that members opposite will do.

People will say, what about unemployment, what about jobs, what about out-migration? The Conservatives will say, never mind, look what about the Constitution? We've got to bring down Pierre Elliot Trudeau. No? You're going to fight the economic issue as well? Mr. Speaker, if that doesn't work, then if the smoke isn't dense enough and people can still see the real issues, then you go to point number two, in the Tory election kit. This is the old sure fire Conservative method, open the can of red paint and smear the Opposition with the old red scare, and I can see it now, Mr. Speaker, I can see that one of the slogans of the next election will be that old tried and true Tory slogan, free enterprise vs. socialism, and the old red scare. The old red scare; talk about communism, talk about socialism — Frank Syms —(Interjection)— yes, I'm glad you mentioned that; I'm glad you mentioned that.

The Minister of Fitness was the one who got out and read out all these commie quotes; commie quotes from all these people that he could possibly get hold of. Well, are any of them members of the New Democratic Party? Well, Mr. Speaker, when someone leaves a party, when someone leaves a political party, you can never be certain, you can never be certain of the gist of their remarks, whether their remarks are exactly what they believe, or whether there are some other factors thrown in. You know, I mean what about Jack Horner, remember Jack Horner — it always pains me to mention his name in this Chamber, because there are people here who believed in Jack Horner. (Interjection)— No he wasn't. He was a Conservative, that's probably just as bad and Jack Horner after kicking the Liberals for 20 years, and road out of the west and my good friend, the —(Interjection)— sure, the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Government Services. The two of them, the two of

them — they supported Jack Horner. They wanted a big, tough, honest cowboy who was going to tell them so and so grits where to get off eh, and they backed him in the convention and Jack was terrific there, he was doing all these wonderful things, talking for enterprise, punching out reporters. He was doing everything right, but he lost the election. He lost the election and then all of a sudden one thing lead to another and he was taken in by Pierre Elliot Trudeau. Then he was sent back and of course, he got clobbered and you know what, it serves him right, it serves him right. I don't have any sympathy for Jack Horner in that regard, especially a person who personified the laissez faire beliefs of the Progressive Conservative Party, and who sold out for a bloody Cabinet position in the Federal House of Commons. Well that was a big mistake, a big mistake on his part.

So I have some sympathy for the Conservatives who maybe first of all shed tears and then choked and swallowed hard, as their idol sided with the enemy camp, but bit the dust, as true cowboys do when there are shoot-outs at high noon.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention a couple of other points. I listened with some interest to the Minister of Highways, the Minister of Highways, who took great delight, great delight in talking about the Ontario election, but you know, I don't know if there is any comfort for the Conservatives in Manitoba about those election results. You know I heard the Premier say, I think it's the only time I agreed with the Premier this year and he made the following comment and I give him credit for this one comment. He said, you know, the results of Ontario will not translate into the Manitoba economy and to the Manitoba election. He said the fact that the big blue machine won in Ontario, doesn't mean that there will be a spillover effect into Manitoba. You know, I believe that's absolutely true, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell you that when I was first starting out in this Chamber and before, I used to think that the results of another election would influence the results here, so that if we won in Saskatchewan, it would help us. If the British Labour Party won in England, it would help the Manitoba New Democratic Party. If the Democratic Party in the United States won, it would help us pick up votes in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, that is a naive attitude and I have given it up and I want to say that if the Minister of Highways or the Minister of Cultural Affairs or the MLA for Springfield, or the MLA for Emerson, believe that they are going to be bolstered by the fact that Cassidy lost in Ontario and Davis won in Ontario, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, they are dreaming, they are dreaming.

I want to point out a couple of differences. I want to point out three differences between the two provinces. The Tories have been in power for 38 years in Ontario — 38 years. Secondly, in fact, the way of life one of my colleagues mentions, there are people in Ontario, Mr. Speaker, anyone under, I think someone said in their early sixties has not known anything else but a Conservative Government. You know the voting age was 21 and there wasn't an election necessarily 59 years ago, it might have been 63 years ago or something like that, so almost everyone under the age of retirement has only known Conservative Governments. They must be

conditioned, at least to the extent where they believe it is futile, absolutely futile to vote anything other than the government.

The other thing I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that William Davis, the Premier, took a different position, a contrary position to the Premier of Manitoba, and I don't know if it helped him or if it didn't hurt him, but it must have been one or the other, because he certainly didn't get hurt, didn't get hurt, wasn't negative —(Interjection)— well, partly it wasn't an issue, because of the fact that the other parties didn't make it an issue. It was kind of a non-issue in the Province of Ontario. So this party in Manitoba is going to try and make that de-issue in the province and, Mr. Speaker, I don't think they're going to succeed. I don't think they're going to succeed whether they hammer that issue, whether they set up a smoke screen, or whether they use the old red smear. It's not going to work, because the real issues, the real issues are going to come out of that fog and out of the red paint and they are going to haunt members of the Conservative Party.

I also noticed that the Minister of Highways forgot to talk about the Federal Election scene. He forgot to talk about the blue blip? He forgot to mention that his Federal Leader blew the Government of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, no more serious an allegation could be made against a political leader that in a period of less than one year he put the government on the line and blew the ball game. That has to be a serious error in judgment which has permanently wounded Joe Clark, the Leader of the Official Opposition and we know in this House, Mr. Speaker, what will happen. The man will carry on for two more years and then he will be dumped and than a new Leader will be chosen prior to the Federal Election. (Interjection)— Well, you want me to tell you about the Honourable Sid Spivak as to what happen to him, and, or do you remember what happened to him?

Mr. Speaker, I want to just mention one more point in a debate and that is that when we talk about the constitutional question, I've been sitting and waiting like everybody else for the last week to hear an announcement by the Premier of Manitoba about an agreement on an amending formula by the provinces and the Premiers of Canada. This is part of the smoke screen that is going on in the country. (Interjection)— No, but I want to say that in my opinion, you know, this is like a poker game, and the Premier of Manitoba is sitting there and he's holding some cards and Mr. Speaker, he's playing both ends against the middle.

In Ottawa, the Clark team, the federal team of Conservatives is saying to the people of Canada and to the Prime Minister and to the members of Parliament, just wait a minute because in Manitoba the Premiers are connected by telephone, or they're going to meet or the Premier of Manitoba isn't this his last day in office; this is his last day as the titular head of the Premiers and then he'll be replaced by somebody else, I think, tomorrow. So, on his last day, we're waiting for this big announcement about an agreement and the Federal Conservative Party is saying to the people of Canada, "There's an agreement being hammered out in Winnipeg, so let's just hold off on the debate because they're going to develop a position and that's going to radically change the whole issue in Canada."

You know what's happening in Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, there's no agreement, there is no position, there is no amending formula. There is a smoke screen and the Premier of Manitoba is waiting; they're waiting for us and our people here in government are holding the fort to wait for the Prime Minister of Canada to put closure into the House of Commons and blow the lid, blow that House of Commons sky high. It's a filibuster. A filibuster is going on in the hope, —(Interjection)— I want to say to my friend the Minister of Cultural Affairs, when she puts down her resolution on the Constitution, you'll hear my position, and you'll hear the position of all the members on this side. Why are you holding it back? Why don't you put it forward?

Mr. Speaker, I'm saying to you that the people in Ottawa are saying wait till a consensus comes out of Winnipeg, and the people in Winnipeg are trying to hold the fort until the filibuster either dies or closure is invoked. That's the game, that is the game. The Premier of Manitoba is playing both ends against the middle, Mr. Speaker, and I say what he is really doing is bluffing, bluffing. The Premier of Manitoba, he doesn't have three kings and a pair, he doesn't even have a pair; he doesn't have two cards in his hand that match. All he's got is a series of cards, maybe he's got a flush of four but he doesn't have five. He doesn't have a pair; he doesn't have anything; he doesn't have a sequence. Mr. Speaker, he's holding an empty hand and he's going to hold it as long as he can so that the Conservatives in Ottawa can cause the Liberals in Ottawa to invoke closure, and, Mr. Speaker, I say a plague on both their Houses; the House in Ottawa where the Conservatives are filibustering and the Liberals are threatening closure and the situation in Manitoba where the Premier is faking it. He is pretending that he has consensus.

Mr. Speaker, he doesn't have consensus and he's not going to get it, because the Premier of Quebec has already said; Rene Levesque has already said that he will not agree to any amending formula that comes out of these talks until a month from now, a month from now. (Interjection)— Well, okay, a couple of weeks from now when the election results are in, and don't be too sure that Rene Levesque will win that election. I'm betting on Claude Ryan, so is the MLA for Fort Rouge. Well, some of my colleagues aren't so sure, but I will set up my friend, the MLA for Fort Rouge, as a bookkeeper and she'll put out a line of odds and she will handle the wagers.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that there's not going to be any agreement, there's not going to be any agreement. You're not going to have Ontario with you and you're not going to have New Brunswick with you, and you probably won't have Quebec with you and we don't know whether you'll have Saskatchewan with you. You'll be with yourself and you'll have five other provinces to try to get behind you, Mr. Speaker, but is that going to be something to hold up the House of Commons for?

I say that to the Minister of Agriculture, are you honestly telling me that you're going to announce within a few days an interim or a position on an amending formula supported by Ontario and Quebec? No way. No way. There's no such thing. You don't have Ontario and you'll never get them

and you won't have Quebec either and you can't get them for a number of weeks, if you can ever get them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that I have been waiting like everybody else in good faith, up until yesterday and the question is what's holding the Premier back? Why doesn't he announce the "Agreement"? What's holding him back? If he has the agreement, let him put in on the table. Mr. Speaker, the answer is natural modesty. (Interjection)— Well, my colleague certainly gives the Premier more credit than I am prepared to give.

So, I say the Premier doesn't have anything in his hand, or some unkind people might say he is not playing with a full deck, and the point is that he is stalling to help his friends in Ottawa, and they are stalling based on him helping them. Mr. Speaker, it is charade, it is a farce, and it is a ruse.

Mr. Speaker, I simply conclude by saying that we are trying on this side of the issue, in spite of the mocking and the jests on the other side, in the various debates and in the question period to deal with the economic issues and the social problems confronting the people of Manitoba, and the government which doesn't have the answers and has a poor record in that regard is attempting to set up a smoke screen with the Constitution, and will resort to the old Commi smear during the Election. You know what, Mr. Speaker? The people of Manitoba will see through that and they'll vote on the record of the Conservative Government in office and they will throw them out sometime this year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the bill before us has some urgency to see it properly processed and passed so that the affairs of the province can continue, and the accounts of the government can be paid and that the some 14,000-15,000 employees can receive their cheques at the end of the week, but, Mr. Speaker, I am prompted nonetheless to add a few words to the debate at this particular time because there is a danger that we fall into from time to time, as government, by remaining silent as repeated distortions of fact and truth are read into the public record in this Chamber.

Sometimes in our desire to get on with the business of the House, particularly as is the case today with this bill, the temptation, of course, is not to add to the length of the debate, but to simply allow what has been put on the record to be placed on the record, and to sit silently and accommodate the Minister of Finance and get the measure passed that's before us, namely, Interim Supply.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned by the constant line that has been put forward by members opposite about this government's lack of concern for involving itself in the affairs of the people; it's lack of concern in spending public money, tax dollars, on the legitimate concerns of the people of Manitoba, and, Mr. Speaker, we give them some credence in enabling them to make that statement, because we have time and time again indicated, whether it comes from the mouth of our First Minister or other members of the Treasury Bench the amount of

reliance that we place on the private sector in fulfilling its role, and the importance of the private sector to create the jobs in the Province of Manitoba, and so that we have, unless we take occasion such as this to every once in a while remind honourable members opposite, and put on the public record, and more importantly the people of Manitoba, remind honourable members that this government has a track record second to none about its willingness to expend public tax dollars where there is a legitimate need, where there is the emergency, and where the dollars go the furthest, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to do that at a time that we have set out very specific goals for us, such as bringing about massive reductions of the public debt that we inherited when we first walked into office, or the annual deficit, which was at some \$195 million, estimated to be \$225 million when we first walked into office. That was brought down in subsequent years to a pretty respectable figure.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance in closing the debate will be able to put them on the record in a more accurate way and in a more factual way than I am prepared to at this particular time. But, Mr. Speaker, the point that I want to say is, the point that I want to put on the record, this was done in the years that this province faced some very difficult times. We had a massive flood on our hands in 1979. Did this government in any way shirk its responsibilities to the people of Manitoba in providing the aid, the assistance in that flood of record of 1979, simply because we are on record as being concerned about how that public money is being spent? Did that hold us back, Mr. Speaker, in any way, shape or form, for mounting one of the most effective flood fighting programs that this province has ever seen? I certainly don't take credit for that. The credit belongs to the co-operation that we managed to engender among the affected municipalities, among many hundreds, indeed thousands of dedicated staff that worked around the clock and brought about a tremendous flood fighting effort in the year 1979 that minimized the damage, that minimized the anguish that was suffered, that could have resulted as a result of that flood of record.

Mr. Speaker, I also take this occasion, but it's worthwhile to remind honourable members opposite that it was a Conservative administration that had the foresight in the mid-Sixties to build those ring dikes around the communities of Morris, St. Jean Baptiste, Emerson, St. Adolphe, that saved all those homes, saved them from the devastation that would have occurred had that action not taken place.

Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of foresighted public enterprise, public works that a Conservative administration can be expected to be involved in. Very little has changed, those are the kinds of concerns that we have about the economic future, the economic well-being of this province. We are not looking for that fast vote grabbing, job hand-out program that the NDP have been so famous for, Mr. Speaker, that when we assumed office, we could take 2,000 civil servants off the payroll and not affect any vital program in this province. Our aged are being looked after; our hospitals are being run; our roads are being built. They are being built at a faster

rate, they are being maintained at a better rate than they were during your eight years. Mr. Speaker, all we have done is trim off some of the NDP fat that had accumulated to the Government of Manitoba during its eight years.

Mr. Speaker, what was the next year that we faced, 1980-81? We faced a drought on record. Did it take us very long, Mr. Speaker, particularly if you want to compare our performance to that of the Federal Government's performance about announcing a \$40 million Drought Aid Program to support the hard-pressed rural agricultural economy of this province? Not at all, Mr. Speaker. Was there any reluctance on the part of this government, because of what you would like to put on the record saying that it's a laissez-faire government; we don't believe in spending any taxpayers dollars to help people out in need? No, Mr. Speaker, quite the opposite is the truth.

As much as we would have liked, under that former tight-fisted Minister of Finance, who had a great concern about bringing down the deficits of this province, my honourable friend, the Member for Riel — as much as we had, as you would like to paint us into that corner of being a tight-fisted mealy-mouthed government not prepared to the use the vehicle of public dollars where there was a legitimate need for one, Mr. Speaker, it took no such occasion, and the Minister of Agriculture can attest to that fact. We saw the need developing; a program was announced; a program was carried out that stands head and shoulders above the effort that the Federal Government with all its resources tried to carry out, Mr. Speaker, and that's not myself saying that, that is coming from the actual letters and from the description of the programs from the farmers who were affected. They are still trying to collect on that livestock program that was announced with a great deal of fanfare by honourable friends of the Federal Government, while our program ran smoothly, in a co-ordinated manner, and provided the help where it was needed, Mr. Speaker.

But this was done, Mr. Speaker, by a government that honourable members opposite like to paint as not having concern for the people in need in this province; being too concerned about balancing budgets; being too concerned about allowing it all to come out in the wash on its own, Mr. Speaker, but, Mr. Speaker, you can't have it both ways.

Mr. Speaker, what did we do? In the meantime what did we manage to do faced with these kind of economic tribulations — weather tribulations, certainly not, the honourable members aren't going to charge the drought to this government. They are not going to charge the flood in 1979 to the fact that this government was here and, Mr. Speaker, they cannot charge the fact during the greater part of the time that government was in office, the Seventies, across Canada we had good economic growth, we had good economic indicators that enabled that confidence to be placed in the economy and our growth was particularly mushrooming in the mid-term years of your administration, 1972 to 1974, 1975, and was then petering out. Not, as I will not charge them, Mr. Speaker, for entirely their reasons. The problems that we as a nation face probably have to be laid far more squarely on the doorsteps of the Federal Government in a successive, a decade of

massive deficit spending that has contributed, again not just in Canada but in the western world, in the free-market world, if you like, to the kind of situation that we now have where interest rates, inflation rates are strangling the opportunities for continued growth. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that it was our misfortune, if you like, that by the time this administration took office in 1977, and as we moved into 1978, 1979, 1980, the economic conditions are totally different from those that honourable members opposite faced for most of the time that you were in office and in power. The kind of automatic revenue growths that could be expected and indeed borrowed upon and mortgaged upon are not the kinds that the current Minister of Finance faces today; not just in this province, not just in our sister provinces, with perhaps one or two exceptions, but indeed across the country.

Mr. Speaker, nonetheless we managed to create and carry out that kind of promise, create that kind of a climate that in a most dramatic way, and really this is the most dramatic contribution that this government has demonstrated in our short three years of office. The fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have, although we admit ourselves, not done anywhere near enough, but at least by attempting to move in the direction of placing our province in a more tax competitive position vis-a-vis our sister provinces; by reducing personal income taxes; by creating the kind of climate even while all general indicators aren't all that favourable, the record that we have provided in our manufacturing industry — some 30,000 new jobs in our three years of which only 2,000 are in the public sector. Mr. Speaker, compare that to the last three years of the previous administration, where you created 10,000 jobs of which 7,000, Sir, 7,000 were in the public sector.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't that difficult to create jobs, if you are prepared to throw open the doors and just simply hire people. Mr. Speaker, that cannot be explained away, and that was done, as I said, during a period of economic conditions not anywhere near as favourable as the economic conditions generally were across this country during the time of the NDP administration.

Mr. Speaker, that was done despite some of the plant closures that we have had to experience in the last few years in this province. That was done despite the high interest rates that we've experienced in the last few years in this province, none of which were present, Mr. Speaker, when honourable members were in office; when honourable members were there to lure in new jobs, new industrial jobs in the private sector. No, Mr. Speaker, they didn't have, they couldn't create the climate to create those 30,000 jobs under much more beneficial economic circumstances than we have had to create them in, because nobody came really and knocked on the door. Indeed, the reverse was happening. There is sufficient evidence to believe, sufficient evidence that was left on the table when we took over office, that indicates that trend, that trend to reduction, particularly in the manufacturing sector, Mr. Speaker. You know, I appreciate the figures can get confusing and they can be argumentative, but the same set of figures, the same set of figures that they like to use show a net decrease of 8 percent, of 8 percent, the last

three years that they were in office in the manufacturing centre. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's an unbelievable figure. That's an unbelievable figure, and I don't care, Mr. Speaker, this game that we play in this Chamber, just about every other day, mainly by the Leader of the Opposition and the economist from Brandon East, that suggests that our sales, retail sales are not as high as some of the sister provinces, or that our growth rate in the manufacturing industry is below the national average, of course that isn't the case. If you just pay attention to that, Mr. Speaker, you forget the fact that our manufacturing jobs have been increasing at the rate of 15 percent a year, the last three years that we were in office, while the last three years of honourable members opposite, they were declining, actual net decline by 8 percent.

So I'm not suggesting that we should be happy or that my colleague, the Minister of Economic Development is happy with the record that we've accomplished. We always look for more and, Mr. Speaker, there's more that's not that far away and of course I gave this advice to the honourable members opposite, I believe during the Debate on the Throne Speech I can afford to give it to them again because they are prone not to take my advice. But I suggest to honourable members opposite that in having chosen, and you know, you've obviously caucused that, you have made your decision. You decided that after having tried for a few years to convince Manitobana that the Honourable Minister of Health put sand in baby diapers at the Health Sciences Centre, or doesn't change sheets or some other such thing, you know, you've finally had to get together because you realize that while you sat and planned for eight years, you did nothing for that major health facility. This government has gotten off its butt, dedicated and committed over \$100 million and that work is progressing right now. That work is progressing right now.

The major construction program, the major capital construction program undertaken in this province in the last several decades, the last several decades, Mr. Speaker, and, Mr. Speaker, that was on the books throughout the eight years of your administration. That was on the books throughout the eight years of your administration. All what you did about it, was study it for those eight years. Our Minister of Health had sufficient influence within this caucus and within this government to get it off the drawing boards, get the machines and get the men working. But more importantly, more importantly, make sure that we retain the Health Sciences Centre as being the, one of the medical facilities on the North American continent, one certainly that we can be proud of, one certainly that the people of Manitoba deserve and one that we have committed ourselves to.

Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of commitment that we have shown to those kind of programs that really help people. The honourable members finally realized that, that their dirty linen debate, their sand in the diapers debates, attacks on health services, even with the collusion of the Federal Minister that talks about diversion of federal medicare funds, medical funds to Rose, didn't really work. She had to embarrassingly acknowledge that and if she would have had any integrity she would have resigned. It

was an unheard kind of admission to have, to hear made in public television, a Federal Cabinet Minister saying, of course that was acceptable, because that's fair in game in politics. We were in an election game and you do those kind of things in politics. That's what Madam Bejan had to say, that's what Madam Bejan had to say about her charges prior to the election, about the diversion of medical funds here in the Province of Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, for whatever reasons, for whatever reasons the Opposition obviously decided that that tactic wasn't going to work, because they now realize that by the time the election does roll around, they are going to be X number of more personal care home beds in the province. The hospitals are being refurbished, renovated and capital expenditures expend on them. The nurses have been settled with and their services are being provided with. The doctors are not fighting us everyday out in the streets, as they were with the former Minister of Health. In fact we are working with the doctors, even though we are in difficult negotiations, but all this is happening, so what have they done, Mr. Speaker? They've caucused, they said we've got to drop that line of tact. The concern has to be centered on economic activity, and we'll focus all our tact on the two items of economic activity and the out-migration of people from Manitoba leaving for greener pastures, as they say.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a pretty shaky foundation to build an election campaign on because, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, as you've heard, as we've already heard in this province, from the Federal Minister responsible for Stats Canada. Look it, don't believe too many, don't take too much faith in our figures. We could be out as much by 18,000 people as to the people that came or left Manitoba. What does the Opposition all of a sudden say, six months from now, or four months from now when all of a sudden it shows that Manitoba is enjoying a steady and substantial growth in our population, rather than a decrease? What happens if there's a reverse in those figures? I wouldn't want to rest my case on the case that you are making on that regard and, Mr. Speaker, what happens is far more important. What happens, Mr. Speaker, what happens, Mr. Speaker, when in a very short time the only problem that we will face in this province is enough manpower, enough skilled manpower to man the jobs that are going to be created in this province, Mr. Speaker? What happens —(Interjection)— well fine, I'm not going to argue or debate, I'm just giving them some good advice, Mr. Speaker, because that's what they built their campaign on. That's what they built their platform on as we move into an election year. Mr. Speaker, they would have been better off, quite frankly, on continuing to depict us as mean, mealy-mouth, tight-fisted, S.O.B.'s, and carried on in that track, but they have switched their tactic, they have now decided that they are the party that will add and attract the kind of economic growth.

Well, Mr. Speaker, time the universe will unfold as it must and time will tell, as to whether or not my few comments this afternoon will not prove as great a disability to honourable members opposite, in attempting to recapture the government, as indeed their problems are with respect to internal division within their party.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I in conclusion would like to say, before transferring out of my portfolio of Government Services, you know you do have these little concerns, these little programs, pet programs if you like, that you like to carry out in any department, I suppose. One of the pet projects that I had particularly uppermost in my mind was having survived, having survived for eight years in a caucus room, about one-third of the size of the present caucus room that the Conservative Party now has, in Room 234 and there were 23 of us, Mr. Speaker. That was before we had — the then government hadn't given us any office downstairs, or anywhere else; 23 of us in just the one centre room of our, what is now know as the Conservative Caucus Rooms. The fore-room was a member's lounge. The back room was the Liberal Caucus Room. There was a Liberal party in those days; remember the Liberals? But they had that Caucus room. Well, Mr. Speaker, that left an impression upon me, about the need for better space for MLAs in this building and I was rather pleased that I was able to convince, not without some heavy opposition I might say, from some members on Treasury benches, that this building and that we should dedicate some prime space in this building to offices, for each and every elected official, each and every MLA.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty is and I'm having trouble with my own back bench, because I made that promise that they would be in there by March 1st, no later; I thought perhaps even as early as the last few weeks in February. Our difficulty is while we're prepared to move, the portions of the official Opposition are so changeable, we don't know where to put the moving partitions in the walls and whose office is designated to whom. We have new parties emerging in the Chamber which calls for different specifications. One more member and I have to look for a Caucus room for the Leader for the Progressive Party, and so that of course, is thrown into disarray, these well laid out, well thought out plans I had in a non-partisan way, for the general improvement of all members, particularly those who have had perhaps some years, the experience of working in crowded caucus rooms to allow them the dignity of first floor, main floor offices, so that when their constituents come to visit them, they could be received properly, as an elected official, elected member of this House ought to be received.

Mr. Speaker, but for the difficulties, but for the problems that honourable members on the official Opposition are having today, that rather nice plan by the former Minister of Government Services, has been postponed, has been deferred and I'm getting all the heat from my back bench now, because you know, they say to me promises, promises, promises, Enns; you said it was going to happen on March 1st and we still can't carry it out. But I offer this, Mr. Speaker, not as any criticism to the current Minister of Government Services. He has to as you would expect him to be, he has to look out and anticipate the future. The Progressives are gaining as fast as they are. The legislation and tradition is very clear. Caucus room facilities have to be provided. We would have to reconsider that plan that I showed to the members of the NDP Caucus way back in December or early January, about how we were going to allocate the different rooms, that has to be

revised, that has to be changed. So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that this opportunity has afforded me to unburden myself of that feeling of regret, feeling of having accomplished less than I set out to accomplish.

It is sometimes these, perhaps not so major things that happen in this Chamber that members do get remembered for. I kind of had it in my mind that upon retirement if I would walk into one of the loges occasionally some thirty years hence from now, somebody would still recall, in fact, they might even you know, the Opposition MLA row of offices on the first floor might even be inscribed as the Harry Enns wing, or something like that and somebody would remember me. But, however, we'll have to wait.

I wish my colleague, the Minister of Government Services well, that things will sort out. I shouldn't be so mean as to say that one has to wonder about a group of politicians or a party that has difficulty in making decisions as to space, whether or not they would ever be in a position to govern this province, but we'll let that be decided by the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the fact of the matter is this, the fact of the matter is this, that despite working in economic conditions, which were by any stretch of the imagination, by any objective measurement, are not anywhere near what they were in the mid-Seventies, in the early Seventies, despite a declared intention and in fact, an excellent record in bringing about, in bringing about demonstrable reductions in current and capital spending deficits; facing unexpected natural disasters which include flood, drought and fire, and yet planning to do those kind of courageous things like adding \$70 million into the new foundation program. You know that foundation program that was instituted by the Conservative administration in 1968 and then more or less left because it was an instrument, I suppose, thought difficult to improve on, during the eight years of the New Democratic Party administration. It awaited this administration to come in at a time when we are pressed for money to infuse a new support program to education, but by and large, prevented property tax rises throughout the length and breadth of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I reject the kind of such position that honourable members like to colour us with, that we are so obsessed with concerns about the involvement or the intrusion by government and that that should not take place. Mr. Speaker, the record is just too plain, the record is just too clear. It doesn't really matter whether it's in the record on this House, but it's in the record on the farm fields that were ravished by drought in rural Manitoba, it's on the record in the \$100 million-plus development that's taking place in the Health Sciences Centre. Mr. Speaker, it is on record that the involvement of this government where a demonstrable need has been demonstrated is there for all to see and it needs to be said, from time to time, not to have members opposite constantly suggest to us that this government is not prepared to apply appropriately public tax dollars where the need is there. Thank you.

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

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had no intention of taking part in this

debate. I thought that we needed a vote in a hurry on this to let it go to make sure that the people were paid, but after the remarks of the mean mealy-mouthed Member from Lakeside, I felt that something had to be said in response to some of the statements that he's made. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I cannot be too mean at this time because I feel for my honourable friend. I really feel sorry, it was quite pathetic to see him, it was just like a drowning man trying to grab a straw or somebody that had lost his balance, lost his feet and was trying desperately to get back on his feet. He talked about everything. He talked about the new jobs in the private sector. I mean, whatever was done in the eight previous years was because everything was well, but they told us that they were miserable years but now we're told everything was well, it was easy to govern. Then they say, well all right, this is why you were able to do that. He doesn't say that in some of the jobs — that's true more jobs were created — he doesn't say that you can capitalize on the devaluation of the dollar, it's going down all the time, and create more jobs; he doesn't say there were more jobs created all over Canada and then the percentage of the province is not up to par, he doesn't say that; he crows because they say we used the figures to shoot ourselves. No doubt this is human nature to try to prove your point and everybody knows that, that you can make figures say pretty well what you want them to say. But I think that my honourable friend is as guilty, and his government is as guilty as anybody else, so let's say that we start even on that, Mr. Speaker.

Then he talks about the jobs in the private sector as if that was something wrong. But because of jobs, because they fired a bunch of people, mostly because their credentials were that they were members or supporters or had been appointed by a New Democratic Party, they fired these people. They made the conditions, for instance, I'll give them an example, the working condition of the nurses so bad that they left the province and now we are faced with a shortage of nurses. The nurses were asked to do —(Interjection)— Not true I heard, and I know that you can't win an argument like this because it'll be the same thing, not true, not true. So I just say ask the nurses; ask the Association of Nurses what they think and they will tell you, Mr. Speaker. And that is the case because they were asked to do things such as we had in St. Adolphe; things that they shouldn't do; they were asked to carry a load that they shouldn't have done. We've closed beds because of that and then we made a shortage of nurses all over because the conditions, the working conditions were such; those are private jobs.

Then if you turn around and give certain corporations, or give certain things to the public, you call it new jobs; if you decide that you're going to personal care homes and you say, okay, the policy is very clear, the difference between the two parties. We do not believe that in the field of health any of these facilities should be profit-motivated but mostly care-motivated. All right, maybe we're right, maybe we're wrong, but it's very clear where we stand on that. But I would imagine that they would say those are private sector if they were in a nursing home because the owner is going to make money, sometimes at the expense of those people holding

these private sector jobs against the public sector. So, you know, you can make figures say an awful lot of things, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I've heard so many things about the people. I remembered just three or four short years ago, during the campaign of 1977, I remember that the Conservative candidate in St. Boniface was a Mr. Poitras and he had been so proud of Manitoba. Manitoba was such a good place to live; he had established, mind you he didn't want to say what kind of house he had because things were supposed to be bad under a New Democratic Government, but he was so proud of that and he had a business. He said to us and to the people, we participated in some public meetings and he said, if the NDP are elected there is no way I'm going to stay here, I cannot stay here in this province that I love, where I've got a business and a home and where I'd like to bring up my kids, he says, because things are going to be bad. Well, you know, God must have blessed him because the Tories won. Shortly after that he left the province, Mr. Speaker. So, Lester he left the province, Mr. Speaker. I'm staying right here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are told also and you know sometimes you have to face things and you have to explain the way they are because it is so easy to misrepresent, to try to tie you with certain things and then that's it, and then it doesn't matter if it's right or wrong. If they can succeed in doing that they are happy, Mr. Speaker.

Now, we have been challenged to say where we stand on the question of succession duty. I think that the succession duty, and I make no apology for that, is a very fair tax. You are taxing because we believe in taxing those that can pay. We believe that those many people born with a silver spoon in their mouth that wouldn't have to fight very much because they've got it made. You know, if they've got a little bit less to help those that haven't got. All right, now it was a big joke to say we were going to take it off anyway. That is true, not because we didn't believe in the principal of it. It was a good principal. It is something that can only be carried out if it is pretty well uniform because then you are giving certain provinces an edge if you don't do that, and it is something that should be carried out by a Federal Government and the Federal Government turns it over to the provinces. The provinces that didn't need it, especially like Alberta, you know, you've heard that, the rich get richer and the poor get poorer and this is the situation. So, they stop and eventually even us very reluctantly felt that we couldn't carry on any more and we were going to take it off. There is no way that we will bring it back unless the whole country does.

I make no apologies for that at all. I think it is a fair tax. One of the fairest taxes, you know, what was it, I don't think that anybody suffered at all and let's repeat that. I think it was a quarter of a million, the first quarter of a million was in taxes, or well, the first quarter of a million to a spouse, I'm told more than that, and then it was only anything in excess of that that you would have to pay. Those are the things and we're told that this was so high.

Well, you know, we want to talk about the record of this government and what gripes me, Mr. Speaker, is that they think that they have the divine right to

make a statement and that statement is right and nobody else, or to establish a definition; they say we will spend money when it is the right time when there is an emergency. So having said that, this is very responsible but anytime we spend money automatically it was throwing money at problems. This is what we heard and maybe we should look at some of the things that are said, Mr. Speaker. We are told and my friend again will have another laugh because he thought that was quite funny. I couldn't believe, I couldn't believe my eyes, Mr. Speaker, when we started the Estimates of the Minister of Community Services in this declaration and I will read it. It should be on the record in this House also. I will read Page 2 of his lengthy statement. It said, "During the initial period of our administration the Government of Manitoba pursued a deliberate general policy of careful fiscal management in an attempt to reverse Manitoba's fiscal deficit and the adverse effects of inflation. In terms of the provision of Social Services this meant the allocation of available financial and human resources according to the sensitive assessment of need and sensible goal." You know, all these words, sensible, if they say that, it's, everything they do is sensible. "By choosing a course of prudence, control and innovation, the government has been able to bring order and responsibility to the province's Budget." — (Interjection)— I think I should read that again. "The government has been able to bring order and responsibility to the provinces' Budget and has found that proper management of financial resources can maintain programs, which are undiminished in quality and can result in additional resources to develop new services."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this has to be the biggest joke of them all. This has to be; we had a government, a group of people, they talk about the gloom, the doom and gloom and the rookies in this House don't remember when they were sitting on this side, when their mates were sitting on the side, what was said. You know, and my friend from Inkster said yesterday I think, talk about somebody from that side who is sitting in this House today who phoned and suggested that people should not buy buses from Flyer's. They wouldn't deliver. You know, that's the gloom and doom. I don't think anybody on our side ever did that, Mr. Speaker. So those are the things that were said and then they don't remember their former Ministers of Industry and Commerce what was said. And if they read Hansard, Mr. Speaker, I think that they would understand, they would see what was done.

But anyway, this government, they had no policy, their only policy was good management because we're all a bunch of donkeys, never managed a peanut stand before. Good management and restraint and for years they wanted to get rid, they talk about dissension, they had somebody on that side that probably did more for the province than anybody on that side, did more, and I'm talking about Mr. Spivak, and they got rid of him by setting him up on this Commission that they raved about and then they abandoned. You never hear them talk about the Spivak Commission or Task Force any more, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they had not been, you know, they say careful, careful adjustment; they had not

been in power for more than two weeks and then there was a statement made that the Minister of Finance was going to clean up everything else, that he had to have restraint and he said in the Department of Health of Social Development, I want \$10 million deducted. I want that cut off. No increase. I want that cut off. How did that Minister base himself in two weeks to know that it had that much fat that \$10 million can be cut out. The Minister of Health did not question that at all. He says, I've got my orders. I've got to cut this down for \$10 million and so they said okay. Their policy was what? You know, it was governing by flying kites to see where it was by being on every side of every issue, by talking one way and doing something else, and it was all in the name of restraint and good government. They kept that up, they talked about that for quite a while. We talked about the the day care, that we had too many day cares and they had said that the work that was being done at the time, there was no way at all, and finally when the Minister, the First Minister, from that side on day care said, yes, we've got a good program, we don't need anymore.

Home care was the same thing. They cut down on staff. They froze the personal care. My honourable friend talks about all the wonderful things they did on health side. They froze the personal care beds. What did it cost the good management? Now, he's saying that we are going to have more beds. He is not going to have more beds that are programmed. He stated that we'll have less and how did they accomplish that by waiting and you can add at least 10 percent of the cost every year, the years that you're waiting, at least. And I'm very, being, if you pardon the word, very conservative, Mr. Speaker. So what happened then? And what did they do? Did they do anything new? There was one personal care home that they changed, which wasn't a recommendation of the Commission, it was one in a constituency my honourable friend taken away from the constituency of my colleague. All right, Mr. Speaker, and that was their claim to fame in this instance.

My honourable friend says we are pictured as mean, as penny-pinching —(Interjection)— he said that, I would never call members in this House s.o.b.'s, Mr. Speaker. I will not pretend that they are callous, that they purposely want to do certain things. I think that, and that's the sad part of it. They really believe some of the things that they say, and it is obvious that all of a sudden this year they are not. These Estimates that we have in front of us is not a conservative estimate. It is against everything, every policy of a Conservative Party. I attended enough meetings, Mr. Speaker, with the Ministers of Health and the Minister of Social Development, where every provincial province where there was a Conservative Government wanted less government, did not want these programs at all. They wanted to cut down on Medicare. They wanted to cut down on many of these things and they said, you know, it's the battle of the fittest, let them survive. They believe that, they believe that. I'm not suggesting, they believe that this is best way that eventually if the rich, if the elite is satisfied, they'll create a climate where the poor person will get a little more and they start by the top. The best example of that, Mr. Speaker, in all this

restraint, what did we do? What have we got in these three years? Higher pensions for the members and the Cabinet Ministers time counts, bigger salaries than we ever had. They are not even paying for their own gas now no matter where they go — if they take their family for a drive. Everything is free for these people and the leader also was set up and he would not move until he was guaranteed a certain amount of money. Mr. Speaker, and then what happened? They made a big thing to say that we were trying to hide the two cents per gallon of gas that we were paying, that we were using to finance Autopac, which is not the case; it was always in the open. There is no way that could be hidden. The financial statement had to say where the money came from. They made a big thing out of that. They yelled so darn much, Mr. Speaker, that they wanted the people to forget that they had increased the taxes by two cents on a gallon of gas because they put that in the general revenue, and they were supposed to reduce taxes. They reduced taxes on large corporations, the elite, you started with the elite. What did we hear? We hear it is the time that needs cost first, needs after, if we can do it. But that didn't take into consideration that the elite had to be taken care of and the members of this House had to be taken care of. The claim to fame to my honourable friend is that he gave us offices.

The Bible, I think there was something in the Bible that there was a fellow working for somebody, he was the bookkeeper and he started reducing the debt of the people. He figured well I might need them pretty soon if I'm kicked out. They want those offices when they form the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. This is the main reason that he's so anxious. He criticizes us for wanting to fix these things. I did not accept an office — the office that was designated to me was like the rotunda at the CNR-CPR station. It was the thing that to go to three different offices they had to go through . . . and my honourable friend said you need an office where you can get your constituents to talk to, and they would be coming to go into three different offices going through between us. I'd sooner get in the hall somewhere in a corner where at least people won't walk right through the middle. So that's his claim to fame and he wants us to call the ends wings. But he's got a wing and a prayer and that's about all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking also about the people leaving the province and what a difference a day makes. When older people were leaving in our time it was all the succession duties — you are forcing them out. But the Minister of Transport not too long ago, yesterday, last night said, who's leaving the province? It's perfectly all right. People that have received their education, that have been given so much by the provinces, are leaving like my uncle and my aunt and they're going to live . . . they're retiring in Florida. It's perfectly all right. But in our day they were forced out because of that succession duty. So you can make things look so good, the same thing that you criticized people for and the policies.

My honourable friend had a lot of fun also when I was the Minister of Health in talking about confrontation with the medical profession. Mr. Speaker, their contract the year that this happened, their contract was terminated on the 31st of

December and on January 7th they were calling a big meeting because they had no contract. The first year with this government their contract came up, six months after they didn't dare anything. Where could they go? They couldn't criticize their friends the Conservatives and it's certainly a free country but mostly I think it's understood that most of the people that are in that bracket would be supporters of, not all, but supporters of the Conservative Government. They couldn't do anything because they had chastised the people although things were the same in every province. You could see this at different meetings. But this was an awful thing; it was a New Democratic Party. Seven days, Mr. Speaker, and what was the big criticism? What had I done that was so awful?

**A MEMBER:** We know.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** No you don't, no you don't. All right, you tell me. Was it a question of money? We had paid the doctors and there was an increase of 45 percent of the doctors working for the government. (Interjection)— Yes, you gave me a new life all right because I am going to refute the things that you've said. What did he say, Mr. Speaker? What did he say? What was it? It wasn't a question of money because there was a ceiling that we couldn't do anything about it. I had suggested to the President of the MMA that I thought before that came in, that's coming in and we can do it fast; I think I can get you 13 percent but they wanted 47 percent or 49 percent, and they fought and then the ceiling came off. But you know why they were mad, because they wanted a clause — everything else was agreed. They wanted one clause; they wanted a clause that said you cannot hire out. That means that we could not, a government, could not hire a doctor to work for the government or anywhere without permission, the okay of the MMA. That's exactly why and look at the records and you'll see that's exactly it. Many of the doctors thought we meant you cannot opt out. It wasn't that at all because we always said, and if I mentioned they had the right to opt out then I was told you want them out. So you couldn't win, everything was turned around.

But the main thing, the big battle and the show of unity that they showed on the 7th of January of whatever year that was, was they wanted a clause, they insisted on a clause that we could not hire out. In other words we would ask the free enterpriser if we can hire people on salary for working for government. We could not do it without the permission, without the veto of the MMA and that was the extent of a confrontation. Tell me is there anybody honest enough here to tell me what they would do if this was the case again? Why is it that they're not asking now for this? Why is it that is not in any other provinces or any other government? I don't think any other government, any sane government would give any group such a clause that you say we cannot hire anybody without your permission.

I'm not too sure — I question the advisability for instance of having a free enterpriser tell the rules or negotiate for people working on salary for a government. I don't think that should be the . . . but anyway wiser heads than mine have decided that and I guess that's the case. But let it be understood

that this confrontation was built on that if there was any confrontation — let that be understood, Mr. Speaker.

Now we talked about the policies and my honourable friend in Health mentioned the Health Sciences Centre. The Health Sciences Centre before this government took office, this had been announced and there was some money set aside. The only thing — you can't win — remember the meeting that we had that three parties were presented at this meeting, I think it was with the nurses and the critic for the then Opposition was the Member for Rhineland, and they said what would you do if you were in government in the field of Health? He says we're not qualified to know what should be done so we'd have a meeting of the doctors, the chiropractors, the chiroprodists, the physiotherapists, the nurses, all of them, and you would tell us what to do. In the Health Sciences Centre, Mr. Speaker, what we did say, we said all right, it's a form of block funding — they have these groups representing the Health Sciences Centre, representing the different institutions and we said, you prioritize.

We had a study made not by NDPs, we had a study made to see exactly what was needed and we acted on that, we moved in that direction. Then they worked, the architects and so on worked with these people to arrive at their priorities. We told them some of the things we wanted. We wanted the cancer research to be dealt with. But it was an asphalt jungle. Things were so mixed up that it wasn't that easy and all the planning. Every day the government were saying full speed ahead and we were waiting on this group to make up their mind and now we're told that nothing moved. They're announcing millions of dollars — that's easy. I did, like my honourable friend did yesterday and looked at some of the clippings that he just happened to have. I remember clippings under the Roblin government where the Health Sciences Centre was going to be the research centre of North America and all these dreams, millions and millions of dollars were spent but we're still waiting. There has been some spent under all governments. But it's easy to make all kinds of commitments like that, Mr. Speaker.

Now there is nothing, not one new thing in the field of Health or Social Development that was not at least on the drawing board. Everything wasn't in place and I give full credit but you keep on you don't stop. You go on in government and you progress. Some of the things were just being developed at this time and they are taking advantage of it and fine. Then some of the things that maybe that they're developing now we might take advantage of if we take credit for it, that's the way, but there is nothing new. Some of the things we were waiting for . . . Money was in there for a psychiatric hospital for youngsters. We're still waiting, after every year saying that's the first priority — we're waiting for that.

Mr. Speaker, now we're told it's a blanket statement and whoever dares take exception to that is wrong and how dare they question these so honest people. They talked about changing sheets. But that's the way it starts. It's not from one day to the other that your people will have three full meals a day and the next day under a policy of restraint that

they won't have any meals at all. It doesn't go like that. It's little things and it seems ridiculous to mention you don't change the sheets or you turn them around or change one sheet, or you take a piece of bacon, or you tell them to bring their own kleenex. This is the thing, but this is what happened. They were so fortunate, they talk about the lucky years. They were so fortunate and they will be the first ones, and Minister after Minister got up and said we have the best programs; this program is the best in Canada. In the field of Health and Social Development we were the envy of most of the other provinces and we took a back seat to no one. We still have some good programs but it has gone down. Look in the field of Home Care, look in the field of Personal Care Homes. Maybe we should talk about Personal Care Homes again with the situation that we have that private operators can do, because that is not conducive. You know what they say — they say, well government could not run anything. They're not efficient. Efficient means cutting costs. Cutting costs means that is the first priority, not the care of the people. That means that you keep people under sedation; they don't make any noise. You can get in a personal care home there's no noise, everything is quiet — they're all doped up, they can't even move, they're like zombies or tied in a chair. That is the case. This is a licence to print money, a personal care home, there's waiting lists — they can't lose. The money that they had, an incentive to build on money because they'll have to borrow at a high cost — they will build when they need it. We had to wait in Selkirk because it wasn't the time to build because it was left to a private operator. What happens after this? Mr. Speaker, everything is in the per diem. So I mean their element, they've got to operate at a profit and I'm not criticising these people at all. They've got to operate. I'm not saying they're all bad. I think we're lucky to have some pretty good ones in Manitoba because we're being very careful. But this is a danger and if you have something in mind, if you say it's fair, well, carry on with that. If it's fair to have private personal care homes why not private hospitals? Why not? We know what that would mean, Mr. Speaker.

So we have the situation that these people have a situation and what do you do? The Minister tells us — like in St. Adolphe. We were told repeatedly that the standards were going down. The nurses told us that the standards were going down. People were telling us that their parents, one of them told us that her father had lost 10 to 15 pounds. The nurses told us that there's some of the harm that you did will stay with these people because now they're older people, they live in fear. All this left a mark on them. But you know what we were told? What would we do if we closed the place? That's just it, they will always have a club. Especially, you can't do too much — if it was a publicly owned or a non-profit organization you could come in and say hey just a minute. But you can't do that in a private outfit. You've got to respect their rights, Mr. Speaker, and what happens. The same situation that we have. And I to this day, and this is something that we could certainly talk about — about the wages because as soon as somebody is on strike these people get up and say oh yes the strike, as if there's something dirty — they're strikers. If the elite, if a member of the

medical profession says look, we had 13 percent increase and 13 percent in two years or something like that. The inflation rose not 10 percent like we thought it would but 10.5 so we want 47 percent more. That's okay. You'll reopen that. You won't say in all fairness, you won't say you'll give them 47. It's easy to ask that and maybe get something that normally you might under the conditions of restraint and all that you might not be entitled to. But the same people working, pushing brooms in the hospital. Remember when you talk about percentages even the Member for Lakeside knows that there's a difference between 10 percent of 100 or \$75,000 and 10 percent of \$10,000 — which is most unfair again; the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. But would the Minister reopen — the people working, pushing a broom at maybe for \$10,000 a year in a hospital — oh, no. No, no, the MHO said no. Well, you hide behind the MHO and say where do they get their money from? From the government. And if the government could say, hey, there's inflation. You know, the doctors are justified and they are justified in saying, hey, we want to keep up with inflation. Well, what about the poor bugger at the bottom of the ladder? You know, you were talking about a little bit of concern. Those are the concerns we're talking about, not concerns like you do this year of bringing these programs all of a sudden and then you're increasing all those civil servants that you didn't need. All of a sudden you are asking for more and look at the money that you're spending this year.

Just about a year ago, you were very happy to say we go with the Crosby Budget, except one thing, they don't go far enough. You are saying Reagan is right, Reagan is your god because he is going to cut down on these people; he's going to put them in their place, but you have turned around and you are throwing money at problems because you say when there's an emergency and there is an emergency, there's going to be an election. There is going to be an election and you have been dismal failure in your policies of restraint. It hasn't worked at all.

The debt, you know, you used to say, go home, son, and tell your mum and dad that you just started living but you have to pay just the debt of Manitoba. Now, maybe you should tell them, go home, son, you owe \$600 more than you did three years ago. Would you tell them that? Is there less inflation? If there is any reason, if you believe in restraint, this is the time to do it, Mr. Speaker, but all of a sudden you're throwing money. The Day Care Maintenance Grant was lousy; they've got maintenance grants now. I'm pleased, they had no research before, it was the restraint now, the cost and the needs and it was the underpaid and overworked, but we didn't say that to the MLA, you've got to be underpaid and underworked. We said this is what happens in other provinces. This is what we say, this happened in other provinces and that's the main claim. Anybody who wants to justify a raise for the MLA, they said, well, we are fifth, or sixth, or fourth of the province. That made it right, it didn't matter, everybody is on the same thing, we're the only one that upped our own salaries, but that was all right. I don't say there's anything wrong in being well paid; don't misunderstand me, but I am saying that if you say, this is what we want to do, we've got to tighten the

belt. Why does it always have to be the belt of the guy below you that you want to tighten? Why? Why don't you want to just take it easy and let everything hang up as far as you're concerned, but tighten the belt of the guy below you? —(Interjection)— And that is the problem. What's that?

**A MEMBER:** You're getting personal again.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I'm not worried about personal things, that doesn't bother me. You know, after 22 years here, personal things don't affect me too much, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I have a lot of fun with that. Was it my friend that is parading now for campaigning with cheques, with the restraint giving cheques around his constituency, that the government grants the cheques he's passing on. Here is God coming in with all the goodies all of a sudden, or Santa Claus in the days of restraint. That's my friend saying that it's a personal thing. Well, let it go at that. Let it go, let it go, Mr. Speaker. These are the things, there is so much fear.

Then we talked about the leadership and let's talk about the leadership. One of the things that happened, Mr. Speaker, is that when you say to be a good leader in politics you got to ruthless . . .

**MR. DOERN:** Rufus.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** No, ruthless and you can't be kind. We've got a leader that, if you're going to look at this business, is a kind and considerate man. It makes me laugh, too, and smile when he hits the board because it's not natural for him, I grant you that. It's not natural, he's trying his damndest, but you are doing it also because I have never seen . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member has five minutes.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I was just getting started, Mr. Speaker. This is for all the time I haven't been recognized for question period. Well, Mr. Speaker, all right, there are so many things to say, I thought I was just started and this is the speech that I wasn't prepared at all. It was just my honourable friend that got me to speak.

Anyway talk about the leadership, I would love nothing more than for every Manitoban to have watched the conduct of this House, and I know you need a hatchet man and I've been one in my time but I never been the Premier of this province. When the Premier of the province indulges in the kind of thing that you do and you call that leadership. I will pin my "too nice a guy" against your arrogant man any day of the week. But watch him, like we in committee, watch him when you come in committee and the things, this name-calling. I've never seen Roblin doing this; I've never seen Schreyer doing that; I've never seen Campbell doing that. The most saddest thing, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a bunch of rookies like the Minister of Highways who thinks this is par for the course. We'll have a generation of people like that, that will mock parliament and especially from a Premier who says that he believes in government and in Parliament the way it works and he is such a defender of that. This is the thing and it has been ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, what we've had to put up with, because of a Premier who has

waved his finger at the Speaker and threatened the Speaker. I've never seen that before and that's leadership. You are welcome to your leadership, keep it. Keep it, keep it, but you won't last very long. I'm glad that it's like this because there are going to be so many, you don't win an election, most of the time you lose an election, and, boy, you're doing your damndest. I know what you're going to do, you're going to call an election not on your record, you're going to call an election on an anti-Trudeau because that's popular. You're going to call an election on the Constitution, because you don't dare face the public and say, here, there's our policy. You know, we're saying that the Feds are spending too much money; we heard that today, but we have a resolution asking them to pay more of the police work, pay more, pay more.

Mr. Speaker, I'll finish with this, we were told three years ago by my friend to my left to prepare two envelopes. He was wrong, three envelopes. He was wrong, five envelopes. They had the Feds, they had us and then prepare the third envelope but they forgot, blame God, like we heard this today about all the problems that they had and blame the municipalities, Mr. Speaker, because we've had them all. So now I say, get ready, prepare five envelopes because your days are numbered.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance. Oh, wait a minute, the honourable member would be closing debate.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, in listening to some of the remarks this afternoon certainly I wanted to take a few moments and some time to answer and to discuss some of the remarks that were made by the Minister of Natural Resources and my colleague, the Member for Lakeside. There is only one statement that he has made that I'm in agreement with him on and I may as well put that one on the record first, where he and I can agree on the one thing. That's the only statement that he has made in his remarks where he said that the Tories, that his government, is not concerned about balancing the Budget. Mr. Speaker, that's probably the only statement that I can agree with the Minister of Natural Resources. At least if he didn't make that statement, Mr. Speaker, that's the analysis that I got from his statement. He said we are not worried about anything else, Mr. Speaker, we are going to build those projects because we are not worried about balancing the budgets of the Province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's about the only area that I can agree with. (Interjection)— That's certainly not what they said when they were campaigning for government but now, Mr. Speaker, we've got to open the taps. The tide is turning against us, so we have to proceed, give out and cover up as much of the muck that we created for ourselves in the first three years so that we can now try to pave our way for the next election.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, as the Member for St. Boniface said to you, a few things have come along that have added to your misfortunes and some of the things you've caused on your own, but I want to deal with some of comments that the Minister of Natural Resources made. He talked about foresight; he

talked about the great programs that the Tory Government had in terms of flood control, in terms of drought relief and those were good well-managed programs, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Natural Resources well knows that while a certain portion of the Province of Manitoba was treated in terms of assistance in flood fighting and flood assistance, not all areas were treated equally, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister well knows that. He remembers the areas that I have raised and the areas are part of the region of the province that he represents. We had his colleague, now the Minister of Finance — I'm advised by people in the native communities that he said that I will meet with you with respect to the Fisher River through the Department of Indian Affairs, I will not talk to you directly, Mr. Speaker. Is that the way to treat citizens of this province whether they be in Southern Manitoba or citizens of native ancestry? Is there any conclusive work being done to provide flood protection for the people on the Fisher River and Peguis Reserves, Mr. Speaker? No, no, Mr. Speaker, there isn't. (Interjection)— The Minister should check the record in terms of the correspondence that I had with his colleague with respect to that very issue. He knows full well that while there was a flood reduction program for residents in the Red River Valley, which I don't argue with, Mr. Speaker, I do not argue at all with, don't get me wrong, but why were other areas of the province not being treated in the same manner?

I raised this matter in the House two years ago, Mr. Speaker, with the then Minister of Government Services in charge of Emergency Measures. He told me, and it's in Hansard, that program would be extended to all the other areas and if it wasn't there we would make sure that those areas would be covered. I went back and checked Hansard, Mr. Speaker, to find out whether my questions may have been able to be misinterpreted. I was speaking specifically about the ring-dike program that the Minister crowed about this afternoon and I did check the record, Mr. Speaker, and I did ask those questions. A year later he said, no, those areas are not included, those areas are not part of our program because we have no agreement, Mr. Speaker. And there were people, not to the same extent I agree, not to the same extent of flooding that Southern Manitoba received . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour being 4:30, when this comes up again, the honourable member will have 35 minutes.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** We are now in Private Members' Hour. On Tuesdays, the first item of business is Private Bills.

Bill No. 31, An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate The Mennonite Collegiate Institute standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

Bill No. 33, An Act to amend An Act to amend and consolidate An Act to incorporate Manitoba Pool Elevators standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

### ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING PUBLIC BILLS

**MR. SPEAKER:** We will then proceed with Public Bills.

Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act, The Motive Fuel Tax Act, The Revenue Act, The Retail Sales Tax Act and The Tobacco Tax Act standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. (Stand)

Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Medical Act standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. (Stand)

Bill No. 17, The Medical Act standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

Bill No. 19, An Act to amend The Veterinary Medical Act standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

### BILL NO. 23 — THE CONDOMINIUM ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 23, the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON:** Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this bill for the Attorney-General, both 23 and 24, I think he's indicated he is going to speak on today.

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, with respect to Bill No. 23, members will recall that The Condominium Act was amended at the last session of this Legislature to provide reasonable security of tenure for tenants in occupancy when a declaration is filed in the Land Titles Office in respect of the conversion of an existing rental property to a condominium property. In substance, one provision provided that the tenant shall have the right to continue in occupancy of the premises he occupied on the date of registration of the declaration for a period of at least two years after the registration of the declaration or at the option of the tenant for a period equal to the number of full years the tenant has been in occupancy of any premises in the property as of the date of registration of the declaration. Should a tenant elect to continue in occupancy beyond two years under the alternative option, the landlord may protest the longer term, in which case the matter would be subject to mediation and arbitration. The sub-section imposes a statutory duty on the Rentalsman and the arbitrator to take into consideration the possible physical, mental or psychological harm that may occur to the tenant due to age or physical impairment, if the tenant's wish is denied. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, proposes to extend the period of security of tenure for persons age 65 or more, for a period of the tenant's choice. Under the existing provisions, if a person 68 years of age lives in a building that is being converted, that person would have a minimum of two years in which to find alternative accommodations. On the other hand, if that person had been in occupancy in any premises in the building for a period of eight years, there would be a right to continue in occupancy for a further eight-year period. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the current provisions would appear to be adequate at the present time.

From a tenant's point of view, Mr. Speaker, I point out that, faced with the possibility of having to provide very long term tenure to a number of elderly

persons, an owner who may wish to retain the option of continued ownership of the building or disposing of it by conversion at some point in the future, may be discouraged from renting to persons over 65 years of age. This would obviously then, reduce tenants' choices and actually be detrimental to the interests of elderly renters.

Mr. Speaker, I also point out that this Bill would require a landlord to make enquiries of every tenant throughout his property as to the ages of his tenants before filing a Condominium Declaration. This of course, Mr. Speaker, would be forbidden under the terms of The Human Rights Act, as being discrimination on the basis of age, and would no doubt trigger a number of complaints to the Human Rights Commission. So, Mr. Speaker, there are problems with respect to The Human Rights Act, there are then subsequent problems, if in fact, false information were to be given by a tenant to the landlord involving a Certificate of Titles which might subsequently issue.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the introduction of this Bill does demonstrate the Member for Fort Rouge's concerns for senior citizens. However, Mr. Speaker, suggesting that perhaps with the amendments that were made at the last Session of the Legislature that appear to be adequate at the present time, perhaps with more experience, the Legislature will see fit to make amendments which would further strengthen the position of our senior citizens. However, the Bill, as I've attempted to explain, does create problems that may adversely affect elderly tenants obtaining occupancy of apartment blocks in the future because of the difficulties that the owner may perceive in the ultimate disposal of the property, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just wish to place on the record some of the concerns I have with respect to this Bill, with respect to the difficulties they may have for residential accommodation for senior citizens and for other concerns that relate to human rights requirements. Mr. Speaker, it may very well be that there will be other members who wish to speak to this problem.

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

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL NO. 24 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CONDOMINIUM ACT (2)**

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, again there's no doubt in my mind that the Member for Fort Rouge is well motivated by bringing this Bill forward also for consideration. This would add a requirement that a Condominium Declaration in respect of a rental property that is to be converted to condominium should be accompanied by a resolution of the council of the municipality consenting to the registration of the declaration. In other words, Mr. Speaker, a municipal council could obstruct a conversion proposal. It is common knowledge, Mr.

Speaker, that before a builder or developer proceeds with construction of a building, a municipal building permit must be obtained, and the proposal must conform to zoning by-laws. Furthermore, there are such requirements as minimum parking spaces, road access and other requirements that must be met.

It is obvious therefore, Mr. Speaker, that municipal council involvement in, and regulation of, building development exists at the proposal stage. This applies to all types of buildings including rental properties. It is also obvious therefore, that municipal authority has been exercised in a building whether it continues as a rental property, or whether it is proposed to be converted to condominiums.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that in converting a rental property to condominiums, the basic nature of the building is not altered. It still provides living accommodations. Therefore there is no change of useage. Admittedly there may be change of ownership of the various units of the building, but these units are still utilized as living accommodations for either the owner or the tenant of the owner. Indeed, it is a fact that many owners buy condominium units for rental as an investment.

Objections to condominium conversions are sometimes based on the allegation that rental units are being withdrawn from the market. While this may be the case in some instances, I stress again that one cannot say that housing units are being withdrawn. Mr. Speaker, I fail to see the rationale therefore, for requiring the consent of the municipal council before a person can dispose of his property. To illustrate my point further, would the member recommend that the owner of a house which is now rented, would require the consent of the municipal council before seeking to take possession of the premises from the tenant for his own occupancy?

Mr. Speaker, no guidance is given to the council so that there is some indication of what basis their consent should either be given or withdrawn. It is likely to vary from time to time, depending upon the policy of the council, which may or may not be uniform throughout the municipality. Nothing in the provisions seems to relate to any problems arising because of zoning or town planning circumstances. Mr. Speaker, it would appear to be an unnecessary requirement which would not likely serve any consistent purpose either for the benefit of tenants or for the benefit of the municipality as a whole.

Again, Mr. Speaker, those are my brief remarks with respect to this piece of legislation, and hopefully there will be other members of the Legislature who wish to comment on it.

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

**MR. JENKINS:** I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Proceed with Bill No. 28, An Act to amend The Employment Services Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. (Stand)

Bill No. 30, An Act respecting the Sperling Joint Community Centre District, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

Bill No. 37, An Act to authorize the Rural Municipality of Montcalm to Sell and Convey a Portion of a Public Road within the Municipality, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I wonder if the honourable member would agree to my speaking on this Bill and letting it stand in his name.

### **BILL NO. 37 — AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF MONTCALM**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns on Bill No. 37.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the Minister for Municipal Affairs is present because I think that this matter should be something that is reviewed by him and by his department. It would appear to be a rather technical and insubstantial Bill as before us but reading the Bill itself, there is obvious contradiction relating to the law and what is proposed in the Bill and it appears right in the Bill itself.

The Bill indicates, in the preamble, that, "whereas a certain section of The Municipal Act," and we'll skip down to 209(12), "A municipality shall not sell, at any stated price, the land previously occupied by a highway to persons other than the owner of the adjoining land, without first offering it to that owner at the same or a smaller price," the principle being, Mr. Speaker, obviously, that an adjoining owner should have a prior claim on purchasing the land adjoining his property from the municipality where there was a highway closed and added to his land, and that he should not be held up for an extravagant price because of the fact that he may be the only person who has a real interest in it.

Then the Bill before us goes on and says, "Whereas the municipality is desirous of selling and conveying the portion of the road to two individuals who are the occupiers of the premises located on that portion, and whereas the said purchasers are not the owners of land adjoining the portion of the Public Road to be closed."

Then it goes on, and the effective portion of the Bill says that the municipality may sell and convey this land to these two individuals, and I quote: "at and for such consideration as may be mutually agreed upon." Well, that's the end of the quotes that I want to give to this Bill. But it now means that the Legislature of Manitoba is being asked to set aside the provisions of The Municipal Act and to permit a certain transaction to take place, the sale of certain land, from the municipality to two private individuals at a price yet to be agreed upon.

Well, Mr. Speaker, having read that, I started to wonder what could that mean, and why is that. But then I looked back to Hansard, Page 2067, when the Bill was introduced, and the Honourable the Member for Rhineland who introduced it said, and I'll just take sections of what he said as shown on that page: "At the present time there's a shortage of lots for residential development in St. Jean. Lots are in short supply. I believe this is going to allow them to have two extra lots for residential development." He says,

"The price to be paid, the same price that they paid for it originally; they can purchase it back for the same price." The Member for St. Vital asked: "Is there no recognition of the appreciated cost of this land while it is under public ownership?" The response from the Member for Rhineland is, "that his understanding is according to the Act, they cannot take appreciation into account in proceedings of this nature," and I'm quoting, "so when I was speaking to the Reeve he told me the price would be the same as what they had expropriated it from at that particular time". Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much, I really doubt very much that the municipality cannot negotiate a price other than the price paid for it originally. Then the Member for Rhineland said: "I don't believe they have an appraisal on it, because I think the intention is to sell the land back to whatever their purchase price was."

Mr. Speaker, the expropriation of that land was made in 1960, 21 years ago, and we know what has happened to the value generally of real estate anywhere. Mr. Speaker, I marvel that a municipality, knowing that the land is to be developed is not a question of letting these people who apparently occupy that land continue to occupy it. According to the Member for Rhineland, it is the intention to sell it back to them at the price for which it was expropriated 21 years ago, in order to be subdivided into two building lots, and obviously to be sold or to be used at a highly increased value. It doesn't sound like a good business deal for the municipality, but we in the Legislature are being asked to do something quite extraordinary.

We are being asked not to change the law, apparently the law is acceptable. We're being asked to set aside the law for the special use and benefit of certain private individuals. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to look at it very carefully. If the law is wrong, one should change the law. If the law is right, then why are we being asked to suspend the law for the benefit of some private individuals, without a much much more elaborate explanation than has been given to us, Mr. Speaker?

I would like to suggest that the Minister responsible for The Municipal Act should indeed look into this question, and speak on this Bill so as to report to the House on the facts he learns, and the conclusions he arrives at, and the recommendation he is prepared to make. Mr. Speaker, it may well be that all of this is a reasonable proposal, but on the face of it, it is not a reasonable one in my estimation. I believe it's the responsibility of the Minister of Municipal Affairs to justify the decision, to comment on it and to advise the House as to the features involved, with that it would be helpful. I don't know whether the Honourable the Attorney-General should also be asked to look into it because indeed he is the person who is primarily charged with the enforcement of the laws of the province and I think be they civil or criminal we are dealing now with a government act and the desire of a municipality to set it aside. So, that, Mr. Speaker, I pose the questions, I do not know the answers but I think we should have the answers before we are able to deal with this bill any further.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River):** Mr. Speaker, I can advise the House that this bill was referred to

staff in the Municipal Affairs Department and they have subsequently advised me that they have no problems with this bill and recommending it to the House. If there is further information that members opposite would like me to bring I can certainly do that at a subsequent time.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, yes I would like to ask the Minister some questions on this. Could he inform us what the present value of the land is? What the sale price is proposed to be and how he can justify the probability that it is proposed to be sold to the private individuals at a value less than the market value of that land?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to take those questions as notice and bring back further information with respect to those questions.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** The second question, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister has already taken the only opportunity as under second reading to speak on this bill, can he ensure that another Minister of the Crown will speak on Second Reading in order to give us the kind of information that he has undertaken to give?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Yes, I would agree to that, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The bill is standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

## **SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILL BILL NO. 40 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS ACT**

**MR. LEN DOMINO** presented Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Chartered Accountants Act for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. DOMINO:** Mr. Speaker, this bill, which I bring forward after having consulted extensively with the Institute of Chartered Accountants, makes several revisions in to The Chartered Accountants Act which was passed by this Legislature in 1970. It makes a whole series of housekeeping amendments but also makes some substantive amendments which I believe are in the spirit of the times. Almost all the amendments brought forward are what I would categorize as consumer conscious amendments. The bill allows for the appointments of lay members to the Council which governs the activities of the institute. It allows the institute to alter the manner in which it disciplines its own members. It gives them a lot more leeway at present. The institute really only has the authority to expell or suspend a member. The new bill would allow them to a whole range of penalties for any members they found who were in violation of the code of conduct.

It further, Mr Speaker, allows for the Institute to require compulsory professional liability insurance, again for the protection of the profession and of the consumers. The bill removes from the Statutes the authority of the Institute to adopt tariffs or fees for its members and it broadens the right of appeal from disciplinary matters by members of the Institute so that any order made on a disciplinary matter may be appealed in the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to discuss this bill at length and in detail, but I believe that these very short and brief remarks at this time are all that's necessary for this bill to receive second reading and to go on to committee stage where it can be discussed in detail and we can look at it clause by clause and decide if indeed it is good legislation and the kind of legislation that we would want to pass. I believe it is. I believe that all the changes that are being asked for are reasonable and will result in the Institute of Chartered Accountants being able to police their own activities better, and will result further in their being able to protect the consumers of the services supplied by chartered accountants, to protect the consumers from those individuals in the profession who might not be totally in tune with the times and who might for some reason or another break the code of conduct.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'd recommend this bill to the House, hope that this Legislature would see fit to pass this bill for second reading, send it on to Committee, where we can discuss it in detail.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I'd like to address some questions to the honourable the member.

Firstly, in view of the fact that it appears from this bill that the appeal provision applies only to penalties imposed on members by way of suspension or expulsion, would the member not agree, possibly to consult with the members of the organization, that people who are refused admittance to the society either as students or as members should have similar rights of appeal against any adverse decision made on their application?

**MR. DOMINO:** Mr. Speaker, that's a very good point. I'm certainly prepared to take it up with the Institute of Chartered Accountants. I would, on the face of things, from just a very quick glance at the legislation, it would seem to be a realistic request that the member has made and I'll certainly take it up with the Institute of Chartered Accountants and at committee stage we might be able to amend the legislation, or if they are not prepared to do that, certainly to give a detailed explanation of why they are not prepared. I can't think of one at this time, however.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, one more question dealing with the rights for an order, next party order for production of documents being granted to the Chairman of the Council or of the Committee, would not the member agree to consider the right of the complainant or of the member himself to have similar

rights to production of documents not limited to the Committee itself?

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

**MR. DOMINO:** Mr. Speaker, I would certainly agree to discuss this with the Institute of Chartered Accountants and would that they would be prepared to consider that.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, there has been in some of these professional bills, and I particularly remember raising it relative to the medical bill and I believe that it is also in The Law Society Act, but nevertheless I see it creeping in more and more, and I understood that it was added to the medical bill some years ago - the power of the institute to penalize rather heavily in moneys a member who they discipline, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, in The College of Physicians and Surgeons Act, the Committee of the College that is hearing the claim or hearing the complaint has a vested interest in penalizing the member because they, Mr. Speaker, and I raise this and I'm going to indicate the similarities in this act, if they acquit somebody and find that he is not guilty of the complaint, they cannot charge him with the costs. If they find him guilty they can charge him with the entire costs of the proceedings. And last year in one case that amounted to \$15,000.00.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want you to imagine that you are the committee of doctors listening to this complaint and as you are hearing it, there is doubt in your mind as to whether it is satisfied or not satisfied and you are teetering one way or the other. Then something in your mind clicks on. If we find him innocent it's going to cost us \$15,000 because we will have to pay for these proceedings and the money is coming out of the pockets of all the doctors; if we find him guilty we can charge him \$15,000.00.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no similarly constituted proceeding with the exception, I repeat, it may also be the way in which the Law Society does it, in which case I would also complain, but if the Conservatives believe in incentives, and they say if you give a financial incentive you're liable to get the result, then here is a financial incentive to convict and a disincentive to acquit. I do not know whether the person who is being tried by this body would consider that to be all fair.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Institute of Chartered Accountants now has the right to suspend or expel a member. My friend will agree that is now their power, to suspend or expel, which means you can suspend for a week. It is a wide range; suspend for a week, two days, a month or you can expel, and that's it. That's a body of chartered accountants who have been given the right to police their own profession.

Look what they are now asking for, Mr. Chairman: the right to expel, suspend, reprimand or impose payment of a fine and cost. Now when it says, "or impose payment of a fine and costs", I do not know if that word "or" is a disjunctive word or a conjunctive word. I believe that it is a conjunctive

word. In other words, they could expel and impose payment of a fine and costs, or suspend and impose payment of a fine and costs. I believe that the chartered accountants are seeking that same type of position. But even if it is a disjunction word, in other words you can either expel or impose payment of a fine and cost, and I think that would make very little sense, so it must be the other way. The Institute of Chartered Accountants is given carte blanche to fine one of its members, how much, Mr. Chairman? How much does this bill fine the member? Can my honourable friend answer that? The member who introduced the bill and I'm not attacking him personally because he is introducing a Chartered Accountants Bill. Can it be \$1 million? Can it be \$100,000.00? Can it be \$5,000 and costs?

Well, Mr. Chairman, the fact is any person . . . may appeal to it within three months from the date of the order or within such extended time that the judge of the Court of Queen's Bench thinks reasonable.

It is subject to appeal. I can tell the Speaker and the honourable member that where you have an internal body, which has been given the power to impose a fine, that the courts are not anxious to undo what has been done unless it is clearly something which is contrary to what they had the power to do.

If my friend wants an example I will tell him that, a good example, somewhat removed from the bill, but nevertheless a good example — when the Rosenbergs were sentenced to be executed in 1950, approximately, the trial judge had a right to impose that sentence. It went through numerous appeals and everybody said, well, they've had all these appeals, but not a single other judge said that it was the right sentence. Does the honourable member follow me? Not a single judge beyond the trial judge said it was the right sentence. All they said was that this sentence was considered reasonable by the trial judge and we can't say that he was wrong, but not a single other judge right up to the President of the United States, who it was finally appealed to and they executed these two people on the basis of that one judge. So, when you go to the appeal, it is not the same as in the initial instance and I do not know, Mr. Chairman, why the Institute of Chartered Accountants needs the right to impose a fine or cost. I believe that the right to discipline amongst your own members is enough, and I say this, Mr. Chairman, I say it with regard to the Law Society. I think that the Law Society if they discipline one of their own members they should bear the cost of that investigation, that is part of the process and the medical profession as well. I think it is wrong to subject a person to the discipline of his fellow members and put them in the position of having a vested interest of imposing a fine, otherwise they have to acquit, therefore giving them a disincentive, if we use the kind of psychology that has been advanced in this House from time to time. We are creating an incentive, a financial incentive to convict and a disincentive to acquit. I don't think the judges who are doing it should be in that position. I would like the members of the Chartered Accountants Association to be on notice that I would want them to explain this at committee.

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

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** We then move on to resolutions. I have to again apologize to the House, yesterday I did not have the proper notes with me dealing with the resolution that was first tabled or first appeared on the Order Paper on February 23rd, Resolution No. 24, by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge — not Resolution No. 24, it was Resolution No. 11.

When the resolution was brought in on March 9th and I refer members to their Votes and Proceedings of that day, the resolution was corrected on the floor in two places where it was in the sixth and seventh paragraph to put the resolution more in the abstract form.

The amendment that was brought forward by the Honourable Member for Springfield was in my opinion based on the original resolution that was first printed and some of the wording in the amendments that he had proposed and I give you an example in the last one where it said:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government continue to give consideration to committing itself . . .

That's how it would be worded if we didn't change it. We did allow changes on the floor originally for the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and I would hope that the House at this particular time would allow the Honourable Member for Springfield to make floor changes to his amendments to conform with the corrected version of the resolution. Is that agreed? (Agreed).

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. ROBERT ANDERSON:** Mr. Speaker, I have a change in the amendment that should conform to the deficiencies that you called to our attention. The change would read that in the eighth paragraph the words, "continue to commit" after the word "government" in the first line thereof be deleted and that the words "consider the advisability of continuing to commit" be substituted therefore. I have copies for your use and for the use of honourable members.

**MR. SPEAKER:** If that is agreeable I find the resolution perfectly in order. Perhaps I shouldn't say perfectly, but I find it to be in order.

**QUESTION put on the amendment.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** I'm sorry, was the honourable member standing?

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MS. WESTBURY:** I must be shrinking.

**MR. PETER FOX:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. PETER FOX:** I believe we also had the Minister of Education speaking yesterday. If we're going to put it all back into context, maybe he now would

wish to continue his remarks. I would suggest in view of the fact that he was speaking to a wrong amendment that he be given the full time that he's allowed on the new amendment as we all agreed to.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is everything agreeable now? The Honourable Member for Logan. (Interjection)—  
The Honourable Minister of Education then.

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for his generosity in this instance.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was speaking to the original resolution some of the concerns that I had with that particular resolution as it had been proposed and more specifically with some of the statements that were made in that particular resolution. One of them that stated that there had been no changes in the Student Aid Program in the last four years; I pointed out yesterday was an incorrect statement. Three years ago we did change the bursary maximum from \$1,400 to \$1,800 and I'm most adamant that I think that has to be on the record, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that misstatement in the original resolution should not pass unnoticed nor should it pass without being corrected.

I'd also spoken to the matter of tuition fees, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to repeat the particular points that I brought forward yesterday in that regard because I think they are significant and do point out of course that our province is in a rather enviable position in relation to all other provinces in this country in the relation of tuition fees. Even with the increase that has been proposed this year by our universities we are still below the fees that are charged in Arts and Science in our sister province to the west, Saskatchewan and to the east of course, where they pay much more in tuition fees, Mr. Speaker. So I did touch on those two points yesterday. I also mentioned that in the matter of student employment salaries, those salaries paid by students employed by the government, that it's my understanding in talking to my colleague, the Minister of Labour and Manpower, that there will be an increase in those salaries this year. I also made the point at that time, Mr. Speaker, that certainly the number of post-secondary students who are employed in government programs is rather slight in relation to the total number of students employed during the summers in this province. I really question how significant that particular point is if we look at the total number of students employed in this province in any particular summer. Nor have we heard, Mr. Speaker, any problems with summer employment of students over the last three years. It would appear that students are finding jobs and that certainly this is having some bearing on their financial need when they return to university. It may in part account for the fact that the number of applications over the last three years have not increased significantly at all. So again that point I feel is also one that cannot be bypassed, Mr. Speaker.

The original resolution of course also says that there's no clear policy on the student aid, Mr. Speaker. I take extreme uncton with that, I think that is not a correct statement at all. The policy has been carefully enunciated each year of the plan. It is

well laid out in the brochures that are passed out each year to students in this province and those interested in the Student Aid as indeed it has been today in the pamphlet that has been circulated, in fact the kit of material that has been circulated to all members of this House.

That policy, Mr. Speaker, is one that we are continually looking at. We are looking at points of concern in the policy and addressing those particular points. I would remind the honourable members that there is a Student Aid Consulting Committee, made up of representatives from the university community and of students, members of my department, who meet and look carefully at problems that may appear in the program at any particular time. It is that committee that often makes recommendations both to myself and my department as to ways in which the Student Aid Program can be improved. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that improvements that we have made in the program for this coming year and which I will be enunciating in much greater detail when I get into my Estimates in many cases are improvements that have been suggested by the Student Aid Consulting Committee and by the students, in fact who form part of that particular committee. I might just touch on a few of those particular points, Mr. Speaker.

The problem of assets has always created rather severe clerical problems I suppose you could call them for not only the people who administrate the program but for students in the past. We have changed that asset policy for 1981-82 and whereby students will be allowed an exemption for the first \$500 of their assets as compared with 50 percent in previous years. I'm told, Mr. Speaker, that this will benefit about 72 percent of all applicants. In other words it will do away with some unnecessary book work and red tape and I think it's the type of positive move that was long overdue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that has been rearing its head in the area of Student Aid over the last few years is that certain students do have needs that go beyond the \$3,600 limit, the \$1,800 of student loan and the \$1,800 of bursary. That has been an area that has not been addressed either by this government or by the previous government. I'm told that about 25 percent have needs that are greater than that particular maximum of \$3,600.00. I'm also told that of that 25 percent some 10 percent receive Community Services and Corrections support to their particular need level through student social allowances, but 15 percent are still left without their needs above the \$3,600 being met either by student loan or by provincial bursary. Of that 15 percent, Mr. Speaker, about 3 percent are married or single parents, 12 percent are single. I might say that in the changes that we contemplate in the coming year that we are studying ways and means and I'm confident we'll find the ways of providing additional funding to those students who fit into that 15 percent category and who do not have their needs met above the \$3,600.00 I would say this is a positive move and a move long overdue and one that I'm pleased to announce at this particular time.

It is quite true, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about tuition fee increases that these do increase the need that students experience as they go to university, and I might say that particular increase in need is one that has been addressed by increases in the

amount of bursary that students have received over the last three years. I won't go into details in the amounts but each particular year we see an increase in the amount of individual awards. Again it reflects not only the increase in tuition fees but the increase in the cost of books and other expenses which students certainly do experience.

We will also be changing the criteria, Mr. Speaker, that determine what particular category students fit into in their application for Student Aid. We have Group A and Group B criteria at this time, depending on whether the student is classed as a dependent of his or her parents or whether they are independent and we are making the following changes this particular year. Students are considered independent, Mr. Speaker, of their families if there is no parent, guardian or sponsor; if the student is married, divorced, separated; or a single parent; or if the student has been out of secondary school for four calendar years and that is the significant change that we are bringing into place in the coming year; if a student has been out of secondary school for four calendar years, or of course if the student has been in the labour force for 24 months each period of which is at least 12 consecutive months.

I might mention also that students will be assessed first using Canada Student Loan criteria, which do not require any assessment of student assets, and this should mean easier access to loan funds for many students. Of course, to determine the financial need of students who apply for Manitoba Government Bursary, 100 percent of the value of student assets over \$500 will be used as a resource in 1981-82. I mentioned earlier that this use of the \$500 limit will necessitate, or at least obviate rather, the need for 72 percent of students to become involved in a great deal of paperwork in this particular category.

Vehicles have always presented some problem in this assessment of student need and this coming year vehicles will be assessed at the lower gold book wholesale value for the first time. This is the first time that the gold book wholesale value will be used. In some cases, Mr. Speaker, vehicles are exempt and in 1981-82 those students who have vehicles in that category will receive an allowance to assist with operating costs.

There are a number of other changes, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly will be describing that we have made in the Student Aid Program for 1981-82. I'll be going into that in greater detail when I get into my Estimates. I don't think that it's necessary to expand on these at this particular time, but I'm rather pleased about the fact that we have been able to make those particular changes, Mr. Speaker. I could mention at this time, of course, to those who may feel or pleased to put forward the point that Student Aid hasn't been something the government has looked at very carefully to point out that since we have taken over government the amount of provincial bursary that has been provided has increased from some \$4 million to a request in the 1981-82 Estimates of very close to \$6 million, \$5,979,700.00. An increase of \$2 million over three years, Mr. Speaker, can hardly be called a matter of ignoring Student Aid or not paying proper attention to the needs that we know do exist for certain students in our province.

I believe one of the honourable members, when we last considered this particular resolution and the amendment to it, asked how many students at our universities do indeed receive student aid. It's one out of every five, Mr. Speaker, do receive some assistance from the province from the Student Aid Program, one out of every five in 1980 were receiving some form of student aid. I don't have the particular figures for our community college students, it's a little more difficult to arrive at the correct figure there, but our universities it is one out of five and I think that is significant.

In the matter of planning, Mr. Speaker, the resolution proposed by the Member for Fort Rouge suggests that there is no planning — I believe it was said for Fort Rouge. The Member for Elmwood has a little hang-up on that. (Interjection)— For Fort Rouge, yes, certainly. (Interjection)— Well, the Member for Fort Rouge, Mr. Speaker, in proposing her resolution suggested that there had been a lack of planning, that there was no policy being drafted in this particular area. I point out, not only to the honourable member but to all honourable members, that there has been a Federal-Provincial Task Force on Student Aid in place. In the last year, it has received submissions, not only from the students at the University of Manitoba, who provided a separate submission I believe, but also from the association of students in Manitoba.

That particular task force, Mr. Speaker, has produced a task force report on student aid in Canada. It has made recommendations; that report is available to all members and it will be accepting further recommendations and further briefs from student organizations and all those in this country who have a particular interest in student aid.

I might say at this time, Mr. Speaker, I'm rather pleased to report that one of the senior officials in my department has been asked and in fact is acting at this point as the co-chairman of that Provincial-Federal Task Force on Student Aid.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have addressed not only the statements made by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge in her original resolution, but I believe I've expanded on some of the changes that we are contemplating in the coming year; changes that I am sure will be well received by students in the province who have had certain concerns in this particular area. As I've said before I will be very pleased to expand on those changes when we move into the consideration of my Estimates before this House. As far as the resolution is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I think the points that I have brought forward certainly would substantiate our concern that there was no way we could support that particular resolution. As I said before, there were incorrections and statements that I felt certainly did not place the whole Student Aid Program in its proper perspective. As I remember that particular resolution, it said a task force should be set up to study student aid in the province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a task force in place looking at the whole problem of student aid across this country and its reports are coming forward. I remind the honourable member that in fact we do have a committee, student representation, university representation, that sits throughout the year in this province and does consider problems that may arise

in the whole area of student aid and does make recommendations that we can address as we have this year in changes that we contemplate in the total program.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to support the amendment to the resolution. I think it reiterates the commitment of this government to make sure that no student will be denied post-secondary education in this province for lack of funds, lack of financial support. That is as I see it, Mr. Speaker, the way it should be and the way it must be.

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

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is a disposition to call it 5:30.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is there agreement to call it 5:30? (Agreed)

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

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

**MR. FERGUSON:** Before we adjourn, Mr. Speaker, I have a change on the Committee on Public Utilities, Mr. Anderson for Mr. Galbraith.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.