

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Wednesday, 25 March, 1981**

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

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

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING  
AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

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

**MR. MORRIS McGREGOR:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same, and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS  
AND TABLING OF REPORTS**

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

**HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a return to an order of the House, No. 7, and return to an order of the House, No. 8, both filed on the motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

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

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a return to an order of the House, No. 11.

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

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** At this time I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 51 cadets from the 44th Sarnia Squadron of the Royal Canadian Air Cadets from Sarnia, Ontario, under the direction of Captain Landry. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Has the Minister of Consumer Affairs received a petition from a group of residents of the Southglen Mobile Home Community on St. Annes Road, in connection with the levy of a charge against them by Winnipeg

Gas as a result of the termination of service, and if so, what has been his response?

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

**HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights):** Mr. Speaker, I received that petition only this morning and I have not yet responded to it.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Then to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, does the Minister of Consumer Affairs as a result of obtaining that petition, and I am certain as a result of having already received information that charges had been levied as against the residents of the Mobile Home Park for the reconnection of service, is the Minister intending to undertake action to ensure that the Winnipeg Gas Company will not in fact receive the benefit of levying charges against the residents of the Mobile Home Park?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, it's indeed unfortunate that due to some vandalism or whatever action that the gas service to the Mobile Home Park was cut off and indeed I am sure that all of us are not happy to see the charges that the people have had to be faced with.

On the other hand, as we discussed very fully with respect to this whole matter during my Estimates debate, the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company is under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Board, not under the jurisdiction of my Ministry or this Legislature. The PUB is not responsible to me, it only reports to the Legislature through me. It's an arm's length relationship that it has with this Legislature, and unless members want to change that relationship, I am not in a position to force them to do anything. They have made a decision in this regard and their decision is appealable only to the courts.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Minister is ducking responsibility. Can the Minister acknowledge that when indeed circumstances are normal, during a period when there is not a strike, that the company indeed does provide this service free of charge even if there is vandalism involved?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, as I have stated on a number of occasions in the House, if that service was provided and to whatever extent it was provided in the past, it is not something that is required of the Gas Company under their relationship with the Public Utilities Board. The Public Utilities Board have sought opinion on this from their counsel, I am informed, and they are of the opinion that the matter was a service that was provided under a customer relations policy, and is not something that they are legally obliged to provide. The Public Utilities Board, as I repeat, has made a decision to this effect.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, is the Minister then indicating to this House that the application by Winnipeg Gas to the Public Utilities Board does not provide for the provision of a service such as this? Is

the Minister then indicating that during normal times this service is simply provided gratuitously on the part of the company and now, because there is a strike, that they have every right to discontinue this kind of free service because, according to the Minister, the service is not included within the original application?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, as I've said before, the matter is not covered by the relationship between the Gas Company and the Public Utilities Board and they are not in a position, as I understand it, to require the Gas Company to provide this service at the present time.

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

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Community Services, I'd like to ask the question to the Acting Minister. If the reports we have are factual, there exists a situation that borders on scandalous, and I'm referring to children that have to walk for miles to get a decent meal, or a meal. Would the Minister be ready to do something positive immediately; that is, either re-open the school during the weekend until there is an investigation to see if these students have parents, and if their parents are fulfilling their obligation or what is wrong? I mean something positive, I hope it's not going to be monitoring; monitoring would have the same effect at this time when people are starving, if it's factual I said, as Nero fiddling while Rome burned.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice for the Honourable Minister of Community Services who I expect will be here shortly.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct another question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and also to the Minister under whom the Public Utility Act legislation falls insofar as jurisdiction is concerned. The Minister had previously indicated that the Gas Company is responsible up to the meter and not beyond. Can the Minister tell us where the connection of service is, before the meter or after the meter?

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

**MR. FILMON:** I'm not sure which service the member is referring to, Mr. Speaker, perhaps he could clarify it.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to the fact that people have had, by some misadventure, their service cut off, and is the reinstallation of that service something that takes place before the meter or after the meter, and if it is before the meter, does the Minister's previous statement that the Gas Company is responsible to see to it that the service is supplied up to the point of the meter, does that

still hold, and will he inquire from the Public Utility Board whether this is something for which the Gas Company would be responsible in accordance with definitions that he previously gave the House?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, the portion of the service connection upon which the Gas Company has jurisdiction and upon which it operated was on its side of the meter. The other action, which the independent contractors were called on to take, was on the other side of the meter, the side for which the Gas Company is not responsible according to the Act.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, that's indeed what the Minister told us previously, and now I'm asking him whether the reconnection of the service takes place before the meter or after the meter? I would also ask the Minister at the same time to see whether now is not the appropriate time for him to go, because he probably would have more influence, to the Minister of Labour and ask that there be an industrial inquiry into a dispute, not for the purpose of having the dispute settled, but for determining whether or not the consumers of the Province of Manitoba, for whom he is also supposed to have some concern, are being in some way unfairly treated, due to this particular industrial dispute? Will he use his influence on the Minister of Labour to see whether the public can be better informed of the facts which are currently in dispute?

**MR. FILMON:** In response to the first part of the member's question, Mr. Speaker, the shutoff occurred on the Gas Company's side of the meter. I can confirm that. I think, Mr. Speaker, there's no question that it's both shocking and reprehensible that this kind of action by vandals would take place in the midst of an industrial dispute, knowing that the Gas Company is not in a position to do anything about the situation because of the current industrial dispute. But at the same time, I acknowledge that it would be better for all sides if the strike could be settled.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Community Services how he can explain his acceding to the north office of the Income Securities Branch being located in the basement at 600 Main Street since the fire took place last January, when even temporary quarters ought to be habitable and not stuck in a basement without proper facilities?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to advise the honourable member that new quarters have been leased at 1790 Main Street to accommodate the services that were formerly located where the fire occurred.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister didn't answer my question, which is how he could not have been sure to find temporary quarters

that were of a more suitable nature, or acceptable, and probably according to standards. May I also ask him whether the address he gave is not very much at the north end of the district, way into West Kildonan and therefore accessible to the inner core, which is part of the north area, except by fairly long bus rides? Is that not a correct location he's just given us?

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding this was the closest location that we could get to rent at the present time and I'm not too sure whether or not some of the services that are presently being carried on in the one location on Main Street might be interchanged, but I'll have to take the question as notice.

We may have further information I might say, Mr. Speaker, when we deal with our Estimates this afternoon, because we will be on the Social Security portion of the Estimates.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the member how long it will take to locate there and whether having it done that, it precludes any possibility of an office being made available much closer to the center of the district, such as a bank building I know that has been vacant for a long time at Bannerman and Main, or even further south at Dufferin and Main, and will that then be the one office that will serve the western end of the area, as well as all the way up to the CPR tracks?

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice and we'll have the information for him at the time we deal with it in our Estimates. I understand we're not going into Estimates this afternoon, so then I would presume it will be tomorrow.

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister is back, I'd like to ask a question. I indicate that I was quite concerned with the report that some of the students had to walk for miles to get a meal, and I wanted to know, I'm asking the Minister if he's ready to do something positive, such as maybe open the schools immediately to make sure that during the weekends these kids get meals, decent meals, while an investigation is going on to see if they have any parents and what the parents are doing? I wanted to make it clear, and I made it clear earlier, that I wasn't referring when I said something positive, I wasn't talking about monitoring, but do something immediately while monitoring and investigating is taking place.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**MR. MINAKER:** I was, like the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, concerned when I read the article that has appeared in today's newspaper and not suggesting that all of the items reported in the newspaper are correct. I would like to advise the

honourable member that I've been in contact with the Director of Child Welfare to have CAS Winnipeg Director contact the individual making the statements that this was occurring, to find out the names of the children that he says are having to walk to the soup line on the weekends, and if necessary to go down to these locations on the weekends to point out the particular children.

Mr. Speaker, I was quite surprised as late as last Monday of this week, our Director of Child Welfare was in contact with the Director of Children's Aid Society, Winnipeg, who advised us that the referral mechanism is still in place, which was put in place between the Salvation Army and the Children's Aid Society, if in case what the Director of Nutrition said was happening, that the Salvation Army would contact the Children's Aid Society immediately to advise that children were standing in line.

To my knowledge, to date nothing serious like has been indicated in the report has occurred, because we have been confirmed that referral mechanism is in place and communication is close between the Salvation Army, as well as the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg.

Further to that, I asked the Director of Child Welfare to contact Rossbrook House in case some of these children that have been referred to are going to Rossbrook House rather than the Salvation Army.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer and I am pleased to see that he is concerned; I never doubted for a minute, but my question went further than that. I'm not interested at this time to see if there's too much red tape or somebody from the Children's Aid Society is saying that this is exaggerated, or to find out the fault or something, if something wasn't done that the Minister had ordered.

I am suggesting that while this is being done, and there's no point in taking chances on that, that maybe certain schools should be opened for the next weekend or so to make sure that these people do not go hungry. I want to admit that the information I had was only in reading the paper today, and my concern is that there seemed to be an awful lot; even if half of that was true I think it would warrant positive action from the Minister immediately while the investigation is going on.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I am awaiting a report back from the Director of Child Welfare, which I expect to get today or first thing tomorrow morning, with regard to what in fact is happening at the Salvation Army and Rossbrook House, and will make any necessary decision at that time if there are children that are being affected, as is suggested.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that we have programs available for parents of these children, the CRISP program, which will give them \$30.00 a month per child, if in fact, it's an income problem. If it's not an income problem, then we have counselling available to parents to provide them with home economists or even counselling and guidance on how to budget their particular income that they have, or if they're on welfare they should have adequate funding.

Now if they are not following through with these particular programs and the parents aren't looking after their children, then the last resort would be

obviously to sit down with the family and Children's Aid Society and maybe, under contract, help the parents out in looking after their children. We hope that that would not be necessary.

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the last resort would be sitting down with these people, but doesn't the Minister agree that the first resort, make sure that these people get fed before anything else is done? Mr. Speaker, the Minister is talking about CRISP and another \$30.00. Isn't it a fact that this is not going to mean much, because some of this will be deducted or charged as a revenue when you calculated the Welfare Program? Isn't that counted as a revenue, before you deal with Welfare?

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, in indicating that CRISP was available, I was pointing out that there shouldn't be any need for children to be going in our city for the need of food with the programs that are in place, if it's a low income family or if the family is on welfare. There obviously is another problem, a social problem, with the family, and we, Mr. Speaker, believe that the responsibility of looking after children is still with the parents and we will do everything within our power to make sure that the parent has the opportunity to look after their child properly. If that fails, I would hate to see us have to go into a full-scale nutrition program in schools to look after children when it primarily is the responsibility of the parents of the children and we have programs in place which will assist those parents to look after their children.

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

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Community Services. Could the Minister assure a constituent of mine, whose child was promised a bicycle for a birthday present valued somewhat in excess of \$100, that the acceptance of that bicycle will not be deducted from the mother's welfare allowance?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I'm confident that it will not be deducted.

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

**MS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Health. Expressing appreciation for the capital programs that have been outlined at the time of Estimates and the news releases, I'm wondering where there appears a description of the building program that is supposed to start at the municipal hospitals this summer.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** It doesn't appear in the capital program for this year, Mr. Speaker. What is under way at the municipal hospitals right now constituted a program that was undertaken last year and announced last year, but the major renovation program that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is referring to was not included in the capital program announced for 1981-82; it is still under consideration, Mr. Speaker.

**MS. WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, the board and administration believe it's starting this summer and I wonder if the Minister can comment on the expected service building behind the Princess Elizabeth for which a zoning variation was being heard last night. I don't know the outcome of the zoning variation but the understanding is that that was to be constructed this summer.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I'll have to check on the precise details, but it's my recollection that renovation of what was formerly a nurses residence, which is still a very structurally-sound building on the municipal hospitals campus, was part of last year's program and that is proceeding. I thought the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge was referring to the very laudable ambition, which I know she has and which I share, for a major, multi-million dollar redevelopment of the municipals, possibly including the construction of a personal care home on the municipal hospitals' grounds. That program has not been approved yet, but I would like to have the opportunity, in the next 24 hours, to check on the specifics of what she has just asked me about.

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

**MS. WESTBURY:** It becomes curiouser and curiouser, Mr. Speaker. In looking into this, I wonder if the Minister could also look into the report that I've had that the renovations to the nurses residence have been cancelled and instead there's to be a renovation to the King George Hospital, accompanied by this new service building behind the Princess Elizabeth that's to be the first stage of \$2.5 million building program.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm any of that at this moment, but I will take it as notice and attempt to report on it very quickly.

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

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Can the Minister advise whether he has yet determined if the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company is including repair servicing and other normal operational charges such as meter reading costs in the estimated billings which are now being sent to their customers? In this regard, I would remind him that the Public Utility Board takes all the company's operational costs into consideration prior to the setting of their rate.

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

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated during my Estimates review, the rates that are currently charged by the Gas Company are based on the 1979 actual costs of the company, and do not assume any future additional costs. They are only based on previous costs, not future costs.

**MR. CORRIN:** I wish to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that the meter readers are also out on strike at Greater Winnipeg Gas and ask whether the Minister will ask the Public Utility Board to impose an appropriate estimate formula which will govern the gas company's current practice of estimating customers' billings during the duration of this strike?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, if anyone disputes the estimated charges they are checked out and physically read at the meter to ensure that they are correct.

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

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister whether he will ask the Public Utility Board to conduct an inquiry in order to ascertain whether the Gas Company is inadvertently overcharging customers, and if so, whether their rates should be temporarily reduced to reflect their lower operational costs during the strike?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, again we discussed that thoroughly under my Estimates review and the Public Utilities Board has its consultants reviewing matters on a daily basis with the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company to ensure that they are not over-estimating charges during the present circumstances.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question as well is to the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs, or the Minister who should be responsible for Consumer Affairs, and I'd ask the Minister what action he recommends to those individuals who have signed the petition which was presented to his office yesterday in respect to dealing with the outstanding costs which they had to pay as a result of the disruption of the gas service to their facilities?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier in today's question period, I have not yet made any recommendation to those people.

**MR. COWAN:** Well, I would hope that the Minister would be able to make, in general terms, a statement as to what action persons, who feel aggrieved by this particular strike, should take in respect to payments which they have to make which they would not have to make had the strike not been on. My question to the Minister therefore is, can he provide us with a general statement in respect to concerns which are brought forward to him, not only by these individuals but by all individuals in respect to the payments which they are forced to pay because of the strike, which would normally be given to them by Greater Winnipeg Gas?

**MR. FILMON:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I think that one word answer says a lot more than the Minister intended it to say.

My final question to the Minister, and I'd like to give him an opportunity to answer a question that was given to him by the Honourable Member for Inkster, and that is: Is he prepared now to use whatever influence he may have to call upon the Minister of Labour and other members of the Cabinet, in order to encourage them and in order to help them come forward with some course of action, which might provide a breakthrough in this particular labour-management dispute and that is, the calling of an industrial inquiry? Is he prepared to carry that message forward to the Minister of Labour at this time?

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take the member's suggestion under advisement and discuss it with my colleagues.

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

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for St. Johns, in the process of asking a question, stated that the per pupil operating expenditures for the Transcona-Springfield School Division were the lowest in Metro Winnipeg, and at that time, Mr. Speaker, I took exception with the statement and said I would provide accurate information today.

I have that information for the honourable member and contrary to his statement, the lowest per pupil expenditure is not Transcona-Springfield, Mr. Speaker, it is Seine River at \$2,395 expenditure per pupil. Transcona-Springfield is not the second lowest, Mr. Speaker, Assiniboine South is at \$2,404.00. It is not the third lowest, Mr. Speaker, St. James-Assiniboia is at \$2,405 per pupil. It is not the fourth lowest, Mr. Speaker, River East is at \$2,420.00. It is the fifth lowest, Mr. Speaker, at \$2,430.00.

These figures are based on the budgets submitted by the school divisions to my department, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the information given by the Honourable Minister of Education, which is in contradiction to the information given to us by the Transcona School Division and he must be aware of that.

I wonder if he is prepared to give us the correlation between the figures prepared by Transcona, which he must have, and the figures which he has given us now, to indicate whether there's a difference in approach as to what the amount is. Or is he prepared to state that the information given to us by Transcona was an absolute lie?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of what particular information the Member for St. Johns may have received. The only possible confusion that could

exist here perhaps is in the area of total cost per pupil. Perhaps that —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would like those figures, he'll find that Transcona-Springfield is in sixth place.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the hilarity that is caused by the fact that we received figures from Transcona that were not as the Minister says, I am still asking him if he is prepared to give us an explanation, which he must have, of the difference in the figures stated to us, which caused me no embarrassment, because I didn't prepare them, and to explain that on the basis, Mr. Speaker, that we were informed in caucus that the Transcona School Division had come from a meeting with the Minister, had presented him with the same information they presented to us. That being the case, the Minister obviously must know the figures they gave to us, and must have the good sense and the knowledge to be able to explain the differential. If he can't, then we will ask Transcona to do that as well. But let me again ask the Minister to give us that understanding, so that we could be as knowledgeable as he is on the figures given to us by the Transcona School Division, whose integrity I have no reason to doubt.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned these figures are based on the school board budgets that are submitted to my department. I have every reason to believe that these are the most correct and accurate figures that are available. I have no way of knowing the figures that the honourable member is quoting from and perhaps he should check them rather carefully before he undertakes to quote.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the statement I quoted was directly given by the Transcona School Division and contained in a brief, as I understand it, which was red coloured and I don't know whether it was rejected because of its colour by the Minister, whether or not he needs me to send him a copy of what was given to us in order for him to have the courtesy, rather than calling the Transcona School Division liars in their statement, to have the courtesy . . .

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the statement I made was directly given to us by the Transcona School Division and reported to the Minister in almost the same words, is the Minister prepared to give us the correlation between what the Transcona School Division told us, and I assume him, and what he has told us, so that we could understand the method in which there is a difference in their calculations, so as to understand why Transcona said what they did and why the Minister said what he did?

Now is that too difficult a question for the Minister to handle?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, it's a very easy question. I suggest to the honourable member that

he go back and do his homework and ask Transcona-Springfield who obviously provided him with the figures, how they arrived at their figures.

I have just given him the correct figures.

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

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, would like to ask a question of the Minister of Education. Mr. Speaker, the government announced a short while ago that moneys would be made available for the expansion of the School of Music at the Brandon University. My question to the Minister is this, are these moneys that have been referred to in addition to those monies that were pledged and earmarked by the previous New Democratic Party Government?

In other words, are these dollars in addition to the \$600,000 set aside, plus the \$500,000, special 75th Anniversary gift for Brandon University, which was made available on a matching basis, for a potential total of \$1.6 million.

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

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, we haven't found any money that was earmarked, set aside or sitting in any special fund, for that particular purpose, but we have provided in this year's budget for the addition to the School of Music to take place.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I would hope the Minister will look again, because there were funds set aside for this purpose. I would like to ask the Minister then a supplementary question. Can the Minister advise now, approximately how many dollars, what amount of money will be made available to the Brandon University so that it can now begin to plan for a possible expansion of their School of Music?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I don't have the exact figures with me. I'd be quite prepared to go into that in my Estimates with the Honourable Member for Brandon East. Adequate funds are provided to put that particular addition in place.

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

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary then, can the Minister assure the House that these moneys will be made available in sufficient time that construction may start on this facility more or less forthwith, certainly within the current calendar year?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, there is no problem from our point of view. I understand Brandon University is rethinking the type of structure and so on that they may require there and that has been holding up the process to a certain extent.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Economic Development and ask him whether he can confirm

that the provincial economy is in a state of stagnation as measured in a record number of corporate bankruptcies in 1980, which is double the previous year and the highest in the last decade?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. J. FRANKLIN JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** There seems to be some confusion among people across Canada who is the worst, Mr. Speaker. Our economy is not in stagnation except in the hopeful minds of the members opposite who want it that way. Mr. Speaker, we are in the middle of Canada as far as bankruptcies are concerned when you take the average of 10,000 businesses.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, is the Minister seriously suggesting that the 154 registered bankruptcies in Manitoba in the past year are a figment of the imagination of the directors of those companies?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** I would just say that the Leader of the NDP in Ontario was making the same type of statement and lost 12 seats.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that on the average of 10,000 businesses we're right in about the middle. It shouldn't be that high. We have had circumstances that have caused bankruptcies across Canada, but also in Manitoba certain circumstances that have contributed to a higher number of bankruptcies. The percentage of increase has been the same as it has been in other years, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker there are, "none so blind as will not see."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also ask the Minister whether he can confirm that there is a record number of personal or consumer bankruptcies in the province which are up some 20 to 25 times over a decade ago? Is that also a figment of the imagination of those people, or is it a figment of the imagination of the Minister?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** No, it isn't a figment of the imagination, Mr. Speaker, and upon checking on those particular bankruptcies, the largest majority of them are caused by marriage breakups, which are at the highest level they have ever been.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The time for question period has expired, we'll proceed with Orders of the Day.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, firstly, I might indicate that after Community Services and Corrections outside the House, the Department of Natural Resources will follow Community Services. Inside the House, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy and

Mines will be away on Monday and Tuesday on government business and should his estimates not be completed, and should we go into estimates in the House, then the Department of Education would be in the House on either Monday or Tuesday or both days.

Mr. Speaker, would you call second reading of Bill No. 36, then Bill Nos. 11, 27, and 29.

## SECOND READING GOVERNMENT BILLS

### BILL NO. 36 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE SECURITIES ACT

**MR. FILMON** presented Bill No. 36, An Act to amend The Securities Act for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill No. 36 seeks to amend The Securities Act in two minor ways, Mr. Speaker. The act presently provides for an exemption from registration under The Manitoba Securities Act of two types of trades; firstly, the issue by a company of its securities as a stock dividend or other distribution from earnings, and a distribution by a company which is incidental to a bona fide reorganization or winding up of the company.

One of the proposed amendments would add a third category of exemption within that clause. This exemption would cover the issue and distribution of a company's securities resulting from the exercise of a right to purchase, convert or exchange granted to the holder at the time he acquired the initial security.

Although the act presently does not specifically exempt this third category of trades, Mr. Speaker, it was the general practise to treat them as exempt trades. When the conversion feature or right to purchase was granted pursuant to a prospectus filed with the commission, it was generally considered that the subsequent conversion was covered by the receipt issue. However, . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** If honourable members wish to carry on private conversations, I would hope they would do it elsewhere; either that or tone their voices down. It is very difficult to hear.

The Honourable Minister may continue.

**MR. FILMON:** However, Mr. Speaker, because Bill No. 72, specifically exempts these transactions, doubt has arisen as to whether or not they are exempt under the present act. The proposed amendment would therefore remove any such doubt.

The second amending clause, Mr. Speaker, the amendments to Section 81, extend the types of conditions that an offer could attach to a takeover bid that would entitle him to decide not to take up and pay for the securities that had been deposited pursuant to the takeover bid.

Under the present sub-clause 81(11)(b) the offerer can withdraw his bid if the board of directors of the offeree company takes any action subsequent to the date of the takeover bid, which materially changes the undertaking assets or capital of the offeree company.

The amendments broaden this clause to include directors or senior officers of the company. The amendment also provides for additional rights of withdrawal if there is any prior undisclosed action by the offeree company, or secondly, if there is any undisclosed action prior to and any action subsequent to the date of a take-over bid by a person or company other than the offerer, including a governmental or regulatory agency; and thirdly, if the required approval of a governmental or regulatory agency is not obtained prior to the expiration of the officer.

This amendment also allows for an extension of 90 days of the time in which the offer could take up and pay for shares where governmental or regulatory authority is required for the take-over bid.

The above proposed amendments, Mr. Speaker, adopt provisions that are already in effect under The Securities Act of Ontario. Without these amendments take-over bids made pursuant to the Ontario provisions are contrary to the present Act. Therefore, they are required to ensure compatibility with other provinces.

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

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** I beg to move, seconded by The Honourable Member for St. Vital that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 11, An Act to Amend the Municipal Assessment Act, standing in the name of The Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 27, an Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act, standing in the name of The Honourable Member for St. George. (Stand)

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 29, an Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act (2), standing in the name of The Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** I move, Mr. Speaker, 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. That's Interim Supply, Mr. Speaker.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Interim Supply with the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair.

### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY INTERIM SUPPLY

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden):** Call the Committee to order. The Resolution before the Committee is Interim Supply.

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$673,466,010, being 30 percent of the amount of the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st day of

March, 1982, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1982.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, we now have an additional situation with respect to the Minister for Consumer Affairs and the Minister of Labour relative to the industrial dispute affecting the provision of essential services now enfranchised to a company which has monopoly control over the distribution of the service. Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt that members on this side by their questions and in debate, have tried to bring to the attention of the Minister for Consumer Affairs and the Minister of Labour the unique characterization of this dispute.

It is not a labour dispute which simply involves an employer and an employee arguing about the amount of wages that shall be due and payable. In this case we have on the one hand a company which is in a unique situation with respect to the dispute, namely that it is the only provider of the service and that it has an exclusive franchise for the provision of the service. The question as to whether or not the employees are being reasonable or the employers are being reasonable is not, I submit, an issue. That's something that has to be resolved between the parties.

What is an issue, Mr. Chairman, is whether or not the company's unique position enables it to take advantage of a situation which cannot normally be taken advantage of by an employer, and we have brought to the attention of both Ministers on numerous occasions, the fact that the company could be in a position of saving money on the dispute and that indeed it has stopped providing services to its customers which were normally provided. Both the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Consumer Affairs have in the past, indicated that this may be an unsatisfactory situation but they hope it will go away. Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose to some extent, and although it certainly won't disappear completely, the dispute is perhaps hoped by these Ministers will go away with the arrival of sunshine and warm weather in which case the Gas Company, I suppose, will be under less pressure to solve this dispute.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have consistently said that I don't want the government intervening in this free collective bargaining situation but sometimes, Mr. Chairman, — and I submit that this is one of the cases where intervention takes place by omission and by an abdication of responsibility — and in this case the government has certainly abdicated its responsibility in two essential areas, Mr. Chairman.

First of all they have taken no steps whatsoever, indeed they have equivocated suggested that they might take steps then suggested that the steps are illegal — which I submit they are not and if they were they could be made legal — that they have intervened by not using governmental authority to deal with the provision of a service which the Gas Company has provided and which was part of their expenses when they established their rates. That, Mr. Chairman, is an intervention in the dispute.

The second intervention, Mr. Chairman, is the omission to have an Industrial Inquiry Commission look to see what is happening. If the Minister will look at the powers of an Industrial Inquiry



Commission, he'll see that it has no power whatsoever to require either the employer or the employee to agree to any terms and conditions of employment, and I agree with that. An Industrial Inquiry Commission has no power to require one party or the other to abandon their free collective bargaining position, but an Industrial Inquiry Commission, Mr. Chairman, would tell the people of this province two things, whether in fact the Gas Company is gaining dollars by this dispute at the expense of citizens of the Province of Manitoba who they are supposed to serve.

I have heard the President of the Gas Company or one of their officials get on television and say it's costing them more. We have indicated in the House that if they don't have to pay their maintenance staff and they don't pay the private contractors who they normally hire, they would be saving money. If they are saving money on the dispute then the only way we will know it is not by listening to what the Labour Union says, not by listening to what the company says, by actually getting out the figures, and the only way that can be obtained is through an Industrial Inquiry and an Industrial Inquiry, Mr. Chairman, then need not intervene in the dispute but it certainly can pass laws as to what the citizens are entitled to expect from the provision of an essential service to which the state has granted a monopoly. The Minister of Consumer Affairs has in effect said that the government can do nothing; that the Public Utility Board is an independent organization, that it makes its own decisions and the government cannot influence them.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that is only a superficial assessment of what has occurred. Is the Minister really saying that the Public Utility Board and the laws and the franchise to the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company, that there is no control over them? That this is solely in the hands of the Public Utility Board? That nothing can be done? Because if the Minister is saying that, he is saying that there is an entrenched statute of rights for the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company, and that it's the Public Utility Board that will make the decision and the Legislature can't do anything.

I thought that the members on the other side don't agree with such an entrenched position. Surely here is an opportunity for them to say not what the situation is, but what the situation should be, and that's what legislators should be doing, Mr. Chairman. If they recognize that a situation has occurred which is not in accordance with what represents their view of the good and welfare of society, they should change it. Unfortunately, today we do not have an entrenched Bill of Rights that prevents you from changing it.

But the Minister takes the position that he's entrenched, that the Legislature can do nothing, that this has been abdicated, that all authority, all powers so to speak, is in the hands of the Public Utility Board, and no matter what they do the Minister can do nothing.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that is not the case. An Industrial Inquiry Commission could provide the Minister with the facts as to whether the company has taken advantage of this situation. There has been reference to vandalism. I don't know whether this cutoff of power resulted in vandalism; I don't

know what allusions are being made, Mr. Chairman. I do know that once I represented a trade union in court and tacks were strewn on the street in front of the company premises, and the lawyer for the company got up and said that the union threw tacks on the street, and not a word was said, Mr. Chairman, by the court before whom we were sitting. The statement was accepted.

When my turn came, I got up and said, the company has thrown tacks on the street, and everybody objected. They said, how can you make such a statement? I said, my lords, I make that statement with the same authority as the lawyer for the employer who said that the union threw tacks on the street, and I was put the question. Well, Mr. Green, but who is benefiting from this? I said, my lords, if we are determining who is benefiting from it, then my case is much stronger, because who is suggesting that the tacks on the street are put by the union and therefore seeking a benefit from that particular event? Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how this vandalism occurred. But I would like the Minister to use means available to him, which are not available to me, to find out.

The second thing that the government has done to intervene in this strike, they have intervened in this strike by an act of omission, and the act of omission has been the act of the Minister of Labour refusing to call an Industrial Inquiry Commission under the guise of non-interference in the dispute. The naming of an Industrial Inquiry Commission is not an intervention in the dispute.

There have been Industrial Inquiry Commissions appointed and I'll name one, it was even a judicial inquiry, the Tritschler Inquiry was appointed, the previous Roblin administration got — I will put into quotation marks — "facts" but it never affected the dispute. The parties to the dispute were left to commence a continued collective bargaining and to solve their problem. As a matter of fact the Industrial Inquiry, Mr. Chairman, came after the strike was settled. Was that not a fact? The Member for Kildonan will probably remember. The Industrial Inquiry was set up and was in the process of being set up and the employees settled the dispute, but the Industrial Inquiry went ahead.

This Industrial Inquiry, Mr. Chairman, is necessary whether or not the dispute is settled, and in my view will not really assist in the settlement of the dispute. What we may find, and what I suspect that we will find, is that as a result of an Industrial Inquiry the Minister would or should come in with corrective legislation to make sure that the Gas Company cannot avoid its responsibility by suggesting that the employees are on strike and therefore the service that is still available to you through private people, shall be paid for by yourself rather than by the people who have an exclusive franchise for the provision of this service.

So in summary, Mr. Chairman, I'm suggesting to both Ministers, who unfortunately are not here, but there are Ministers here and the Attorney-General is a good man to carry forth this message, that an Industrial Inquiry into this particular dispute is probably more justified than an Industrial Inquiry into any other dispute that ever took place. I will, Mr. Chairman, indicate what I believe the terms of reference of such an inquiry should be and it has

nothing to do with the terms and conditions of employment.

1. Is the gas company during the occurrence of the strike, requiring its consumers to pay charges which were previously charged, which were previously paid by the Gas Company itself, with reference to services which had been provided by the Gas Company and which were included in the amounts that were shown as expenses in the submission made by the Gas Company to the Public Utility Board when they obtained their rate increases? That should be the first term of reference.

2. Can witnesses be found who will be able to deal with those questions which arose during the strike, relating to what the Minister refers to as vandalism without any evidence on his part, with respect to vandalism — and there was a second malfunction at one of the facilities some weeks ago — is there evidence obtainable as to how these things occurred so that there will be not an unfair innuendo about how they occurred?

3. Is the present legislation sufficient to see to it that consumers who are tied to this exclusive provision of service, is the present legislation satisfactory to see to it that they continue to get the service?

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me also point out that whether it is good or bad, and I'm not going to go into that question at the moment, whether it is good or bad the Gas Company is not going to lose by being required to pay for those services that they previously paid for. They have a captive audience and they will add it to the bills. Ultimately it's going to be paid for by the consumers in any event. Who are being treated unfairly are those consumers who happen to need that individual service, because they won't get their money back; the Gas Company will get its money back; each of the people who buy gas will probably have to pay for whatever services are provided; the Gas Company will add it to its account and it will be spread out amongst the consumers of Winnipeg, but that won't repay the person who had to pay \$90 or \$50 or \$25 for that individual service.

So if this comes as some type of an attack on the financial position of the gas company, it doesn't. I make this as a criticism of the very scandalous way in which the gas company has behaved, not essentially to its employees. The employees when they go on strike they know that they could be out for a long time. The gas company has essentially copped out or double-crossed the consumer, and they are using that consumer as a patsy to assist it in an industrial dispute.

So, Mr. Chairman, I've given three terms of reference — I see that the Minister is now here — I will try briefly to indicate that an Industrial Inquiry Commission has no effect or, I want to not exaggerate, need not and legally does not affect the rights of the parties with respect to the dispute.

I indicated earlier that the Brandon Packers Industrial Inquiry came after the dispute was settled. What we are interested in, from the point of view of an industrial inquiry, which I consider the failure to set up as being an omission and an intervention in the strike by the government, on behalf of the employer. The Minister is shaking his head and disagrees with me, I didn't expect otherwise, Mr. Chairman, but that's what I consider it to be and I'm

suggesting that, whether I am right or wrong, the Minister can't answer any more than he can answer that the gas was cut off by means of vandalism.

The way in which these questions will be answered is not by asking the chairman of the gas company; not by asking people to give innuendoes as to how it occurred; but by setting up a commission which will have the power of subpoena and the power to gather evidence. Mr. Chairman, I have absolutely no guarantee, indeed I don't have much optimism, that this will cause a settlement of the strike. The strike will probably be settled when the normal forces of collective bargaining take their place, which are not taking place at the present time, because from the surface, and I submit that the surface speaks loud and clear, the employer is using a preferred position granted to them by this government to not settle that strike.

So the third term of reference, and I go back to it and I gave the first two, is the present legislation satisfactory and can an Industrial Inquiry Commission make recommendations, not with respect to strikes in the gas industry, but how the consumer is to be protected for the continued deliverance of a service when there is a problem of this kind.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister softened up just a little bit. He said he will consider it and, if I could have got the floor again, I was going to stop using him as a conduit pipe. I wanted to go back to the Minister of Labour who is not here and say, okay Minister of Labour, you've been saying that this publicity is going to do a good job; this publicity is going to be used by the union to end the strike; and that my questions were very valuable in this connection.

Now he will realize that my questions did not have the value that he attributed to him; now he's no longer going to rely on me or any other member in this House who wants to ask a question; now he's going to rely on the elected representatives of the people who have formed a government, that majority group, to do what they can, Mr. Chairman, not to end the dispute, but to enquire into the special circumstances of the dispute. Mr. Chairman, I say that if ever an Industrial Inquiry Commission was warranted this is the case and I ask the Minister, not merely to consider it but to move positively to have such a step taken.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** I hadn't planned, Mr. Chairman, to join this discussion or debate, but I think that it's one that merits the attention of all members. It's one, as the Member for Inkster has said, that certainly in this afternoon's question period warranted considerable interest on the part of a variety of members on the Opposition side.

I don't, Mr. Chairman, agree with the premise of the Member for Inkster, relative to the endowment of special status on this particular employer. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is, within the law of this province, adequate protection to assure that Greater Winnipeg Gas Company will not enjoy special privilege during times of labour dispute. And I'm referring, as I did, Mr. Chairman, during the course of my questions in the question period, to The Public Utilities Board Act. Mr. Chairman, there are

provisions in that Act which allow the board to make either partial or interim or permanent orders which, in effect, will govern the rate structure which sets the price at which the gas company can sell its product.

I want to talk a bit about this and I want to elaborate a bit about this, Mr. Chairman, because I think it's worthy of consideration and this is the point that I tried to make during question period today. I would suggest that there is no need for an industrial inquiry because the Minister simply can ask the Public Utilities Board to enquire into all the circumstances that are now pertaining, that are flowing from the strike situation. And the Public Utilities Board, upon making the necessary inquiries — I'm referring specifically, Mr. Chairman, to Section 44 and 45 of the Act — can make orders which will ameliorate the situation that is currently existing with respect to the possible profiteering — I don't like to use that word, because it may be that it's inadvertent — but certainly can ameliorate the situation that the Member for Inkster is concerned and justifiably concerned about. I think it's a concern that's shared, I would hope, by all Members in the Chamber.

There is substantial evidence, Mr. Chairman, to indicate that the gas company is making a profit, and I say that because of course, at the last rate review hearing the operational costs of the company were taken into consideration, as is prescribed by the regulations in the Act, in the course of deliberations on the subject. So the Minister if he believes that such things as meter reading charges and repair costs and so on are not taken into consideration when the rate is set, is simply in error. And I tell him that in a respectful way because, Mr. Chairman, he should be fully aware and be fully apprised of the circumstances by which and through which the Public Utilities Board deliberates and makes decisions. So the Member for Inkster, Mr. Chairman, is quite correct, and it should be noted.

I suppose my concern, if I was to specify an emphasis, Mr. Chairman, would be not only with the current imbalance with respect to the labour dispute, and that I think has been quite adequately dealt with by the Member for Inkster, but also the position of the consumer during the course of the dispute because you know, Mr. Chairman, it's one thing I suppose for the government to say as a matter of philosophy that they don't want to get involved in the labour dispute, that they don't want to try and intermediate or conciliate the differences between the parties, I don't know, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Member for Inkster is right, perhaps this government has a sort of bias in favour of the employer. It would appear on the evidence at this point that may well be the case because the government seems completely unwilling to take any affirmative action that we would remedy the current imbalance between the parties. But more important, Mr. Chairman, or equally important, they are not doing anything to ameliorate the lot of the consumers who are being affected by the strike. There are well over 100,000 households I believe in the City of Winnipeg who use that particular utility service and during the course of this strike over the past — I guess it's about eight weeks now, it must be approximately two months we have had this strike, that's a long time — we've had a situation arise where there haven't been any meter

readings, the meter readers are out, so that people are being sent guesstimated or estimated bills.

Now, as I understand it, there is a formula that also prescribes how estimated bills are to be calculated but when the Public Utilities Board determined that subject when they deliberated on the question of estimated bill formulas, they never contemplated a strike situation. That wasn't on the table before the board. They were thinking in terms of normal business practices; they were thinking in terms of the concern of the utility about the rising costs of affecting meter readings every month. I believe — and I'm subject to correction if I'm wrong — that they were given an order that allows them to estimate the bill over a two-month period so that they don't have to do a monthly reading. So it's really every other two months they have to do a reading, I think that's how it works.

But I draw members' attention to the fact that we have a situation where people are being asked — and I have received at least a few calls on this subject from irate constituents — consumers are being asked to pay estimated billings that are not necessarily in accordance with the real operational costs that are being borne by the utility. Now some of the people that have phoned me have suggested as a matter of principle that they don't like that. I don't know, perhaps they are supportive of the employees; perhaps they feel that government or the utility should be more responsible. They feel that the utility shouldn't be allowed to profit as a result of a strike situation but be that as it may, Mr. Chairman. The fact is that if they don't pay within the prescribed payment period they are then penalized and are required to pay a penalty which I believe is now set at — and I'll just check my figures because I looked this up — 1.75 percent per month which is an extraordinarily high rate of interest.

So the customer who agrees with the Member for Inkster, or the customer, and I've had other phone calls from people who are in this other position, the customer who feels that the guesstimate is inordinately high and I've received calls from two senior citizens who have suggested that the estimated billings are simply out of line with the normal gas costs that are reflected in their meter-read billings, those people are put in an invidious position. If they don't pay their guesstimated bills on time, then a 1.75 percent per month penalty charge is levied against them and they are forced to even pay more.

Now I ask you, Mr. Chairman, is this just? In all fairness, is it just? Why should the consumer pay for the lack of attentiveness and responsibility of the utility? I suggest that they should have gone voluntarily back to the Public Utilities Board, realizing that they shouldn't profit from a strike situation, they should have volunteered to go back and had a revised rate hearing, but this is what we're facing. This is what our constituents are up against, so I think it's worthy of consideration.

I would suggest, as I suggested during the course of the question period, that the Minister has a responsibility to ask the Public Utilities Board to impose an appropriate formula which will govern estimated billings during the course of this strike. In doing so, I would hope that the Public Utilities Board would be asked that whatever formula is set, is set in

such a way that all profits that have accrued to the utility during the course of the strike action, would be recouped by the consumer. So if the strike lasts four months I would like to see an order rolling back prices that would extend for four months, notwithstanding when the strike actually ends. As the Member for Inkster has said, with the end of the heating season we don't know if and when it will end. So, Mr. Chairman, that's the first thing I've asked. I've asked that they look at those estimated billing formulas and they scrutinize them closely and evaluate whether or not they represent the true cost of delivering the gas with an additional increment for a fair profit.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I want to know whether there have been any advertent or inadvertent overcharges to the consumer and the Minister can ask the Public Utilities Board to enquire into that subject. I'm not one who is standing here shouting for an Industrial Inquiry and all that it entails, Mr. Chairman, I'm not asking that the government show favour to the union over the employer, but I'm asking the government to take steps to create a balance, not only between those two adversaries, but also as between the utility and the consumer, because in the long run for all I know the utility is able to take a profit of many hundreds of thousands of dollars per month at the cost of the poor consumer, and I suppose at the cost of the union if it's true, without any review of that. So what have we done? We're in fact, allowing the laws to be used inequitably to legislate an inordinate profit and to put an employer in an obviously superior position vis-a-vis the employee group. That's not right, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to think that we could convince all members, government members as well as the committed position of the opposition members, that that is simply untenable and intolerable. Reason dictates that the government has to do something so if they won't move on the Industrial Inquiry, Mr. Chairman, I suggest then they have to move on the Public Utility Board inquiry.

When the Minister stands in his place and suggests that Public Utility Board officials are daily monitoring practices, that's ludicrous. The Minister knows that the legislation prescribes a format for the board being able to do that. The board can't simply independently intervene. Somebody, some interested party must apply, must do something to set the wheels in motion. The Public Utility Board is not made up of legions of investigators and inspectors, Mr. Chairman, that's a sort of misrepresentation. It's made up of a few appointed persons from around the province who, when a matter is properly brought before them, are required to sit in review of certain subject matter and these matters under the legislation can be brought to the board's attention and we can compel, the public or the government can compel the Public Utilities Board to evaluate the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I fear to say that's not what's going to happen but rather the government is going to wait till the union's position is inexorably hopeless, when the heating season is completely terminated and the way the weather appears to be going, I guess one could suggest it could even be as early as May 1 this year — I should have said April 1, excuse me, April 1 — I look to government to be more affirmative.

Sometimes I think that I'm too repetitive in that respect because I know that I say that with respect to so many matters but it seems to me that it bears repetition.

I think government has a responsibility to act as a public advocate; I think government has a responsibility to try and not only conciliate interest but to balance interests in society, employee, employer, consumer; I think it's important the government play that sort of assertive and affirmative role. I think that's in keeping with simply the modern state of society. I think it's necessary the government perform that sort of responsibility but there seems to be a real entrenched reluctance on the part of this government to take that sort of position. I'm very disappointed.

Frankly, I would have thought with the change of Minister, we would have also seen an altered philosophical position vis-a-vis consumer, well, certainly consumer affairs. I was hoping that we would see a bit of a new wave; we would see a much more reform-oriented government Minister but that hope has not been realized. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I can say that we on this side are disappointed in the lack of diligence, the lack of aggressiveness, the lack of compassion because that I think is what, in the final analysis, is most moving as far as deficiency goes, the lack of compassion and humanity on the part of this government. I'm not — and it's a matter of record that the Member for Inkster and I often disagree — but with respect to this issue, there may be a difference in emphasis but it's very difficult to disagree when the member presses for strong government, when the member wants government to act. He's really just asking for responsible democratic government. It's pretty basic.

So, frankly I think the Minister of Consumer Affairs should have been in his Chair to respond. He listened to the Member for Inkster. He began to listen to my remarks and I suppose he became bored but I think it behooves him to participate in this sort of debate. There are over 100,000 homeowners who are involved. It's not just a question of several hundred employees and their families, it goes much further than that, Mr. Chairman. We're also talking about over 100,000 homeowners. So, today I just want to express my deep dissatisfaction with the approach of this government again and put on record the fact that the government has, with some degree of intransigence, once again refused to act on behalf of the people they purport to represent. Thank you very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. DAVID BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to just add a few words in this debate just to keep some balance on both sides of the House. I can't let them share all of the debate over on that side.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get into the debate of the last two speakers with the Gas Company, the workers and who is right and who is wrong. Just as an outsider looking at the situation, I think that the union representatives or the union leaders were doing a great disservice to their people by taking them out on strike at a particular time because they appear to have them in a box where it looks like a

no-win situation, and any union leader that would take his people out on strike over an issue such as that I don't think is being responsible to his membership. I'm not going to get into it because I'm not familiar with either side in the situation but it would seem to me just as an observer looking at some of the newspaper articles, that the workers aren't going to win very much by this particular strike. For that reason, I think it was an unwise move to take them out at this time. However, we'll leave that debate to those that are more involved.

Mr. Chairman, there have been quite a number of speakers so far on this particular issue and I hope I don't take long, but I was here the day the first two speakers opened debate. The Leader of the Opposition who among other things, said that I am going to speak about the issues of the economy and I'm going to discuss the lack of economic growth, job creation and the diminishing population in the Province of Manitoba among other things.

Well, the population of Manitoba doesn't appear to be diminishing. The latest statistics that have come forward indicate that the population has indeed increased in Manitoba but, Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition went to great lengths to carry out the job that he appears to be dedicated to do as Leader of the Opposition and that is to tear down the Province of Manitoba in order to discredit the government. The doom and gloom creatures on that side don't seem to get the message that there are a great number of good things in this province that should be supported and should be built upon. They're content to tear everything down whether it have some positive aspects or positive advantages to the people or whether it hasn't. The message that they got from the last election to the east of us, Mr. Chairman, should illustrate in no uncertain terms that particular tactic just is not going to get them elected in Manitoba to this side of the House. There has been no doubt in my mind about that in any case but the statistics, Mr. Chairman, bear down to the number of seats.

The weak link in the chain has indicated what the labour movement has done and the labour movement obviously didn't deliver too much of a vote to his party in Ontario. So the message is there, Mr. Chairman, that the people are proud of this province and they would like to hear about some of the good things and some of the things that can be built upon rather than have them tear everything down. —(Interjection)— The great statistician from Brandon East that is feeding his leader all this great information, Mr. Chairman, people in my part of the province are well on to him. He's still taking credit for the building of the First Street Bridge into Brandon, and that contract was let before he was even elected, but let that be as it will, Mr. Chairman. He continues to make those utterances when he's out in our constituency and the great fuss that he kicked up when he got up to speak about the hog barn out at Shilo, Mr. Chairman, about the environmental problem and what not, that it was creating, well I don't blame him for not knowing that that hog barn was closed and the hogs had been removed because he's living in Transcona now and he really can't smell it all the way to Shilo from Transcona.

The leadership responsibilities, Mr. Chairman, that the Member from Selkirk undertook when he won

the Leadership, I suppose that's the word to use, we were looking for great things from him. He came on with a great deal of fluster and bluster and we at that time, Mr. Chairman, referred to him instead of heavy Howard, as powder puff Pawley and that really hasn't changed too much, Mr. Chairman. We still consider him in that light because he wanders around.

The Member for Burrows the other night mentioned something about us locking the barn door after the horses were gone and the Leader of the Opposition, speaking of horses, Mr. Chairman, wanders around a great deal of the time and he doesn't know whether he's lost a horse or just found a halter. So many simple little things, Mr. Chairman. We've all been trying to get office space in this side of the House and he can't even get the people on that side together long enough to decide what offices they want. We might have been in them by now if they would have been able to get together over there. Now he's got an additional problem, Mr. Chairman, because we've got to find space for two or three weak links in his chain. The chain gang over there, they're just increasing every day. The hands are going up and the numbers are increasing. We may have to revamp that whole office set-up that we had designed a few months ago because we're not too sure how many parties we're going to have in Opposition.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Leader of the Opposition and members of the Opposition could really do their party a little more credit if they would be a little more constructive. The Leader said that he was going to talk about the economy and how he was going to get the economy back into a growth position, then he went on to spend a half an hour as did the Member for Brandon East, just completely tearing down Manitoba and making it look like the worst place in Canada for anyone to live. The people were moving out; the wages were poor; there were sweat-shops and, Mr. Chairman, that is just not good enough from the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite.

There are a great many things in this province that can be built on. Statistics aren't all doom and gloom. There are many of the statistics that are favourable. We hear today about the bankruptcies; take the bankruptcies across the country and then take Manitoba's. —(Interjection)— Certainly do that. The Member for Ste. Rose says "let's do that" and he should know all about bankruptcies.

Mr. Chairman, there are great economic problems in the country and there's no doubt that Manitoba is suffering along with the rest of them. There's no question that high interest rates are affecting a great deal of the business people in this country today, but we're not alone with economic problems and you can't settle them overnight. We knew when we came into government in 1977 that we weren't going to turn around eight years of mismanagement overnight, it takes time.

The Conservative Government in England is finding that, that it took after some 20-some years of problems, that they just can't turn it around overnight. Our friend to the south of us is going to find the same thing. It takes time to change an attitude. People have got used to abundance and to have great expectations and it's very difficult to turn

that around, but I maintain that has to be turned around. We're never going to get this province into a strong economic position unless we change our thinking and increase our productivity. People have got to go to work with a good attitude and really start producing and taking our rightful place as an exporting province and not only as an exporting nation, as an exporting province because we can't consume all that we produce in this province and there has to be ways found to get it out of here.

I know some of the problems that they're facing. I had a call from a constituent the other night that had been in the dairy business. He sold the farm to his sons and after a couple of years, as the members that might have some agricultural background on that side of the House, it's not really the nicest job running a dairy farm. You have to be there seven days a week, night and morning, to do that particular chore to those animals that have to be done and obviously, the Member for Ste. Rose knows what has to be done, twice a day. The boys decided that there was a better way. Grain prices weren't that bad so they sold the dairy cattle — kept the equipment mind you — now they realize that monthly cheque was pretty nice for their cash flow and they want to get back into the dairy business. There's no quota; they can't get a quota back.

So I get a call from the father who was worried about his investment, of course, because I guess the mortgage payments have to be met and blaming the government for his boys not being able to get back into the dairy business, and you know that's not an easy problem to solve. There are complexities there, and naturally he can go out and buy a herd and buy the quota with it which they're going to have to do; it's the only way he can get back in, then try and pick up some quota later.

But what I'm indicating, Mr. Chairman, is that when you get all of these controls on, they create great problems and there has to be some way that if somebody wants to go in to produce a broiler chicken or milk or whatever, there should be some way for them to do that and there should be a market for it when there are so many countries around the world that are looking for food and looking for things to buy. I know they don't always have the money to buy it but there must be some way that could be looked at in a little better light.

The Leader of the Opposition went on at great length to enlarge on some articles that appeared in the paper about the Enterprise Manitoba Programs whereby the small businessman was having it stuck to him and that just doesn't wash, Mr. Chairman. I think you can go around the province to the small business sector and find out there are a great many things that have happened to their business and to their operation in the past three years that have been pretty beneficial to them and I'll list some of those a little later.

Going back to the Member for Brandon East that was so long in the praise of what his party had done for business and the questions of the members opposite flailing the Minister for not bringing this so-called Helicopter Plant in here as quickly as possible, Mr. Chairman, we remember the Member for Brandon East who was the Minister responsible at that time when we criticized Saunders Aircraft — or Squanders Air — that he stood up and it's in

Hansard, we can dig it out, where he stood and thrashed the Opposition for criticizing that plant and he went as far as to say if it hadn't have been for the good efforts of his department and this government, that aircraft plant would have gone to the Province of Quebec. Well, my god, don't we wish it had, Mr. Chairman, don't we wish it had.

These are the dangers and the signals that the Minister responsible now is watching for to make sure that this doesn't happen again and I mentioned in my remarks earlier that this has had some effect on the Leader of the Opposition's constituency, who has a very fine Industrial Park there that's not enjoying the growth that was anticipated when that park was developed, because the plant at Gimli had been closed and it presented a pretty competitive feature because that was a problem in that particular area that had to be looked at. So trying to put industry into both of them has maybe had some effect on his particular area.

But the Member for Brandon East, it doesn't seem to matter what you announce there. You announced multimillion dollar care home facilities just the other day and he says oh, it's not enough, it's too late and this is wrong and that's wrong, he should have welcomed that with open arms for his constituents, because we all know that we can't build them fast enough as the economy and finances just don't permit you to build them as quickly as you would like to put every person that would like to be in a care, in a care home.

They had an opportunity there, Mr. Chairman, and it's well known with the Hydro Development Project that was on in those years, that General Electric would have set a plant into Brandon that would have been functioning today with a few 100 employees. That was turned down in a short-term gain of a few dollars on a contract that picked up the Russian generators and we all know what a disaster that particular move was.

Kraft Foods would have had their crushing plant. There's going to be another crushing plant probably go into that area now. It could have been in there long ago, Mr. Chairman, but the agricultural arm of the NDP Party, the Farmers Union were boycotting Kraft at that particular time and there were bumper stickers and whatnot all over the place and the Kraft people, when they came to negotiate just didn't like the atmosphere and felt that well, we're not going to impose a plant on a community that doesn't want us. The Member for Brandon East can jump up and defend that and say it's documented, Brandon Sun defended me, I did everything I could. Well, he might have done what he thought he was doing to bring that plant there but he wasn't convincing the other people in his Cabinet that it should be there because the Minister of Agriculture was governed by Red Willie and the strong arm of the Farmers Union that were dumping on Kraft at that particular time and the plant went wanting or went elsewhere.

There was a great deal of time spent on the outmigration of people, Mr. Chairman, that I referred to earlier. There's no question that the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan have enjoyed a great deal of economic activity lately due to their potash, their oil and gas wealth that we don't have here. There's many many young men from my particular area have gone out there. But I'll tell you they're coming back

now just as fast and as long as there's jobs here, they'll be back. This is not a phenomena, it's gone on for years. People will move back and forth across Canada seeking jobs and seeking to better their position. The Member for Churchill is well aware of that. I mean, he arrived up here looking for a better way of life and a way to improve his position. So let's not criticize people because they happen to move around looking for employment or looking for a change of environment, Mr. Chairman.

There was a great deal of time spent on the campaign that indicates, in a little more graphic form, some of the benefits of this province that we should be proud of. This was criticized strongly by members across the way, as well the hiring of several people that were left jobless when the Tribune newspaper closed down. If we had not taken some of those people on they'd be screaming that we weren't providing employment; we weren't looking after these people that had been thrown out of work. So you're damned if you do and you're damned if you don't, Mr. Chairman, by members opposite. —(Interjection)— That's right, you just can't win, Mr. Chairman, and if they're capable people and there's a job for them to do, regardless of where they might have worked before, we've taken them on.

Governments aren't that hidebound, I understand that one of the governments has maybe offered a position to the Member for St. Boniface that he's maybe considering and we can only live and hope that he might take it. I just wanted to make one or two of those comments, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the remarks that have been directed towards the Minister in the Estimates that are before the House right now. There is no question about it, the problems that they're having internally, Mr. Chairman, is going to grow and I feel for the Leader of the Opposition because he has such a rift in the party there and when they refer to, someone over there the other day referred to the weak links of the chain that had left them and now they were stronger and it didn't take long for someone to point out that those weak links were three former cabinet members of the former government, Mr. Chairman, and if they are weak links, I don't know what he's got left to form a government with if he hopes to take over the reins of government after the next election. We, God save us, we could Pistol Pete there as Minister of Agriculture. I don't know whether that would do much for the productivity, Mr. Chairman.

I want to tell the members opposite, Mr. Chairman, and also get it on the record, that if they're going to associate with their members that are going to continue to show disrespect for Her Majesty and what she represents, that this is not going to do them any good at the polls either. The wearing of black armbands when the President of the United States visited the House of Commons, these things are filtering around the country and those that won't stand up when God Save the Queen is played, it's well-known who they are, Mr. Chairman. I say to the Leader of the Opposition, this is not going to do his party any good if he continues to associate with people like that. He may take a lead from Mr. Nystrom and a few of the others that have the good foresight to take a leaf out of the Conservative Book in Ottawa and vote against some of the Constitution

nonsense that's going on and, as you see, Mr. Romanow now and a few others have taken the same route. I would say it's time that the Leader of the Opposition got off the fence that he's been on for some time, Mr. Chairman, and told us just where he stands on the problem of the Constitution question.

Mr. Chairman, there are a great number of things that are going to happen in Manitoba that are going to embarrass the members opposite. I'm sure that there are members on that side that when they look out and see it raining today are wringing their hands saying, oh my God, we were hoping there would be another drought and we could blame it on the Conservative party.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Boniface on a point of order.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. Are you going to allow statements like this? That there's members of this House who would want to see misfortune on the citizens of Manitoba? Are you going to allow that? I've asked a question of the Chairman of this committee.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Logan on the same point of privilege.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Chairman, imputing motives in this Chamber, or in this Assembly, is definitely a breach of the Rules of this House.

Now the member is making a very fine distinction and he's treading a very fine line, and he's trying to instill in the minds of the public and impute a motive that members on this side are disturbed because there's moisture falling outside today. Mr. Chairman, I think you should take the point under consideration very seriously.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Rock Lake on the same point of privilege.

**MR. HENRY J. EINARSON:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to rise on the same point of order and I'd like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have listened over many many weeks to comments from the Members for the Opposition, which lead to one's impression that they are of that thought, that it's doom and gloom for the Province of Manitoba. I don't think it's a matter of motivation whatsoever, I think that the Member for Minnedosa is expressing a viewpoint that is ascribed because of the kind of comments he's heard from members opposite over many weeks, in regard to the economy and the progress that Manitoba has made under this government for the past three-and-one-half years.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Boniface on the same point of privilege.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, on this same point of order and I'm asking you to rule. A statement was made in the House that certain members would hope that there wouldn't be any rain so the farmers could be trouble, and this was a direct statement that was made and I'm just asking you to rule.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I think, in decency to the Legislature and what we stand for, it would be in

order if the member would just rephrase that line or withdraw it, because we do not add any dignity to our membership here with those terminologies.

The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. BLAKE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll rephrase that, it might appear that some of them over there would be happy to see that happen. Let me put it another way, Mr. Chairman, if the economy of this province is just bustling and hustling like it has never been in history, are they going to be, as far as getting re-elected, are they going to be happy with it or are they going to be happier to see it the other way, where they can attack the government. How are they going to attack the government if things are going great guns, which they're going to be going in very very short order.

So, Mr. Chairman, that . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Boniface on the same point of order.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, I would like to put it on the record that this doesn't satisfy us at all and the last statement would indicate that this is the way he feels that all politicians should be; that he feels if you're not going rejoice are you going to get back in office, that you wish that people should have misfortune, and I think it is very wrong and is starting a precedent if this is allowed. If the Minister doesn't withdraw, without any qualification, if this is allowed to go along, well then you'll see how much respect, and there's so little respect in the House now, no wonder the people of Manitoba don't respect politicians if we don't respect each other.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I think, to the committee, we are on Interim Supply and the sooner the members address their remarks to the Interim Supply, the sooner we'll get the supply motion passed.

The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. BLAKE:** Mr. Chairman, I stand by my earlier statement that I hope the Member for St. Boniface takes that job that he's been offered, so-called by Ottawa.

Mr. Chairman, any time that we get embarrassed by the Member for St. Boniface . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Ste. Rose on a point of privilege.

**MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, because the Member for Minnedosa in his comments imputed motives to members on this side of the House, that we would hope that there would be another drought, then we could attack the government. That I believe is just about the words that he said. He was asked to withdraw by you, Sir, he was asked to rephrase those comments and he did not do so, and we're not satisfied with his answer. He has not withdrawn those remarks and I would hope that you would see that he does, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Finance.

**MR. RANSOM:** On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the issue could be cleared

up if the Honourable Member for St. Johns will withdraw the allegation levelled from his seat, that the Member for Rock Lake was lying, and I think that the Member for Minnedosa would probably be willing to withdraw any inference that the members took exception to.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** On a point of privilege, I deliberately called that a lie because I wanted to make sure that it was withdrawn, and of course I would abide by parliamentary procedure to withdraw the statement that what the Member for Minnedosa said was a lie the moment he withdraws the lie from the record. I will withdraw, of course I will, Mr. Chairman, but the moment he withdraws.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Rhineland on the same point.

**MR. ARNOLD BROWN:** On that same point of order. I did not hear the Member for Minnedosa imputing any lies to anybody whatsoever. The Member for Minnedosa was expressing his opinion as to what he perceived that the Opposition stance was and he is perfectly entitled to say so.

Now if the members on the Opposition object, they can say so, they can say this in debate, but I would say, Mr. Chairman, that there was no point of order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Inasmuch as the Chairman has to recall many statements in the last ten minutes, I'm not certain of exactly what was said, and the Chair would certainly like to have a right to look at it in Hansard in order to rule if there is an overstep of our parliamentary procedure, then it will be ruled on.

The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I hope it continues for several days and several nights, Mr. Chairman, being a man who tills the soil myself, Mr. Chairman. Those in power send it down on us with great abundance in order that this land and the crops may flourish and add to the economy of this great province of ours, to quote the Honourable Member for Roblin.

Mr. Chairman, I don't like to create ruckuses such as that. If my remarks have been considered by members over there as a little intemperate or ill-considered, that's fine, this happens in this Chamber from time to time, as you well know. That was just a way that I perceived the situation to be and it may well be that members on this side of the House don't agree with me at all. It wouldn't be the first time in my life that people have disagreed with me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Burrows the other night talked about an incentive-oriented system that we were going to create, that was going to do great things for the Province of Manitoba. There's just one or two facts, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to maybe run through before I finish my remarks, the things that this government has done, Mr. Chairman, that create that incentive-oriented tax system.

Firstly, there's a reduction of personal income tax, Mr. Chairman, from 56, the record opposed by his government, to 54 percentage points; there's the expiry of the personal income tax surtax; there's



been a reduction of 15.4 in Manitoba Corporation Income Tax for Small Business, from 13 percent of taxable income to 11; there's been the abolishing of the succession duties in the gift taxation, I think one of the greatest incentives, Mr. Chairman, that we have had; and there's been over a sevenfold increase in the exemption of corporation capital tax from \$100,000 in capital tax to \$750,000, Mr. Chairman; there's been a replacement of the two-tiered Mining Royalty Tax system which penalized the industry with a single rate system. I might say, Mr. Chairman, to do with the mining industry that was so heavily jumped on the other night in the Minister's Estimates about the productivity being down. That may well be, but exploration is up so substantially since this government came to power with their incentive tax systems, Mr. Chairman, and how are you going to keep a strong, healthy minded economy going for years and years and years if you cut out exploration, and that's what that government over there did. Exploration dried up, ask anybody in the north. The Member for Churchill will know it; the Member for Flin Flon, who unfortunately isn't here, they will know how many mining and exploration companies have been in the field in the last couple of years and how many were in the field the last year that they were in power. These are the things that the incentive tax system has done, Mr. Chairman.

The Incremental Royalty Tax of 50 percent and 35 percent, that's been replaced with a single 18 percent rate and that has led to a great deal of the expansion in that area, and the so-called informed or reformed legislation this government has brought in, Mr. Chairman.

There was a termination of taxation of small quarry operators, by terminating the taxation . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. Order. The Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, the member is reading from a document. I would ask that it be tabled, as I tabled a document the other day when the Member for Rock Lake has asked me to do. I would ask him to table it. He's reading from a document and I ask that it be tabled. (Interjection)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** I read from a document last week, Mr. Chairman, and I was asked to table it. It was not a public document, it was notes that I had and I agreed to table it and I would ask the member to do likewise.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I think my years around here, Committee, that many people read from guidelines and I here have no idea if that's a printed note or if it's the member's rough notes.

The Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, the Member for Ste. Rose referred to myself as asking for a document, the day that he spoke. I would like to inform the members of this House that was an official document, namely the Commonwealth, and that was an official document that the Member for Ste. Rose spoke from, which is different to what my colleague from Minnedosa is

merely saying, he's using speaking notes and that's a vast difference, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Minnedosa has approximately two minutes left, if my calculations are reasonably right.

**MR. BLAKE:** Deduct all the interruptions I had, deduct the interruptions. Mr. Chairman, I assure you these are speaking notes, it's not a published document or a publication such as the Member for Ste. Rose was referring to.

There's additional sales tax exemptions, Mr. Chairman, in addition to the abolition of the mineral acreage tax, and I won't go into them all. The sales tax was abolished on insulation material, safety equipment, purchased by employees, farm water systems, farm buildings, trapping, tractor mowers, snowblowers and granaries. There's a whole list of things. We've doubled the sales tax commission paid to the merchants of this province, that provide a great service to this government by collecting that sales tax, Mr. Chairman. The gasoline tax exemption — and I'm sorry that I haven't got any more time — Mr. Chairman is giving me the finger, I hope he's signalling time. Mr. Chairman, the gasoline tax exemptions for gasohol plants that I won't go into, that's a whole other speech there, to encourage the production of gasohol to relieve the serious energy situation that we have.

I'll get into the income tax side of tax deductions on salaries paid to spouses, Mr. Chairman. I could go on for a great amount of time yet, but I'll get an opportunity a little later I know to finish this. So with that I'll just await the comments of the next speaker, because they've been furiously making notes while I've been delivering this thrashing address to them, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In rising to take part in this debate, Mr. Chairman, I specifically want to draw attention to one major area in this province and that is dealing with the agricultural policies of this government, rather the lack of agricultural or co-ordinated agricultural policies in Manitoba, over the last three and one-half years of the Tory administration.

Mr. Chairman, the farm sector over the last several years has been faced with extreme difficulties in terms of weather conditions, in terms of market conditions, in terms of being able to meet the rising interest rate costs, in terms of meeting the increased costs of energy, just being able to, as one could put it, keep their heads above water, Mr. Chairman. In fact, many of the producers in this province have not been in a position to do so.

Mr. Chairman, before I go into my remarks, I heard the Member for Minnedosa while I was out of the Chamber and in the caucus room, speaking about the hiring of staff from the now defunct Winnipeg Tribune and using them in my opinion, as the political advertising arm of the Conservative Government of Manitoba. For the Member for Minnedosa to get up and indicate that some of these people that were hired on were people who would make good civil servants, Mr. Chairman. I imagine the odd one in terms of doing the work that they've

been hired to do, won't do a bad job, Mr. Chairman, but the jobs that have been given to them are really P.R. jobs to try and salvage the unsalvageable, in terms of propaganda and the downward slope that this government has taken in this province. They won't help you.

The fact of the matter is, even though you have hired them into Civil Service positions, rather than appointing them, as they should have been done as a political P.R. person for the Minister responsible, that at least when you leave government, which it'll depend on when you have the courage to call the election, whether it will be in June, whether it will be in the fall or whether you'll wait until the end, and we will wait to see, Mr. Chairman, those people really should go out with you, do not try and bury them; especially people, Mr. Chairman, people who have been in the media, and if you look at their articles and their comments historically, have berated the public service and the public sector as being some terribly inefficient, terribly wasteful group of people to now come to the public trough and slop at it, I really don't know how those people could stomach, could even look themselves in the mirror, to come to the public sector now to bail them out, and come here for a job and to have the Tories attempt to hide them within the civil service, oh my goodness, talk about political patronage, Mr. Chairman. Talk about political patronage in terms of the hiding of staff.

Mr. Chairman, talk about a double standard, and we had it in Committee just the other day. The Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation said that since this government came into power, the Autopac's General Insurance division, which was to be competitive, had to bid against other companies for the general insurance business in terms of the government sector; so they did, Mr. Chairman, they got some contracts and some others.

But what did they do with respect to accounting, Mr. Chairman? Did the accounting firms — that they wanted the Crown agencies to have their accounting done by private firms — did those firms bid for the business of the Crown agencies? Oh no, Mr. Chairman, there was no bid. It was an assignment by the Minister of Finance to say, this company does Autopac, this company does the Telephone System, this company does Hydro, Mr. Chairman. Is this the free enterprise bidding system, Mr. Chairman? Is this what they have been talking about? No. Even though Autopac accounting costs doubled in the first year that they changed accounting firms, did that make any difference? Did any of them blink an eye, Mr. Chairman? Did they give competition to the industry in terms of at least bidding for that accounting? Did the Provincial Auditor, let's put it in true perspective, did the Provincial Auditor at least have an opportunity to bid on the accounting of the Crown agencies that they were not taking away? Oh no, Mr. Chairman, that's a bit too much.

But, Mr. Chairman, if it's the public, we cannot in any way make the public sector look as good as they really are because the public sector in the Conservative eyes has to be inefficient, has to do things more expensively. The only way and the only reason that it does so, is by design and by policy of those members opposite.

Mr. Chairman, I believe they operate in a double standard. If you talk about business acumen, why

would you want to double the costs of accounting in a corporation, Mr. Chairman, for nothing else but ideological reasons that you do not want the accounting to be done at the public purse? And it's done, the figures were there, from \$30,000 to \$70,000 in one year, Mr. Chairman, that was the increase in costs. Does Wawanesa ask for bids for insurance on their building, on their large building on Broadway? Do they go out on the market and say, we will insure our buildings and we will ask MPIC, we will ask Portage Mutual to give us quotes on our property because we may be able to get a deal? What a bunch of nonsense, Mr. Chairman, what a bunch of nonsense. That is the type of administration we have in this province, backwards, backwards if one can put it in those words.

Mr. Chairman, the Conservative Government in the Province of Manitoba in terms of agricultural policy or lack of it, has certainly left the farmers of Manitoba out in left field. There's been no direction, no direction, no policy, no direction and certainly many farmers, as a result of their lack of action are being forced into bankruptcy. If they're not being forced into bankruptcy, there's such difficulties and there are examples in the Member for Dauphin's own constituency, and the members should know.

The entire hog industry has been in trouble for almost two years, Mr. Chairman. They have practically come to this government on bended knee to say look, help us out, help us, we are in trouble, we are losing over \$30.00 on every hog that we market. They have received calls — I'm sure the members opposite have received calls, I've received calls, members on this side have received calls — I've received calls from constituents who have indicated that they did the returns that they received on the marketing of their hogs. They do not even cover their feed costs, let alone any utilities, any labour costs or any depreciations or anything. They don't even cover the feed costs. They announced a \$40 million drought program in 1980, as late and as disjointed and as uncoordinated as it might have been, in terms of the actual application, Mr. Chairman, they couldn't get along with the Federal Government, but they made that announcement and it did help many farmers. I don't want to berate them but approximately half of those that were committed were spent, less than half of those funds were spent in assisting the agricultural sector.

Mr. Chairman, the government spent \$20 million or thereabouts, I think it's even less than that. We talk about \$10 million thereabouts, \$8 to \$10 million on the Greenfeed Program; \$2 to \$3 million on the Hay Transportation Program, well, Mr. Chairman, the Hay Transportation Program was cost-shared by Ottawa, by the railways and by the Province of Manitoba. — (Interjection)— Well certain instances, which instances did they not share in? Which instances did they not share in the transportation of hay? Because they were shared three ways, Mr. Chairman. The Province of Manitoba made those announcements, before any consultations with Ottawa, with the senior governments. They thought that they would want to play one upmanship and try to hit them over the head. Well, what happened? Ottawa said look, you want to play your own game, we'll announce our own program and so there we have a gee and haw. No program worked very well. The Ottawa one is still up

in limbo where producers are still waiting for payments and are having difficulties in collecting, Mr. Chairman; anomalies have crept into the Greenfeed Program where producers applied and lost their crops and could not gain compensation on their insurance; they were hit doubly hard. We raised them. Have we heard anything from the government whether they will look at those? No, we haven't, the Minister said he will take them under advisement.

But, Mr. Chairman, the point that I was making is that half of the funds that they made a to-do about were utilized but for the prime reason, for the prime reason for the Minister of Finance to be able to play the figures game so that he could announce a large deficit in the spring when the program was announced; then at the end of the year, although they made those announcements and those moneys they never spent those funds or committed those funds, they could say, look, our deficit went down, Mr. Chairman. That's the name of the game that's been played over the last three years. The producers haven't been fooled at all, Mr. Chairman, they are going bankrupt.

We had a fire in the constituency of the Member for Dauphin, suspected arson, Mr. Chairman. What kind of an operation? The farm, I believe, was on the verge of bankruptcy or if it wasn't on the verge it had already gone bankrupt, but all of a sudden it burned, Mr. Chairman. Amongst other insurers involved in that I understand that MPIC is involved in that package as well, as one of the insurers. We know we have one of the largest and upstanding producers in Manitoba who has been in the hog industry a long time, has been indicating publicly and pleading with this government to assist them, while we know, Mr. Chairman, that right now there is no hope at this present time of having a national stabilization plan in the hog industry. Manitoba is the odd man out. The producers of Manitoba cannot ride out a fight against the treasuries of Ontario, Quebec, Alberta and Saskatchewan. All those treasuries are supporting their producers to maintain a level of production.

Mr. Chairman, the concern that we have on this side is that during this period of time we will have an upsurge, and there has been, especially in the Province of Quebec, an upsurge in production. Then what we will have is a push to have national market sharing, supply management, Mr. Chairman, that's what we will have whether the members like it not. That will be the tone and the tenure of discussions that there will be stabilization if there will be some balance in terms of production. Well, what I'm afraid of, Mr. Chairman, we should have gone into national stabilization years ago because what will happen is that now there will be a move to go into that area with Manitoba being the loser because of the loss of production that we have witnessed over the last two years. We will be the losers in the long run in terms of being able to have a uniform supply or at least a historical relationship of supply in the hog industry, because right now our producers cannot withstand the losses that they have absorbed, have had to carry on their backs over the last number of years. So, Mr. Chairman, that has implications throughout the entire industry.

What about our processing industry that the Minister of Agriculture has toted so highly about that

he wants increased production. Well, he encouraged hog producers to produce all they can because there will be all sorts of markets for them, Mr. Chairman; where is he now? Where is he hiding, in the manure pile? Where is he hiding in terms of all the incentives, all the great encouragement that he gave the producers in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman? — (Interjection)— Or maybe behind the manure pile, Mr. Chairman. (Interjection)— He's not falling into the pit, Mr. Chairman, because I doubt whether he'd make it out of there but I'm sure some of the hog producers would love to get their hands on him because, at the same time as they are suffering in the marketplace, they are faced with double problems; they are faced with vertical integration in the hog industry, your opportunity to become a Manitoba hog producer, Mr. Chairman.

Cargill Pork Systems may be the answer for Manitobans who are sincerely interested in becoming part of a vital hog industry. Now isn't this a nice gesture to producers who have not been able to make ends meet over the last two years. Who is going to help them out, Mr. Chairman? — (Interjection)— Not the government, we will have Cargill Pork Systems. CPS will provide genetically superior stock; you provide your management skills and the production facilities; CPS will assume all market risk factors, including hog market price feed and health costs. Mr. Chairman, are they the new welfare agency in the hog industry? Are they doing this just for the health of the hog industry and the hog producers of Manitoba? Mr. Chairman, are they feeling sorry for the producers of Manitoba? Are they more conscience-oriented than the Government of Manitoba? Do they have a conscience and you don't? Is this what you are supporting, Mr. Chairman, because obviously they are taking a chance, on what? On having a good chunk of the market while producers go belly-up. In the short run it may be an expense but a very good long-term investment if you are able to control a certain percentage of the market in the Province of Manitoba. That's basically the intent. You know, they're not fools in the marketplace; they know that there will have to be stability in the hog industry, Mr. Chairman. Eventually there will be some stability, eventually when they have a share of the marketing ability in the Province of Manitoba they will have it enshrined in the long term if there is a national agreement. But that's really where we have had a clear lack of leadership, in fact, it's not only been clear in terms of lack of leadership, there has been a concerted attack placed upon all the orderly marketing systems within the province, within this country by that administration, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister of Agriculture, when he talks to farmers who happen to have had the opportunity to participate in an orderly marketing system in a marketing board, in a nationally organized marketing board, this Minister when he comes to speak to them he is in a real dilemma. They really have a hang-up about that because, on one hand, he says I support marketing boards; but on the other hand, he says they are not very good because producers are not able to do what they want to do, they are restricted and people can't get into the industry, so we really don't like that. Now where does he stand, Mr. Chairman, where does this government stand?

Where does this government stand? I think they really have a hang-up because they don't want to rock the boat of those producers who are organized but yet, Mr. Chairman, they have to tell them that they really don't believe in what they are doing. And it's evidenced, Mr. Chairman, by every speech that is being made by members opposite, the Member for Gladstone, all the rural members; they are really hung up about that because they really are not supportive of orderly marketing within this country, Mr. Chairman. They would rather let the hog industry disintegrate in the Province of Manitoba. If the members don't realize that it's on the verge now, Mr. Chairman, they will never realize. In fact, in many instances it will be too late.

If the Minister of Agriculture is intending to make some announcement at the annual meeting, within another week, of the pork producers, Mr. Chairman, in many cases it will be too late. There are a lot of producers that have gone under. Don't they realize that? Listen to Albert Beilfor. You know, he has no axe to grind, Mr. Chairman. What about the producers that I told him about, that they are not even meeting the feed costs, Mr. Chairman? I'm sure the Member for Springfield can relate stories and calls that he's had from hog producers about their plight. I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the Swan River area, some of the producers could tell him what they are being —(Interjection)— One went under. (Interjection)— One spoke to you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know what relationship the member has with his constituents but certainly I would think that they feel a great concern but maybe because there's certainly been no real concern shown.

There have been meetings with staff, the Minister of Education in his area, the meeting was held in the Stonewall area, Mr. Chairman. The producers were told by staff that there would be some proposals for assistance last year yet, Mr. Chairman; the producers are waiting. I am sure that they have been very patient; they have been so patient they are on the verge of bankruptcy. Can you imagine that kind of patience, Mr. Chairman? The patience likely in many instances will, and has, run out. This government, they should not want to play games with their bookkeeping system as they have done and get serious with the economic problems of this province.

I've only hit upon one of them, Mr. Chairman, but the impact of the loss of a vital sector of our economy, the hog industry, will have devastating effects on the rest of our industry. We've already witnessed that, Mr. Chairman. We've witnessed it in a closure of one of our processing plants in this province. Do we want another closure, Mr. Chairman? Are we really serious about how we are going to assist the backbone of this province, Mr. Chairman, the agricultural sector of this province which is the backbone of this province? Why are we letting it drift? When will you learn, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour of 4:30 having arrived, the committee rise for Private Members' Hour. Call in the Speaker.

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

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

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

### RESOLUTION NO. 10 — CHILD CARE PROGRAM WITHIN PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

**MR. SPEAKER:** We are now in Private Members' Hour, Wednesdays we deal with resolutions. The first resolution is Resolution No. 10, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Community Services. The Honourable Minister has eight minutes remaining.

The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I had completed my remarks the last day when we discussed and debated this resolution.

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

**MR. WARREN STEEN:** The Honourable Member for Inkster, Mr. Speaker, has asked me to say something nice. Well, I was going to refer to Hansard of Wednesday, March 4, which was the last time that we discussed this resolution, Resolution No. 10, by the Honourable for Inkster, Mr. Speaker. I want to quote from Hansard of that particular day, March 4, on Page 1324 where the Member for Inkster says that "the concept that working parents would add to the work force and thereby potentially add to the wealth of society; and that this would apply either to one parent or both parents, and if there is a single-parent household to the single parent and that household is something which has occurred certainly for many years". Well, I'm sure that every member in this House would agree with the Member for Inkster that we want to get single parents back into the work force, particularly if they have a training that is in need in the work force and they have a skill. I know of a number of professional nurses, and there's a great need for nurses in our province today, who are single parents today and do want to get back in the work force and with day care centres assisting them, when they have pre-school age children, they are able to get back in the work force.

The Member for Inkster also goes on to mention that day care facilities have been in existence for many years and that there is a demand for these services, and I quote on Page 1325 of Hansard, where the Member for Inkster says, "The demand for child care institutions has now been recognized by virtually all levels of society, and what occurs is that the notion of day care institutions is accepted by most people", and I would agree with him.

He goes on further in his remarks to talk about the Progressives. I hope that when he talks about the Progressives, he's not only talking about his own group of three, he's also talking about persons on this side of the House as well as persons on the other side.

The history behind day care centres, Mr. Speaker, goes back many years. Day care centres have been operating for a number of years, but it was the former government in 1974, which the Member for Inkster was a part of, that recognized the fact that day care centres should have some government assistance financially. Therefore, when they were going to be assisted financially, they would come under some sets of rules as to standards that day care centres would have. Since that time our government has substantially placed more money into day care centre budgets and we've enhanced the program. Today I think, Mr. Speaker, we have one of the best programs in the whole of the country of Canada.

The Member for Inkster, if I understood his remarks correctly — and I was here when he made them back on March 4th, I've read his resolution over, I've read his comments in Hansard — I think he makes two points, and they are that he doesn't want to overprofessionalize day care centres, and he wants to make day care centres more accessible to the single parent, or both parents if that might be the case. Well, to the Member for Inkster, I have no quarrel really with his remarks other than the fact that I don't particularly think that we want to have our day care centres getting into our public school system for one fear that I have is that Kindergarten starts at the age of five now. Mr. Speaker, I can recall when Kindergarten came in after the Second World War, because I was likely one of the first persons that ever attended a Kindergarten in the Winnipeg Public School system, it was started in 1945-46 era. My great fear is if we put the day care centres into the public school system, operated by the public school system, under their jurisdiction, what we would have is Kindergarten 1 for age 4; Kindergarten 2 for age 3; and all the way down, and we would have an overprofessionalized day care program and that would be my fear.

If I'm incorrect in understanding the Member for Inkster, in wanting to use the facilities, I'd like to point out to him that in the City of Winnipeg now there are 103 day care centres. These day care centres are in church basements, church halls, some of them are in schools, public schools. One that I'm very familiar with, Mr. Speaker, is one that is downtown here in Winnipeg in the Central YMCA. I, some mornings, don't get to the Y to do my road work too early and I'm often concluding my road work over at the Y at about a quarter to nine, and there will be two or three members of the day care staff that will be getting mats out for tumbling and different gym equipment that does exist at the Y, and the various facilities. I've seen the 40-some-odd youngsters that are enrolled in that day care program working out and using and playing games in the YMCA gym floor, using the mats for tumbling, climbing on ropes and getting themselves involved in the various tumbling events that the four or five instructors have them doing for an hour each morning. I think it's a super program. It's a public facility and so are church basements and that's why I say that I think we have sufficient church basements and church halls and public facilities in Winnipeg, without us going on a universal program through our public school system.

Mr. Speaker, also in the Winnipeg area, there are parents of school age children that often do take in

young persons, young students and pre-student-age youngsters, up to the number of five, into a home without them being a fully licensed day care centre. In Winnipeg we have over 300 youngsters that are enrolled in such facilities. Outside of the City of Winnipeg we have a like number. So in the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, there are some 3,630 students or day care youngsters enrolled in the 103 day care centres; outside of the city there are 2,150, giving you a total of 5,780. When you add the 600 that are in the private homes that are being cared for by other mothers, it brings the total up to 6,300. Then with the enhanced program that the Honourable Minister has announced at the tail end of last year's session, which is being implemented over the past 12 months, and being enhanced upon at all times, it is expected that next year we'll have some 8,600 pre-school-age youngsters in a recognized day care program.

I think that day care programming in Manitoba has gone a long way in the past 10 years; that credit belongs to members on both sides of this House, as far as the funding of such programs, because it was the previous government that got involved in it. I'm led to believe that the then Minister of Health, at that time the Member for Seven Oaks, expressed a fear that day care is really baby-sitting, it is not part of the school curriculum and it should never be part of the school curriculum. If my understanding of what the Member for Seven Oaks, who then was the Minister, did say, I would totally agree with him that it is baby-sitting and that we shouldn't have our youngsters enrolled into school programs at ages of five or under.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, a great fear that I would have is if the programs were implemented and operated by school divisions, that it would be part of the curriculum. School teachers average salary, I believe, in this province, runs in the neighbourhood of \$24,000 - \$25,000 a year. Perhaps the Member for Elmwood might get back into such a work force, the pay is getting more attractive all the time. I'm afraid if it was ever operated by our public school systems we would be overprofessionalizing the day care programing.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, with 103 day care centres in the Greater Winnipeg area, I think the other problem that the Member for Inkster has raised is accessibility. I think that problem is not a major problem because 103 day care centres in the Greater Winnipeg area usually gives most single parents a choice of one or another centre to go to. One problem about using the public schools is that most of them are located in the residential areas, and it has been found that many parents want to take their youngsters with them to a day care centre in and around their place of work, and that many parents want to take their youngsters, and many do drive cars in this day and age and want to take them, whether they work in the Inkster Industrial Centre out in Fort Garry off McGillivray Boulevard, or downtown in Winnipeg, they want to take their youngsters with them. I know that the one at the YMCA operates from 7:30 in the morning until 5. Most church day care centres operate until 6 o'clock. If the parent chooses to leave their youngster at a day care centre in and around home, they can usually leave work and still take public transit or

drive their own vehicles, and pick up their youngsters before 6 o'clock.

But there seems to be a sufficient number of day care centres in the Greater Winnipeg area and, as the Minister did announce, that he has got an enhanced program, one of the drawbacks to adding additional moneys into his Budget is that it takes time to get these day care centres on stream, and that you just don't open up the doors of a church basement and say we're going to operate a day care centre. You've got to get some responsible parents that want to have their youngsters in such a program; you've got to find yourself some employees to operate the program.

The other feature of the present system that I like is that 80 percent of the decision making power rests with the parents of the youngsters that are placed in such day care centres. Only 20 percent of the decision making authority rests with staff. So therefore the mothers, through their 80 percent voice, can guarantee that the programming is exactly what they want it to be and that they cannot be overruled by professional staff. Therefore hopefully, the fear that the member who sponsored the original Bill said that overprofessionalization should not take place.

I still believe that the prime responsibility for caring for the children in this province still rests with the parents and, therefore, I'm glad to see that 80 percent of the authority of day care centres still rests in the hands of the parents. The day care centres are regulated, and they are under the direction of the department, therefore, they must be in facilities that are kept clean and have sufficient facilities to provide for the youngsters for their stay during the day.

Recently, in talking to the Minister, he was mentioning to me that Norma McCormick, a name that is well-known to many members in the Legislature, who is the operator of the largest day care centre in the Province of Manitoba, that being the one at the Health Sciences Centre, said that when she travels outside the Province of Manitoba and maybe at a conference meeting with other persons in the same profession that she is in, that she is proud to say that she is from Manitoba, and that Manitoba has one of the finest day care programs that exists in any province within our country. I think that's a compliment, that both the former Ministers who had day care centre programming under their jurisdiction, from the former government and from the present government, should be aware of and take credit for.

Recently it was announced by the Minister that the grants to the day care centres were being increased, and that there is a maintenance grant that was \$500.00. It has now been increased by \$150 to \$650.00. The per diem rate for each youngster has been increased. A mother who is earning in the area of \$8,000 a year, Mr. Speaker, will have her cost of day care centre for her youngster fully paid for by government funds. It isn't until a person is earning in excess of \$12,500, that a person loses some of the subsidy.

But let me point out that we do have the day care centre at the Health Sciences Centre which has a number of professional people who have youngsters in that program. Those people are all making over \$12,500; they're still receiving the maintenance grant

towards the upkeep of the largest day care centre in the Province of Manitoba. So even the persons, whether they be professional doctors or professional nurses and earning high salaries, they are still receiving assistance from the taxpayer in total.

So I think that the key to day care centres, Mr. Speaker, is that they be accessible to all regions of the city; that they be good, clean facilities; that they be operated with the parents having the greatest voice in the say as to how the programming at such a centre should be undertaken; and that the professionals or the so-called staff members do not have the largest voice in the operation of such a centre.

The problem that the department faces when they do come through as they did last year, Mr. Speaker, with a large increase, \$4.5 million, the moneys are available for increased per diem rates, but they're also there for new day care centres, for start-up moneys and to also increase the maintenance, is that it takes time to have a day care centre come on stream. You have to get a group of parents, in order to start a new one, to band together and have one good common cause, and then go out and search for some staff members that can assist them in running such a day care centre.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to amend the original Resolution No. 1, that was proposed by the Member for Inkster. I have copies which I can give to the page, which can be distributed.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Rhineland that the resolution be amended as follows:

Preceding the first WHEREAS insert the following: WHEREAS the prime responsibility for the caring and raising of children rests with the parents; and

WHEREAS some sole support parents and parents who are participating in the work force or receiving educational or occupational training require assistance in caring for their preschool or early school age children; and WHEREAS the government of the Province of Manitoba has recently provided for the expansion of existing day care centers and for additional day care centers to be funded so as to meet the needs of these parents; and

In the first WHEREAS of the resolution in the third line, substitute the word "reasonable" for the word "universal".

In the second WHEREAS of the resolution in the third line, substitute the word "reasonable" for the word "universal".

Delete the fourth WHEREAS in the resolution and everything thereafter and then add the following:

WHEREAS it is necessary to ensure that these services remain affordable, not only to the parents but also to the taxpayer; and WHEREAS it is necessary to ensure that equality of care continue in the day care system; and

WHEREAS some of our existing day care centres are utilizing available space in schools and other public buildings;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government, wherever possible, encourage the use of available space in public buildings and by day care centers and the use of volunteers including students and senior citizens, to

supplement the care provided by the day care centre staff.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I guess the Member for Inkster is now going to have to decide whether half a loaf is better than none because I guess the government is mixing his proposal with some of their own.

I wanted to say that I am not enthused about the original proposal and I wanted to relate to the Chamber an analogous story and to the Member for Inkster in particular, who enjoys stories, both hearing them and telling them, that his proposal appears to be a modest proposal. Namely it looks like an inexpensive volunteer solution to what may be a difficult problem or may be perceived as an expensive problem by some people.

When I think of that it reminds me of the story by Jonathan Swift, a famous short story called "A Modest Proposal" — and I see my old teaching colleague, the Minister of Education, I'm sure he recalls that one quite well — where Jonathan Swift started out, he being the author of "Gulliver's Travels", he started out talking about the fact that there was an overpopulation in Ireland and that there were a lot of children running around on the streets and then he said he had a solution. He said there was a solution to the problem of famine, as the Member for Inkster says, or overpopulation caused by famine or whatever, he said there are too many children around and he said that there was a solution to the problem.

The solution was this, you could take as an example a nine pound baby, pop it into a pot with some vegetables, heat it up and then eat that young succulent child. He said this was in effect, the solution to the problems of children in Ireland. Now, of course, this is sort of a macabre story or solution but Swift was a famous satirist and he knew exactly what he was doing. He was trying to draw to the attention of the public, the horrors of the economic system which was resulting in a lot of children starving in Ireland and he was trying to underline this and catch the attention of a jaded or an uninterested English public. So, I say that Swift's Modest Proposal was something more than some people could stomach and I say that the Member for Inkster's proposal appears on first hand to have some merit but I think there are some serious problems with it.

It reminds me a bit, Mr. Speaker, of the one-room school that we maybe worked so hard to get rid of in this province and I'm sure there are still people who look back to the good old days when they went to a one-room school house and got their education and went on to other things. In those schools — and I only attended one I think for about two days, in Grade 1, one summer vacation period when I was visiting some relatives — and my understanding of the system was that to a large extent the students taught each other, in the sense of the older students presumably helped the younger students, etc., because I don't know how on earth any teacher could cope with that situation of 9 to 12 grades in a room and all those subjects and all those kids; one

kid is in Grade 5 and two are in Grade 7, and so on and so on, I think it must have been something. But they did help each other and the system more or less worked. I'm not going to either criticize it or defend it other than to observe. As someone from the city I found it difficult to appreciate the merits. I realize there were financial limitations and so on but I would think that the 1980 Public School System, with consolidated schools and larger divisions, is in many ways superior to the old system.

Now the Member for Inkster, a lot of his resolution hinges on the fact that this is only a pilot project and I personally am somewhat sympathetic to that part of it, namely that it's only an experiment, but I also see some difficulties with the experiment itself and I think it might prove to be just a waste of time or not productive. I'd be interested in hearing some of the member's remarks in response to the Minister who made some interesting points and in regard to the points that I intend to make.

One of the problems I see, Mr. Speaker, about this resolution is that you would then integrate small children into the school yard and into the school and this to me would immediately result in a series of problems. For example, I have some familiarity with day care because of the fact that my daughter, who is now eight in Grade 2, went for a couple of years to a neighborhood day care centre in Elmwood and one of the things that is done in a day care centre is of course the children normally sleep at noon hour. So therefore, there has to be co-ordination in terms of the other children in the school being quiet. Most of them go home, some of them stay and have lunch and run around and yell and scream in the schools, etc. That's one problem.

Another point is that they may require separate facilities in the school yard and in the gymnasium, etc. One of my colleagues says even the washrooms may have to be reconstructed or adjusted for smaller children and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, in a school yard, in many ways, I think it's a jungle out there; young children even in primary school can get pretty rough.

I recall myself when I was in primary school at Strathcona in the North End, it was a tough school and you had to watch what you were doing because otherwise somebody might slug you or beat you up, etc., etc. I went there for five years and when I transferred to Faraday, which was a different type of school, I found the atmosphere like night and day. But in a rougher school I don't know whether the kids in Grade 1, 2 or 3 will respect these little gremlins running around in their school yard or whether they will work them over or beat them up or push them around or what. I'm told that there are some projects now, or at least one or more that I am aware of, where they have a day care centre in a public school and that they do have a fenced-off area for the children, because the smaller children have different kinds of play equipment; they would probably have slides and sand boxes, etc. So again, you might want to separate that from the other kids who might want to come in and use those facilities, etc.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure again what the value of students working in the system would be? For example, many younger children have brothers and sisters that they babysit. There are of course one-

child families, etc., but there are many children who are in the school system who take care of their younger brothers and sisters and don't especially need the experience of looking after somebody else's kids; those that do frequently do so for money. They are called babysitters and they earn part of their income, maybe an essential part, by looking after other kids. So, you're going to attempt to carve out a group, presumably between those with brothers and sisters and those that babysit for money who would be interested in working with small children in the school system, I don't know how large that would be.

If it is true that there are dangers of overprofessionalization, and I have listened to this for at least 10 years and I admit that if you say that everybody working in the day care system has to have a Ph.D. in child care, then that is called overprofessionalization and that is expensive, that is unnecessary and I'm not sure we need a bunch of psychiatrists and people with advanced degrees in home economics — or as it is now called human ecology — in child care and this and that, all working in the school system, in the day care system; that strikes me as being too much one way. The Honourable Member for Inkster wants to go I think the other way, and he wants what I would call a system which is an amateur system, or a system that contains a large component of amateurism and I think there are some dangers involved in that.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have some familiarity with the current day care system in Manitoba and from what I have seen I have been impressed. I have heard some criticisms. I've heard people tell me that such and such a centre isn't that good, but I have not seen this myself. I have some experience with three or four or five in the sense of observed while picking up my daughter, etc., and I must say that I have been uniformly impressed with the quality of care, the staff, the programs and the equipment in those particular day care centres. It sure beats a system whereby say somebody in the neighborhood would look after a bunch of children. But I suppose even that system may have its place. The convenience factor may be of some particular value. So what worries me, is the fact that we may be, in supporting this resolution, attempting to turn the clock back. So I say to the Member for Inkster, in that way he is not putting forward a Progressive proposal but a Conservative one.

He should also be concerned about the dangers of a system devoid of professionalism, or one that counts upon volunteer, amateur or what some people have described as mere babysitting. I think the Member for Inkster would have to answer that point as to, is this babysitting that he is proposing? How does it differ from babysitting, if it isn't? Now one of the underpinning points in the resolution is the fact that there are empty rooms in schools. This seems to be a key component and I just want to mention that there are, of course, empty schools themselves, complete schools that are empty and available. Leased space is available by the thousands of square feet or meters. The fact that there is vacant space doesn't necessarily mean that one should immediately put in a program. This building here isn't used 24 hours a day. I suppose someone could argue that it's inefficient not to use the building

between 8:00 or 10:00 o'clock at night and 8:00 o'clock in the morning. There are a lot of community clubs in the City of Winnipeg that are not fully utilized. I could name some in my particular area. Few buildings are used 24 hours a day or to 100 percent of capacity so that argument alone I don't think would carry. I suppose the main reason the member puts it forward is that it's close to the market of supply, namely, that there are students available that he wants to access and involve in a day care program.

So I say that if we don't want to spend too much money on PhDs watching children, we also want to avoid what might be called a source of cheap labour, that we don't want to go too far the other way. I don't know which way the pendulum's swinging but it seems to me that the way it is now is more or less about right. It maybe should be improved a little but I am concerned about diluting the program. Most of the women, I gather, that are involved in the program, the ones that I've seen I think have some kind of training at Red River Community College, then they're supervised by somebody else and I don't know how that other person got there, but the head women that I have seen in the program are first-rate. I don't know what their academic qualifications are but I know in the case of the Cobourg Day Centre in the King-Gordon Church in Elmwood that I've seen that operation and I think it hums along rather efficiently.

One point I want to mention only in passing, and I maybe will raise this again with the Minister of Education, one thing I would like to see taught in the school system, maybe it always has been and maybe it is as well in the day care system, is a better sense of manners. One of the things I find most disturbing in modern society, and I suppose some of us get carried away in the Chamber from time to time, is a lack of good manners and courtesy which seems to be deteriorating in society.

**A MEMBER:** And in this Chamber too.

**MR. DOERN:** And in this Chamber as well. So, Mr. Speaker, the Minister himself expressed a concern about the family unit. I thought that was somewhat of a red herring that he introduced. He did say that the system was mainly used by working parents and so on and he did I think point out that there would still have to be supervision by professional staff. I also wanted to mention to him that I, for one, I don't know about all my colleagues, am supporting the Member for St. Matthews in that constituency fight that's coming up because we're looking for the best person to knock off. I just wanted to let him know that we're not throwing our weight behind him but we're backing the Member for St. Matthews as a Conservative candidate.

Mr. Speaker, just a few other points. One of the most telling criticisms I think against this — (Interjection)— well, he's going to need some support, he doesn't have very much in my end of town. Mr. Speaker, consistency is very important and I discussed this resolution with some people in the day care system. I think the main point that they made — all the points that I have made so far are my points — the point that they made to me which I accept is that consistency is crucial and that if you have a whole series of different people and different



faces coming in, one for every eight children; so if you have 50 or 100 kids in a day care centre and you have hour after hour different high school students coming in or junior high students coming in so that the faces change and the children are looking around, they feel that this would be most unsatisfactory, that recognition and consistency are essential in a school system and in a day care system. So if you're going to have a whole bunch of students coming in rather than one adult instructor who is experienced and educated and trained, then this would not be useful.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that I am not enthused about the proposal put forward by the Member for Inkster, even if it would be one that would presumably save money because I think that what it attempts to do is to be a counter against overprofessionalization. But what it may end up in is simply an amateur babysitting service.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The member who has just spoken has managed to spend his entire time in addressing himself to what is ostensibly before the House without telling us how he's going to vote on it.

There is an amendment before the House being pursued by the Member for Crescentwood, which would dramatically alter the original resolution and which would fall completely in line with what the Member for Elmwood is saying and which, if he votes as he speaks, he would support it. So let's get the record clear, Mr. Speaker. The member who says that my resolution is less progressive and more conservative will be supporting the conservative position and I will be supporting the progressive position, Mr. Speaker. Fortunately, there is also some credibility to what I am saying, even in the member's own party's ranks, because the Member for St. Boniface got up and said that he will be supporting the resolution, and didn't see any of the problems that are being now enumerated by the Member for Elmwood.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing terrible about what is being now proposed by the Member for Crescentwood. One could look at it and find minor disagreements with some of the whereases and some argument as to whether emphasis is necessary. The Member for Crescentwood has put in motherhood in an attempt to embarrass; whereas the prime responsibility for the caring and raising of children rests with parents. Of course if you don't say that you are attacking motherhood.

But it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the member would not place that emphasis on a resolution which says that children should not be sent to boarding school. Introduce a resolution into this House and say that, Whereas the primary responsibility for caring and raising of children rests with parents and therefore this House resolves that they will discourage parents from sending their children to boarding school. But you know why he won't do that, Mr. Speaker, because there are many people who support the Conservative Party who will send their children to boarding school and don't want you telling them that they are avoiding their parental responsibility.

So this is the kind of snobbishness, Mr. Speaker, which I said would greet the resolution. Now the big problem, Mr. Speaker, with what has been said thus far, with regard to the existing day care system, is that the existing day care system does two things. One, it provides a system for middle and upper-middle-class groups and subsidizes them heavily or it makes people come into the system and say I am poor and I need state money. Mr. Speaker, both of those two features of the existing system make it an inaccessible system and the people who need it most do not get it because, despite the low amount of the cost, that low cost can only be realized by means of a social worker means test, which I say, to start with, puts the parent who has to go through that test in a difficult position or it is expensive; despite the low cost, Mr. Speaker, it is expensive.

So what the resolution said, and it didn't even say, Mr. Speaker, change the existing system. The resolution doesn't say undo what you have done, the resolution says try a program, a pilot program to see how it works, just to see how it works. It doesn't undo this resolution, it doesn't undo the amendment. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to vote against the amendment, not because I disagree with some of the things that are in it but because I would like the government to consider the advisability of setting up a pilot project within the school system, within the public school facilities, the buildings. I'm not talking about it being run by the public school; I'm not saying that this becomes a part of the public school responsibility to provide a day care system; I've never said that in the resolution. When I made my remarks I never said that. What I said is that we could use the physical facilities; it would still be run as part of a provincial day care system and would be supervised by day care people knowledgeable in the field.

**MR. COSENS:** We do that now in the school system.

**MR. GREEN:** Of course, the Minister says you do that now. I was in The Pas and I didn't see the seven and eight-year olds running around clubbing the two year olds. I have never seen that, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell the Member for Elmwood that I have had experience in this area. There is no better companion for a two year old or a one-and-a-half year old than a 14, 15 or 16-year-old child. They have a natural affinity to those children; they have the proper time reference in speaking to those children and in playing with them; they do not get bored by them; they do not bring their hostilities in with them; they do not bring their problems from broken love affairs into the children; they play with those children in a way which is beautiful to watch. The reaction that I get from the Member for Elmwood is what I said, and then it was denied, I said, Mr. Speaker, that when I was a New Democrat I introduced this. And who was against it? The day care professionals who saw their position in some jeopardy, although it's not. If you did this there'd be more day care professionals employed than there are now because you're dealing with . . . How many children did you say are now served by day care? — (Interjection)— 6,500, Mr. Speaker. It can't be 5 percent of the possible population that could be served. If you had them within the school system and

it became universally available there would not be less day care workers employed; there'd be more. But they see it as a threat, Mr. Speaker, to the pedestal that they want to climb up on because they want to say that nobody can be a day care worker without a degree; they want to say that the salaries of day care workers have to go up because of that degree; they want to put themselves in the position of the doctors, the lawyers, the dentists and who can blame them? That's what they want. But we are not devising a system for day care workers; we're devising a system for children.

Mr. Speaker, for the Member for Elmwood to compare this with Swift's modest proposal I suppose was just done for the purpose of trying to get people's attention in talking to them. Swift's modest proposal was a proposal for the alleviation of the Irish famine. It was put in some of the terms that the Member of Elmwood refers to and then he says this is that kind of thing. This is not put satirically, Mr. Speaker, it is not put ironically. There is no basis of making that kind of comparison. We are talking in this proposal of experimenting with a two-directional program. One, to provide a inexpensive existing facility and I would not charge the day care, except the incremental cost of the facility. That's what's wrong with the school system now, the school system now charges the day care rent and therefore uses the rental as revenue for the school division. Now I say that the school division should only charge the incremental cost, not rent. The incremental cost is virtually nothing or if it's not nothing, it is next to nothing, because you're talking about an existing classroom, an existing building, existing heating, existing playgrounds, all of which are there and for the school division to charge the day care system a rental, is merely to rob Peter to pay Paul. It's shifting the money around, it doesn't create money, and increases the cost of day care.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I have against the Member for Crescentwood's proposal is that it undoes the other proposal. Why can't we do exactly as we are doing now as Conservatives would like to do including the Member for Elmwood? I repeat, when I brought this up in the New Democratic Party it was the day care workers, not the mothers who need day care, the day care workers and the unions, because the unions saw that they do not have the possibility of organizing the 13, 14 and 15 year olds and collecting dues from them and adding to their membership and the day care workers saw a threat to their aspiring professionalism. That's why it was challenged, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member for Elmwood is merely mouthing those particular groups at the expense, Mr. Speaker, of the children, because you're talking about 6,000 children who are now served. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the lowest income group, the one that needs it most, is the one that will not be served and will continually have less and less service if the direction is not changed.

So we asked for, Mr. Speaker, a pilot project. What has the government got against a pilot project? The member says that we now have them in the schools. Okay, so the use of the facilities in a way which I am not suggesting, but that is already there. Now I'm saying, go further within the public school system; have a program of child care responsibility

and have people take courses in it; make it voluntary. The Honourable Member for Elmwood says they get paid for it. Now would they do it for nothing? First of all we are not talking about babysitting. Secondly, we are not talking about an income plan or a work plan. We're talking about teaching a sense of responsibility. The member says and this is predictable, that the day care worker says you need consistency. You have to have that worker relating to the kids every day.

Mr. Speaker, the reverse is true. The danger with pre-school children is not that they are going to find it difficult to relate to a new young face, male or female, to come and play with them on the basis of a morning or an afternoon a week and that they will meet more of these people. The danger is developing a father or a mother image out of some adult who has needs with respect to those children, who themselves are serving their needs with being with the children rather than serving the child's needs. Mr. Speaker, I know because I have worked in the field for many years. I have worked in the field for many years. —(Interjection)— Absolutely, I've worked with young children, pre-school children, school children, teen children, in my years. I worked for ten years as a lay social worker at the YMHA Community Centre. I was the Director of the B'nai B'rith Camp which had 120 children, ages 9 to 16. I had an after camper group which was composed of mothers and babies. So if you're asking me how I know, I know as good as the people who are advising you. I say that there is a greater danger, that with one person there will be first of all a mother or a father image with that person; and secondly, that because that person is an adult and because that person has already developed those kinds of adult problems which we all have, Mr. Speaker, that person could be using the child to serve their needs rather than serving the needs of the child.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Yes. I'd like to ask the member this, and we know the member is skilled at proving the opposite even when it's pretty far out. I want to ask him whether he thinks it's detrimental in the public school system that in primary grades, one teacher with all their needs, aspirations, flaws and faults, teaches a class. Is he proposing a new system whereby you have 100 teachers a year?

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'll answer the two questions one after another. First, is it possible with an adult teacher with a group of kids, that you are going to get the wrong one and have a problem with your children? Absolutely, and it has happened. I'm not making a criticism of the public school system on this account. But if you're asking me whether semi-neurotic teachers will relate to the children and the child will have a problem as a result of that, I'd say absolutely.

Secondly, would I then say that the child go through 100 different teachers in a year, no I wouldn't. I don't see how one has to do with the other. I'm not talking about teachers, I'm saying that

what the child at the age of two, at the age of one-and-a-half, at the age of two-and-a-half in terms of a day care centre experience is looking for, is not an emotional attachment to an adult, but a fun attachment to somebody that they can have fun with. And having that fun and developing their own personality through the having of that fun will be much more beneficial to them than having a day care worker working on them as a social worker, as a case worker with that child. Therefore I dismiss, Mr. Speaker, out of hand, these suggestions that we shouldn't even try it.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood tried very hard to disagree but in the last analysis he said that the strength of the resolution is that it calls for a pilot project. If the strength of the resolution calls for a pilot project and if that is the resolution, and it's not a resolution to undo the existing system and reinstitute a new one that he disagrees with, why would he vote against the strength? Why would he find the non-existent weaknesses? Because none of the things that he has said are proposed by the resolution. What he has said is that there should be universal accessibility, I still think so; that there is a danger of over-professionalization; if he doesn't agree then the experiment won't hurt him; and that there are means of dealing with the problem. One of the things that we should do is see whether or not it works.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that it is too often that the professionals start to serve the professionals and not their consumers. The fact is that I have heard from this side of the House that the doctors are more interested in the doctors than they are in their patients. The lawyers are more interested in the lawyers than they are in their clients. There's a danger that the day care workers will be more interested in the day care workers than they will be in the children. I am suggesting that we are, to use a bad pun, in our infancy in day care. Let's make sure that we explore all avenues before we fix ourselves to a system which the community cannot afford.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the

**MR. SPEAKER:** Any desire to call at 5:30? (Agreed).

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, with the consent of all of the members, we can take the Member for Burrows name off the list because if he doesn't happen to be here on the day that this is called again he will lose the right to speak, whereas if his name is not on the list he will be able to participate in the debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is there agreement to leave it open? (Agreed). The hour being 5:30 — the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have a change in Public Utilities Committee, the name of Mr. Brown for Mr. Domino.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is that agreed? (Agreed). The hour being 5:30 the House is adjourned and stands adjourned till 2:00 o'clock tomorrow.