



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



VOL. XXXII No. 26A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 22 MAY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	IND
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virten	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 22 May, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASUK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the reports of the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board, the 32 Annual Report for the year ended March 31, 1983; the Annual Report of the Mineral Resources Division of the Department of Energy and Mines for 1982-83; the Annual Report of the Manitoba Energy Authority for the year ended March 31, 1983; and the Annual Reports for the Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd. 1982-83, and the Annual Report for 1983. The reason why there are two reports for Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd. is that their year end was changed from March 31st to December 31st, and as a result there are two reports available for Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to the Legislature on the successful visit I made to Europe last week in connection with industrial development and investment opportunities in Manitoba.

My first stop was in Zurich, Switzerland, where I met with a group of 25 senior Swiss industrialists and investors. Their particular interest in Manitoba investment opportunities focused on the potential here for energy intensive industries. The meeting, at which I was joined by the Canadian Ambassador to Switzerland, exhibited a keen interest on the part of potential investors in the Manitoba economy. Two of the gentlemen present will be visiting Manitoba later this year for more detailed consideration and study of opportunities for investment.

In Zurich I also met with the officers of the Union Bank of Switzerland and discussed with them the investment potential in our province. The Union Bank, along with Credit Suisse and the Swiss Bank Corporation jointly sold the \$100 million Swiss franc (\$56 million Canadian) bond issue signed by the Minister of Finance and myself during our visit. The 10-year bond issue carries interest coupons at 5-3/4 percent and were sold at 99.5. Proceeds of the issue are for Manitoba Hydro and will be applied to maturing debt obligations.

In Dusseldorf, West Germany, I spoke at an industrial development seminar organized by the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology, which attracted a

number of development and investment officials from a wide variety of German enterprises. The seminar was the centerpiece to a number of smaller individual meetings organized by the department with potential investors in the German industrial heartland. Energy intensive industrial potential in Manitoba was, again, a particular focus of interest by the business persons and industrialists.

Of particular note, and an indication of the importance to Manitoba of the interest by West German investors, was the presence of five Winnipeg business persons - who travelled to Germany at their own expense - at the Dusseldorf meetings.

In addition to participation in the Industrial Development Seminar, I held a number of individual meetings with West German business persons on investment potential in Manitoba.

I also met with the officers of the Westdeutsche Landesbank, the Prime Minister and officials of the State of North Rhine-Westphalia, representatives of the Dusseldorf Chamber of Commerce, the Central West German Labour Federation (DGH) and others interested in our province as a place to do business and help develop the economy. The industrial areas represented in the meetings were quite diverse but included finance, resources, textiles and agricultural processing.

I was delighted to be able to issue an invitation to Manitoba to a West German investment mission planned for this fall. Winnipeg will be one of only two Canadian locations to be visited by the mission seeking development and investment opportunities in Canada and the United States. The group will be in Winnipeg September 21st.

Clearly, the nature of the exploratory discussions held with a number of potential European investors must be a matter of business discretion. I was keenly impressed with the expressions of interest in Manitoba and the visit resulted in what I expect will be valuable leads in encouraging the European business persons to place Manitoba high on their list of opportunities for development.

The government, through ongoing assistance and activities to firm up specific interests expressed, and by the projected visits of potential investors, is most encouraged in respect to same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to have this report by the Premier on his recent trip overseas with the Minister of Finance. We're always glad to know of the government's interest in attracting private investment capital to Manitoba, since that has been an area during the past couple of years in which Manitoba has fared poorly, private capital investment having been down over the past two years in Manitoba.

We are pleased now to see that the government is finally recognizing that we must indeed promote the advantages of Manitoba for private capital investors

so that we can indeed be pursuing long-term capital investment and job creation activities that will leave long-lasting benefits to Manitobans, instead of the short-term makework activities that the government has concentrated on during the past year or more.

Mr. Speaker, I must indicate, of course, that we on this side were surprised that the Premier's Office was not aware of the details of his trip during the past week, and couldn't indicate who was accompanying the Premier. In fact, the Deputy Premier was not able to tell us on this side of the House just who was with the Premier during his visit.

So we're pleased now to get this report, and to find that indeed the Premier and the Minister of Finance did have some degree of success in at least meeting with potential investors, industrialists overseas. We hope that this will bear fruit.

We are glad, as I say, that the government is now recognizing that it is imperative that we not only concentrate on public sector capital spending, but that we attract private sector capital spending to this province to leave some long-lasting benefits and real job creation, for the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, I have a ministerial statement.

Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from John Taylor Collegiate where I had a demonstration of the current application of computer technology in our schools. I want to say, before proceeding to the brief statement that I have today, that I was extremely impressed with the demonstration and with the high degree of interest shown by students and teachers.

My statement today is as Chairperson of the Manitoba Jobs Fund. The Jobs Fund will commit \$1.5 million this year to help develop Canada's first joint industry-government computer resource centre for Manitoba's schools and teachers. This educational technology initiative has three key purposes:

Firstly, we see it as an innovative approach to stimulating business development in an important and rapidly growing area of technology where we can help the private sector create long-term jobs in producing and marketing computer-based educational material for Manitoba, Canada and, eventually, U.S. schools.

Secondly, we use this interdepartmental approach as a way to ensure that our children will be able to learn about and use state-of-the-art computers, and that school boards will be able to acquire computers at the most favourable prices.

Thirdly, this joint venture will provide up-to-the minute support for professional development for teachers, employing the latest technical information needed to integrate computers and technology into our schools.

Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance brought in his Budget, members will recall that he tabled a Manitoba Jobs Fund report entitled, "Investing in our Future."

In that document I said, and I quote, "The 1984-85 Jobs Fund will continue to provide employment, but

its role in our long-term economic development strategy will begin to change to one as the facilitator, or catalyst, for change and for the development necessary for long-term growth."

This undertaking that I am announcing today is not only unique but also exemplifies our role as both the catalyst and facilitator.

To date, seven computer technology companies - Apple, Burroughs/Cemcorp, Cybershare, Commodore, IBM, Sperry and Tandy - have been involved in negotiations for this project. These companies are all considering their participation, and their interest has been most encouraging. Their potential investment in this project and in the overall provincial economy is subject to current discussions at the present time. As agreements are concluded, further announcements will be made.

To give members some sense of the economic market and development implications involved with this sector of technology, it is estimated that Manitoba School Boards will invest some \$16 million in new computers and courseware over the next three years. Canadian schools will spend some \$75 million in the same period to buy courseware alone.

It is in the writing, production and marketing of courseware - the electronic school book, if you like - that we see as the Manitoba technology opportunity.

We also hope to attract other elements of the industry and to see the expansion of existing Manitoba companies as well. Equally important is the added attraction of being able to offer our educators, teachers and school trustees access to the latest in computer technology and the ability to participate in deciding how it is going to be applied in our classroom.

Mr. Speaker, this initiative represents an investment in our children, but at the same time is an investment in the growth and expansion of our economic foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Minister for his announcement today. We certainly are pleased to see investments being made in our future and education, particularly in investment in our children and their future training and development in fields of technology. We're also pleased, Mr. Speaker, if this is indeed an indication of the Jobs Fund redirection into joint development work that will involve private sector investment.

We're encouraged by the Minister's indication of seven companies negotiating with the province for participation in this particular undertaking, but I could be wrong, and perhaps the Minister later in question period can confirm but the wording is rather vague in terms of the commitments that are available. It says here that these companies are all considering their participation and it talks about their potential investment. It says that they hope to attract other elements of the industry to see the expansion of existing Manitoba companies. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that although the indication of direction on the part of the government is an encouraging announcement, the level of commitment on behalf of the private sector is not

evident in this announcement. So we thank the Minister for giving us an indication of direction that the government will be pursuing and we hope that he'll be able to pursue that and add to the indication of direction a commitment on behalf of some private sector people with this project.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. R. PENNER introduced Bill No. 4, The Blood Test Act; Loi sur les analyses due sang.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN introduced Bill No. 5, an act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of members to the gallery. We have, representing the Kenyan Government, Dr. Koich, in his capacity as Chairman of the Kenya Institutes of Technology Heads Association, who is visiting Canada and the Minister of Education in connection with the International Technical Assistance Office announced recently within her Department.

There are 35 students of Grade 11 standing from the W.C. Miller Collegiate. They are under the direction of Mr. Schmitt and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Premier's trip overseas

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Premier. It follows upon his announcement today and the announcement by his office last Monday about his visit along with the Minister of Finance to Switzerland and West Germany last week. What members of staff of either the government or Crown corporations participated with the Premier and the Minister of Finance, who were the members of the party who visited West Germany and Switzerland along with the Premier last week?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in Switzerland, the Minister of Finance and the Deputy Minister of Finance and myself, no one from my staff. In Germany we were met by some officials of the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology, the Deputy Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and one other official from that particular department.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, were there any representatives of Manitoba Hydro who attended with the two Ministers last week?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to say that the Deputy Minister of Finance, being a member of the Manitoba Hydro Board, certainly was there in that capacity, as well as being the Deputy Minister of Finance, Mr. Curtis.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the announcement today by the Premier indicates the potential attendance of a number of people in Manitoba later this year from various industrial concerns, is the Premier able to indicate to us either who will be coming here from West Germany or Switzerland or, on the other hand, is he able to indicate the industrial sectors that they will be representing?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for posing that question and his interest. First, insofar as those sectors that expressed an interest in coming to Manitoba were in areas of the manufacturing sector that were most interested in the energy cost aspects of doing business in the Province of Manitoba, and at least four such enterprises expressed an interest in coming to Manitoba in order to explore those possibilities with officials of the Manitoba Government.

Secondly, insofar as the group that will be coming to Manitoba in September, that I made reference to, on September 21st, that will be a group of approximately 20 West German business people from the Dusseldorf North Rhine-Westphalia region of Germany. They will be visiting Toronto and then, after Toronto, Winnipeg and then journeying from here on to United States to pursue other investigations into investment possibilities and prospects.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, is this trip in September sponsored by one of the federal export development agencies or who will be sponsoring the trip?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, for purposes of accuracy I would like to double-check, but as far as I know it's a privately financed trip by the business community themselves in West Germany and is not financed by way of government. But I would prefer to take that matter as one of notice as to whether there's any external financing.

MR. G. FILMON: In the Premier's announcement today, there is reference to two of the gentlemen present at particular meetings in Zurich, I believe, who will be attending in Winnipeg later this year. Is the Premier able to indicate who they are or what types of manufacturing concerns they represent?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it would certainly be wrong for me to divulge the confidentiality as to the names of the companies. Officials received the names of those companies for purposes of follow-up. In fact, there will be two from Zurich at least, and two from Germany that expressed an interest and only time will tell as to the extent to which that interest develops.

We're interested in the expression of interest on their part to come to Manitoba. We will only know if indeed that bears fruit. The areas involved are mainly in the fields of manufacturing, the heavy manufacturing industry, and in particular areas that do achieve benefits from the energy savings from intensive energy utilization.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, during the trip to Switzerland, the government negotiated a \$56 million loan with the three banking institutions in Switzerland. Were commitments undertaken or made for further loans to be confirmed later this year, or is the government seeking additional capital by way of loans on the European market for later this year?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there were no commitments pertaining to later loans to be obtained, but it would certainly be my anticipation that in view of the capital investment opportunities and other areas in which capital investment will be required that certainly other borrowing will be required and that borrowing will depend upon the state of the market at the particular time, the location of potential funds for capital borrowing, where it is in the best benefit, the best interest of the Province of Manitoba to do its capital borrowing at any given time.

I'd like to just add that there is considerable concern that I would like to underline at this time in regard to the uneasy interest rate situation brought about by the Federal Bank in the United States and nervousness as to where that indeed may lead the capital market over the next period of time throughout Western Europe, as well, of course, as in Canada itself.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the \$56 million loan undertaken in Switzerland was taken out in Swiss francs, is it the government's intention to hedge the investment, to protect Manitobans against the foreign currency exchange rate swings, which could adversely affect that rate and adversely affect the viability of that loan?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge. I think that question would be better addressed to the Minister of Finance, except to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that experience has in the main been very favourable to respect to borrowing on the Swiss franc market. As indeed with the American market, there has at times been the ups and downs, but generally, since borrowings have taken place both under the Schreyer administration and in fact under the Lyon administration, under this administration, as a whole, borrowing insofar as the Swiss market is concerned has been worthwhile and has in fact been a stable market. It's my understanding that it's been every bit as comparable, if not more so, than the borrowing on the American market, certainly in later years.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that particular loans that were undertaken in foreign currencies by the Schreyer administration ended up costing the taxpayer - although they were at a relatively nominal face value, the rate of interest - an interest rate with foreign exchange added on in the

neighbourhood of 25 percent in some cases, would the Premier consider investigating the possibility of hedging those loans, so that we are not subject to the adverse effects of the major swings in foreign currency exchanges?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be useful, in fact, to examine the stability of the Swiss market in relationship to the American market. I had the opportunity to discuss that with our own officials and in fact the Swiss market compares well with stability in the American market, insofar as currency is concerned. There was, on the whole, in 14 issues - which by the way also some issues were floated during the time of the Lyon administration in Switzerland, both administrations at different times have borrowed on the Swiss market - it's my understanding that insofar as, I believe, 14 issues, subject to correction as to the precise number of issues, that there has in fact been balance insofar as the market is concerned, and if indeed the utilization of the financing is done over an extended period of time in a balanced manner that the net result is one that is not unfavourable to Manitoba, certainly not one that is more unfavourable than utilizing other currencies in other countries.

Computer technology in schools

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and it follows upon his announcement today with respect to the demonstration program on computer technology in schools and the use or the involvement of private sector companies in this particular project. The Minister indicates that seven computer technology companies have been considering participation in this program and my question is: how many of them have actually committed to participate in the program at this point in time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can indicate that all of the companies have indicated interest and support with the concept that I announced today. In terms of their specific participation, that is a subject of discussions, a subject of negotiations that are taking place at the present time. In fact one of my staff is presently in Toronto meeting with and finalizing arrangements with some of the firms, so I would expect within the next few weeks to have specific agreements with specific companies with respect to their participation in the centre.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, so then I take from this that none have committed at the present time. There is a further question, Mr. Speaker, about the investment of some \$16 million in new computers and courseware that Manitoba School Boards are expected to make over the next three years, is that all publicly funded investment, the \$16 million, or is any of that in a co-operative sense with private sector companies?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, that relates to what we've been informed is the anticipated amount of purchases by various school divisions throughout the province in terms of their own purchases for computer-related equipment.

MR. G. FILMON: So in other words, Mr. Speaker, that's all \$16 million of public-sector investment. As a result of this joint project, will any companies be setting up additional operations, either in manufacturing or in distribution, in Manitoba?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: It would certainly be the aim of the joint approach to have further expansion of companies that exist here in the province in terms of their present work force or into new areas. The area that we see of particular advantage to Manitoba and to Manitoba companies is in the area of courseware development, where there is throughout North America a lack of development. It is obvious that in the next number of years there's going to be a number of companies that will be working on the development of specific courseware for uses in school divisions. So this is where we see a unique opportunity for development, using what is already an existing base here in the Province of Manitoba.

Child abuse

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Community Services. I wonder if she could precisely inform the House as to the policy changes that the government has brought into effect with respect to returning abused or neglected children to their parents.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite must be inquiring about the new child abuse guidelines, and I'd be happy to see - I think he would have had a copy but I'll see that he gets another. The procedures outlined relate first of all to the obligation to report if there is any suspicion of child abuse, then the responsibility of a team including medical and child welfare people and the police, where appropriate, to determine the next steps to be taken, and corrective work with the family, where that proves effective. Only if the team were satisfied that the child would no longer be in danger would the family be reunited.

But I'll undertake to see that the member gets another copy of the child abuse guidelines.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate - the Minister referred to child abuse guidelines announced recently by the government. I believe sometime last fall the Minister referred to a change in policy with respect to child welfare agencies returning abused children to their parents. Can the member indicate whether there has been a change in policy in that area?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall any such announcement last fall to which the member is referring.

If he could be more specific, I would undertake to check it through. There was a protocol that went out following the moratorium on adoption out-of-province, but it did not deal with the child abuse situation.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, last December, the Minister was reported as indicating changes, new directions in child welfare, and is reported to have said that the primary function of Children's Aid is protection to children but to recognize the family and community and cultural group from which children come as primary support areas and to put more resources into helping them do a better job. Mr. Speaker, I pursued a matter privately with the Minister and I would ask her, in view of the death of a child under one year on January 16, 1984, despite concerns expressed with people involved with that child that the mother was not following a plan that was adopted and in spite of concerns expressed by individuals within a week of that child's death that the mother was not following a plan that was developed, can the Minister indicate whether or not she is prepared to arrange to have an inquest called into the death of that child so that some inquiry might be made of the resources that her department is providing to mothers and children found in this situation?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the case which the member is referring, to my knowledge, had no different procedure followed than had been in place for some time where a team at the child abuse centre, in co-operation with the child welfare agency, worked out on a team basis the procedures that were to be followed in a specific case of potential neglect. There was no difference in procedure that emanated from my office, and in terms of the follow-up on the particular case, the police were involved in an investigation and have completed their investigation and any follow-up that will be indicated will certainly be taken. But at the moment, we have taken every step to review the situation and to complete it as well as we can, that I'm aware of.

The overall concern about giving adequate protection to children is always going to be with us, human beings being what they are. And what we must do as a department is be sure that we give adequate leadership so that we put in the field teams of people with the type of training and judgment, who as a group will be best able to make the wisest choices.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this child was left abandoned for a period of 12 hours, with perhaps a small interruption of five minutes, and was found dead in its crib after complaints had been received a week earlier about the mother's care of the child, following upon specific indications that the plan developed was not being followed for over a period of a month, would the Minister not agree to hold an inquest so that this whole area of the resources that are available to children returned to their mothers in this situation can be thoroughly reviewed? Because obviously, Mr. Speaker, this kind of situation cannot be allowed to be repeated.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we have asked that the procedures that are being followed in these cases -

they're under constant review. We are in an area, I guess, where more is being learned, particularly with the help of the professional insight from the Child Abuse Centre, to enable all of us to handle the cases more wisely.

It's not a field where everything is known, but I am satisfied that the group of people who are working on these types of cases are doing the very best they can: (1) to make as good judgments as they can; and (2) to learn when there is a regrettable incident, to review it very very carefully to see if there is anything that can be learned to reflect back on the kind of procedures that are followed.

Fires in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. In view of the extensive rainfall over the weekend since the fire-related restrictions were enforced, I want to ask the Minister if it's still necessary to have these travel restrictions in spite of the heavy rainfall?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the honourable member for giving me notice of the question. As honourable members all appreciate, we had heaven-sent rains on Saturday. We had over one inch of rain fall in the Nutimik and Whitemouth areas. All the fires are now under control. Manpower and equipment are being demobilized, and our staff is involved in mop-up operations. It is, therefore, recommended that all restrictions be removed. So accordingly, we will be following that advice.

Adoptions

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Community Services, and ask her whether the staff in her department explains and advances the option of birth and adoption to young unmarried, pregnant women?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. DOERN: Is the Minister then indicating that there is a bias or preference within the department in favour of abortion as opposed to adoption?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if I misunderstood the initial question - I was assuming that the member meant, were we as a department offering the option that Dr. Joe Caulfield has been offering young pregnant women, where there seems to be an offer of financial assistance to enable a person to go through with their pregnancy.

If the question is, is any counselling done under the auspices of the government based on introducing to a woman the range of choices that are available to her and assistance in thinking through the options and the consequences so that she is better able to make the choice that matches with her particular moral view of the question, then the answer is yes, the counselling is of that open variety.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I then assume that the Minister is saying, the department is neutral in that regard.

I would also ask her whether she can confirm that in this day that there are approximately some 1,800 abortions performed annually in the province, and that there is also a waiting period of some four-and-a-half years for couples wanting to adopt children?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The purpose of question period is to seek information, and not to be giving it and asking for confirmation. Would the Honourable Member for Elmwood wish to rephrase his question?

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister, in view of a large number of abortions that are performed annually, can she indicate what the waiting period is for a couple in Manitoba that wants to adopt a child?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, that falls in the responsibility of the Department of Health, and I understand that I'll be following next or second with the Estimates, and I'll be able to give that information during the Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MR. R. DOERN: On a point of order, I mean surely

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

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point of order. The fact that X number of weeks from now, the Minister may provide an answer, I don't think precludes him from answering a reasonable question. The question simply is: if a couple wants to adopt a child at this time, how long is the normal waiting period in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a point of order. The Minister may choose to answer or not answer a question as he sees fit.

Crosswalks

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways. Recommendation is being

presented to the City of Winnipeg Council that 107 pedestrian corridors be changed to flashing beacons at a cost to the city of \$840,000.00. Is the province planning to share in the cost of this safety change?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, the province has responsibility for certain corridors, and therefore will accept those costs naturally. However, the responsibilities that fall under the City of Winnipeg are priorities that they choose. They have chosen to upgrade those pedestrian corridors. We're very pleased that they are doing that for safety reasons, and we're working with the city on a joint committee that is making recommendations with regard to the changes in The Highway Traffic Act, and also an informational campaign to make people aware, pedestrians and drivers, of their responsibilities as regards pedestrian corridors. But we are not sharing the costs of the physical makeup of the corridors that are the responsibility of the City of Winnipeg.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: To the same Minister, will the province be sharing in the costs of the information that will be going out in relation to the safety corridors?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would have to ask that question be repeated. The Honourable Member for Pembina was talking during the question, and I wasn't able to get the question.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I was simply reminding the Minister that on Thursday during the Peter Warren Show, he told listeners across Manitoba that the province had responsibility for Portage Avenue and other highways within the city limits.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Member for Pembina knows that is not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Highways, will the province be sharing in the costs of the information that is to go out about the safety changes that will be made?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, we haven't made any final decisions on that, although I would like to see it be included in the ALIVE Program that is taking place now. There are a number of phases in the ALIVE Program, including last year the first phase dealing with seat belts, child restraints and helmets, and the second phase that was just announced last week dealing with drinking and driving. A third phase will include other aspects of safety, including hopefully the matter of pedestrian corridors. That decision has not been finalized at this time, but that will be my recommendation that we do include information through our ALIVE Program and financed largely by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

Fishing regulations

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. Is the Minister currently negotiating changes to the regulations governing fishing by Treaty Indians?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Negotiating changes? No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister proposing changes to the regulations governing fishing by Treaty Indians?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, we are advancing proposals that were made within the Department of Natural Resources prior to my becoming Minister under the previous administration. We have advanced those further to Ottawa with a request that they consider their authorization.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister then, can he confirm that there have been no changes in the position taken by the Department of Natural Resources in the last two-and-a-half years that this government has been in power, no changes in the proposals put forward in that regard?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is seeking any change at all, or maybe changes in commas, or maybe changes in some of the wording - well, the Honourable Member for Pembina says don't be cute. The questions that come from opposition members are often cute, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to be precise.

If the question is: has there been any change at all in the wording of those proposals that were crafted before under the previous administration with respect to Domestic Fishing regulation? - I am not absolutely certain of that. I'll take that as notice. Basically the policy is the same.

MR. B. RANSOM: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister undertake to provide us with a copy of the present position which the government is taking in that matter?

HON. A. MACKLING: I'll take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Burns - plant closure

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development. In view of last week's answers given of the closure of the Burns plant in Brandon, the Minister made reference to a letter that was sent to the mayor

of Brandon, and he indicated that he would table it. Will the Minister now table that letter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will provide a copy of that to the Assembly - as soon as I can locate one.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on the same line, in view of that fact that the Minister had made indications or told this Assembly that the plant at Brandon would be left open, or the company said they would leave it open if the government would get involved in encouraging the union to back off some of their wages, does he have evidence of the statement that he has made that the Burns Company did say that if the government would get involved in the negotiations or would ask the employees to back off that their reconsideration would be made, can he provide proof that that's a factual statement?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: As I indicated to the member, in response to one of his questions last Friday, that position was advanced to both myself, the Minister of Agriculture and other staff of both the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology, and the Department of Agriculture at a meeting that was held in Calgary, I believe it was on Thursday, May 2nd, with Mr. Child, Mr. Best and one other member of the Burns Corporation, at which time they indicated to us that they were closing the plant, as was relayed to us the day previous by the vice-president of Burns Manitoba; and that since we had expressed our concern about that closure and since we asked them what might be done in order to avert that closure, they indicated to us the only way that that could be averted if there were major concessions by the workers in terms of wage reduction and other benefit reductions at the Brandon plant and at the Winnipeg plant. Those statements, Mr. Speaker, were made in direct face-to-face discussions between myself, the Minister of Agriculture and other members of the staff of the Government of Manitoba with representatives of Burns.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not exactly clear that the Minister is consistent with what he said last week. I will ask the Minister: were they asked as a government to influence the union to back off on their wage negotiations? Was that, Mr. Speaker, the position that was taken by Burns? Were they asked to get directly involved in asking the employees to back off on their demands, Mr. Speaker?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I still believe that my statement was very clear. The position of Burns was that they would reconsider the closing of the plant if there were to be major concessions made by the workers at their Brandon and Winnipeg plants, that is, if they were prepared to take a reduction in their current wages. That was the position that Burns advanced to us, asked us that if we could come back with assurances from the union, that that would be the case, then they would reconsider the closure of the Brandon plant.

Beef Income Assurance Program

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I will take a little more time to check out precisely the record from last week's answer.

I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that we have lost jobs for 150 people or will be in August, in view of the fact that he made the decision not to include the beef feedlot industry in his support program this past year or on the implementation of it, will he now reconsider, Mr. Speaker, the application of the Beef Support Program to those feedlot industries which would supply beef to our packing-house industry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I will answer the question, but one must, in viewing the situation, look as to how we arrived where we are now. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris doesn't like to be reminded that it was his administration that, first of all, ruined, totally ruined a beef stabilization program that was designed to increase the number of slaughter animals in the Province of Manitoba.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: When the cattle industry came to their government in 1980 and '81, what did they say to the cattle industry? Zippo, no assistance to that industry, after they ruined the beef program. So, Mr. Speaker, let's just understand where we have been going in this matter, Sir.

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

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister is abusing question period. I asked him if he would be implementing the support program for the feedlot industry.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member knows that questions should be short, concise and to the point; and answers should also be short, concise and to the point.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the question, while it is short and concise, the problem is of a larger magnitude than meets the eye. The honourable member makes an assertion in his question that feedlot operators are not included in our present beef program. That is totally erroneous, Mr. Speaker. All feedlot operators are able to finish cattle for farmers in the Province of Manitoba. Every feedlot operator who wishes to do custom feeding for beef producers in the Province of Manitoba is eligible to participate in the beef program, Sir. Custom feeding is a prime . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, you know it reminds me, Sir, of the assertion that they made with the Cattle Producers Association, the checkoff as being a voluntary checkoff. The same thing, they go on, and to indicate that the beef industry, the feedlot operators, are not able to participate in the beef program - all feedlot operators who wish to provide custom feeding for Manitoba producer-owned cattle . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, there's an assertion here . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . by honourable members that they can't participate, that they have been excluded. They are not excluded under the present program. Sir, the number of slaughter cattle reached an all-time low in the Province of Manitoba of just under 300,000 head in 1981 - the last year of their administration, Sir. In 1983, a year after the beef program has had a chance to take hold, Sir, we have had over 326,000 animals finished in the Province of Manitoba, available for the slaughter industry.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the honourable member should also be aware that historically only about 15 percent of the Manitoba slaughter kill has been source from large commercial feedlots; 15 percent of Manitoba's share, and the bulk of the slaughter cattle have come from smaller feedlots and from the Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, before we go into Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could get leave from the House for a short non-political statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Minister have leave? (Agreed)
The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, as I think most members are aware from press reports, a long-time member of the Legislature, Russ Paulley, passed away last Saturday morning and because of the long weekend I don't know if everyone was able to get the information about the funeral arrangements in the press.

There will be memorial services which will be held at 1:00 p.m. on Friday, at St. George's Anglican Church in Transcona. But there is also a funeral service this evening at 8:00 p.m. at Transcona Funeral Chapel. Anyone wishing to pay respects can do so from 7:00

p.m. to 8:00 p.m. this evening at the Transcona Funeral Chapel with the service taking place at 8:00 p.m. tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, before we call the Orders of the Day, further to the statement made by the Minister of Energy and Mines, I would like to advise members that we will be proceeding on Friday of this week, the day of the memorial service, with condolence motions with respect to four former members of the Assembly who have passed away in the last year, including the former Member for Transcona. So that would be immediately after question period on Friday of this week, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the first item of business. Since the written question is not called as an item, Mr. Speaker, but appears only as notice I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if this question could be converted to an Order for Return because of the nature of the information requested. It's detailed information. We have no objection of providing it but I would ask that it be converted under our rules which allow that conversion.

Then, Mr. Speaker, would you call the first motion standing in the name of the Member for Arthur?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Government House Leader . . . the referenced resolution.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood on a point of order.

MR. R. DOERN: Would it be in order to ask a question of the House Leader at this time concerning procedure?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: I wanted to know whether the House Leader could indicate whether it's his intention to do two things each day, namely to call the motion on bell ringing and to ask for leave to eliminate Private Members' Hour?

MR. SPEAKER: I don't know whether it is an appropriate question to be asking at this stage under Orders of the Day. I'm sure the honourable member will find out.

Does the Honourable Government House Leader wish to answer?

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I submit the question is not an appropriate one in terms of discussing House business. If there are questions with regard to the ordering of House business the Opposition House Leader and I have on occasion discussed those as part of our arrangements for House business during the week. But the details as to what might be called for future days, even if appropriate, Sir, may not be determined and I may not even be able to answer that type of question during question period.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I've been informed that the written question, being posed in the name of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, is a written question that the member is entitled to pose. If there is to be a change in the other form of proceeding then it would require the leave of the House to do so which I would assume would come from the honourable member.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I made my proposal under our Rule 48(4) which allows you, Sir, upon the request of a Minister of the Crown to direct that a question stand as notice and be transferred as an Order for Return.

I was suggesting, Sir, that we were prepared to accept it as an order, skip the notice procedure and accept the written question as an Order for Return under Rule 48(4). That has been done in the past, Mr. Speaker.

Written questions are not normally moved as such but appear, and are taken as notice of a written question, and appear every second Wednesday until the question is answered.

I was, Sir, because the question asks for detail and is not of the character that is normally used for written questions stating that we were agreeable to converting it to an Order for Return under Rule 48.4. Mr. Speaker, I don't quite understand what the problem could be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, my purpose in proposing it as a written question was to give the Minister responsible notice of the questions that I was going to ask and give him time to get the answers. The reason it's there as a written question is that I'm liable to get the answer within a few weeks time. If it goes in as an Order for Return you know what happens, I'll get the answer next year, and there's nothing I can do about it. I'm looking for the answers to those questions reasonably soon, as soon as the Minister can get them. And it can't be that difficult, Mr. Speaker, there's only a few hundred beekeepers in Manitoba, and I would prefer it to stay on the Order Paper as a written question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

With regard to the written question, our Rule 48(4) does stipulate that it may be changed to an Order of the Day where the question is of such a nature as to require a lengthy reply. In looking at the proposed question it seems that Item 3 might require a lengthy reply which is not necessarily conducive for our Order Paper for a reply. If it is then the wish of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources to treat the matter as an Order for Return, so be it.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RULES OF THE HOUSE - BELL RINGING

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Government House Leader.

The Honourable Member for Arthur has 40 minutes.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I initially had not planned to debate this particular item until it appeared as if the government

were not going to bring other matters of business before this Assembly other than the Estimates. I would take, Mr. Speaker, from that there are very few items of major importance whether it be legislative programs, or other policy directives that they're going to be initiating and therefore found it important to get in as well as the principle that lies behind the proposed rule change.

Many points have been made, Mr. Speaker, on the fact that most rule changes, in fact, I believe almost 100 percent of the rule changes that have taken place in this Assembly over the past many many years, that it has been by a consensus of the Assembly that all members agreed that it was in the best interests of the operation of the Legislative Assembly itself, and that it was quite in everyone's best interests to agree and bring it forward to the House as a unanimous recommendation. I stand to be corrected but I think usually on matters of making the House, and making the Assembly work better that it has been the wishes of all sides to accommodate that.

However, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with the unique situation, as we've seen this particular case develop, as we've seen the government proceed in two-and-a-half years of administration, the inability, first of all, by the First Minister to appoint a Government House Leader that had the trust or the confidence of the Assembly, and then of course, to get himself and his government into the kind of a mix-up and into kind of a situation that they found themselves at odds with some 80 percent of the people of Manitoba or plus.

They saw the leaving of many hundreds of New Democratic members from their party. They saw the leaving of one of their MLAs from their government benches over the particular issue, the fact that the Manitoba Government Employees Association found fit to criticize, to oppose the kinds of changes in the Constitution that this government was making. That, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of situation or the kind of environment in which we find ourselves debating or asking to consider and support a rule change, which would allow you, Sir, to make the determination, after 15 minutes of bell ringing, to say as to whether or not the bell ringing would end or you would wait and call the members of the Assembly to vote up to a 24-hour period of time.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the government, particularly in light of the continued introduction of this change, the continued pressure that they feel that it has to be put through, continues to demonstrate philosophical kind of strategy that they use when they come to approaching a problem, and it's extremely unfortunate that we haven't had a little more time to reflect, that the government haven't taken more time to reflect on really why and how they are proposing a change.

I want to again make the point, is this the biggest priority on the agenda of the government? Is this why we are continually spending time debating it, when we are seeing the closing of packing plants, when we are seeing the kinds of economic hardships that Manitobans are going through, that here we are paying our attention only to the problem that was created by an incompetent government, Mr. Speaker? An incompetent government.

That's why we're here today, Mr. Speaker, debating an issue that's not in the interests, certainly the immediate interests of the people of Manitoba, in the longer term preservation of the parliamentary system.

Yes, it is their interest, but I think it's the bread and butter issues, Mr. Speaker, that we should be dealing with at this particular time in this particular Assembly.

Ask the person on the street, what is their concern? Their concern is meaningful employment, meaningful income, meaningful medical services and that kind of protection. It is not, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not the bells of the Legislative Assembly should be allowed to ring longer than 15 minutes and that you, Sir, should have the power vested in you to determine as to whether or not they should ring longer, up to a 24-hour period. That is not the issue that is on the street in Manitoba. That's not on the minds of the people of Manitoba. It is, as I said earlier, the jobs, the bread and butter issues that the government should be paying attention to.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what we should be debating here today, not the fact that we want to change the rules to accommodate a government that has been misguided, that does not understand the people of Manitoba, and who actually tried to make a major constitutional change against the wishes of some 80 percent of the people of Manitoba, against the wishes of many of their caucus members. Of course you see one of them bolted the ranks, and I'm sure has caused them a little bit of difficulty, and again, pointed out by the President of the MGEA, and of course, the evidence by the numbers that have left their party and I repeat that, because that's the kind of background, as to the reason for this government trying to impose a change.

I warn them again, Mr. Speaker, to reconsider the use of the bulldoze technique - the kind of technique that is not in the best interests of parliamentary systems - but to listen to the people of Manitoba. The people of Manitoba, when it comes to a constitutional change, Mr. Speaker, want a position or a mechanism that will stop any government from making a change that is irreversible and not in everyone's best interest. I think it's extremely important to do that, but the consensus should have been reached by the committee.

Why do they push it past the Rules Committee of this Assembly? Why are they pushing it past and not listening to the kinds of debates that my colleagues put forward in committee? My colleague from Fort Garry I know has pleaded with them in committee as to why they shouldn't be moving in the manner in which they are. The case has been made, Mr. Speaker, many times over in this debate. Why won't the government listen and pull it off the Order Paper? Reconsider it, Mr. Speaker, in light of the other urgent matters that the people of Manitoba are really deserving of having dealt with in this Assembly. That has to be the major point that is made here today and has been made by many of my colleagues.

Well, we talk about why the rule change. The rule change, Mr. Speaker, that they are proposing is to try - try in a very major way - to allow this government who have not been able to deal with the parliamentary system in a way in which has been traditionally done. You know when I talk about that, it hasn't been tradition in this province to change our laws by limiting debate, by moving a closure motion and saying that you have until 2:00 o'clock in the morning to make up your mind and all the rest of your members can debate and then the question is put. Mr. Speaker, let your imagination go a little bit as to what the kinds of changes could be implemented by a government such as this.

My colleague, in his speech, and I made reference to it, so I don't have to repeat it, as many of my other colleagues have said, what if the government proposed to do away with elections? What if, Mr. Speaker, they wanted to make changes that would stop the process of parliamentary democracy and allow the public to elect every four to five years, the member of their choice to this Assembly? — (Interjection) — Well the former Speaker of the House, I'm surprised to hear him speak out, because you know I haven't heard him give one speech in this Legislative Assembly and I've been here since 1977. I've been here since 1977 and I haven't heard him give one speech on any issue, yet he's prepared to support a government that uses the closure motion to push legislation and debate through this House. Why doesn't he participate, Mr. Speaker? He is excellent in speaking from his seat but he never stands up and participates in debate to support the government that the people sent him here to be with. If there's some reason then, let him say it, Mr. Speaker.

But that's the very point I'm trying to make, that there have many members on that side of the House that haven't stood to debate and support the government and you could pick out many of them during the recent debate on the proposed constitutional change that didn't participate in it, and yet they sat there and they said we will allow our House Leader to impose the closure motion. When it comes time to have your chain pulled, you'll stand up and you'll whistle and you'll vote in favour of the government, not getting involved in the debate, not standing up saying to their constituents, this is why we're supporting the constitutional change by the government. No, they supported a closure motion which in fact led to the kind of rule change that is being proposed, and yes, they're going to stand up when the question is put, when we're forced to vote on this. They're going to stand up and vote to have the rule change of eliminating the bell ringing longer than 15 minutes.

Well again, who was embarrassed recently by a rule change or who would have been embarrassed by a rule change, other than the government - the very government that are proposing to have a 15-minute limit on the bell ringing? They couldn't muster enough members when it came time to vote for the Attorney-General's salary. Where were they Mr. Speaker? - and if the 15-minute bell ringing rule had have been imposed in that situation, he would have been restricted or limited in his wages to a dollar, I believe it was. Mr. Speaker, why don't they stop and think who we're trying to protect? Who are we trying to protect, Mr. Speaker? Not only the parliamentary system, we're trying to protect the members who are here, in a legitimate sense, to represent the people.

Mr. Speaker, it is a heavy-handed approach and there have been lots of examples given of areas of other jurisdictions that have a restriction, but I am sure the restrictions weren't imposed following the experience of a government that failed to debate and support its wishes of the government past this debating system. They were unable to convince the Legislative Assembly. They were unable to use the mechanism that was at hand to pass the constitutional change which they believed in, Mr. Speaker. They were unable to use the mechanism. So what did they do? They proposed a change which, if ever again they got caught - and that's

the other point the people of Manitoba are asking on this particular issue - the reason they want to eliminate the bell ringing, is so that you can't stop them when they reintroduce the proposed constitutional change on the language issue.

They were unable, Mr. Speaker, to accomplish it under the rules system that was in place, so they changed the rules. Now that, I believe, adds insult to injury to an incompetent government. It should, Mr. Speaker, again point out to them that they are wrong in what they're doing. They're wrong. They were wrong on constitutional change, and they are backing it up again by trying to impose a rule change in this Assembly that will give them an advantage.

Mr. Speaker, we know of some jurisdictions that operate in that manner, but I and my colleagues are not going to let this government continue or to proceed on the path that they are intent on going without the rest of the people of Manitoba knowing it. I would hope that the First Minister and his Cabinet and his backbenchers again, who haven't been able to stand and defend the government either on rule change or the constitutional change, I would hope that they would go the people, that they would go to the public in the next coming election and they would say, it was in your interests that we imposed a rule change that would allow the Speaker to determine as to whether or not the bells would ring longer than 15 minutes; that would give the power to the Speaker to make those kinds of decisions, Mr. Speaker, rather than the Legislative Assembly itself, rather than the elected people themselves being able to sort out the kind of rules that they are going to operate by.

It is really a reflection in my mind, Mr. Speaker, as to the kind of government the people are getting by the New Democratic Party. It is a reflection as to the kind of system that they believe should be imposed on the people of Manitoba. You do it all by force. You do it all by push. Whether it be seat belts, whether it be constitutional change, whatever it be, Mr. Speaker, you use the heavy hand of government. It has been demonstrated time and time again, but they can't and they don't understand the people of Manitoba and the way in which it has been traditionally governed and the governments have handled the affairs of the province. It's there in spades, Mr. Speaker, that they know not what they are doing. They continue to push and to perpetuate, in fact, the concerns that people have about the manner in which these people are setting precedent in our democratic system.

Mr. Speaker, the point that has been made by many members - and I know again the member of the New Democratic Party that bolted ranks because they wouldn't listen to him and he had no input, makes a suggestion as do other colleagues of mine - (Interjection) - the Member for Inkster makes a comment that the Member for Elmwood never showed up to caucus meetings to influence the caucus. Well maybe the Member for Elmwood will have something to say about that in his next comments.

I will continue, Mr. Speaker, to make the point that the proposal has been made by many of my colleagues that on constitutional matters, constitutional change, that there should be a mechanism, there should be a written law or a common understanding by the Assembly or by the people of Manitoba that there is

a mechanism, a procedure which you go through before a constitutional change is made. I support that, Mr. Speaker. I believe - (Interjection) - well, the Minister of Health says, good for me. He got a new hairdo over the weekend, you would have thought that would have made him feel a little better.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this Assembly not be asked to have it pushed through by the way in which the government were proposing a constitutional change, but let's back off and let's reflect for a few months as to how better we can deal with this problem. I think we can go back to what the objective of most members of this House was, to come up with a consensus. We all want this system to work. We want it to work in the best way possible, and you don't make it work again by using a closure motion or forcing a rule change that will protect the government when they are going the wrong direction.

The people of Manitoba have told them that time and time again. Why have we got such great support throughout not only the country but the North and the city, Mr. Speaker, by the general public and by the electorate? Why is there such support? It's not, Mr. Speaker, because we were yielding to the government. It's not because we were being seen as people who were against this system. It is because we were protecting those people who had no other mechanism but us and the ringing of the bells on constitutional change.

If you take that away, Mr. Speaker, what kind of a system have we got? There has to be a committee of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the Rules Committee should be doing it - I believe they should be taking some time, they should be taking several months to hear the public, to look at other legislative systems, to spend some time to see how this issue and this rule can be changed to the advantage and the betterment of this system. But don't take away, Mr. Speaker, the right of the people - and this is their right, and it was used and demonstrated that it was effective, Mr. Speaker - don't take that protection away from them on a constitutional change which was wrong.

It was demonstrated wrong by everybody in this society. In fact, the real demonstration of it was the lack, again the lack of the government Cabinet Ministers and the backbenchers to stand up and defend their government action on constitutional change. Again I haven't heard many of them stand up and support the rule change. Well that either says, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier or the House Leader, who got his training sitting right at this table and I'm sure will get an education when it comes to going to the people again - that is proof in my estimation that they aren't committed whole-heartedly to either the rule change or the constitutional change that was proposed by this government and rejected by the people.

You know, under tradition, under general understanding of people, neighbours of mine and my parents and people who came to this country and have really respected the system which we've had - it's been a part all our lives of our government - can't understand that when a government loses the confidence of the people, loses the confidence of the Legislative Assembly and had to prorogue a House and back off, Mr. Speaker, on a major issue, why they aren't calling an election.

You know, it's an unwritten rule almost. It is an understanding in the British Parliamentary system that

you should have the mandate of the people before you continue on after such a major defeat. It's fine for them to sit in their chairs and to sit with power for the next year-and-a-half to two years, but whatever they do, Mr. Speaker, does not have the confidence of the people. The people do not believe . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: The moral authority.

MR. J. DOWNEY: That's right. The Member for Pembina says, and he uses a good term, the moral authority to do it. They don't have the moral authority that is needed, and that's a good term. They don't have the moral authority. Do you want to hear it again? But it's true.

If, Mr. Speaker, they were so confident in changing the direction of our province and making a constitutional change and they were defeated in this Assembly, they backed off and then had to come in with a rule change to advance on other matters that they were afraid they may run into, then I think they would be well-advised to call an election. I am doing it not as a member who is that sure of himself, no. I'm doing it, Mr. Speaker, because I believe the people of Manitoba deserve it.

Let them cast their ballot to make the decision as to whether or not the government have the confidence of the people. That's the point, Mr. Speaker, that they need the support and the trust of the people to continue on to govern. They need the support and the trust of the people to make a rule change in this Assembly, and they haven't got it. It's an accommodation, Mr. Speaker. The rule change that they're proposing is an accommodation to cover up for a government who are unable to govern in an effective and positive way. It is a cowardly way out, Mr. Speaker. It is a cowardly way out to pass a rule in this manner to cover up for their inadequacies because they proved that they were inadequate, in bringing forward a constitutional change, debating it on this floor, and passing it in a way in which was tradition to this province.

They were unable to do so, Mr. Speaker, and they'll be condemned for a long time, not only by members of this Assembly, but members of their own party, members of the public, and of course, the member that bolted from the ranks because they proved to him that they wouldn't listen, as they proved to this Assembly they wouldn't listen, as they proved to the people of Manitoba that they wouldn't listen.

When a government gets that mind set, when they get that direction as it would be said in the farm community, when they get the bit in their teeth, they can become impossible. They have become impossible, but there are ways, Mr. Speaker, of changing directions of those kinds of people.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong advocate and will continue to advocate in light of the kinds of situations that have developed and the problems that have developed, because this government haven't been able to first of all, govern the province; secondly, pass laws in this province that they themselves have confidence in and can stand up and debate; that we have now got a rule change based on that background; that we have had excellent debate on this side to point out as to why we are unable to deal with it or don't want to support it, in the manner in which it's being proposed; pointed

out to you, Sir, that it could put the Speaker in an extremely difficult position at the end of 15 minutes, whether he or she who happens to occupy the Chair at that particular time, has to make a crucial decision. If it's on a money vote, Mr. Speaker, it is the Speaker's job to determine whether or not the government should be upset or whether it shouldn't be upset. Is that, Mr. Speaker, what is tradition to our parliamentary system? No, Mr. Speaker, it isn't.

So I plead with the government to reconsider the rule change that they're proposing to push through us, past us, that the people of Manitoba would be better served if a committee of the Legislative Assembly were to reflect on the proposal, to come back with a mechanism or a recommendation to the House, as to how best a constitutional change should be dealt with; whether it should be two-thirds majority of the Assembly; whether or not it should be an election issue that the people should be asked the question, Mr. Speaker, as has been demonstrated in many many service clubs and other organizations in the province before a constitutional change is taken; that there is in fact a mechanism to do that. Because of the constitutional changes that have been made in this country and our ability to change it, I think it would only be as natural as day following night that there would be some mechanism put in place before the kind of proposal was made.

I, Mr. Speaker, will again conclude my remarks by saying that I cannot accept the fact that the government want to impose a rule change only for the purpose of covering up their inadequacies or pushing through this Assembly, by use of the rules, either rule changes, constitutional changes or legislative changes, by force, rather than by persuasion of debate. That's what it boils down to. They're unable, they've demonstrated they're unable to persuade by debate the support they needed, when you look at the records of the speeches in the House. How many of their members did not speak? There are a large number that did not speak either during the constitutional debate or participate from the floor on the changes of the rules. I say look at the record, yet they're pretty good at chipping away from their seats. They're pretty good at chipping away from their seats but haven't been able to stand up and give a concrete speech supporting the kind of changes that they want to impose on either the Legislative Assembly or the people of Manitoba. I challenge each one of them to do so. I challenge each one of them to do so.

I again want to make the point that I started out with, Mr. Speaker, because I think it's important to do so. I think it's extremely important to do so, that here we are again debating an issue - an issue which is brought forward by the government, it's their business, there is very little other legislation that they're proposing to us. Yes we're going through the normal process of Estimates, Mr. Speaker, but what are the other things we have to deal with? Why don't we have, Mr. Speaker, a debate on the economy? Why don't we have a more open debate on the proposal of bringing in an aluminum plant or the power sales, Mr. Speaker? Why don't they bring forward the kinds of thrusts that they talk about? The Premier just comes back from a big tour of Europe and he makes a ministerial statement. Why don't we hear more about what the future of Manitoba - what's on hold for the people of Manitoba?

We have a farm community that are in extremely difficult situations with record bankruptcies, but we aren't dealing with priority items, Mr. Speaker. I again ask the government to go out on the street or to do a survey as to what are the priority items and you know what? When it comes to the rule change on bell ringing, if they did ask the people, first of all it wouldn't be a priority item, it would be a bread and butter issue. But if they did say to the people on constitutional change, do you want to have the bell ringing option taken away from you, as used by the Conservatives to protect you from having a government move something that you don't want and isn't in your best interest? You know what they would tell us, Mr. Speaker? They would tell us leave the rules as they are - 80 percent plus would say leave the rules as they are.

That's the case we're making, Mr. Speaker. it's not a slight partisan position or something that should be taken lightly. It is a major change we're being asked to make. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the government to reflect on what they're doing. I would hope the Government House Leader - I would have thought he had learned his lesson. First of all, I would have thought the first Government House Leader might have learned his lesson in the way in which he tried to handle this House and ran into a brick wall and a major problem.

Then we had the Member for Springfield who is the knight in shining armor, who was going to come along and say, oh, Mr. Premier, there's nothing to that. I'll just go in and smooth talk and we'll slip this thing past them and we'll have a constitutional change. He is the falling star. He fell, Mr. Speaker. Now we have him again trying to say, well I wasn't able to do it on the Constitution, but I can sure fix it for the next constitutional change, because we'll change the rules so they're to our advantage. He's not getting away with it, Mr. Speaker. He's not going to get away with it, Mr. Speaker, and it's our job to continue to point out what he's up to and we don't want to stand for it, nor do the people of Manitoba.

So we do not, Mr. Speaker, accept closure in this Assembly. We do not support the kind of a forced rule change that would limit debate, that would limit the amount of bell ringing that could take place in a constitutional change, Mr. Speaker, because it's not right, and when it's not right, we have to point that out and won't support it.

So I, Mr. Speaker, would suggest again and strongly recommend that the Rules Committee re-meet, reassess, and reflect on the debates that have taken place in this Assembly and try and work out a mechanism that would allow for the majority of the people of Manitoba to agree with a constitutional change before it is made and not do it via changing the rules in this Assembly so that government can use their heavy hand to impose the wishes of a few people on the vast majority of the people of Manitoba.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I would move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa, that debate be adjourned.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is moved by the Member for Swan River, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa, that debate be adjourned. Is that agreed?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All those in favour of the motion . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MOTION presented and defeated.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I do appreciate the opportunity to make a few comments on this resolution, however after having said that . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: As I said at the onset, I appreciate the opportunity of having a chance to make a few remarks on the record regarding his resolution, but after having said that I would say that debate on this resolution is absolutely not necessary. This resolution should never have seen the light of day. This government brought in a constitutional amendment without the mandate to do so. They had lots of opportunity during the 1981 election campaign to advise the people as to what they were planning on doing in this constitutional amendment.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we did not hear one word about what this government was planning to do in 1981 with respect to a constitutional amendment. Not one word. You can't find anywhere in their literature, their campaign material, that the NDP Government was planning on amending our constitutional amendment to include extended French Language Services and entrenchment of bilingualism. So this government did not have the mandate to proceed on this resolution.

We all know the slippery way in which this government tried to put through this constitutional amendment. It's so vivid in the minds of not only the people in this Legislature but also the people of Manitoba of what was happening. They brought out very fancy coloured brochures explaining that Manitoba is not becoming bilingual. It goes on to say that this is not going to be a program like Trudeau's; no, it's not going to be a Trudeau form of bilingualism. But how could they assure the people of Manitoba what was going to happen once this amendment went through here and then through Ottawa? They have no control over it after that.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: They had no control here either.

MR. D. GOURLAY: That's right. My colleague for Roblin-Russell says they had no control here, and that's been obvious.

Why did that happen? It wasn't something that happened just by accident. The people of Manitoba were not dumb, they knew exactly what this government was up to. They tried to slip this through very underhandedly. They brought out these, as I say, the coloured brochures and the pictures, and they had a big picture of the Attorney-General saying Manitoba is not going to be bilingual. — (Interjection) — Yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Did he say that?

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes. The Minister of Health says did he say that? The Attorney-General, who was piloting this program, they had all kinds of statements that would indicate to the people of this province that this was a non-issue, that we were just going to amend our Constitution because we would like to do that. It doesn't really mean very much, but we all know that that's not the case. The people of Manitoba knew what the situation was.

You recall the big speech that the Secretary of State presented to the SFM. Did he say that Manitoba's not becoming bilingual? I don't think so. From reading his comments to the SFM meeting, I believe it was in March of 1983, he indicated many things. One was, in due respect, he gave credit to the Franco-Manitobans for their role in our history, but he talked of the role that was going to be played in the future, that this was going to be a French state, that the Franco-Manitobans would become more effective in the schools, in the municipal governments of Manitoba, in the day-to-day living of this province. It was going to be a bilingual province according to Serge Joyal. Yet the government said, oh, no, that's not the case. We don't have the mandate. They never ever said that. They felt they did have or underhandedly were going to put this through but they never ever had the will to go out and talk to the people and say that this is what we are planning on doing - I'm referring to the 1981 election. No, they never ever mentioned one word about that, then all of a sudden they dropped the bombshell about a year ago.

One of the members opposite, I believe it was the Minister of Agriculture, indicated how we fanned the flames of opposition, how the members of the opposition went out and drummed up the anxiety of the people over this resolution. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people were well aware what was happening.

The people came to us to see if we would attend some of the meetings that were called to really give them our version of what was happening. In some cases many of us took that opportunity. I know that I had the opportunity of attending a meeting in Dauphin. It was reasonably well attended. I think there were something like a couple of hundred people there and certainly they weren't all Conservatives. As I understand it, there were a lot of NDP supporters at the Dauphin meeting.

Who organized the meeting at Dauphin? Well, it was organized by the Grassroots Organization which is made up of many people of many political stripes. But they were quite conversant with what was happening; they knew that the government really didn't have the mandate to do what they were doing.

They told us, on many occasions, let the bells ring. They were of the opinion that we were backing off and

we were giving up on this issue and we would let the constitutional amendment pass some several months ago. They said don't do this, don't back off because this is not right. The people of this province do not want this constitutional amendment because it's going to divide this country even more so than it already has been because of this crazy amendment that the government's bringing in.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, the government didn't have the mandate to bring in this sort of constitutional amendment. You know, it's similar in some respects to the frustrations of the people of Camperville. They've heard lots of lip service provided by this government how they could have self-government, how they were going to get more non-conditional grant monies to their communities. The list goes on and on. The people of Camperville, because of the lack of meaningful dialogue with this government, have decided to impose their own form of self-government. Well, we all know that the people of this province do not agree with what's happened. I'm sure the members of the government, although it's hard to find out, but I'm sure that they don't agree with what's happening.

We, on this side, don't agree necessarily with the actions of the Metis people of Camperville, and I'm sure the majority of Manitobans don't agree with this kind of self-imposed government. But it's not really all that much different from this present Manitoba Government proposing a constitutional amendment with over 80 percent of the people objecting to it. There really isn't much difference. So we're saying that we're prepared to talk with government members through the committee to try and come to a consensus on the rules.

We don't necessarily believe that bell ringing is a desirable out on many issues but it hasn't been used on many issues. It's only been used on a government that has brought in a constitutional amendment when it didn't have the mandate to do so. It was the only kind of mechanism that was available to us to stop this mad government.

Certainly, to say that the people were drummed up to oppose what was happening, the people understood what was happening. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to this government to pull this resolution and to get on to some meaningful discussion within the committee to try and resolve this issue in a businesslike manner. Certainly I believe that there's not all that much difference in getting a consensus.

I'm sure that the members opposite, and we haven't heard from quite a few, certainly must appreciate the situation with the way they saw it in the last Session.

They must go home on the weekends and between Sessions and meet with their constituents. They must hear what the constituents are telling them, because certainly that is the message I'm getting, that the bells served this province well. People, I don't believe, like to hear bells ringing or the buzzers on many issues, but certainly they understood why the bells were ringing. They said on many occasions and numerous occasions, "Let the bells ring." Mr. Deputy Speaker, had the bells stopped ringing and this constitutional amendment been passed, then we would have experienced all the abnormal people coming out of the woodwork such as the Lorties of Quebec.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is what brings out the bad in some people that they do many crazy things. It was

unfortunate, the situation in Quebec, with the individual that shot up the Legislature. Perhaps it was partly on the language issue was what made him do it, but certainly a lot of the people that attended the Grassroots meeting, they were not abnormal people. They were all very quiet, concerned Manitobans that understood what this government was doing. But, in addition to those many thousands of people, there are always those eccentric people that want to take the law into their own hands and do some drastic things. We have just seen by the actions of the government opposite that by doing the kind of actions or bringing in the constitutional amendment, when they didn't have the will of the majority of the people, serious consequences can happen.

I think the bells did serve us well in this respect, because it did provide the opportunity for Manitobans to register their objections to this government. I feel again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Government House Leader and to members opposite in the government, to sit down and discuss this rules issue in more detail, because a consensus can be arrived at, I'm sure.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with those few remarks, I would conclude at this time, but certainly do appeal to the government to really take notice of what has happened in the past year and reflect on the comments that they've heard from their constituents with respect to the operations in the past 12 months, and really examine the bell ringing before we do not have the opportunity to stop a government from bringing in a constitutional amendment as important as the one that we've just had in the past without the will of the people being recognized.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable . . .

The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Roblin-Russell, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and defeated.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: How do you figure that?

A MEMBER: He's only got a left ear to hear.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, this further illustrates the point that my colleagues have been speaking on for the last number of days while we have been debating the resolution on the rule change to do with the bell ringing.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I'm going to be covering ground that has been covered many many times by my colleagues, but I don't know how many times I've heard in this House when it comes to rule changes, and the Member for Kildonan, a former Speaker in this House, has said it so often, that rule changes and the operation of the House must be done with consensus. I happen to agree with him, Mr. Speaker, but there doesn't happen to be a consensus here.

This government and this House Leader seem hellbent on pushing this resolution through, no matter what objections he receives from this side of the House. I think a consensus can be reached on this matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with some further consultation. I don't think there is any great rush to bring about this rule change. We've got a great deal of business before this House. We're studying the Estimates at this time. We have two small bills on the Order Paper. There have to be many more come, I expect. We will be debating those bills thoroughly before they pass on to committee, and I can see no reason why we're being refused to adjourn this debate and let us get on with other important matters that brings us into Legislative Session once or twice a year.

Mr. Speaker, we all know why the bells rang in spite of what has been said, and it's been said so many times. This government brought in a proposed constitutional change to do with an extension of French language rights in Manitoba that they had no mandate to bring in. This was never mentioned during the election campaign and, therefore, that probably should have been brought in with some consensus. That was not done. It was laid on the table in front of us and said, you will vote for this without any changes. Then after great debate and pressure, kicking and screaming, they finally agreed to some hearings of a propaganda nature around the province, which we had them expand into public hearings.

Mr. Speaker, it's well-known what happened in those public hearings. The government got a pretty strong message, but that wasn't enough for them. They had to keep on and they got a stronger message, Mr. Speaker, later on when they found that 80 percent of the people of Manitoba were opposed to what they were doing.

They beseeched the members of the opposition to stop this foolhardy government from bringing in a constitutional change that would be irreversible. They made that known to the opposition members with some force, I might say, Mr. Speaker, the demonstrations that were conducted in this building, the demonstrations elsewhere on public forums that were held throughout the province with an organization called "Grassroots" that sprung up. As my colleague, the Member for Swan River said, it wasn't comprised of abnormal people. These were all normal, serious, honest-thinking Manitobans like the former Premier, Mr. Campbell, and former Cabinet Minister, Mr. Bend, a member of the NDP Party who left his party on a matter of principle. Former members of the NDP of some prominence in the party left on those grounds.

When you get all of those people on public platform of all political stripes, Mr. Speaker, opposing what the government was proposing to do and, after all debate had been exhausted, the only vehicle left to the opposition to stop this government from bringing in an irreversible resolution - goodness knows what it might have led to in the Province of Manitoba - was ringing the bells, which was what the opposition resorted to with. I must say, Mr. Speaker, in spite of what was said in some press about it and some media, a tremendous amount of support from the ordinary people out there in Manitoba that were opposed to what this government was doing.

There was no question that was the reason it was done. It was the only vehicle that was left. Under threat

of closure, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to debate knowing, when you run out your string of speakers, that's the end of the line. So you try and find various other ways of getting your point across, and trying to stop a government from making another move that was going to be detrimental to the large majority of Manitobans. That's the reason the bells rang, Mr. Speaker.

Now when the government has found that they have lost the support of the vast majority of Manitobans which will be evident in the next election, Mr. Speaker, now they have resorted to bringing in a rule change — (Interjection) — that's going to hamstring the opposition. Now the House Leader said, as it was last election, Mr. Speaker. Now 47 percent of the popular vote's not bad. You didn't win it by that much.

HON. A. ANSTETT: That's right. Forty-seven percent's not bad.

MR. D. BLAKE: That's right, but wait till next election, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to pick out the eight or nine of them that are going to be back.

But the rules change, Mr. Speaker, when governments change, the rules can change. If this rule change is brought in with a consensus of all of the people in this House, Mr. Speaker, it probably would not be necessary to change it back again. But rule changes that are not good for the ruling of this House or are not good for the majority of the people of Manitoba should not be brought in, but this government doesn't appear to be able to govern effectively, Mr. Speaker, no matter what they touch. They just seem to step from one cow platter into another, no matter what area they move into.

There is one mistake after another, one blunder after another. They're making another one here, because they're leading us through days and hours of debate. It is something that doesn't have to be done right now. It can be done with further consultation and further meetings. We could be going on with bills and with the Estimates that are before the House, and various other work that's before us.

But, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba do not trust this government. This rule change is going to make them very very nervous, because they're going to say, okay, if they bulldoze this rule change through which they're doing by not allowing us to adjourn debate and taking more time on this, if they bulldoze this through, the little old people out there are going to be saying, aha, Mr. Speaker, what are they up to? Next Session, are they going to bring back in the French language bill? Are they going to bring it back in? Now that we've got the opposition hamstrung and shackled, are they going to bring it through and ram it through again?

I know the zealots, Mr. Speaker, the Member for wherever - well he's not as much of a zealot as the Member for Radisson is in my estimation. That's only my opinion, Mr. Speaker. Is he going to push his government? I don't know how much power he's got in Cabinet, probably not too much, but maybe the Member for Inkster who seems to have a lot of influence on the government over there and he's crazy enough to do it. Maybe they are going to bring in another bill now that they've got us hamstrung and shackled with a 15-minute bell ringing or whatever limit they're going to put on it.

So, Mr. Speaker, the people out there are going to be very very nervous if this resolution is bulldozed through by this government in the manner that they are going to put it before us now. So, Mr. Speaker, the ground that I have to cover has been covered over and over again, and I can't see any point in belabouring it and carrying this debate on too long, but I am just warning this government - this is one more bad move that they're making. God knows, they made enough already. This is just one more bad move that they're making, and there are going to be a lot of people out there very very nervous when it hits the press that they have rammed this bill through, limiting the bell ringing when the threat of closure is hanging over us. No matter what they bring in, there is no way we can stop them. We can debate it till we run out of speakers. They slap closure on us. That's it. Bingo! Fait accompli, and that's how they are going to pass legislation.

It bothers me, Mr. Speaker, that this is being pushed through where there is really no urgency for it. With further consultation, as I say - the Member for Kildonan has been a great advocate of consensus on rule changes that govern the conduct in the House. I haven't heard him speak on this resolution yet, Mr. Speaker. That is my whole argument, that there is no need to rush it through. There is not an emergency in front of us.

But the House Leader is, as I say, hell bent on ramming this thing through, and I suppose he is going to have his way because he won't let us adjourn the debate. The speakers that we have left are busy engaged in constituency matters. We could string it out for a while longer, but eventually if he keeps putting the gun to our head, we're going to have to let it come to a vote anyway.

So with those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the House Leader and the members on that side of the House to reconsider this resolution. Let's try and arrive at something that we can all agree with, because the constitutional change was the one reason, the bells have never rang in this House before, and I don't suppose they will ring again unless we have some fool resolution or some foolish move by the government that doesn't have the support of the vast majority of the people of Manitoba. Unless that happens, I don't suppose they would ring again unless there was a member couldn't get in. They might ring for a couple of hours to let some members get in to vote if the government side happened to be short.

We have seen an example of that already, right off the bat, Mr. Speaker. The motion on the Attorney-General's Salary, we had to accommodate them and step outside the House so they wouldn't look too embarrassed and let the poor Minister be down to a dollar on his salary.

But there are just some examples, Mr. Speaker, and I can't think of any other reason that the bells might ring other than a very very serious resolution such as the motion to change the Constitution of Canada. That is what the people out there objected to, and I know that the government is going to reap the whirlwind from what they have started and what they've run into on this debate.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Government House Leader will be closing debate.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have only a few brief comments in closing debate. I should be able to do so in the time allotted this afternoon.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I commend the Member for Minnedosa on his short remarks. Obviously the comparison to which he alludes does not apply to him, despite his facial foliage. I would suggest to him that it would just as inappropriately be applied to me. I would remind the honourable member that those kinds of references have never had a place in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the fellow who on the opposite side often likes to quote a British statesman, a statesman who he views with some great respect, one Winston Churchill. It's a statesman who the Member for Charleswood has not quoted in the last 12 months, because the Member for Charleswood and other members opposite have a new-found respect for an old democratic principle.

Mr. Speaker, it's a concept called populism. It has been one which has been used at times in the most anti-democratic fashions. It can be a very powerful motive force in parliamentary democracy, but it's one when used to support views that are anti-parliamentary or extra-parliamentary has the portent of great danger.

I was suprised to hear members opposite through the last 12 months, but more glaringly throughout the last three weeks, talk about this populous tradition, and reflect on it admiringly when they look back at its great successes and will find generally in parliamentary terms a denial of parliamentary democracy and extremism of both the right and the left.

It was the Member for Lakeside who, some 10 years ago in this Chamber, spoke glowingly of the Mensheviks in 1917 and their short period in government, and how that was a parliamentary democracy, and how the populism of the Bolshevik Revolution some nine months later - and that populism, supported by guns but certainly an extra-parliamentary vehicle, was something to be a shame no matter how popular it was, no matter what kind of support it had. I am sure he would attach the same criticism to what happened in Italy in April of 1926.

I am sure the Member for Morris who, just a week ago, had this new-found feeling for this populist tradition would also decry what happened in Germany in 1933, all of these things the most apparent aberrations of populism in modern 20th Century history. There are examples from both Canadian and American experience which will support this, but not to the same extremes.

But, Mr. Speaker, the great danger of that kind of extra-parliamentary activity is that there is a temptation to carry it into the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, that temptation, when yielded to, is an attempt at a coup

d'etat. Those are the words used by the Member for Lakeside just now. We didn't mount a coup d'etat but, in effect, the attempt to take extra-parliamentary means into this House is an attempt at a coup d'etat.

Mr. Speaker, it is a challenge to this very institution and everything it stands to.

MR. C. MANNES: Do you have the courage to go talk to the people directly?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris talks about courage and talks about going to the people directly. The Member for Morris, I assume, would like to take all issues of contention, all issues which appear after a government has received a mandate, to the people. After the government has received a mandate and an issue arises, the logic of the Member for Morris is that government is then the captive of its mandate; that no matter what issue arises after an election, that issue if it has any significance at all cannot be decided until the mandate is renewed. That kind of populist interpretation of our institutions goes a long way to fomenting the kind of extra-parliamentary activity in which members opposite were involved during the last year.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to be short, and unfortunately I'm yielding to some of the comments opposite. I will choose to ignore as many as possible and quote with regard to the kind of populist activity in which members opposite have engaged, the kind of denial of parliament, of legislative supremacy which, as short a time as three years ago, they sang the praises across this nation. Not just in Manitoba but across the nation, they sang the praises of legislative supremacy and of the rights of parliaments and of the rights of duly-elected governments.

Mr. Speaker, today to quote from Bernard Crick, "In Defence of Politics," they forget that ". . . the first business of government is to govern, which may at times call for the deliberate endurance of unpopularity." And then quoting Churchill: "The politician . . . "Churchill said this at his last Washington press conference when Eisenhower was President. "The politician who cannot stand unpopularity is not worth his salt."

That's the test. The test is not to do everything that the people want; the test is not a willingness to hold one's finger into the wind and run with the crowd. If the test of populism is to always do what one believes the people want then, Mr. Speaker, we have a new interpretation of parliamentary democracy.

The Member for Emerson wants to put a strange interpretation on my remarks. He wants to suggest that the test of democracy in my words is to do the opposite of what the people want.

A MEMBER: That's what you said.

HON. A. ANSTETT: No, Mr. Speaker. But the test is not to be a slave to the crowd. The test is not - as the Member for Charleswood sitting in this seat said once during his term that he would not yield to the mob in the gallery. Those were his words. Has the mood opposite changed? Is there now a willingness to yield to the crowd? Mr. Speaker, if this new perception of

denial of legislative supremacy based on a new-found respect for the gallery is what motivates members opposite, then I sincerely ask them to reconsider.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite are concerned about the people of Springfield and their perception on my views of our democratic institutions. Mr. Speaker, I told them exactly what I am telling members opposite four months ago. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that one wins respect when one follows the crowd. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe that one loses respect when one's principles are sacrificed for the express purpose of following the crowd and moving in the direction the winds are blowing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly comment on some of the arguments that were made by members opposite. Mr. Speaker, some members have suggested that this was the first time a change in our rules was undertaken without consensus - the first time. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside didn't say that. The Member for Roblin-Russell wouldn't say that. The Member for Virden would, the Member for Pembina, but certainly those who were here in the '60s know that's not true. Mr. Speaker, they will dig out of the Journals citation after citation of rules changes which were imposed on this House, of standing divisions on amendments proposed in Committee of the Whole which were moved by men such as D.L. Campbell or the late Buzz Paulley, in which a majority led by the current Member for Charleswood imposed their will on rule changes for 11 years. He was the House Leader, and he made those changes, and he dictated those changes to the House.

Mr. Speaker, there was no consultation. There weren't any meetings. There weren't discussions of options. There wasn't an attempt to reach a consensus. Those changes were made, and the Member for Lakeside knows whereof I speak. We tried to reach a consensus on this issue. That wasn't possible, and I am the first to concede that it wasn't possible. But for members opposite to suggest that a consensus could have been achieved is an assumption that there was no difference. Mr. Speaker, what it is as the member now says from his seat is, there was a consensus possible "if you agree with our suggestions." Mr. Speaker, that's not a consensus. There is a fundamental difference of opinion as to whether or not there should be a limit on the bells. I respect that difference but, Mr. Speaker, after consultation that difference could not be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, it was also suggested by the Member for Pembina that it wasn't really necessary to have a provision for calling in members, Sir, with your concurrence for an extension of the time period for the bells, because that was only to protect the government. Opposition members didn't need that, because they could have their Whip stand and advise who was away and how that person would have voted had he been here. That's a new rule that I've never heard of from the mouth of the Member for Pembina, this new mechanism for declaring the votes of absent members. I have never heard of a proxy system in our House, but the Member for Pembina was adopting the pairing system to a new form of proxy declaration.

It was also suggested that no Legislature in the parliamentary system would put their Speaker in such an "untenable position" as having to adjudicate extensions. Mr. Speaker, in the Legislature, the Province of Quebec has been in that position for a number of

years. It hasn't created problems. In fact, their experience with that rule, which doesn't even provide a minimum, it's at the determination of the Speaker as to how long the bells should ring. Mr. Speaker, that hasn't created a problem. In fact, I think some members opposite would welcome that type of rule more openly than the straight 15-minute rule, provides a more wide discretion.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite have also said that the rules change was without consultation. I have dealt with that in terms of addressing the question of consensus but, Mr. Speaker, I think the House should know that there have been discussions ongoing essentially since this House prorogued on possible avenues of consensus. We have agreed on this side at the last meeting of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House that we were prepared to look at a time guarantee for debate on constitutional amendments in the future, something along the lines of the Throne Speech or Budget, a set, specific time during which closure in the previous question could not be used. We hoped that upon further discussion with members of the opposition, that idea might come to fruition. That would not limit the debate, but would rather provide a minimum guarantee, so in some ways the opposite of the Throne Speech or Budget, but a minimum guarantee that that much debate must take place before debate could in any way be limited under our rules.

The suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite want to exempt constitutional amendments completely from the limits, they knew is ultra vires the province. Mr. Speaker, if they're in any doubt that it is ultra vires the province, they should consult with the Member for St. Norbert and the Member for Charleswood who will advise them to that effect. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure they know that.

If they want that kind of change, they must bring it in by way of an amending resolution to The Manitoba Act and to Section 43 of the Constitution of Canada, 1982. Mr. Speaker, that's how that would be done. The Member for Morris says, we should do it. We have no interest in doing it. We see no need for it. Our current rules will be adequate for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, there is also this perception that for some reason the bells have only been rung on this issue. Mr. Speaker, I dare say if the tool of abuse of the bells had been available in 1970 in the Autopac debate, it would have been used. I don't think there is any doubt at all. Members on both sides of this Chamber only became aware of the extreme to which that tool could be pushed in March of 1982. It was only perceived then as an obstruction tactic, and it was only developed then as an abuse of our parliamentary system. For the Member for Virden or others to say that it wouldn't have been used in August or July of 1970 in the Autopac debate belies the fact that those members said and did use every tool available to them to obstruct, filibuster and frustrate the government of the day.

Mr. Speaker, they believed, and they had a constituency out there that provided them with fuel for that belief, that if they could have forced an election at the time, they could have defeated the government. With a little co-operation from my seatmate here, they might have been able to do it as I understand that the

current Member for St. Boniface at times was not exactly convinced as to how his vote should be cast on several of the votes in that debate. So, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that members opposite would have used that tool had they been aware of it.

Now that's not all bad, but what worries me - coming to that realization doesn't change anything - what worries me, Mr. Speaker, in a nutshell is that now that the tool has been found, it will be used again. The assurances of members opposite that they won't doesn't hold any water on this side.

A year-and-a-half ago, we had the assurance of the then Opposition House Leader - we've had no experience with the use of the bells, and neither opposition nor government would behave irresponsibly and do that kind of thing as happened in Ottawa so we didn't have to change our rules. You know, I believed him, and I think most members on this side did and I think most members opposite did. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the Member for Turtle Mountain would make that statement today. I don't believe he would make the statement that abuse of our rules by bell ringing will not occur in Manitoba, because members are too responsible. I don't believe he would say that.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Turtle Mountain, every time he has difficulty with an argument, wishes to exchange personal insults. I consider it a great honour that there have been so many personal insults from members opposite during this debate directed at me personally. If anything, it is a reflection on the merits of the argument that they have to indulge in personal attack, rather than deal with the argument which they find above reproach.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line on the motion before the House at the present time is to debate the detail of the proposed rule change in committee. I think, rather than continue the extended debate on the principle or on the issue that brought this issue to the forefront of the Standing Committee and now to the House - and I hope that we will have an opportunity to debate the merits of the change, perhaps suggest amendments to it to make it in any way more applicable to our proceedings, to adapt it if that's necessary. We are willing to look at that, but we are not willing to move from the fundamental principle that this matter should be dealt with and must be dealt with to protect the basic parliamentary institution that we fostered in this Chamber, and prevent extra-parliamentary abuse of our rules and proceedings.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question before the House, moved by the Honourable Government House Leader as printed. Do you require it read?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House, it's moved by the Honourable Government House Leader:

THAT the Report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House, received by the Assembly on April

30, 1984, be referred to the Committee of the Whole House for consideration.

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

YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Evans, Eyer, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Penner, Plohman, Santos, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

NAYS

Blake, Brown, Doern, Downey, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Hammond, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Ransom, Sherman.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas, 26; Nays, 20.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.
The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was paired with the Premier. Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Minister of Finance. Had I voted, I would have voted against the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Minister of Labour. Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour, the Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if there would be an inclination on the part of all honourable members, but I believe there may be, to dispense with Private Members' Hour to go into Committee of Supply.

MR. R. DOERN: No.

MR. SPEAKER: There appears not to be leave.

RES. NO. 3 - MANITOBA CREAM SHIPPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution, Resolution No. 3.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Turtle Mountain, that

WHEREAS Manitoba cream producers are being restricted from shipping cream to creameries because of lack of quota; and

WHEREAS many family farm operations depend on income derived from milk cows and shipping cream for their daily essentials; and

WHEREAS the creamery industry employs many people and adds millions of dollars to our economy; and

WHEREAS the present NDP Government is ignoring the problems faced by our small family farm producers and related industries;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Assembly request that the Minister of Agriculture take action on behalf of Manitoba cream shippers.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a few points that I want to make in introducing the resolution. The main one, Mr. Speaker, being that for several weeks now we have been waiting for the Minister of Agriculture to respond to questions placed earlier in this Assembly, dealing with the problems of some of our small beginning farmers and people who have carried out a responsibility in society that I think we all should be extremely proud of, and that's one of looking after themselves when economic situations get tough, that they can revert to and get into the business of milking cows and shipping cream for their daily needs. We do not want to see that kind of a situation be taken away.

Mr. Speaker, we felt that we were representative of the small family farm; that we, as members of the opposition, have truly demonstrated that we are sincere in protecting that family unit; that we want to see it continued, and felt very strongly about taking a stand in this particular area.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution, in introducing it, I want to point out that we have seen the numbers of cream shippers in Manitoba, or people who are involved in the industry reduce at about the period of 1980-81, and then stabilize at that particular time; if anything, from that time forward, has actually seen an increase in numbers that have gone into the business of shipping cream for their incomes, so we have in the neighborhood of 2,000 to 2,500 farmers that are actually involved in the shipping of cream. We see there are 17 creameries in Manitoba and probably well over 100 people employed in that industry, with a value of butterfat purchased that goes into the farm community about \$4.5 million, that was in the period August 1, 1982 to July 1983. So in pointing that out, Mr. Speaker, it is not - and I emphasize - it is not the largest income that people in the agricultural community are getting, but it is an important part of a lot of people's income. I will try today to demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, as to why I think it is important, and we think it's important that this resolution should be supported.

As well I want to point out that I did not specifically make any firm directive as far as the Minister of Agriculture is concerned; that I ask him only to act on behalf of Manitoba cream shippers. I know that there

is a national supply system; that there's a provincial supply system controlled by the Milk Producers Marketing Board and all that has to be taken into account. But the point that has to be made is that they have been crying out for assistance in getting more quota so they don't have to stop shipping cream in the middle of the production cycle of their business, that they are allowed to continue to market and get a cash return which is so essential to them.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would at least, in responding to this resolution, indicate to the House and to the people who are involved in the industry, what he has done in the last few weeks and months, because we are on record of having asked him to deal with it. He has the responsibility, as Minister of Agriculture, to deal with it and we would like to know what he has done.

Just to further elaborate, Mr. Speaker, on the kinds of people, and I speak from experience because I happen to be - and I say fortunate enough - to be a member of a family, who, in earlier days when we went to school - that was part of our job to milk cows and to ship cream and to a large part put a lot of the essentials on the table. I'm sure there are many rural members here that can attach themselves to those kinds of backgrounds. I'm proud of it, Mr. Speaker, I'm extremely proud of it because I don't think that it did any one of us, or anyone that was involved in that any harm. That again is why today I feel it's important that we speak out on behalf of the small family farm who have participated in the raising of incomes in that way and possibly the Minister of Agriculture himself may have come from that same kind of background. So he has to appreciate how important it is for the household keeper, for the mother of a family - whether it be large or small - that when the cream cheque came in, that it was used in a very meaningful way of putting the essentials on the table, or putting shoes on the children's feet, so it is an extremely important part of many people's income.

What has happened in the last few years, Mr. Speaker, because of so many restrictions in getting into the production of milk or selling it commercially, people have reverted and have not been able to go directly into the production of table milk to sell to the milk industry, but have been restricted to getting into the shipping of cream. Again, when times get tough, as they have under the New Democratic Party Government, then they have been forced to look at the alternatives that are available to them. Yes, we, Mr. Speaker, have seen a stabilization of people involved in the shipping of cream, and, in fact, increased to some degree.

So what is the kind of difficulty that has been created? Because of the quota system, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that we have an established amount of production for the 1,000 or 1,200 milk shippers in the province, I believe, that we have seen a lack of an increase, of an ability for them to, at the national level, get quota available to continue to expand their operations which would allow the cream industry to expand at the same time. We've seen a tightening down of the availability of quota.

What I'm pointing out to the Minister, as I've done before by press release and by communication by letter, was to ask the National Supply Agency to get a little more elbow room for the Province of Manitoba. There

is room for him to get more quota, if he is determined enough to get it. It is he who has to take the lead, Mr. Speaker. He has to take the lead when it goes to approaching the National Agency and the National Government. It is his responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, he can get up today, and I can tell you, he'll get up today and he'll make an attack on the Conservative Party that we're against the supply and management in the dairy industry. That is absolutely an incorrect approach that he's going to take. We're suggesting to him and to his government that they make the approach to the National Agency. I want that clear on the record. We want room to expand in Manitoba for a milk industry or milk producers, as well as allow our cream shippers to provide a quota of availability to them, so they can continue to ship.

I really want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, the importance that the Conservative Party places on our small family farm operators. That's again demonstrated. You know, we so often hear the New Democratic Party going around touting that they're for the little guy. They're always for the little guy. Well, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that that is not true and they continue to demonstrate it when they see the kind of thing they allow to happen in the dairy industry.

We're seeing it demonstrated time and time again. If one were going to line the New Democratic Party up with anyone in society today, you'd line them up with the union bosses. That's who we would see the New Democratic Party would be in bed with or controlled by. The Dick Martins of this world, who is now sitting in the Cabinet Room when the Premier goes in, they always have to yield to what he says. These are the people, Mr. Speaker, who are controlling the New Democratic Party and who they yield to.

So the point I'm making is that we do care about those people who live on the land, who are determined to make a go of it on their own, not depend on government welfare rolls, not to look to other people in society to help them, but through their own hard work and determination they will expand their operations, or diversify their operations, and add income for their daily needs. Those are the important points that have to be made.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, we want a society where that kind of self-help is disallowed. We do not want to restrict people from making a go of it on their own. What would happen in society today if everybody who wanted to plant a garden plot were restricted from doing so? If the carrot producers of Manitoba wanted to start stopping the people in the City of Winnipeg or of Brandon or of Thompson or anywhere, that they wanted to impose a quota regulation that said you couldn't produce carrots in your backyard because you may sell them in the marketplace or you may feed yourself, that we're going to restrict that. That's the kind of problem that we can get into, Mr. Speaker, if we see this kind of thing continue.

I ask the Minister in my resolution to take action on behalf of the cream shippers and that leaves him no boundaries. I haven't said to him, "Take a look at the total dairy industry within Manitoba" - and I can tell you there'll be members of probably our side would agree that probably there has to be some reviewing done.

When we got into government, Mr. Speaker, we're proud of our record with the dairy industry. We acted,

Mr. Speaker. What happened to the dairy industry? - and I should put this on the record to make it very clear. Mr. Speaker, the dairy industry was controlled by the whim of a small Milk Control Board appointed by the former New Democratic Party, made up of who? Consumer advocates, Mr. Speaker. Well, I've got nothing wrong with consumer advocates or consumers. I believe they should be involved and we did involve them. We involved them when we established the Milk Prices Review Commission, Mr. Speaker. We took away the principle where a dairy farmer had to go cap-in-hand before a consumer advocate board or people, who in society, were not always on the side of the farmers and said, "You have to justify to us each year before you can raise the price of milk." That wasn't good for the dairy industry, Mr. Speaker. It wasn't good for the consumers, because we were putting in jeopardy the continued expansion of the needed opportunities for increases in our dairy production and the kind of relationship that was needed to continue on.

And, yes, the present Minister of Agriculture - let's get this on the record - the present Minister of Agriculture and all his caucus members that were here in opposition voted against a positive change to help the dairy industry. He voted against it, Mr. Speaker, and let him stand in his place and say why he did vote against it. Has he repealed it? - and I challenge him. He voted against it. Is he now going to reintroduce the Milk Control Board, Mr. Speaker? Is he going to reintroduce the Milk Control Board? Let him stand up and tell the dairy farmers that he's going to reimplement, reimpose the dairy board on them, that they're going to have to go cap-in-hand annually to the consumer advocates to get a price increase. Let him tell us that, that's what he's going to do. He voted against progressive and positive action in the dairy industry. That, Mr. Speaker, is why this resolution is here. Maybe he has a chance to make amends. Maybe he has a chance to make amends with the dairy industry and pick up the lead that has been pointed out here by the members of the opposition and help our cream shippers who are getting cut back. Let's just deal with that for a few minutes.

Let's look at a person who has gone out and borrowed some money, whether it be through MACC, where the Minister has a vested interest as the Minister responsible. If a young farmer has gone out and borrowed money and he said "I can ship cream to the creamery at Minnedosa, who are employing people, and I'm going to get \$50 for every five-gallon can of cream that I sell and I can get two of those a week." Well, that's about \$400 a month and he goes to MACC and he lays out a budget and the MACC say, "Fine, that's a good idea. Go and buy yourself some cows, fix your barn up, so you can milk those cows," and everything is rolling along nicely. He's shipping his cream, the cheque's coming in, he's paying his bills nicely, and all at once he gets a letter in the mail saying, "Oh, oh, I'm sorry, but you can no longer ship anymore than X number of pounds of cream to that creamery, and you're going to be cut off as of next month." What happens to that person, who has worked so hard to make it on his own, gets a letter saying, "Oh, oh, it's all over"? He goes to MACC and he says, "Well, I'm sorry, the cream that I've been shipping to the Minnedosa Creamery, or wherever it is, they can't take

it anymore because there's a quota system and they're not only letting me stay at the same, they're cutting me back. They're cutting me back, cutting off my income."

We can't accept that, Mr. Speaker. We can't accept that on some 2,400 or 2,500 people. They cannot be allowed, Mr. Speaker, to be put in that situation. So we carry it through, Mr. Speaker. MACC aren't going to get the money, the employees at the creamery aren't going to get a job. We have more people going on our welfare rolls, Mr. Speaker. We have to have the Minister of Agriculture pick up his responsibility, go to the dairy industry and say, "How are we going to work out this situation? How are we going to be able to allow the cream shippers to make their payments to the credit corporation or to the banks? How are we going to be able to allow them the kinds of availability of making an income that are essential in tough economic times? I'm not at odds with the milk producers of this province who say, "To get quota you're going to have to take it from the milk producers." That's not true, Mr. Speaker, that's not true. If the Minister of Agriculture were doing his job and showing the leadership that should be shown in the agricultural community, we wouldn't have gotten into this situation, because he should have known there was a reversal in the numbers of cream shippers.

There's another point that has to be made. There was a change by the Milk Producers Board and by the Natural Products Marketing Commission saying that if a person was shipping cream and wanted to convert into a milk shipping program that that was one of the avenues that they could do it. Well, it caught a lot of people in the middle of transfer and again they have converted to milk coolers and bulk tanks and again added expense. The point that has to be made is that there should be more leadership and direction coming right from this Minister's office and he has failed. He has failed.

We haven't tied his hands, Mr. Speaker, this resolution hasn't tied his hands. There are many alternatives. Many alternatives, and I'm sure I've got many colleagues here who appreciate the importance of the cream shippers and those many numbers of cream shippers have phoned us asking us if we couldn't do something to get an increase or at least maintain the quota that they had this past year so they can continue to make their payments and make an income.

I'm interested to hear what the Minister has to say. I have not seen him make one progressive move in any area of his responsibility, Mr. Speaker. We've seen the failure of the packing-house industry after spending how many millions of dollars. We've seen the dumping of milk, Mr. Speaker, when the cheese plant couldn't take all the milk. Where can he tell us that he has a success story, Mr. Speaker? He has not got one. What are his priorities? He wants to change our Constitution, Mr. Speaker. That's what his priority is, he wants to change our Constitution, so that we have to extend the French language rights. That's his priority, Mr. Speaker.

I, Mr. Speaker, would hope that the Minister would take this resolution and take the directive that's coming from it and look at all the opportunities and options that are available to him. I would hope he would have his department and the Milk Producers Marketing Board put pressure on the Federal Government, on the federal

Dairy Commission, to get more quota in total for our milk shippers, so they can continue to expand and survive and also so our small cream shippers can do what is most important to everyone in life and that is to look after their own daily needs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to speak on this resolution because I'm rather amazed that a member of this House and a former Minister of Agriculture would come to this House as ill-prepared as the Member for Arthur has come on this resolution. It's really pathetic, in terms of the content of the resolution, of a member not checking out and not checking his facts and not finding out where the industry is at today and really what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is a former Minister of this Assembly. He should be aware and should have been aware that the quotas and the regulations dealing with quotas rest with the Marketing Board. He was one of the Ministers who said that I don't interfere with marketing boards and he's the one who allowed marketing boards in this province to give away, to allow quota change for other than reasons of comparative advantage.

You know, we haven't gone back to that whole area. When he talks about going to the Federal Government and fighting for a market share in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, we have been fighting a rear guard action to try and get back to where we were. When that bunch was in charge of the administration of this province, he just let everyone do their own thing. But not only that, Mr. Speaker, he comes to this Assembly and says, look, the creamery industry employs many people and adds millions of dollars to our economy and he said that we're proud of the Tory record, of their record.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened to the creameries during the period when they were in office, Sir? Let's just look at the record. In 1976-77, cream production in Manitoba was 1.733 million kilograms, when they came into office. By 1981-82, cream production had declined by more than one-third, Sir, to 1.147 million kilograms. Mr. Speaker, what was the Member for Arthur doing to help cream producers during that period? Where was he, as Minister of Agriculture? What was he doing to help cream producers during that time?

Mr. Speaker, our quota problem this year has arisen because of the downward plunge and cream production has stopped. It's stopped. Production increased by 6 percent last year, Mr. Speaker, and as I stated earlier, is increasing again this year. But more than ever, what has happened to the investment that he talks about, the millions of dollars to our economy? What has happened to the creameries, Sir, during the period of drastically declining cream production when he was in office? Chatfield Creamery closed 1978; Beausejour Creamery closed 1980; Glenella Creamery closed 1981; Crystal City Creamery closed 1981; Melita Creamery closed 1982.

Mr. Speaker, today the Honourable Member for Arthur expresses such great concern for the creameries in

the province and the people that they employ. Where was the Member for Arthur and his colleagues and their concern for the cream industry during their term in office? Where were they when they allowed cream production to decrease by one-third during their term in office? They allowed that to happen, Mr. Speaker. They allowed four creameries to close during their term in office. Let them explain that to the farmers of Manitoba, where the farmers have to pay increased transportation costs to haul their cream all over rural Manitoba, Sir. What's he talking about? Talking about being proud of their record.

Mr. Speaker, if anything, the Leader of the Opposition should be looking at a replacement for the Member for Arthur and his chief critic, for a member to come into this House and misinform his own colleagues about what has happened in the cream industry, is low in terms of information to the farmers of this province and to members of this Assembly. He does not know what he is speaking of, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Honourable Member for Arthur that the needs of the cream producers are being looked after. Mr. Speaker, they have sufficient quota to cover their cream production for this year. In case he didn't check it out, because he didn't, he tabled this resolution and didn't check it out, because the board did write a letter.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Arthur hasn't even had the mental capacity to check with the Manitoba Milk Marketing Board, who does administer the quotas and who does impose the quotas, vis-a-vis this situation. He knows full well, or at least he should have remembered full well as a former Minister of Agriculture, that that policy, in terms of putting on quotas and the like, does not rest directly with the Minister of Agriculture. It is and has been delegated by virtue of the plans filed by the Milk Marketing Board in the Province of Manitoba.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we were and are concerned and have been concerned about the actions of the Milk Marketing Board. When they imposed the quota situation on the producers, without giving sufficient notice, without realizing what was happening and without discussing it with the cream producers, we were sufficiently concerned, that we did and have - and I personally have met a number of times with the Milk Marketing Board to discuss this and many other problems that the milk industry faces. But, Sir, for the Member for Arthur not to check with the Milk Marketing Board about the time that he was tabling this resolution and they, in fact, wrote the producers. Mr. Speaker, the producers received a letter dated 84/02/20, February 20th. Mr. Speaker, every producer received a letter from the Milk Marketing Board indicating that cream producers, who originally were notified that they would have to cease production because of their market share quota is filled, will not have their quotas cancelled due to the four-month non-delivery policy and will be allowed to ship cream again in the dairy year which commences August 1, 1984.

Mr. Speaker, all the member had to do was pick up the telephone and talk to the board. All I can determine from the honourable member is that he is being mischievous in this House, is playing games, being totally mischievous, Sir, in terms of the dairy industry. At one time, he wants to be on the side of the

consumers, saying that marketing boards charge too much; and on the other side of the question, he wants to be on the side of the producers, so they can produce any amount that they wish; and when the price plunges he will come to this Legislature and say, "Government, we want you to interfere in this industry because farmers are going broke." Well he can't be on both sides of the question, Mr. Speaker.

Talk about a party who is supporting the small family farm, who wants to and who says we support the family farm, Mr. Speaker, he was one Minister of Agriculture who brought in a marketing board in the Province of Manitoba to prevent the importation of product into this province, the bulk of that product which is controlled by corporate entrepreneurs in this province, and I speak of the broiler industry, Sir. That industry is virtually integrated. Mr. Speaker, we are looking at that whole question.

The honourable member says, what are you going to do about it? The fact of the matter is, for someone who speaks for the family farm, it was much easier for the Conservatives to protect the quotas of commercial operators, feed mills and processing companies by the formation of a Marketing Board. Now, he has the gall to stand up in this House and say protect the family farm. Mr. Speaker, it is totally inconsistent, possibly consistent for the Member for Arthur and a Conservative philosophy that if you're going to protect you may as well protect those few who are in control of the production and give them the choice. Then you can scream at whoever is in office to allow further production - but further production for whom? - not for the small family farm, for the large corporate holders of quota who are being protected by the virtue of setting up of a marketing board that he brought into this province, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, cream producers in this province are being looked after. We have met with the Milk Marketing Board. We believe . . .

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

MR. J. DOWNEY: I have a question for the Minister. I wonder if the Minister would answer a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Minister answer a question?

HON. B. URUSKI: I'll be pleased to answer the question if I have some time at the end.

A MEMBER: Oh, come on, Billy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I didn't interrupt the honourable member when he spoke.

Mr. Speaker, the situation of over-issuance of quota to cream producers, Sir, has arisen because the Natural Products Marketing Council and I have met with the Producer Board on three separate occasions this past winter. While quota for cream production was not the

only item discussed, these concerns were reviewed each time.

The production of cream by individual producers historically has fluctuated considerably from year to year but, Sir, this fluctuation presents some problems to the Marketing Board in managing their market share quota in Manitoba. There is no doubt. On the one hand, the board needs to allocate sufficient quota to cover the expected level of cream production. On the other hand, if the board plays it too safe and reserves more quota than is required for cream production, milk producers will have lost the opportunity to utilize that quota. The result would be a loss to both milk producers and milk processors. It would also reduce the contribution of the dairy industry to the economy of this province.

In some years, there is very little difficulty as production decreases by some producers are offset by increases by others. The problem arises when production begins trending strongly in one direction. Mr. Speaker, this was the situation in the dairy year beginning last August 1st. By the end of January, production was up by 5 percent with the rate of increase growing.

Mr. Speaker, the Milk Board was concerned with having enough quota to cover the year's production, and we were concerned that individual producers who have traditionally operated on an open quota system would suddenly find themselves unable to sell their cream. Sir, in this instance, the board has seen fit to over-issue a cream quota with some risk that it will have to pay over-quota penalties to the Canadian Dairy Commission. But, Mr. Speaker, the board has on four occasions issued additional quota to cover shortages of individual producers. They are in consultation with the producers, and have written them, written every producer that no one will have their quotas cancelled due to the four-month, non-delivery policy.

And it happened long before the member even brought the resolution in - this letter was - all that the honourable member had to do, because he had the letter, he had the original letter, of the 1983 letter advising producers - all he had to do was go to the Milk Marketing Board and say, what's your update on quotas? He neglected to check, Sir, but he did check on statistics. I am told by the board that he phoned the board and checked on statistics.

At the same time, all he had to do was ask the question, what is your policy today vis-a-vis cream quotas but, Mr. Speaker, he couldn't even do that. He didn't even bother to check what the present situation is. The present situation was changed in February, Sir. When did he table his resolution? He tabled it in May, Sir, May 4th was when he brought the resolution in - May 4, 1984.

Well, Sir, either the member doesn't know what he's talking about, has failed to check out his facts, or is just being mischievous in presenting this resolution to the House, Sir. I repeat that the honourable member really doesn't know what he speaks of and the Leader of the Opposition should really take heed of looking at a replacement for the Honourable Member for Arthur. Someone there, I'm sure the Member for Morris, could do a more credible job in getting involved . . . knowing the Member for Morris, who sat on the Natural Products Marketing Council, he would not get up and make such

a statement because he knows how the quota system works. He knows, as a former sitting member of the Natural Products Marketing Council, that the situation isn't as simple as the Honourable Member for Arthur tries to point out. He knows that within a national quota system there are certain parameters, certain restrictions, albeit there are restrictions on production, because there is one side factor. There is a guarantee of price; a guarantee of income that producers receive, and for that guarantee of income, Sir, there is the benefit to consumers of a steady supply of milk and to make sure that there are no surpluses, or at least to try and balance the production with the needs of the consuming public as best a system can, and it's done, Sir. It's done a reasonably good job over the history of those systems that we have in place.

Mr. Speaker, it's done for Manitoba reasonably well with the exception of one area, and the honourable members don't like it. It is the area dealing with the future potential of production in this province. For a government, for a former administration to allow the over-base quota to be allocated on other than comparative advantage, Sir, is really sticking your neck on the guillotine. That's what they did. That's what the former Minister of Agriculture did to all the producers, to all the producing groups who were in supply-managed commodities on this province, Sir. That's what he did. He put their neck on the chopping block, because, Sir, what happens when you allow one group to deviate from the principle of comparative advantage, every other commodity is on the block, every other commodity group in this country is looking and saying, look, if this group can do it, why can't we?

Mr. Speaker, when he allowed the Turkey Board - and it was the Turkey Board, it was my own group - to go and negotiate - and I have to admit that provinces were blackmailing the national agency because they were threatening to pull out; but for a government to allow a board to use population, regional market share as - and there's a third criteria - a future market potential as being the dominant criteria for a greater quota or greater production rights - for him to stand up in this House today and shout and scream and say we want more production rights, is very hollow, is hollow indeed.

It's a shame on the ministry of Agriculture's Office, which he had the privilege to hold for a short period of time and I'm sure that the public and the farmers of Manitoba will show him that he should not hold that office again, Sir. He will not be in a position to hold that office again, especially, Sir, when in the mid-'70s, when we were in office, we fought so hard to have within the national legislation, any allocation of over-base quota, over the historical production share, that the dominant criteria for allocating additional production rights would be on the base of cost of production or comparative advantage, and Manitoba did have that section included.

But for another government to go there and allow one of its boards to agree to something different, to really put the producers of all commodities on the block, Mr. Speaker, that is a shame and that is, if anything is, an abrogation of its responsibility and really letting the family farm go down the tube in terms of what they are shouting for today, Sir, and this resolution should not be allowed to pass in this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Minister's time has expired. Is there leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister made reference to the fact, or criticized our government joining the National Broiler Agency. Is it his intention to withdraw the Manitoba Broiler Industry from the National Program?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, there are more ways than one to deal with the problem of vertical integration and corporate farming in production. There are ways in which to deal with and make sure that future allocations of quota, and that there is a period of time in which grandfather rights do expire, and that the production rights of product be shifted from corporate owners to family farm corporations, family farms, and individual farmers. That is the policy that I intend to pursue in the long term, so that primary production be in the hands of family farms. That is the intent of this government, and we will be pursuing that policy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that members opposite don't even want to remember that they were in this Chamber this January, and this February, but we, Sir, were and we honestly tried to deal with some of the pressing issues of our constituents, and among those issues was the problem raised in this resolution by the Member for Arthur.

The Member for Roblin-Russell got up from his Chair on numerous occasions; the Member for Arthur asking about the plight of the cream shippers well before any action was undertaken by the board. So, Mr. Speaker, should the Honourable Minister now feel that he's got a little, you know, game going on his behalf, because finally the board did move; if that's to be regarded as upmanship on his part, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it was, and hopefully so by the response of the kind of questioning and the kind of concern shown in this Chamber by people like the Member for Roblin-Russell and the Member for Arthur on this question at a time that many small cream shippers were particularly concerned. They had just received notices and letters earlier on that meant a sharp curtailment of their production and could have caused, you know, uncalled

for problems for the people that in so many instances were in the poorest possible position to defend themselves.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I could carry on a little bit talking about the irony of this kind of statement coming from a Minister that was part of a grandiose scheme called Crocus Foods, among other things, which might well have done a great deal more damage to the production of cream that this resolution is talking about.

However, I'll desist from that because, Mr. Speaker, what I really would like to do for a few minutes is to use the vehicle that the excellent resolution my colleague the Member for Arthur has provided for us to talk about, general concerns that I have about the impact of marketing boards on the small fledgling, the newcomer to food production, and talk about some of the troubles that I have, recognizing that when I say so, it is not to be meant in any way as an attack on marketing boards.

Marketing boards, Mr. Speaker, have carried on a very positive role in modern agriculture, a role that I have never, Sir - you can search Hansard - suggested that that was not the case. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to have followed in the footsteps of the Minister of Agriculture of our late friend and member of this House, the late George Hutton, who certainly in modern agriculture in Manitoba introduced the basic and fundamental changes to The Natural Products Marketing Act, which brought about the organization of the marketing boards that we now have in this province. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege, in the late Sixties, to have been involved in the establishment of some of these same marketing boards.

Mr. Speaker, what bothers me about this is that in all instances, and I can remember as a Minister being appealed to by producers supportive of marketing boards, by staff people within the department and by others about how necessary this kind of a marketing-selling structure was to preserve some elbow room for that fledgling, small, starting-up farmer. I prefer to call them food producers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

When this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have four minutes remaining - pardon me - 16 minutes remaining.

The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.