

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 19 May, 1981

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS McGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK, Jack Reeves: The Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following second report:

Your Committee met on May 15, 1981 and heard representations with respect to the Bills before the Committee as follows:

Bill No. 42 — An Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act; Mr. George Marshall; School Trustee; Mr. Jim Ernst; City of Winnipeg Councillor.

Bill No. 57 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act; Mr. John Wiens, Manitoba Teachers' Society.

Bill No. 37 — An Act to authorize the Rural Municipality of Montcalm to Sell and Convey a Portion of a Public Road within the Municipality; Mr. S. E. Braun, Schmidt & Gregory, Morris, Manitoba.

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 37 — An Act to authorize the Rural Municipality of Montcalm to Sell and Convey a Portion of a Public Road within the Municipality.

Bill No. 57 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered:

Bill No. 29 — An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2).

Bill No. 34 — An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act.

Bill No. 38 — An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.

Bill No. 42 — An Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act.

Bill No. 51 — An Act to amend The Fires Prevention Act.

Bill No. 52 — An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. McGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Radisson that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

MR. JIM GALBRAITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Private Bills begs leave to present the following second report.

Your Committee met on May 19, 1981, and heard representations with respect to the Bills before the Committee as follows:

Bill No. 16 — An Act respecting Montreal Trust Company and Montreal Trust Company of Canada, Mr. Randall Gray, Solicitor.

Bill No. 31 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Mennonite Collegiate Institute, Mr. John Wiens, Solicitor.

Bill No. 33 — An Act to amend An Act to amend and consolidate An Act to incorporate Manitoba Pool Elevators, Mr. Alan Scarth, Solicitor.

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 16 — An Act respecting Montreal Trust Company and Montreal Trust Company of Canada.

Bill No. 31 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Mennonite Collegiate Institute.

Bill No. 33 — An Act to amend An Act to amend and consolidate an Act to incorporate Manitoba Pool Elevators.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

MR. GALBRAITH: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the copies of the financial statements for Tantalum Mining Corporation, year ending December 31st, 1980, and also to table copies of the Provincial Tax Comparisons which have been provided to members for the past two years.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this time I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the loge on my right, where we have Mr. Blaine Thacker, Member of Parliament for Lethbridge, Alberta. Mr. Thacker is part of an Inter-Parliamentary Group that are studying fiscal responsibilities.

We also have a Mr. Orland Hanson, a member of the North Dakota State Legislature with several other visitors and we also welcome him.

We have 48 students of Grade 4 standing from the Margaret Park School, under the direction of Ms. Norma Lee Nelson. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

We have 25 students of Grade 9 standing from the MacKenzie Junior High, under the direction of Mr. McCallum. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dauphin.

We have 30 students of Grade 11 of the Ashern Central High School, under the direction of Mr. Moroz. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Just on a correction, much as I enjoy having young school children come and I certainly welcome the ones from Margaret Park, I have to admit that they are in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks and not Kildonan.

MR. SPEAKER: I trust that that correction will be duly noted.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister reporting for Hydro. In view of information that the Brandon Thermal Plant has been operating at a time when it's not usually called upon and the information that Mr. Webber today was interviewed on radio, discussing the already known shortfall of water for power production, will the Minister indicate the extent of the problem as it is now foreseen for the summer and the following winter?

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

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I believe on the first question that the Brandon Thermal Plant was also brought into production last year as well. It's done as a precautionary measure to reduce the amount of water required in the water generating plants and to pond as much as possible, so that is the reason that it is done as a precautionary measure.

With regard to whether or not there is a pending problem depends again on the amount of rainfall we

can expect over the summer season for next winter's production requirements. At the present time, my understanding is that the Churchill Diversion is carrying over half of the supply for the Nelson River and is operating at somewhere over 30,000 cfs. at the present time measured at Thompson. And in addition to that there's some 6,000 to 8,000 cfs. being spilled over the Missi Falls structure that could be available apart from the restrictions that are on the Diversion at the present time.

The supply out of the Lake Winnipeg, as far as my last information is concerned, was somewhere around the order of some 20,000 cfs. so the Nelson River plants are being sustained primarily by the Churchill River diversion, at the present time, which happens to be running quite the opposite to the southern river systems and is running at good support levels and that outline is generally the picture. It will depend to a large extent what occurs over the next month or two this summer.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: In view of the obvious need and effectiveness of Lake Winnipeg Regulation in this difficult time as can be foreseen, can the Minister indicate why it is that the gates are dropped at 713 which is not the maximum capacity?

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Member for St. Johns that there's water being ponded in other lakes in addition to Lake Winnipeg; the Cedar Lake, Lake of the Woods, Lac Seul, to some extent South Indian Lake, although to a more limited extent and might be optimum at the present time, there's water being ponded wherever possible. Maybe he could repeat the second question so I could get it with a little more clarity.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for St. Johns repeat his question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'll vary it somewhat by indicating that one of the options that were agreed to with the Federal Government was that Lake Winnipeg Regulation would be one of the means whereby increased capacity will be provided for storage, especially during the time when there can be foreseen the shortage of water. My question was, why is it that the gates are now at 713, which is below the capacity of Lake Winnipeg for regulation purposes?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member, I think, is asking a question that I may be able to help him with by taking it as notice. I would simply remind him at the present time, in the meantime, that the east channel coming out of Lake Winnipeg is not controlled, therefore you don't have complete and absolute control over the flows out of Lake Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Energy and Mines. Having

just had tabled before me a Tantalum Mining Corporation of Canada Ltd. statement showing that the net income of this mine, after taxes, is \$9 million, and before taxes \$17 million, would it be correct that the Hudson Bay Mining Company by acquiring half this mine, an option which was available to the people of the Province of Manitoba, which they refused, have recovered in equity their entire investment in less than two years?

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that question may depend somewhat on whether the member is prepared to take into account that in addition to normal income tax at some 36 - 37 percent and a mining tax rate of 18 percent to the Province of Manitoba, bringing the total taxation rate on the mining company up to something in excess of 50 percent, that perhaps his estimate, before he wished to make that speculation, should take into account the returns to the government that are obtained without requiring an equity.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister did not understand my question. Net income after payment of all taxes is \$9 million this year and was \$5 million last year, a total of \$14 million. If they put up \$6 million for 50 percent, and are entitled to equity of seven, they have recovered — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, they bought 50 and turned 13 over to Kaweck Berylco, but they paid \$6 million for 50 percent and they have recovered over \$7 million in the first two years, after taxes. Is that not correct?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I can't verify the member's numbers. What the company may have paid in income tax, of course, he will have to state before he can complete his calculation.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, is it not also the fact that in addition to the mine having made, after taxes, over \$14 million in the last 24 months at the outside, that their projections are that they will make another \$10 million next year after payment of taxes?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I certainly hope that their optimistic projections are realized.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro. I would like to ask the Minister whether Hydro is importing power into this province on a daily or an overnight basis?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the last information I had was that there was some power being imported rather than exported from the Province of Saskatchewan. I can take the question as notice, if the member can be specific about the time frame he's referring to.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question to the same Minister. If Manitoba Hydro is in fact importing power into Manitoba, as I believe the Minister has admitted, would the Minister care to acknowledge from that fact that Manitoba Hydro in fact does not have a surplus of power at this time?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Hydro system operates a system to protect itself over the long term, not just for the requirements of a day or a week or two weeks, so I would have to presume that whatever measures they are taking are to protect themselves for their prime requirements, which are later on in the current season.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. In view of the fact that Mr. Kris Kristjanson, the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, recently made public statements indicating that Manitoba Hydro had a surplus of some 40 percent, is the Minister prepared to acknowledge that was in fact a misleading statement, it is a misleading statement, and what steps does he intend to take to make sure that Mr. Kristjanson reports truthfully to this Legislature and to the people of Manitoba?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think the member is making a speech rather than asking a question. If the officials of Hydro wish to make comments regarding surpluses or any other aspect of Hydro, they are fully free to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines regarding the potash mine. Could he advise as to the amount of royalty per ton which the province will receive for this potash; what is the per ton amount of royalty?

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, those details will be tabled at the time of the final agreement but they will be roughly the same as the previous regulations indicated, which is some 4-plus percent of production, reduced by roughly some 49 percent because of the recoverable content of one of the products contained and the net result works out to around 2.1 percent of selling price royalty.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere with a supplementary.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister. In view of the fact that in Saskatchewan the per ton income is approximately \$20.60 a ton for the year 1979, and the formula which the Minister has just indicated to us would be less than \$4.00 a ton, can he explain to the House the five-fold difference in income for Saskatchewan as compared to Manitoba?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the member is not stating the facts correctly. He is mixing up apples and

oranges and I have to presume that he generally tends to be more responsible than that or perhaps he doesn't wish to be in this case.

What he refers to is not the per ton royalty. The per ton royalty that he asked me the question on is pretty well identical to that in Saskatchewan.

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

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm sure the Minister is aware that in New Brunswick you're talking about \$8.50 a ton and the \$20.60 is in fact an accurate amount for the income earned by Saskatchewan from its potash. I might add, Mr. Speaker, the reason we're concerned is that when we look at the Tantalum Report we see a \$5 million non-interest bearing loan to shareholders and we have to be careful about any agreements entered into between this government and any mining company, especially when we consider the fact that this government, when it was elected to office, was elected on the basis that it would get out of mining and it is now demonstrating . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please.

I thank the honourable member for his comments. Next question please.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It relates to a question that the Minister of Health answered on the 12th of May. Can the Minister now assure the House that the government has reached agreement with the city in regard to the four basic points in disclosure of information relative to public health inspections of restaurants?

The four basic points that were raised by the city with the province in their meeting, have they all been agreed to and will the city be able to proceed at its meeting tomorrow night, Mr. Speaker?

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

HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm not sure on what basis the city wishes to proceed at its meeting tomorrow evening. I can tell the member that in discussion amongst staff of both the Minister of Health's Department and my department, we agreed on three of the four basic points and the fourth one required some clarification and a legal opinion in our view. That information, I thought, was conveyed to members of the city's staff; perhaps it wasn't. After reading on the weekend the news report that indicated that there was some need for clarification, I spoke this morning to the Mayor and arranged for a senior staff get together between officials of my department and the Minister of Health's Department and the city to try and pave the way to complete agreement on all four points so that fourth point that we had some concern about could be clarified and agreed up, and I believe that such is being done either later this afternoon or some time early tomorrow.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of Health on April 14th advised the city that his department had strongly advised against release of mandatory food notices, has that position been adopted by the Cabinet to the effect that they do agree with the city on the disclosure of mandatory food notices?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the details of the information contained in some communication by the Minister of Health on April 14th. I will repeat that we have indicated our agreement with three of the four points and the fourth is under discussion.

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

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, if I may refer to a statement by the Minister of Health . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the honourable member a question?

MS. WESTBURY: In view of the statement by the Minister of Health to the effect that changes would be required at the provincial level and not be required to come before the Legislature regarding this particular matter of mandatory notices being publicly disclosed, has that step been taken by the province in order that the city can go ahead, in co-operation with the provincial health inspectors?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'll repeat my earlier answer. We have arrived at agreement on three of the four points. We are seeking a legal opinion in discussion with both the City Solicitor's Department and our departmental solicitor and our senior staff officials, I think, are getting together in the very near future to clarify that fourth point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, in answer to a series of questions, primarily from the Honourable Member for Inkster as it related to one, Dario Perfumo, I have received today Mr. Perfumo's resignation from the Labour Board and I consider the case closed at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for indicating the present status of this matter. May I ask him, because I don't think the matter relates to any one individual, if the Minister is able to assure us that the provision in The Labour Relations Act providing for freedom of speech is not intended to negate the provision of the Act which says that no employer shall interfere with the formation of a trade union?

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it clear that I would be happy if neither of them were there, but given all of the restrictions against labour unions in the Act, can the Minister assure us that it is still the policy of the government that the Act, which says that no employer shall interfere with the formation or selection of a trade union, is intended to be the policy that the Labour Board is administering?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I think I said before, and if I didn't I quite readily say it now, that our government is prepared to live by the existing legislation and myself, as Minister of Labour responsible for the Labour Board, expects the Labour Board to live by the legislation that today is presently in place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. In view of the drowning of a four-year-old boy in the City of Winnipeg in a retention pond on Saturday, which is apparently the third incident of a similar kind in the past eight years, is the government considering any legislation in this regard?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I believe this unfortunate event only occurred over this weekend and the government is not at this time considering any legislation. I can't indicate at this time, Mr. Speaker, whether or not there will be an inquest into this death. Certainly the primary responsibility for the lake, as I understand it, resides with the City of Winnipeg.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, given that the City of Winnipeg and its Council is either unable or unwilling to act on a matter of public interest and safety, will the Provincial Government not study and consider such legislation for such man-made lakes in densely populated areas?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the middle part of that question. I wonder if the member would be kind enough to repeat it.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, my question is that since the city is unable to unwilling to act, and since there is an obvious need for something to be done in view of a series of deaths of young children, is the province willing to consider bringing in legislation that would cover such structures in densely populated areas?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, whether or not a fence would prevent such a tragedy is something that I note in the newspaper story that covered this incident. One of them was commented upon by one of the members of the public who lives in that particular area and the person who was interviewed said that if a fence were erected it would probably serve more as a challenge to youngsters in the area, who might then be challenged to climb the fence and put themselves into some greater degree of danger.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the City of Winnipeg would examine their policy towards man-made lakes, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, there was a drowning in the Red River, I believe, this weekend and no one has suggested that the Red River and the Assiniboine River, through the City of Winnipeg, be fenced.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not in any way trying to make light of the situation. I think elected representatives of the City of Winnipeg and at the

provincial level would be prepared to do anything that would help the situation and provide a real benefit and solution to hopefully prevent such deaths.

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

MR. DOERN: I again say to the Minister and I say to some of his backbenchers, who apparently think this is a big joke and are talking about bathing suits and other smart remarks, that a whole series of children have drowned and I ask the Attorney-General whether he is just prepared to sit there and let more children die — I am talking about man-made lakes. I am asking the Attorney-General not about the rivers, not about the northern lakes, I am talking about man-made structures with sloping sides to it that seem to be tailor-made for young children to go up to and tumble into — whether he is not prepared, in view of the inaction of the city, to do something, or is he simply going to take a hands-off position and wait until there are more tragedies, along with the councillors on the City of Winnipeg Council?

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

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Yes, the Member for Elmwood has made remarks pertaining to the backbench. I don't know who he is referring to, Mr. Speaker, about smart remarks about licensed bathing suits and outlaw drownings and what-not, I'm saying, any remarks that I might have made was that the Member for Elmwood, as he is apt to do on many occasions, is preying on tragedy. If he wants to make something of this particular issue, he can talk to the responsible ministers in a quiet way. He has to bring every tragedy . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member did not have a point of order. Order please. Order please. Order please. Order please.]

The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a point of privilege.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I am a representative of the City of Winnipeg and I am concerned and have been for a time about children who are drowning in man-made structures.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member had no point of privilege because the point of order was raised. Order please.

The point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa was ruled out of order, so a person cannot rise on a matter of privilege on something that was already out of order. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood on a point of order?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, it is not in order to impute motives to a member of this Chamber. It is the Member for Minnedosa who is making remarks, cheap and stupid remarks about bathing suits.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I suggest to the Honourable Member for Elmwood that

he withdraw the remark that he made. The honourable member has been asked to withdraw the remarks that he's made.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to answer the last question from the Member for Elmwood, if that's in order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Elmwood has used language which is not in the best interests of this Chamber, and I would ask him to withdraw the remarks he has made.

The Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): I'd like to speak to this point of order. Mr. Speaker, I clearly heard the Member for Minnedosa impute a motive to the Member for Elmwood. The Member for Minnedosa indicated that the Member for Elmwood was preying on personal tragedy. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a case of imputing motive to another member in this Chamber, it was that statement by the Member for Minnedosa.

The request by my colleague for withdrawal of that statement, Mr. Speaker, is sound, is very extremely reasonable; in fact, Mr. Speaker, I think, there can be no alternative under the circumstances of the statement that was made by the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. One of the problems that we have in this Chamber is that members continually are interjecting and the only voice that is recognized by the Chair is the one of the member that is speaking. I heard no remarks from the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. I did hear remarks from members who had the floor; remarks that were clearly unparliamentary in this Chamber and I would the Honourable Member for Elmwood, who had the floor, to withdraw the unparliamentary remarks he used.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask you, Sir, whether you heard the statement made, on his feet, holding aside the comments on the bathing suit, I ask you whether you heard what motives that he imputed to me when he got up and made that statement? He should withdraw that statement, then I will withdraw mine.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The remarks, the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa was ruled out of order, and as such it is not a matter for concern of this . . .

The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. It's true that the remarks were ruled out of order, Mr. Speaker, but if a member says a slanderous thing about another member, despite the fact that it is ruled out of order, if it remains on the record, the member who has been slandered has a right to demand a retraction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you've indicated you did not hear that remark. I am almost certain, Mr. Speaker,

that it was made by the honourable member in the course of his remarks and will appear in Hansard. I would urge you to read Hansard, tomorrow, and if indeed the remark was made about the Member for Elmwood that he is preying on personal tragedy, because he raises a question about an event in the City of Winnipeg, that that remark should be withdrawn and I think the Member for Minnedosa would want to withdraw. But if you have doubt as to whether he said it, Mr. Speaker, I would urge you to look at the Hansard of tomorrow, and I'm sure that the Member for Elmwood's position would be substantiated.

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

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, if that particular remark, preying on personal tragedy, has offended the honourable member, I have no problem in withdrawing it, if that was the context in my remarks, but I do wish he would get his headlines in some other way than the method that he chooses.

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

MR. FOX: Well again, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Minnedosa does a beautiful withdrawal and then he imputes motives in his final statement, in his withdrawal. I think that if we are going to conduct ourselves in any kind of parliamentary fashion there can be no equivocation, there can be no withdrawal with conditions or anything else, so therefore I would suggest that we do it as gentlemen and conduct ourselves with the decorum deserving of this Assembly. If we don't, then we'll never get over these kinds of problems, because one will incite another and the other will incite a third and that's all that we'll be dealing with, is these kind of inflammatory remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. All honourable members in this Chamber, their own personal conduct in this Chamber is their own affair, but when it affects other members of the Chamber, then it does become a matter for the House. One of the things that I have found in question period and other occasions, when members don't get the answer that they want they become very upset and there is no way that a member can direct an answer from another person. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa has absolutely no right to ask a member to get his source of questions from any particular source and so I would ask the honourable member to withdraw the statement.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, only on your request that I would withdraw that, but the Honourable Member for Elmwood also suggested that he would withdraw the remarks that he implied to me and his remarks, if I withdrew mine.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. No person can threaten to take one action if another person takes another action. It has to be complete withdrawal and I would ask the honourable member to withdraw the statement he made.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: To facilitate your carrying on the business of the House, Mr. Speaker, I have no intentions, but I expect the honourable member will come to me privately and offer his explanation.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Member for Minnedosa has on each occasion qualified his withdrawal. Firstly, if it offends the Member for Elmwood, he must know it offends everybody who heard him and understood him. Secondly; he said on your request, and only on your request.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is very clear that a withdrawal has to be unconditional and straightforward and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, with all respect, that the member must be compelled to withdraw without condition; an unqualified withdrawal.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have accepted the withdrawal by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. Now we'll deal with the remarks of the Honourable Member for Elmwood and I would ask the Honourable Member for Elmwood to withdraw the unparliamentary language he used.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in view of your request and in view of the retraction of the honourable member, I will withdraw my statement about him.

I would then ask the Attorney-General if he will answer this question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, certainly I believe the government would be prepared to review this entire area. It is my experience, Mr. Speaker, that the unfortunate deaths that occur in these man-made lakes usually involve children from homes not bordering the man-made lake but some distance away from the man-made lake. No doubt the people who have purchased homes on the shores of the retention ponds or man-made lakes would have some objection, because they have purchased homes in those specific areas for recreational or aesthetic purposes, Mr. Speaker, but if there is something that can be done to eliminate, if at all possible, the unfortunate death of young children in these man-made lakes or retention ponds, Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to consider that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Member for Ste. Rose asked a question about the pre-provincial tax price of gasoline at the last time that the monitoring was done for the purposes of the ad valorem tax. The price at that time, March 1st, 1981, was 25.9 cents per litre.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Clean Environment

Commission. In view of the information which I have supplied to the Minister indicating that the City of Winnipeg intends to proceed irregardless of the decision of the Clean Environment Commission pertaining to the addition to the existing sludge bed in the Municipality of West St. Paul, can the Minister advise whether or not he has undertaken any steps to discuss this matter with the officials of the Clean Environment Commission in order to ascertain whether or not the City of Winnipeg can proceed regardless of the fact that the Clean Environment Commission has not brought down any ruling pertaining to the City of Winnipeg's application?

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

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for bringing that matter to my attention. In reviewing the matter, I think it is regrettable that the City officials have decided to proceed prior to receiving the ruling of the Clean Environment Commission on the matter. In fact there is no question that the Clean Environment Commission can't stop them from proceeding at the moment until they are in a position to enforce limits that may be set by an order. I think it is regrettable that the City is proceeding on this basis, because in fact they are risking taxpayers' dollars in investing in construction of a facility that may not receive the approval in its present form of the Clean Environment Commission and I think that this is a matter that obviously the City officials will have to respond to the taxpayers of the city on should something go awry, but clearly they are able to, at their risk, commence construction of the facility, and we will see what happens after the Clean Environment Commission order is issued.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister. Can the Minister indicate whether or not he, as the Minister responsible for the Clean Environment Commission, has made any requests to the City of Winnipeg not to proceed with additional work until such time as the Clean Environment Commission has made known its findings?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, after receiving the information from the Leader of the Opposition's office this morning, I placed a call to the Mayor in the hopes that I might just indicate the concern that has been expressed. Obviously I am not in a position to issue instructions to the City in view of the fact that any order that may be issued is appealable to me as Minister, so I don't want to be put in a position of issuing a directive upon something that may ultimately be appealed to me.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, by way of final supplementary, does the Minister then indicate that the information provided in the letter by the City Solicitor, Mr. Carnegie, indicating that in so proceeding the City complied in every respect with the requirements of The Clean Environment Act, that indeed that information is incorrect and that the City is not indeed proceeding within the requirements of The Clean Environment Act as claimed by Mr. Carnegie?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, obviously that's a legal opinion of the City Solicitor on the matter and I

suppose that it's open to interpretation by those who will evaluate the facility that the City is planning to construct and that may be a matter that ultimately, as I say, is appealed to me as Minister or ultimately may be a matter for a decision of the Courts, but that's a legal opinion that has been expressed by the City Solicitor and that's exactly where it rests.

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

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, given the stage of the Session, I wonder if I may have the leave of the House to revert to the Introduction of Bills and introduce the bill which I asked to stand earlier on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member leave? (Agreed)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. GREEN introduced Bill No. 64, An Act to amend The Elections Act.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, it would be our intention today to deal with Estimates, Mr. Speaker, then if that is done to move on to Adjourned Debates on Second Reading and Second Readings. The Committee is meeting tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I would indicate that we would be calling the House tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m. and at 2:00 p.m. and we'll be able to determine tomorrow, whether it will be necessary for the Committee which is meeting tonight to again meet tomorrow night. There are also other bills on the Order Paper, which will have to go to Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order Please. The honourable member on a point of order.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take exception except that there was question when we brought this Speed-up motion, I asked the question of the House Leader, if this will be called only after the Estimates would be finished and the Minister assured me that this was the case. I have no objection, but we should make sure that this is a commitment that was made by the Minister and we're not quite finished with the Estimates as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I did have some lengthy discussion with the Opposition House Leader and the Member for St. Johns during question period and it was the preference that rather than have the Committee also called for tomorrow morning, which is meeting tonight, that it would be preferable that

the House meet in the morning and the afternoon and if it is necessary that the Committee meet again, that it could meet tomorrow night.

MR. DESJARDINS: I have no objection at all, but to keep the record straight I wonder if the Minister could ask for leave and we could proceed in that manner.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Executive Council.

SUPPLY — EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): Order please. This Committee will come to order.

I would direct the honourable members' attention to page 7 of the Main Estimates, Department of Executive Council, Resolution No. 5, Clause 1 Administration, (a) Premier and President of the Council's Salary — The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the First Minister, I'll be pleased to receive any of the observations or the questions that the Opposition may care to direct on this salary. I believe this is the only item left under Executive Council.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you. Just on the comments made by the Minister, the First Minister said that he would appoint another Minister to deal with the balance of his Estimates. There was no suggestion, as I recall it, that he would receive comments and questions and not respond to them. I would indicate to the Minister that I, for one, expected that we would be free to deal with the Estimates and that a responsible Minister would be prepared to respond to the comments that are made. I'm just pointing out to the Honourable Minister that my understanding was not that he would just receive them.

MR. SPEAKER: (a) — pass — The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, if I have given the Member for St. Johns any indication that we were not prepared to respond to any questions that he might have, then that was not my intention, but I certainly will be pleased to have his questions.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak on this motion, I wish to first of all express a

degree of disappointment that the Premier is not in a position to respond to the propositions and the questions that are put to the government, but notwithstanding that, Mr. Chairman, I think that it's worthwhile to point out to the government that the country as a whole, and certainly Manitoba, is at the present time suffering from very bad economic conditions and I guess one could extend that to all of the western world for that matter; certainly the United States, Canada, Europe and so on.

One of the problems in Manitoba that is contributed so dramatically to the economic decline stands out above all else — one sector, Mr. Chairman, stands out above all others and that is the construction industry sector. That particular sector has had now roughly three-and-one-half, four years of downturn in activity in this province. It seems to me that there ought to have been and still should be a fair degree of co-ordination between the Government of Manitoba and the construction industry in terms of planning projects, both in the private sector and in the public sector in order that that particular sector might be revived at least to the point where they can sustain themselves and to the point where we are not going to face the total destruction of that particular industry in this province.

I think that it's obvious to all, Mr. Chairman, that many construction firms have left the province and have relocated elsewhere in Canada and in particular Western Canada, but it seems to me that government can be used as a mechanism, as a tool to bolster that part of our sagging economy, simply by zeroing in on fairly substantial construction projects, particularly building projects, something perhaps that may not be in the planning stages for the next year or two but which could be speeded up, knowing that it is going to occur in any event down the road and that we withdraw from the economy at a time when we have more stable economic conditions. This is using government in a counter-cyclical matter, Mr. Chairman, which seems to me ought to make sense even to a Conservative Government who prefer not to get too involved in the directing of our economy, who prefer very much to rely on the private sector.

In the 1977 Election Campaign and indeed in many subsequent speeches in this Chamber, I know that the Government of Manitoba has insisted that they have totally relied or intended to totally rely on the private sector to be the main economic engine in this province, and I believe I'm using the right words in that context, Mr. Chairman. Obviously that has not been sufficient because the Manitoba economy has slid much further than did occur in the slides that occurred in other parts of Canada. We're somewhere around ninth or tenth place now in terms of economic performance.

Mr. Chairman, that takes us quite substantially away from the sort of medium and better than medium position that we have enjoyed for a good number of years, up until 1977. I believe, Mr. Chairman, to be honest that we have to agree that the decline in the Manitoba economy did begin some time in the calendar year 1977, there is no question about that. I think what has aggravated it, Mr. Chairman, was that we introduced a new philosophy to government which chose not to do anything about

it at the time when it was beginning its decline and so we have had abstention, no action, and we have simply left the economy to private decisions.

So, Mr. Chairman, there are two areas that are compounding this situation. One is the last of initiative on the part of the Government of Manitoba to move projects ahead and the other is obviously the interest rates that Canadians face. In terms of the Manitoba scene, those are the two key elements that are destroying any chance of early recovery of our economy.

The Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman, although he likes to, and does indeed enjoy the Ottawa-bashing technique that has been developed by his party over the years, Mr. Chairman, I think that he has to do a little more than just point his finger at the Government of Canada because there is a need, Mr. Chairman, for tremendous pressure to be brought on the Government of Canada by provincial governments, by the private sector, in an effort to bring down unrealistic interest rate charges, even if it means, Mr. Chairman, temporary regulation of money flowing out of the country, exchange controls, even if it means that on a temporary basis.

I heard Walter Gordon, who was once the Finance Minister in the Pearson administration, making the point this morning that in his view we are at the stage now where we can no longer and should not be prepared to follow the United States money market, that we should untie ourselves from the trend in the United States with respect to interest rates and even if that means exchange controls for a period of time. But it seems to me to do nothing.

It seems to me we will see, and we are witnessing now but we will witness in spades in the months ahead, bankruptcies on a scale never before imagined in this province outside of the period of the 1930s, Mr. Chairman. I don't believe that a modern society which is supposed to have the techniques, ingenuity, capacity to control economic conditions much better than we did in the 1930s, that we should allow those conditions to come back. It seems to me there has to be a willingness on the part of all governments to bent their efforts in a way that would convince the Government of Canada that we are prepared to support a policy of lowering the interest rates, even if it means exchange controls for a period of time, whether it's three months or six months or twelve months — I don't know what the time frame would be, because I'm certainly not an economist and don't know the lag-time effects and psychological effects of that kind of intervention fully, but it seems to me that we have had a number of learned people in this field advocating that particular position. I referred to Professor Bellan only a few months ago, who made that same suggestion that even if our money deflates another point or two, so what? It will have impact, yes, on the price of imported goods, but it will be offset by a better price on exported goods and which will also create more jobs in Canada, so that it's not altogether to be looked upon the negative vein, Mr. Chairman, the idea of losing another point on the value of the Canadian dollar vis-a-vis the U.S. dollar.

So it seems to, Mr. Chairman, that what I'm saying to the Minister of Finance — yes, he's just leaving the Chamber — that rather than wasting his time Ottawa bashing, that he and his colleagues

throughout Canada ought to make a sincere effort to convince the Government of Canada that they have got to amend their present economic policies for the sake of tens of thousands of business people and farming people who are going to find themselves, and are indeed now — many of them are indeed now in dire straits. Not to mention, Mr. Chairman, the fact that those people who are renewing mortgages this year are going to find themselves in an impossible position, many of them, given the fact that their income escalation does not follow . . .

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

MR. RANSOM: Yes, since the Member for Lac du Bonnet had to put it on the record that I was leaving the Chamber a few moments ago, I would like to put it on the record that I am now back in the Chamber.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I was just about to do that.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance and his colleagues, and I again regret that the Premier is not here, ought to be more preoccupied than they have been to date with this question. We ought to reinvigorate the Manitoba economy by stepping up provincial projects, in particular to aid what is known and recognized as the weak spot in our economy, namely the construction industry, and we ought to make sure that that business people and farm people at least have a fair chance at survival by doing something with respect to interest rates via the Government of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, when I was interrupted, I talked about the people who are renewing mortgages on their homes. Certainly, if we are going to see people caught in a position this year of not being able to renew their mortgages, of having to give up whatever equity they have in their homes because their incomes have not kept pace with the interest rates, which require huge adjustments in their monthly payments, then there ought to be some consideration of that aspect as well and perhaps even some legislation, Mr. Chairman.

Now, we have the other category, and that is the people who are wanting to buy their first new home, or the part of our construction industry that desires to build new apartment accommodation, but where the economics just aren't there. It seems to me that this whole business of interest rates is impacting so much on all these sectors that the two have to go together, but certainly this province hasn't shown a degree of willingness, Mr. Chairman, to at least move in the area where it has jurisdiction.

I would urge the Minister of Finance and his colleagues to give it some consideration in order to save the people in the industry that we have left because goodness knows — I don't have the numbers — I am sure that people who are more familiar with statistics would verify that there are many that have already left, many that have already gone into bankruptcy, Mr. Chairman. That is something that we just simply cannot tolerate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to put a few remarks on the record on the Premier's Salary, because it is here that we can talk about some of the actions of the government. I think the point has to be made, and it's being made by my colleague and maybe addressed by other members on this side, that the government's failure in office is a failure of leadership in a sense of directing attention to the problems facing Manitobans today, namely the problems of the economy, employment, inflation, etcetera. These are the questions that the government, I believe, has failed to address and to properly tackle, because of the fact that this government and this Premier, in particular, have been obsessed with the constitutional debate. I was somewhat amused, Mr. Chairman, to read about a week ago that the Minister of Finance criticized the Prime Minister of Canada for not tackling the problems of the economy and for being obsessed with the Constitution. I'm sure if the Minister of Finance was being objective, he would have to condemn his own leader for the same short-sightedness. (Interjection)— Well, I say to you that your own leader has spent an undue amount of time, that cannot be warranted, on the Constitution. He has spent a great deal of time, as the First Minister in charge of the Premiers' Conference — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, it's clear . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. One speaker at a time, if you please.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, it's clear that this was a diversionary tactic on the part of the government and I believe that that is just as true — I will agree with my friend from Rock Lake that it is just as true on the part of the Federal Government as on the part of the Premier of Manitoba, that this is the same old type of tactic that has been used time and time again in history, where when things are bad in the local arena, you try to divert someone's attention to some other conflict. On a national scale, it's frequently done in terms of a war or another country or international issues.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the First Minister has spent far too much time — far too much time — and I for one say, and I don't want to dwell on this point, but I say that I feel somewhat cheated that it is because of the fact that the First Minister has apparently exhausted himself in office that he is unable to be with us today. I say that the reason is that so much of his efforts have been put into that whole constitutional procedure and I don't believe that it was productive and I don't believe that that issue is the kind of issue that was alive and well only a few months ago. At that time, it was possible for one to argue that that was a considerably important issue. I do not think that that is the case today — (Interjection)— Well, I know my friend from Inkster won't agree and I know that some of the Conservatives won't agree, but I'm sure that all of them who felt this was the burning issue of modern times, 1980 to 1981, now feel that it is somewhat evaporated and that —(Interjection)— Well, I say it has. When there was agreement, a consensus of agreement taken in Ottawa by the leaders of the three federal parties, Clark, Trudeau and Broadbent, I say that the pins were pulled from that issue and

that whatever argument the First Minister had and the Member for Inkster had in this particular House, that their case is less strong today than it was a few months ago. I say that evidence of that, Mr. Chairman, is the very resolution that's on the Order Paper, the club that the First Minister showed to the Opposition and presumably was able to beat the Opposition into the ground or beat them off or threaten them with a beating, that club still lies on the table.

The point is this, that whereas the First Minister felt that by introducing that resolution he had something going for him, he had an issue that he could not only score points on the Official Opposition, but he could go to the people of Manitoba, call an election and win a province-wide election on that particular basis. Well, you know, who on that side, other than my friend from Rhineland and my friend from Roblin would think that that is still an election issue. Surely that is a cold issue, and may never have been, as my colleague from Ste. Rose would argue.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the government blew that issue. I mean, think of the amount of time spent by the Attorney-General and the First Minister and the — what was it, \$160,000 in legal fees? — I don't know what the amount was. The Attorney-General could provide that information. All that money spent on high-priced lawyers and all the time spent in the government by I don't know how many people — how much valuable time, how much travel time, how many trips to London, how many more trips to London still promised, and for something that has obviously passed them by, that that issue is no longer the kind of issue that it was. I say that when the Supreme Court brings in its ruling, which in my judgment will undoubtedly be in favour, and it goes back to the House of Commons and through London and so on, the people will have said we've had enough of that and we don't want to hear of that for some time to come. (Interjection)—

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster says we'll hear about it for a hundred years. We've heard about the Constitution for a hundred years and we will undoubtedly hear more about the Constitution for our lifetime, but the point is that that particular issue, in terms of bringing the Constitution back, and an amending formula, is all but over. That can be debated forever but once it is done, it's a fait accompli and the debate generally, generally becomes academic.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with one other point and that is that I think this government has, as well as misspent a great deal of time on the wrong issue, either misspent unintentionally, which is not my opinion, or because of a poor judgment or deliberately misspent the time of the government and a lot of the attention on the people by trying to focus it on an issue which was not a central issue to the future of Manitoba.

I think that there have been a score of incidents which have occurred and I just want to deal with one small aspect. I will leave some of the economic questions to my other colleagues, one of whom spoke on inflation, one of whom, I am sure, will speak on the economy, and just say that when I think of the amount of money spent by this government in an attempt to keep itself in office, I

think it's one of the most shocking misuses of time and of dollars that we have seen in recent times. I can't think of any other government, at least going back to the Roblin era, that spent so much public money, so much in the way of public funds, to promote itself through a whole series of pamphlets and films and ads, that it had no right to do. I think back to the beginning of the session and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is in fact clearly an abuse of power and clearly a desperate action on the part of the government, and I remind you of one of the first things that was discussed back in the Estimates of the Minister of Economic Development, where \$62,000 was spent on a series of ads which had no other purpose than to promote the right kind of attitude in regard to the Progressive Conservative Party in office. I will go from that one to the present pamphlet, there you had \$62,000.

Then we had this blue pamphlet which went to every household in Manitoba — well not everybody but perhaps your neighbour picked it up — but this pamphlet was mailed to several hundred thousand households in Manitoba at public expense, and of course the Member for Emerson thinks this is okay, but when he's in opposition, although he'll never be in opposition because he won't be back next term, but if he was an opposition member, and the government, a New Democratic Government, spent money on this type of an effort, I could assure you he would scream blue murder. I tell you that it is not appropriate to spend money on pamphlets of this type to promote a particular position.

Similarly the government spent \$5,000 on ads. The Minister of Finance saw fit to make up a letter and send one to each and every civil servant saying in that letter that the New Democratic Party was responsible for delaying their pay cheques. I have never heard of that being done before in my life. Not only have we condemned that, but the MGEA also condemned that, and I think that was a fair criticism; namely, that if you are going to start having mailings put into pay cheques, where does it stop, Mr. Chairman? When do you stop?

That's like in the old days, and some of my colleagues would know better than I, but I believe it was true that years ago in industry there were notices put in with pay cheques telling the workers how to vote or where the workers called out in assembly and instructed how to vote by some of the people in management.

Now we have the latest brochure which is put out by the government two years later, this fancy document. Notice the colours, Mr. Chairman, of this document, the stripes found on each and every page, red and blue. It looks kind of familiar. Those colours tend to look pretty close to this pamphlet which was in 1977 the major pamphlet of the Conservative Party that was distributed as, I think, an advertising supplement in all the newspapers. What is this, a coincidence? A coincidence — it's one of those fortunate coincidences that occur from time to time, and all this fancy stuff, two years later, just a series of pictures of houses deep in water —(Interjection)— Well, of course, there is a picture of the Premier and there is a picture of the Minister of Government Services, but this to me is what really smacks of something funny, is this colour scheme, which is obviously going to hopefully register on the people of

Manitoba and which just happens to blend in with the Conservative colours that have been used and will be used in the next election. Just a coincidence isn't it?

I am just saying, Mr. Speaker, that when you spend . . . I don't know what this costs, surely it must cost a dollar or two per copy depending on how many copies. Something like this handed out — where has it been handed out? How is it being distributed? How many copies and how much does it cost? Those are the questions I ask. They haven't been answered by the opposite side.

Mr. Speaker, those are the only few remarks I wish to make at this time. I am disappointed. I don't want to criticize the Premier for being sick. I know he is not feeling well, but the reason why he isn't here today, which is, I assume, exhaustion by his labours, I think were partly unnecessary in that those efforts should have been the result of his grappling with the economic issues facing Manitobans; very very serious issues, and we have had to date three-and-a-half years of failure and now we are getting a few months of promises. We are getting the dangling mega projects being promised, but the four-year record in office is a record of failure and I also think, Mr. Speaker, that it's a record of abuse in that far too much time and energy and money have been spent on the wrong issue, and far too much money has been spent from the public purse rather than from the Progressive Conservative coffers on promoting the Conservative Party of Manitoba. That, Mr. Chairman, is an abuse of power.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I guess everybody chooses their issues. Probably when the member says he's never heard of that being done before, I've never heard of it being done before to talk about the exhaustion having been wasted by the First Minister, who happens to be apparently convalescing, and I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that whatever we think of the First Minister and despite all our efforts to remove him from office and thereby give him convalescence or relief from any efforts in that regard; we do, Mr. Chairman, recognize that the job is a difficult one, that the Minister is indicated to be not well, and that all members of this party are hoping that he has a full recovery from any difficulties that he now has. I would like that, Mr. Chairman, conveyed to the First Minister, that the members of this group, regardless of the fact that we are trying to defeat him, want him to enjoy a full recovery, and recognize that anybody in that office is giving of himself in such a way as to be of possible jeopardy to his own health, and we would not want to see that kind of effort go unrecognized and dealt with, Mr. Chairman, as a point to be made an issue of. So I would want, Mr. Chairman, the Minister without Portfolio to convey our wishes for his best health to the First Minister.

The other point that I make, Mr. Chairman, is that this group, and I don't believe the public of Canada are going to criticize somebody for efforts to retain democratic government in this country, and to the extent that the First Minister has been fighting for the retention of responsible democratic government in this country, Mr. Chairman, I for one want to

congratulate him and go further. I will do anything that I can to assist him, and if the New Democrats have a problem because their Federal Leader has facilitated this attack on responsible government and they can see, Mr. Chairman, the results of that facilitation within their own party and they're therefore trying to cover up the internal difficulties in their own party by bringing up something else, that's their problem, Mr. Chairman. (Interjection)— I'm not joking, because the member who said that the Tories are raising another issue to cover up problems and that's what's happening in Ottawa and federally, the member is an expert at that, because the New Democrats had a very serious problem at their convention and they tried to cover it up by saying that there is going to be an election and therefore let nobody talk about this problem, it doesn't exist. So he is an expert, Mr. Chairman, at the kind of diversionary tactics, and as far as I am concerned, I want to indicate that we only have one chance on this issue. (Interjection)— The honourable member says that it was blown. Do you know who blew it? Ed Broadbent blew it, because Ed Broadbent gave the First Minister of this country the right to say that I have support throughout the country, I have support in the west, and he used the Manitoba MP's and the Saskatchewan MP's and the BC MP's as patsies for the Liberal Party of this country. He's the one that blew it, and I don't know what could have been done that wasn't done except, Mr. Chairman, I have never had much faith in the court case. I have never had much faith in the court case, although I won't go quite as far as the Member for Elmwood, who is apparently a legal expert who knows better, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Elmwood knows better than the two judges of the Court of Appeal of the Province of Manitoba, and three judges of the Court of Appeal of the Province of Saskatchewan, and nine judges of the Supreme Court of Canada who are presently considering the legality of what is happening. The Member for Elmwood has the presumption to say that undoubtedly it will be decided against the provinces.

In that respect, Mr. Chairman, I think that he who has this great knowledge as to how courts decide things is able to tell the people of Canada that undoubtedly the Supreme Court of Canada will decide in favour of the Federal Government. Mr. Chairman, as I say, he knows better than two Superior Court judges of the Court of Appeal. Mr. Chairman, I have never felt that the provincial case is a good one and I have said so, but, Mr. Chairman, I have always said that there is something else that I don't know and I have learned it from experience, not like the Member for Elmwood, I have never been able to predict how a judge will decide a case. There are nine Superior Court judges sitting on that case, who still don't know how they are going to decide it, but the Member for Elmwood knows.

Now if the First Minister is right and I'm not suggesting that he is and this court decision goes against the provinces, then how has it been a wasted effort? I happen to think that it's wrong, but I will be shown to have been wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know how the court case is going to go. I know that some of the best cases I have ever had, I've lost, and some of the worst cases I've ever had I won, and that's the way things

happen in court, and if the Member for Elmwood doesn't know that, that's too bad, but that's the way it is.

I have another problem, Mr. Chairman, that I want to raise and that is, Mr. Chairman, my problem of having been deprived in conjunction with all of the people of the Province of Manitoba of the right to have earned \$7.5 million in the last two years. Mr. Chairman, I have before me the statement of the Tantalum Mining Corporation of Canada Limited, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is the most profitable financial statement that I have seen in fourteen years of government; that there has never been a more profitable financial statement presented to the House.

If you will look at this financial statement, Mr. Chairman, you will see that in the past two years, the Tantalum Mining Corporation, after taxes, — maybe two-and-a-half years or three years — but certainly it has earned since that period, after taxes, after having paid several million dollars in taxes this year alone, Mr. Chairman, after paying \$8 million in taxes it has earned \$15 million, and it has paid dividends of \$11 million. Now the payment of dividends is significant, because if you were a half owner of the property, you would get \$5.5 million in dividends and still have the right to two more. So there is \$7,500,000 available to anybody having 50 percent of the mine.

Mr. Chairman, several years ago we had the right of an option to purchase 50 percent of the mine and turned it over to the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Corporation. We turned over \$7.5 million in two years on an investment of \$6 million. Wow-ee! The people of the province of Manitoba through the Conservative administration turned over \$7.5 million in two years on an investment of \$6 million. Now who invests \$6 million and in two years gets their entire investment back, plus next year circumstances are not going to be any different, there is going to be another \$10 million earned. Mr. Chairman, the worst feature of this is that private enterprise did nothing to create this situation. This mine was owned by a private corporation up until the time that it was completely on its back, came to the public with pleas to help it out and the public invested a \$1.5 million in that mine. At that time, \$1.5 million bought a quarter of the mine.

As a result of the public investment, the mine started to run more efficiently and given some time, Mr. Chairman, given some time and patience, Mr. Chairman, became profitable. Once it became profitable and the writing was on the wall, in jumped the private sector and with the assistance of the Conservatives, who decided that they would privateer that mine for the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Corporation because Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Corporation was in need of social assistance and really was in bad shape and needed a hand from the government and of all the people in the Province of Manitoba, of all the people who are on social assistance or who have lost their jobs or whose businesses have gone bankrupt or whose homes had been foreclosed on, the Conservative Government of the Province of Manitoba found that somebody needed a break, the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Corporation. So they gave them a break. They gave them 50 percent of the mine for \$6

million and Hudson Bay turned over 13 percent of it to Kawecki Berylco, so that now it's 37-37-25, when it should have been, Mr. Chairman, 75-25. The result of this break that they gave Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Corporation, in two years, the Hudson Bay got a dividend of 5 . . . well, their dividend will be 37 percent of \$11 million, but their price would go down by one-quarter as well. But the 50 percent that we gave them the option of to buy, regardless of how it is now held, earned \$5,000,500 in dividends, and another \$2 million in retained earnings — \$7,500,000.00.

Mr. Chairman, I remember asking the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation two years ago when he appeared before committee, "What do you say about the fact that before the year is out, they are earning almost certainly their money back by extrapolating what will be made in the next year?" And the Chairman said a very interesting thing, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Parsons said, "I would say that Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Corporation made a very prudent purchase." I would say, Mr. Chairman, the Conservative Government of the Province of Manitoba made a very imprudent stupid sale, and even tried to deceive the fact, tried to deceive the people of the Province of Manitoba as to the value of the shares because the shares were held by the Development Corporation, they turned them over to the government and they turned them over for a million-and-a-half dollars, wanting to show that the shares weren't worth anything more than were paid for them. So they turned a quarter of the shares over for a million-and-a-half dollars, but 50 percent was worth \$6 million on the market, so how much was one-quarter worth? Well, the Member for Emerson, he can calculate. It was worth \$3 million.

But because they didn't want to agree, because the Conservatives are ideologically blind, Mr. Chairman, they can never see a public gain; if there is a public gain, it's a mirage and therefore you have to cross it out. They wouldn't attribute to the Development Corporation a transfer of \$3 million, not a million-and-a-half until, Mr. Chairman, it was raised in the House and the Manitoba Development Corporation directors went to the Minister and said we are being cheated. That's what they did. We have earned this money, you have not shown it in our balance sheet. The Minister, fearing a storm from the Manitoba Development Corporation directors, fearing a public outcry, then attributed another \$1.5 million to the Development Corporation, so that it could at least be shown what it was worth. But, Mr. Chairman, it was worth much more. What is it worth to have something that earns net \$10 million a year; net? How much is it worth to have something that earns a net of \$10 million a year? —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, we can't count \$50 million because the mine has a life, it's different, it's different, it's a little different than something that's going to earn that in perpetuity. But I'll tell you something, it's worth more than a \$1.5 million and it's worth more than \$3 million. How many businessmen on that side would not invest \$6 million on the basis that they will get \$6 million back in two years and still have earning power, still have earning power?

Mr. Chairman, this is the worst example of the Conservative Government privateering of public

property in the interests of private developers. There are others. The potash mine; we owned 50 percent, we now own 25 percent with an option for another 15. The Trout Lake Mine, Mr. Chairman, we owned 50 percent, and again, Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting was in trouble so we turned over that share of it — not the 50 percent of it, we owned about 46, we now have . . . what do we have? We now have 26? So we've turned over 22 percent to the private sector.

We took a canning factory, Mr. Chairman, in Morden, and it wasn't a big success, it wasn't. It was losing in the neighbourhood of \$300,000 a year. We turned it over to a private company and that private company we relieved of a million dollars in debt to the Development Corporation. We relieved them of another \$1 million in debt to the bank and we also gave them \$1 million in inventory free. So we relieved them of \$3 million a year in assets. How much is \$3 million at 10 percent? — \$300,000 a year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Conservatives are running around saying, look, this man is making a success of it; the government couldn't, but on the balance sheet that we gave that man, we were making a break-even point before that, Mr. Chairman. So if you will undo the balance sheet and wipe out the debt and then turn it over to the private sector, maybe they can make a go of it, Mr. Chairman, but so could the public sector. Interestingly enough, in each of the areas that I'm talking about, the Morden Cannery was a private firm; Tantalum Mine was a private firm. They both went belly-up, and the government saved them, Mr. Chairman, the government saved them. With regard to Trout Lake, we went into the business with a private firm. So the chickens come home to roost, Mr. Chairman.

On this one investment the Manitoba Development Corporation, which we had to go under Part II, would be making, and don't forget this would not be after taxes, because if it was 75 percent a Crown corporation, our 75 could be, in my opinion, drawn up so that we were 100 percent with a partner who owned 25. But in any event, if it were a Crown corporation and we owned 75 percent of it, we would be making \$12 million a year on one investment, on one investment. If it were not a Crown corporation and we take it at the \$10 million, we would be making \$7,500,000 a year on one investment.

Now that, Mr. Chairman, would not clear up the entire difficulty, but it would show the way. The same thing would happen with the Trout Lake Mine, Mr. Chairman, and if we wiped out the indebtedness for the Development Corporation of the Morden Fine Foods, it would be showing a break-even balance sheet every year.

So the thing was starting, Mr. Chairman, to show that the people of the Province of Manitoba were not incompetent, that they could do it, that they could make an investment which would succeed, that the people of this province have the capacity to do it. And the Conservatives, in order, Mr. Chairman, to preserve the rhetoric that this could not happen, disposed of these investments so they don't have to show them as profit-making. Luckily, we still maintained 25 percent and I'll tell you how it was maintained, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister was going to get rid of the 25 percent and there was a motion in the House that I had on

the Order Paper to have an emergency debate about the Minister, who at that time was the Tourism and Recreation Minister, Mr. Banman, the Member for La Verendrye, came in and before I could make the motion indicated that we were going to keep the 25 percent. Well, Mr. Chairman, that's probably the best pressure we ever put on the government because it means we keep getting these statements to show what the public was able to accomplish through their participation in a resource development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) — pass — the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few comments. Some of the matters that have given me some concern are what this government is doing in regard to its support of the Canadian Wheat Board, for one thing, and we have seen a lot of bad-mouthing on the part of members of the government and the Minister responsible for Agriculture. We would like to know where the First Minister stands on this question.

We have the Minister of Agriculture bad-mouthing the Federal Government on almost everything. Every Minister who stands up has to bad-mouth the Federal Government. I believe that the relationship between this government and the Federal Government at the present time has deteriorated to a very serious state. I say that, Mr. Chairman, because we know that in committee we have asked some of the Ministers on the cost-shared programs, and particularly the Manitoba Northlands Agreement, and, you know, Mr. Chairman, we cannot receive an answer. All we hear is yes, we've made a proposal and we're waiting, we're waiting for a favourable reply from Ottawa. I say how can the Government of Manitoba expect to have co-operation on cost-shared programs, and cost-shared programs that make up a great percentage of the revenues of this province? Let that be clear, Mr. Chairman, that a good percentage of all our revenues in the province come from transferred payment in one form or another.

So we have a government here that Minister after Minister and member after member getting up and bad-mouthing the Federal Government for their own bias, for their own reasons, whatever that may be, and I say that this is a sad state of affairs for Manitoba. I am not surprised that the Federal Government is reluctant to cost-share with Manitoba on this basis; they're having some difficulty, whether it be on police services, whether it be on medical, whether it be on other transfer payments, equalization payments, Manitoba Northlands Agreement. Nothing done, no agreement signed. What else do you expect?

We have a First Minister, who for the last three or four years has been bashing Ottawa on their expenditures, not so much lately, because I think they see the handwriting on the wall. But we have had a First Minister who has bashed the Federal Government on its deficits and cries crocodile tears when the money is not coming. That is what we have seen and I think it's a deplorable state of affairs when we see this happening. Now as I say, lately we have not heard the First Minister being too critical on Ottawa's deficits or their expenditures and I believe the reasons are is that they have seen that we are

dependent to a great extent, perhaps 40 percent, I'm not sure of the exact figures but I wouldn't doubt that 40 percent of all our revenues come from transfer payments in one form or another, whether it be Medicare, whether it be Education, payments on Education, whether it be cost-shared programs on Highways; whether it be cost-shared programs with Northern Development or whatever it may be. Whether it be cost of policing, that the Member for Dauphin, I believe, introduced a resolution.

Mr. Chairman, how can the Member for Dauphin expect the Federal Government to come forward with the funds if the First Minister, the leading voice in the province, tells Ottawa to cut back on your expenditures? How can you then come in and say, "Well, we want you to spend."? Where is the consistency in that kind of an argument?

We have had a series of attacks on the Wheat Board. We had attacks before or even before the show got on the road, Mr. Chairman, on the MAP program. Not even time to discuss it, to look at what it was that was being presented to us, it was shot down by the government before it even got off the ground, before hardly any meetings were held by the Advisory Committee, before even the meetings were being held in the province by the Advisory Committee to try and get some feedback. There was no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that nothing was ready for the program. They even said so. They even indicated, Mr. Chairman, that there was no way the program could be in place by the new crop year which is on August 1st. There was no possible way that they could put that program in place and the only reason why those meetings were being held was to . . . maybe their timing was bad. Maybe the timing was bad, Mr. Chairman, because there was disagreement on the pricing of energy and just to come in at that particular time when there was animosity in Western Canada, particularly in Alberta, because that's where the program got shot down, was in Alberta. That's where the Market Assurance Program really got shot down, was in the West. Perhaps the timing was bad but we have a government here who did not even want it to be discussed.

That is the impression that I perceived from the Minister of Agriculture and the Member for Gladstone bringing in a resolution, a very distorted and badly drawn-up resolution to begin with, not factual, distorted, and not even any semblance of facts. They started off, again, bad-mouthing the Federal Government through the Wheat Board and so on. Again, bad-mouthing. So the resolution that we've seen was very badly worded. We attempted to make the resolution constructive, brought an amendment in to make it constructive, to make the government look good and of course they didn't want to vote on it. They didn't want to have to vote against our amendment that made the resolution constructive. So they were visibly embarrassed with the resolution as proposed by the Member for Gladstone.

But on other matters, Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned about what is happening in the Province of Alberta in regard to the Canadian Wheat Board and we have seen where the Province of Alberta have set up their own marketing and distribution system for grain in that province, and undermining the Wheat Board. The purpose is to destroy the

Wheat Board and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there have been discussions with this government and the Minister of Agriculture. I believe there have been discussions with the Alberta Minister of Agriculture in regard to the possibility of Manitoba setting up a similar type of marketing system for grains in Manitoba and undermining and circumventing the Grain Transport Association, the committee that's in charge of allocating box cars for the transportation of grain, whether it be to the head of the Lakes, whether it be to Vancouver, or whether it be to Churchill. We have seen a flaunting by the Province of Alberta, a flaunting of the regulations and the authorities of the Transport Commission; the Grain Transport Authority, that is how they are called. We have seen where thirty some cars of grain were diverted on orders of the Alberta Government to be placed at their own terminals, Mr. Chairman, at government terminals in Alberta, to load grain and circumvent and plug up the facilities on the West Coast, depriving other shippers, depriving them of access to cars, depriving them of storage space in Vancouver. This is the kind of scenario we are seeing at the present time in regard to what is happening in Alberta and I am very much afraid. And we never hear, when I posed the question to the Minister of Agriculture in this regard, on the circumventing of the Grain Transport Authority. All we got out of the Minister of Agriculture is that he was happy to see grain moving out and the more grain that they could move the better it was and this is the kind of beating around the bush answer that we get from the Minister of Agriculture when it comes to answering questions.

But I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Agriculture was very delighted on what was happening in the Province of Alberta. And I say that there's some concern, Mr. Chairman, by farmers right across this country about what's taking place in Alberta. And I do believe that this Minister here is sympathetic to what Alberta is doing and I'm very much afraid if there was an election and if the people of the Province of Manitoba were unfortunate enough to have the same government they have today after the next provincial election, we will see that happen here. We will see this very thing happen that's happening now in Alberta and that is the undermining of the Wheat Board and I would not be surprised if a similar type of situation that they have in Alberta, I wouldn't be surprised if the same thing was implemented in this province. Though I'm certainly concerned for our producers to see the direction that we are now going in this province in relation to this very very important marketing tool that have been fought many years ago by our farmers and fought so hard to achieve.

Now I've heard the Minister again get up and criticize the Wheat Board for not moving sufficient quantities of grain out of the Port of Churchill, again criticizing a federal institution even though it's arm's length from the government, criticizing the Wheat Board for not sending more grain or exporting more grain out of the Port of Churchill. Mr. Chairman, if they had to depend on the private trade to keep the Port of Churchill alive, I say to you, sir, that the Port of Churchill would not be there very long. So I say that whatever grain is being shipped and we hope that there will be more grain being shipped out of

Churchill because there's no reason why, Mr. Chairman, this is Manitoba's only ocean port, and why we should not do everything in our power to retain that export facility. Now there's some disagreement. We are told that it's the Wheat Board that decides where the grain should be moved to. Now we hear that it's the shipper that decides, so there's some disagreement. We have the Wheat Board saying one thing and we have other people saying other things, Mr. Chairman, buyers saying other things.

So I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister gets up and bad-mouths the Wheat Board for not shipping sufficient quantities of grain out of Churchill, he should also get up and bad-mouth the Grain Exchange or the Grain people for not doing likewise, Mr. Chairman. I am sure that if the port facility at Churchill was privately owned, it would be doing double the business and maybe triple the business it's doing now, if it was privately owned, but because it's a public facility, no way, no way, Mr. Chairman. And so actually what is happened is that the Wheat Board is the only source really of grain going to Churchill and, Mr. Chairman, we are bad-mouthing the Wheat Board —(Interjection)— What about the Grain Exchange? What about the Grain Trade? Mr. Chairman, they want grain to go to the head of the Lakes. They want grain to go west where they have facilities. That is where they want the grain to go. That's the situation and the Minister should start telling it like it is instead of trying to confuse the issue.

Mr. Chairman, there is much more that I want to speak on, but I'm going to leave some for another time. I have some other related areas that I want to speak on; I want to talk about other things as well, but I will use another opportunity and I think we will have other opportunities to address our remarks on other items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, there have been a number of comments made by members opposite. The Member for Lac du Bonnet, the Member for Elmwood and the Leader of the Progressive group.

I thought it would be appropriate perhaps, Mr. Chairman, to acknowledge and thank the Leader of the Progressive group for his kind remarks in respect to the rest period that the First Minister is taking. He is away from his duties for a few days and I will certainly convey to him the best wishes of the Leader of the Progressive group. It was the Member for Inkster as well who took issue with some comments made previously about the way in which the First Minister had been using his time and the relative priority of certain issues which the First Minister had been endeavouring to present.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it's not necessary for me to repeat those remarks and I concur completely with the Member for Inkster in this respect that the importance of the constitutional issue is certainly one that is difficult to measure in contemporary terms, but history I think, will certainly mark it as one of the greatest issues of our times.

The Member for Elmwood may not at this stage appreciate the importance of the decisions which are about to be made with respect to the future of our

country, but I am sure there are others in this room who do realize that certain major changes, if once made, would be difficult to reverse.

I'm convinced and I know all members on this side and some members on the other side of the House are glad that the First Minister had the judgment and the courage and the strength to support and to bring all of the powers, which he had to bear, and to lead others who were of a similar view, in presenting as strongly as he did the feeling of eight of the provinces of Canada, that until it could be demonstrated that what the Federal Government and the Prime Minister was anxious to bring about was likely to be more beneficial to the people of Canada than those rights and privileges and those ways of life which they now enjoy. But again that decision and that final determination will not be made perhaps this month or this year, but it will be for historians to evaluate, but I do thank the Member for Inkster for his expressions in respect to the contribution made by the First Minister of Manitoba.

I perhaps could go back and comment just briefly on the Member for Lac du Bonnet who chose to remind us of the flattening out of the construction industry in Manitoba in the period which he described as beginning in 1977 and I think that's a matter which concerns everyone in the Province of Manitoba. Perhaps the cure for that problem is not the one which the Member for Lac du Bonnet would ask us to accept. It's not likely that would be completely acceptable on this side, but I do point out that he does realize and agrees that it is not something which — and I'm speaking now of the problem of interest rates as they effect construction — it's not something which can be attacked in a major way by a provincial government. Others on his side do not perhaps admit that and as a matter of fact, the Member for Elmwood almost contradicted that position in his subsequent remarks.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet didn't mention that the beginning of that perhaps flattening out period in construction in Manitoba was in 1977. He mentioned the year, but not the fact that a decision made by the previous administration to suspend construction on the Nelson River was taken and perhaps was the beginning of that kind of flat period. I think we should remember that. Not that there is any objection to that decision having been taken, because it probably was the only one that could have been taken at that time, but it did in fact, mean the beginning of a lower degree of activity in construction in our province.

Things have happened more recently which the member I'm sure is aware of and which we don't need to remind him of. We have chosen to direct our efforts to bringing to the province some major projects, which we believe are going to very quickly take up the slack in the construction industry. One has already been announced and will do a great deal towards improving the employment record in that area.

What the Federal Government might do in respect to interest rates; I agree that certainly they have within their power the ability to take measures and the member suggests that exchange controls might be one way. But are we to perhaps accept the advice of the Member for Lac du Bonnet and again attack the Federal Government for not addressing this

problem? His colleagues on the other side in the last few minutes have been very critical of this government's — the buzz-word at the moment is "Fed-bashing" — and, Mr. Chairman, we can do much to encourage the Federal Government to address this problem in a very real way in order that some construction can begin to develop in areas where it's now pretty obvious that it's needed, in more rental accommodation and more office space, particularly in the City of Winnipeg. But there is a question as to how much authority the Federal Government can have in the North American money markets when our great neighbours to the south are involved in a program of inflation control through the making of credit more difficult and how much can be achieved unilaterally by the Canadian Federal Government, much more than can be done by a Provincial Government, but again there are limitations as to what can be done by Canada in isolation from other world powers.

Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to take very much time on the remarks of the Member for Elmwood, who is satisfied in his mind that this government is using the constitutional issue as a smoke screen to cover up other major problems which he believe are far more important to the people of Manitoba. I think we've dealt at some length with his views in respect to that particular issue, both in this debate and in previous debates.

He mentions the certain pamphlets and certain promotional programs that have been undertaken by the various departments of government in an effort to promote Manitoba as a province of attraction and a province where the good things of life are available in abundance. I don't know that there should be any modesty about the obvious advantages of the province that we govern and it's, I think, only a continuation of a program begun by a previous administration, that there should be a continuity in the message getting out to people of all walks of life, that there are many good things and many opportunities in our province.

He also mentioned some colours on a pamphlet, which seemed to upset him a little bit. Those red, white and blue stripes or red and white are not peculiar to any one political party or any one company, and I think it's unlikely that anyone is unduly concerned about those colours as they appear in printed forms. One may have noticed that during the presentation of Annual Reports that the variety of colours is almost as it has always been. There are some orange reports that come out from time to time and some blue reports and even some red coloured reports. So I think it's not an issue or a particularly important one at this stage.

Mr. Chairman, let the Member for Lac du Bonnet be assured that we are concerned about the development of construction industry in our province. We will take methods somewhat different from those which he would promote; that is the public activity in construction. We prefer and we always will philosophically the efforts that can be generated through the private sector or a combination of public and private sector development, and these are occurring and they are impressive and I think members on the other side will certainly have to agree that this is happening in Manitoba and is likely to occur with other projects within the next year to 18 months.

The Member for Ste. Rose made a number of comments about the activities of this administration. I think the key word in all of his remarks was "bad-mouth." He was accusing the government of bad-mouthing Ottawa and that there should be more friendly approaches to Ottawa in order that some of our shared-cost programs would continue to receive the transfer of payments that have been received in the past. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think the member really intended to say that the government should back off on positions or contrary views when they feel that those views and those positions are in the best interests of the people of Canada or Manitoba.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, he does not mean that we should be quietly agreeing with the Federal Government in Ottawa and I don't think he's intending to infer that the delay in the consummation of certain Federal-Provincial agreements are related to perhaps differences of opinions and differences of points of view that have been pretty obvious in the past three or four months. If he is suggesting that, I think perhaps that would be a position that I would hope has no foundation.

I would think that we could continue to be business relations of the Federal Government in Ottawa and that we could continue to support those positions and points of view that we feel are right and proper and I'm sure the First Minister continues, and intends to continue, to do that. There isn't any reason to believe that our previous federal-provincial cost-sharing agreements will not again be achieved. There have been some delays, admittedly, but I think the Federal Government is coming to a position where they are at least giving some attention to the need to perhaps review with greater concern the total expenditure of the taxpayers' money in Canada.

The Member for Inkster, the Leader of the Progressive group, is very much concerned about the shared position with respect to Tantalum Mines and that if we had kept it all, that we would have been a lot better off. I think this will continue to come up as a difference of point of view between the Member for Inkster and this government and whenever there is an instance where the profit and loss statement is particularly good, it will be pointed as an instance where there should not have been a sharing. Where there are instances where there was a sale of an interest to a private sector and the results were not nearly as good, I expect we will not hear too much of that.

The question of whether or not the expertise in the mining industry that was introduced to the Tantalum mining operation by the participation of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting again may not be clearly admitted by the critics of those who say that the deal that was made some years ago was not a good one for the Province of Manitoba. We will again, Mr. Chairman, have to await the results of a number of years of operation in that field.

Mr. Chairman, those are a few of the remarks made on which I wanted to comment. I am sure there are other observations that will be made by members opposite.

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

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to raise with the First Minister at this time a couple

of matters having to do with Manitoba Hydro and one having to do with Manitoba Data Services. I'm not sure whether the Minister without Portfolio was present when the First Minister was replying to the debate on his Salary in Room 255 — I believe it was Thursday or Friday afternoon — and I raised a matter with the First Minister on the handling by the government of a particular instance with Hydro, questioning the government's policy in this regard.

The First Minister did not make any reply to that particular criticism because of some remarks following immediately by, I believe, the Attorney-General. So if the Minister without Portfolio is able to or intends to reply to them, I would certainly appreciate that. Just in capsule form, the matter that I had raised with the First Minister had to do with, in particular, a particular letter that Hydro had sent to a law firm and the law firm had then replied suggesting further direct contact between Hydro and the solicitor involved. We had sought to have the Minister indicate quite clearly what the government's position was on that and that he should either instruct Hydro to do as what suggested in the letter in order to clear the matter up or on the other hand to refuse to let Hydro take that particular course of events.

That was simply one example in a number of occasions where the Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro had taken a similar position, not making a statement of a policy or a principle that we would have expected from a Minister of the Crown, but more to slough the responsibility off onto Hydro itself.

Honourable gentlemen opposite had a great deal to say when they were in Opposition of the politicization of Hydro during the previous government's tenure and yet here we see in this particular instance, this government doing the same thing, only more so. It's Hydro's responsibility and expertise in providing electrical power to the people of Manitoba; it's the government's responsibility to make the political decisions involved. What the Deputy Premier was doing, and is doing in this particular instance, is to simply abdicate his responsibility for those political decisions and leaving them up to Hydro, which is clearly, Mr. Chairman, inappropriate to do so and Manitoba Hydro, I believe, lacks the ability to get involved with the politics of the matter and should be in a position to make those technical and professional decisions that they are best able to do so.

I was interested to hear what the First Minister had to say in that regard and whether he approved of the actions of the Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro and whether that was in fact the position of the government, to abdicate its responsibility in matters of this regard and simply leave them to Manitoba Hydro to deal with.

I have a couple of other matters having to do with Hydro that I would like to come back to later, Mr. Chairman, but in the meantime I want to ask the Minister without Portfolio, reporting for the First Minister, whether he has any comment on the fact that Manitoba Data Services, which is a Crown corporation, has not reported to the Standing Committee of this House on Public Utilities for the last two years. At the time that Manitoba Telephone System appeared before the committee last year,

and at a guess it was May or June, I began to address a question to the chairman and general manager of Manitoba Telephone System about its formerly wholly-owned subsidiary, Manitoba Data Services. The Minister, who was in attendance at that meeting, the Member for Lakeside, and I'm not sure whether he recalls the instance or not, pointed out to me that some year or so earlier the Manitoba Data Services had been struck off from the Manitoba Telephone System and was in fact a Crown corporation in its own right and that it was improper to ask the chairman of Manitoba Telephone System about a Crown corporation for which he was not responsible. The Minister at that time, the former Minister as he now is, the Member for Lakeside, assured me quite solemnly, Mr. Chairman, that Manitoba Data Services would in fact appear before the Committee on Public Utilities in order to fully and openly answer any questions that we might have. (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, we look forward with some interest to Manitoba Data Services appearing before the committee at the last session in order that we might ask our questions and for whatever reason they did not appear before the Public Utilities Committee, whether it was the House was so busy or whether Manitoba Data Services were too busy or involved with other things and could not come, or whether it was a matter of the Minister himself failing to summon the Manitoba Data Services, that Crown corporation for which he has responsibility, to appear before the committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, one complete session went by without a Crown corporation appearing before the Public Utilities Committee. I am not sure whether the Public Utilities Committee has submitted its final report for this session but we are nearing the end of the session and we have had no indication from the new Minister reporting for communications, nor from the Government House Leader, that Manitoba Data Services will in fact appear before the Public Utilities Committee before the end of this session. (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that that will be most helpful and most beneficial if the present Minister of Natural Resources speaks to his successor Minister. I realize that things are not always easy when there is a lack of continuity and the responsibility or a portfolio changes from one Minister to another, so I recognize that there could have been some difficulty involved in that particular instance. But what we are looking at at the moment, if another meeting of the Utilities Committee is not called, is that it will be three years, in other words the session next year, before we have heard from a Crown corporation, the Manitoba Data Services.

The amount of dollars turned over by the Corporation is not that great, it's in the area of \$12 million. The Corporation has, though, we notice in the five years or so that it has been in existence, incurred a modest deficit for each of those years. There is a projection that the 1980-81 year will show a slight excess of revenues over expenses and we would be most interested in talking to Manitoba Data Services, whether their projection as of a year ago in fact came into being.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not there was a difficulty in handing over that responsibility, the ultimate responsibility in this matter still lies with the First Minister and with his Cabinet. I am not sure whether

this was an oversight or an error, or whether there was something deeper than that involved, whether there is some sensitivity or embarrassment on the part of the government as far as answering questions is concerned. We wonder if the First Minister has dealt with the matter of one of his Cabinet colleagues in neglecting to summon Manitoba Data Services to the committee a year ago, as he in fact promised. Did the First Minister speak to his colleague on this matter? Was there a rebuke or a reprimand involved, or was it in fact never brought to the First Minister's attention? What did the First Minister do or what action did he take in the case of the present Minister that has responsibility for Manitoba Data Services? Does he bear responsibility in this matter for allowing a second year to go by without Manitoba Data Services appearing before the committee? Is it a matter of incompetence on the part of the present Minister or was it a matter of simple neglect or was there some other reason, that the present Minister is too embarrassed to have MDS come before the committee, or is there something that they are trying to hide?

Well, Mr. Chairman, we won't know that unless we get a reply from the First Minister or perhaps we will not find out for another year when MDS appears before the committee and we can put those questions directly. I really hardly expect that the Minister without Portfolio will have all of the answers to these questions but I note that we are rapidly approaching Private Members' Hour and perhaps the Minister without Portfolio has made note of the questions raised and the rather unusual circumstances of two years going by without a Crown corporation appearing before a Standing Committee and we look forward to a future time when perhaps the Minister can provide us all with answers to these rather intriguing questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I gather we don't have very much time this afternoon left to debate the Premier's Estimates but nevertheless, knowing that you're a very strict Chairman, I intend to speak for my first two minutes and perhaps carry on tomorrow morning or whenever these Estimates are renewed again.

I regret that the Premier is not able to be with us. I regret that he is ill but nevertheless, that is the way the cookie crumbles, as they say, but I'm sure that the Deputy Premier or his designate will take note of some of the comments that are made in these Estimates of the Executive Council — and the staff — and perhaps pass on some suggestions.

I share some of the views of my colleague, the Member for Elmwood, with regard to the efforts made by the Premier on the matter of the Constitution. There's no question of course that the matter was raised by the Federal Government and there had to be a response and the Premier of this province did respond in a particular way, as did many other Premiers in this country of ours, but nevertheless it is regrettable that the Premier has spent so much time on the Constitution and has had very little time, in my view at least, for other important matters affecting the welfare of the people of Manitoba.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, the number one issue for the people of Manitoba has got to be the economic situation that we find ourselves in today. It's the number one issue I would say, Mr. Chairman, whether you look at statistics or whether you look at the newspapers or indeed whether you talk to people around the province, and particularly if you talk to small businessmen. I think of anyone, of any particular group in our society, it is the small businessman that expresses the deepest concern about the economic situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30. Private Members' Hour. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: We're now under Private Members' Hour. Tuesdays the first order of business is Public Bills.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 17 — THE MEDICAL ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The first bill is Bill No. 17, The Medical Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Johns was granted leave and perhaps the same courtesy might be extended to myself; I will require more than the allotted time. We did this in the interest of saving time originally but events changed somewhat as a result of considerations given other matters in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Johns made an excellent address in this regard and perhaps we should remind newer members of the House, it was primarily as a result of a motion of the Member for St. Johns in 1967, that a Special Committee of the Legislature was established to review professional associations in the Province of Manitoba and that Committee continued for a number of years and I had the privilege to be chairman at one time, for that Committee.

But, Mr. Speaker, it was decided at that time in the early Seventies that we really didn't have the problems that they had in some other jurisdictions vis-a-vis professional associations. But events have changed, Mr. Speaker, and one of the things that has caused me some concern is the apparent

inability or unwillingness of the present government to act in the public interest.

We have had several occasions, which in my view, during this session of the Legislature, that they were more interested in being politically expedient and doing that which might be popular than exercising the responsibility that they are selling to the people in the province, that they would be willing to undertake to protect the rights of individuals. The Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, by their actions, is totally inconsistent with their avowed policy. When they purport that they are going to protect the public interest and don't, in my view, Mr. Speaker, this is misleading the public and it is to this particular point that I wish to address my remarks.

It is something which, for some reason or other, in the way it was dragged up or something, that I believe that rules and establishment and procedures exist for good reason and if we understand the reason why they exist and accept at the same time that things have to change, then perhaps we can bring about reasons to change.

My friends in the House will recall that when some photographer stuck his nose around the House and took a picture, I was one of the ones who was hollering at him, because the rule was that he shouldn't be taking pictures in the Chamber, but yet at committee I was one of the ones that suggested we should change the rule; that if rules have lost their efficacy or their utility in present day terms then we should doubtless change them, but we should be ever cautious that we are totally cognizant of the changes which we are allowing to take place.

In looking at the laws of the Province of Manitoba I don't know how many people realize it — they probably subliminally do realize it — that every Act from the first Act, Chapter A(7) of the continuing Statutes of the Province of Manitoba to Z(1), every Act that's passed in between there, contains the phrase, "Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba enacts as follows." Every Act which is passed says that. Nothing is passed except by Her Majesty with our consent and this is a responsibility.

I know we get all wrapped up in political parties and everything else and caucus whips . . . but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, if the people of the province that we represent, in any day in our Confederation, or of our position in Confederation, have the right to ask their elected officials is, what are you going to do to protect our rights; are you going to review all pieces of legislation as they affect us? We can glibly toss this off and say yes, you vote for me and I will protect your rights; I will take care of my responsibility to protect your rights.

It is against the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, to reflect on a vote which is already passed or a matter which has already been dealt with in the current session, but nevertheless the argument which was presented by the Minister of Health of the Province of Manitoba relative to that particular bill, I think is a principle which transcends the defeat of that bill.

In other words, if the Minister argues on Monday in a certain way, I would presume that he would argue the same way on Tuesday and Thursday on the same principle, on the same matter. So without stretching the rules in that regard, I'm not referring

to something which has been dealt with, Mr. Speaker, but the words of the Minister of Health in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I have to strongly urge members of the Legislature to reject a particular bill and to protect the integrity and the responsibility of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba in its role as that body responsible for professional standards and ethics as they relate to the practise of medicine and through them the protection of the public, where medicine is concerned. That is garbage, Mr. Speaker. That is garbage. This is the body — this is the body that is charged with that responsibility. We can delegate authority, Mr. Speaker, but there is absolutely no way we can abdicate our responsibility and for the Minister of Health of this province to hold that view frightens me because how many other Ministers of the government hold similar views on similar principles when it comes to protection of rights of the individuals of this province?

Her Majesty, by and with the consent of this Legislature does this, that, or the other thing. So for a Minister of the Crown to say that because that responsibility is vested in some other body, is not in keeping with the avowed position of the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba, relative to the constitutional debate, which is taking place in this country.

When we're talking about these powers that the Minister of Health says is vested in the College of Physicians and Surgeons, what are we talking about? The particular principles are set out in the bill which is before us but roughly, Mr. Speaker, it deals in the matter of who will be admitted in the first instance to the School of Medicine. Is every member in this House satisfied with the procedures being used to become a doctor in this province? Who decides? How do they decide? Is it the person who has the intellectual ability; the dexterity in their fingers, their hands? Are we getting the best people from all over the province admitted to the School of Medicine? This is our responsibility to ascertain that that is in fact being done.

The qualifications of the people who are providing medical services in our province — are we satisfied that the best possible medical service is being provided by the educational system, by the training system in our province? Are we as legislators satisfied because Her Majesty with our leave and consent will pass on this matter? We can ignore it and say aye, send it to committee. The College of Physicians and Surgeons can come and make their case and we can obtain Royal assent to a bill maintaining the status quo. But is every Member of this Legislative Assembly satisfied that the rights of the public are being protected?

Licensing — who shall or shan't practise in the Province of Manitoba? Are we satisfied that this is indeed being done in a manner which protects the rights of the people of the province?

Then, Mr. Speaker, we get down to the matter of discipline. Are we satisfied? We have had one member show his dissatisfaction with the particular issue, which was not supported by members of this House and I would dearly love to comment on that issue, Mr. Speaker, but I don't want you calling me to order.

So the admissions, the qualifications, the licensing and the discipline, these authorities we have delegated to the College of Physicians and Surgeons. But I repeat, Mr. Speaker, no way can we abdicate the responsibility for that delegation of authority.

A number of things are happening and it is related to the public interest and the protection of rights. We have a Commission in the province that has ruled in a particular way that each one of these seats belongs to a political party. You know, I think I referred to it in another debate one time, the analogies, similes and metaphores, I guess, reflect my generation. The story of the youngster that put his finger in the dike and sat there all night because he knew if he didn't keep his finger in the dike that the movement of water through that hole would erode it away and they would have a flood. Every once in a while, Mr. Speaker, members of this Legislative Assembly have to kind of say, whoa, where are we going? What are we doing? This is one of those occasions.

Why are we just going to take one bill, Mr. Speaker, because it is a Private Member's Bill, as this bill before us is a Private Bill, and pass it, because it comes to us by way of the Member for Rhineland? Is he, as the mover of this bill, satisfied that everything that is in this bill is a protection of his responsibility as an elected person? This one bill — apparently the Minister of Health, in his silence, says that this bill is acceptable to the College of Physicians and Surgeons — but somebody who wanted to have a bill sent to committee so that they would have an opportunity to ask the College of Physicians and Surgeons got short shrift in this regard.

There is perhaps a need, Mr. Speaker, and it's one of the things that we as a group will be looking at, is the accountability of those agencies of the Crown which are delegated this kind of responsibility. The Member for St. Vital a moment ago found it a little strange that one of the agencies of the Crown hadn't accounted to this group. Perhaps the day has come about, Mr. Speaker, that any agency at all that is granted authority in some field has to report to a committee of the Legislature on an annual basis, not in a case of witch-hunting and all the rest of it, but to make sure that the public interest is being protected.

The case which went to the College of Physicians which prompted a bill which was defeated, I found passing strange. I have lots of questions to ask, that I would have loved to ask the College of Physicians and Surgeons, because I have people come and ask me, people that I represent, and I can't answer them, so therefore there is somebody standing between me and my responsibility and that is this House in that regard.

We will have an opportunity to debate this issue more fully, Mr. Speaker, as time goes on, but it is with regret that I must move at this time a reasoned amendment, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words following the word "that" in the first line thereof and substituting therefor the follows: "This bill not now be read for the following reasons:

(1) This House has not received satisfactory evidence or assurances that the public interest of Manitoba requires the enactment of such bill;

(2) The Government has taken no steps to engage in a public dialogue relative to the extraordinary powers of the College of Physicians and Surgeons in the Province of Manitoba;

(3) The provisions of this bill do not provide adequate mechanisms for the protecting of the public interest relative to the extraordinary powers of the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and defeated.

QUESTION put on the amendment and defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: The question now is second reading of Bill No. 17. The Honourable Member for Rhineland will be closing debate.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all the members who have participated in the debate on this bill. I am certain that every opportunity will be given to question the representatives who will be appearing before the committee when this bill is before committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: We proceed now to Bill No. 43, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood. (Stands)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster, Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Elections Finances Act. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. (Stands)

We'll then proceed with Resolutions. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is a disposition to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there agreement to call it 5:30? There is not agreement.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE
COMMITTEE CHANGES**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, in the interim period, I would like to make some changes on Statutory Regulations and Orders. It will be Mr. Downey for Mr. Hyde and Mr. Domino for Mr. Mercier.

MR. SPEAKER: Are those changes agreed to? (Agreed)

We are proceeding then with Resolutions.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

**RESOLUTION NO. 2
PATRIATION OF THE CONSTITUTION
SPEAKER'S RULING**

MR. SPEAKER: The first resolution on the Order Paper is the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster, Resolution No. 2. I have reviewed the resolution and in light of the resolution of the Honourable First Minister, I believe that the subject matter of this particular resolution is incorporated in the resolution of the Honourable First Minister and I would have to rule Resolution No. 2 to be out of order.

**RESOLUTION NO. 3
REJECTION OF SEPARATISM
SPEAKER'S RULING**

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 3, the motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the same reasons would apply. I believe that the subject matter of that resolution can be dealt with in the resolution of the Honourable First Minister.

**RESOLUTION NO. 11
TASK FORCE RE
CONTINUING EDUCATION**

MR. SPEAKER: That then brings us to Resolution No. 11, the resolution of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Springfield.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take very long on this because the Minister has indicated that he will not support the resolution as I have presented it and I'm afraid I find that the amendments that are provided by the government's members are lacking in substance and are merely self-congratulatory towards the government in matters which would not have been brought to this Legislature, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if they were a matter for self-congratulation on the part of the government.

There is a very serious situation in Manitoba as far as post-secondary education is concerned. There is a tendency now towards students, young people who should be students, not entering post-secondary institutions because they are not able or not assured or getting necessary assistance and because of the harassment that they know will be provided to them in their appeals for assistance.

Mr. Speaker, they know it because of the experience of their brothers, sisters and friends who have undergone the audit procedure, which is the practice and has been for some years now of the department and which is placing the students in an inferior position compared with almost any kind of citizen, any kind of taxpayer or non-taxpayer within the Province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, I consider the amendment to be meaningless. I consider the assurances of the Minister to be no answer to the problem of the students as to the problem has been, I think, delineated by myself and by the resolution.

I will sit down now, assuring the House that if we are going into another session before the election, I will be presenting an updated and similar resolution

asking for proper consideration of the needs of post-secondary students in this province without the sort of — well, self-congratulatory is as good a word as any, I think, for the attitude that meets these requests. Students shouldn't be treated as though they are somewhat lesser citizens, non-contributing citizens, and there should not be an attitude, and I suggest there is such an attitude in this government, that those students whose parents are not able to help them should not be entitled to post-secondary education. I think that's a very unfortunate attitude and whether it's intended by the Government or not, that is what the students are recognizing as being the attitude of this government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put on the amendment, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Now the proposed motion as amended.

QUESTION put on the motion as amended, MOTION carried.

**RESOLUTION NO. 12
CHILD CARE CENTRES
SPEAKER'S RULING**

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 12, the amendment of Mr. Steen. I have reviewed the amendment. On March 10, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface introduced a resolution which asked the Government of Manitoba to undertake to pass immediately a Child Care Act reflecting the standards recommended in the United Way Day Care Study. The resolution further asked assurance by the Government that unless these standards were met, no public funds would be expended either for capital expenditure for day care centres or for subsidies for families using private profit-making centres. It was also requested that the Government consider the advisability of initiating a program of child care centre expansion.

On Thursday, April 2, the Honourable Member for Crescentwood presented an amendment which among other matters suggested that the government continue its policy with respect to ensuring standards of good quality day care and that it be commended for initiating programs of child day care expansion, etc., to meet present needs throughout Manitoba.

Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, citation 425 states: "The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original which must, however, be relevant to the subject of the question."

Citation 425(1) states: "A motion may be amended by: a) leaving out certain words; (b) leaving out certain words in order to insert other words; and (c) inserting or adding other words."

In checking through Parliamentary records, I find that on Pages 165 and 166 of the Journals of the House of 1970, Mr. Speaker Hanuschak ruled in order an amendment which would strike out the portion of the resolution by the then Honourable Member for Ste. Rose which asked the Government of Manitoba to consider the advisability of

introducing legislation to abolish the provincial portion of estate taxes and substitute a proposal that the Government of Manitoba continue to press upon the Government of Canada the desirability of exclusive federal administration of estate and succession taxation in Canada.

Again, on Pages 222 and 223 of the same Journal, I find that Mr. Speaker Hanuschak ruled in order an amendment to a proposed resolution which proposed that the Standing Committee on Agriculture be called into an emergency session to consider problems being encountered by farmers. The proposed amendment recommended that the House commend the Minister of Agriculture for his initiative and representation to the Government of Canada on behalf of the farmers of Manitoba.

In my opinion, there appears to be a close parallel between the motions and amendments mentioned and the proposal now before the House and the amendment thereto. Therefore, I rule the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood to be in order.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. FOX: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In respect to our procedure, we didn't get through the Estimates and I thought we possibly would but we didn't and in regard to the commitment that apparently the House Leader had made to the Member for St. Boniface, is he still going to have the session meet tomorrow morning at 10:00 or is he going —(Interjection)— I hear a little echo there, which is totally unnecessary. I would like to ask whether the House Leader is going to still have the House meet at 10:00 in the morning and at 2:00 in the afternoon and have the committees meet at night or whether he has had a change of direction because of the fact that we didn't get done with the Estimates. And further to that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that we call it 5:30 in respect to Private Members' Hour at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, following the conversation I had with the Opposition House Leader and the Member for St. Johns, particularly with respect to the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations which will be meeting tonight, Mr. Speaker, my understanding was that it was the preference that the House meet tomorrow morning, and in the event that the Committee had to meet again, that it was the preference that the Committee would meet tomorrow night. That would be, Mr. Speaker, what I would propose for tomorrow in the event that the Committee does not complete its deliberations tonight. The House would meet at 10:00 a.m. tomorrow and 2:00 p.m. in the afternoon.

If the Opposition House Leader, Mr. Speaker, has expressed a disposition of all members present, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that this House do now adjourn until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning (Wednesday).