

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 21 April, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital): Presenting Petitions . . .

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. DON SCOTT (Inkster): I beg to present a petition of F.G. Holdings Ltd. praying for the passing of an Act to grant additional powers to F.G. Holdings Ltd.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. JERRY T. STORIE (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directs me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney General.

HON. ROLAND PENNER (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the Report of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission on Investment Revisions under The Trustee Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is particularly appropriate that I rise today to remind members that it is the birthday of Her Majesty the Queen.

This past weekend, Canadians saw Her Majesty participate as Queen of Canada in one of the most historic moments of this century. There is no doubt that her personal participation made the patriation ceremony more meaningful to people in this and to every other province in Canada.

Her participation signified the fact that the one aspect of her Constitution and system of government which is universally accepted, is the Monarchy. Her Majesty has lived a life dedicated to public service and to the public good. Her personal warmth and dignity have increased the devotion felt by her subjects to the monarchy. In addition, she has continued the splendid tradition of British monarchy, its adaptability to

change in the structure and system of government over decades and, indeed, centuries. I think that all of us in this Chamber can heartily endorse the statements by Her Majesty in her address to the nation, Saturday last, in particular I note her comments that, "Perhaps the most significant step in Canada's history was the decision of the communities to take pride in their several languages and cultures rather than to deplore the differences." Her praise of the genius of Canadian federalism's ability to overcome differences through reason and compromise and her declaration of unbounded confidence in this country.

While referring to the historic nature of Her Majesty's most recent visit, I also want to note the unique distinction conferred upon the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. To my knowledge, he is the only Provincial Leader of the Opposition who has ever been a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada. I am sure all members join with me in congratulating him. I have every confidence after witnessing Saturday's ceremony that the Canadian Constitution may be changing but the Canadian love and respect for Her Majesty remains as strong as it has ever been.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all members will join in marking Her Majesty's birthday and expressing best wishes and renewed loyalty to her on this occasion at this most historic time in our own known history.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, we of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition wish to associate ourselves wholeheartedly with the birthday congratulations and the tribute to Her Majesty expressed so warmly by the First Minister.

As the First Minister has said, Mr. Speaker, Queen Elizabeth is beloved by all of her people. She is now in the 31st year of her reign and each year of her remarkable reign strengthens our faith in the institution of the monarchy as uniquely fitting and suitable for Canadians. Her personal strengths of character, her grace, her compassion, cause her to be universally loved and admired, not only in Canada, not only in the Commonwealth, but, indeed, in the broader world community. We certainly join in wishing Her Majesty and her family the fullest measure of peace and good health and contentment in the year ahead.

I personally thank the First Minister for his reference to the fact that he and I joined Her Majesty's Privy Council on Saturday. I think the House would wish to congratulate the Premier of Manitoba on the unique distinction which he holds of being the second Premier of Manitoba in the history of our province to be accorded that distinction. God Save the Queen.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If I might direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, we

have with us this afternoon 25 students of Grade 9 standing from the John Pritchard School. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River East.

There are five students of Grade 11 standing of the Sisler High School, which school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

On behalf of all of the honourable members I welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question for the First Minister or for the Attorney-General. Given the fact that the Bill of Rights is now the law of Canada as proclaimed by Her Majesty the Queen on Saturday last, could the First Minister or the Attorney-General give us an update on the study, which I believe the Attorney-General announced some several weeks ago, into those laws of Manitoba which will be found to be in conflict with that Bill of Rights and the kind of procedure that we can expect that will be followed by this Legislature in making those laws conform with the new Bill of Rights of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PENNER: I'm sure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will not mind if I offer a minor correction, it's the Charter of Rights. Yes, a study has been authorized and then approved, and funds allocated through Treasury Board for a study to take place over the summer under the leadership of Professor Dale Gibson of the Faculty of Law, one of Canada's eminent scholars in the field of constitutional law. It will employ a number of Faculty of Law students at an advanced level and I expect to receive a preliminary report before the end of the summer. At the same time, of course within the normal process, my Crown Attorneys, the Crown Attorneys of the Government, may have to face some problems that will inevitably be raised in the courts. That's to be expected and we will be monitoring the reaction of the courts to various sections of the charter very closely.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if some of the citizens of Ontario claiming that the new Bill of Rights gives them the right to sell and show pornographic, lewd and dirty pictures, books and live productions; I wonder if the Honourable Attorney-General could assure the Manitobans that this type of pornography under the guise of freedom of speech, with regards to the new Bill of Rights, will not be allowed in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PENNER: First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is the Charter of Rights. I mean, the Charter of Rights is only two days old and already it has not only been misnamed

by members Opposite but they're already, it seems to be implied, attacking the Charter of Rights and throwing a scare. Of course, there will be people who will raise very seemingly odd or strange questions in terms of the effect of the Charter of Rights. I would just like to point out to the House that Section 1 of the Charter talks about reasonable limitations. I have faith in the judiciary of this country and in the judiciary of this province and the Supreme Court of Canada that the interpretations that will be given to the Charter are going to be such that the honourable members need not fear, as apparently they do, that a flood of pornography will be chasing them down the back streets and into the grocery shops of their communities, that the charges when warranted and advised by the police with respect to pornography, will be laid as indeed some have recently. It may be that a defense attorney retained in such cases will raise the question and I have no fear that the floodgates of sin, damnation, are about to be opened by this new constitutional instrument.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Health. In view of the Minister's comment in Committee of Supply last night, that the Department of Health will continue to use Home Orderly Services Limited for the provision of personal health care services to wheelchair clients, can the Minister confirm that the government is satisfied that the company is providing an acceptable quality of service in what is admittedly, a very difficult health care field?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I think that I should state here that there has been a review that in fact it being an overcharge, that the Commission felt that was an attempt to extort; it was caused by bad bookkeeping practice. That has been changed with the help of the Commission. We will continue with this group. It's a very difficult service to provide. It is as good as we can get at this time but like everything else, we will keep on looking and we'll try to improve it, but we're satisfied or we wouldn't stay with them at this time if that wasn't the case.

MR. SHERMAN: My question is to the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines. In view of the government's conclusions following a review of the Home Orderly Services Program, and in view of the Minister's actions during last November's election campaign in which he orchestrated a press conference which was used to attack both the service and the government on a number of sensationalized, trumped-up and phony charges, will the Minister now repudiate that cynical and crassly political action that he took at that time?

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

HON. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I don't know the propriety of his question relating to my actions in Opposition but I do note, Mr. Speaker, that the company that I raised concerns about with respect to the possibility of extra-billing, has indeed paid some \$1,000 back to the Government of Manitoba after I raised this matter with the Provincial Auditor, even though the Minister of Health at that time was sitting on his hands through this whole episode.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister in all honesty and candour concede that any comments with respect to bookkeeping practices and possible anomalies were welcomed by the government of the day, but that his orchestrated press conference was geared and staged to accuse the service of an unacceptable quality of service, unacceptable response to client calls and general complaints as presented by him, which did not in fact exist and which cast a considerable cloud over what is a very difficult service and a unique service. I don't know of any other province that has a service such as that. Would the Minister in candor concede that his press conference was really built around those kinds of charges?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my press conference was built around complaints that had been received by myself from people who were concerned with the service, who had indeed contacted the Minister and felt that the Minister hadn't taken any action when he was Minister of Health at that time. I had raised this matter with staff of his department. I believe the questions, the whole set of questions are out of order, Mr. Speaker, but I'll respond to the out-of-order questions of a sore loser.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister consider responding to the orderlies and to the public of Manitoba and apologizing to the orderlies and the public for misleading the public with respect to the quality of service provided in that very difficult health care field.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I raised concerns about the fact that there might be extra billing, that there may be instances of public spending. Mr. Speaker, when the auditor took a look at this he found that there was \$1,000 of overbilling. That matter has been corrected. Apparently the matter is being reviewed; apparently the service is improving; apparently the Department of Health under a new NDP administration is monitoring the situation. They are trying to improve the service, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased that my colleague, the Minister of Health, is doing that. I believe that's what the people of Manitoba elected an NDP government for, to provide humane, compassionate and competent government. That's what they are getting. They didn't have it before.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Community Services. I would ask him whether in view of the feigned outrage of the NDP Opposition last year against the government of the day with respect to soup lines at the Salvation Army's Harbour Light Hostel, whether the Minister can advise the House now of his position and

his attitude this year in the light of increasing numbers in those soup lines and whether, indeed, his attitude this year is one of let them eat soup.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, my attitude this year is the same as it was last year. Indeed, I'm very concerned about anyone in this province of ours who is unemployed, and I would urge honourable members to participate and support the resolution we have on the Order Paper calling for the Federal Government to finally see the light at — (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, blame it on the Feds, the fact is that economists, there are officials of major banks in this. Mr. Speaker, there's no question but that the people of our great province and concerned persons right across the country recognize the folly of the tight money policy being followed by the Federal Government causing undue high interest rates and causing, indeed, this unemployment which is so unfortunate in our midst. Until we get a change in that policy we'll continue to see right across Canada, a recession.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm having some difficulty in hearing the Honourable Minister make his answer. The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can assure honourable members that this province, this Provincial Government, does indeed take a humane attitude to all people who are disadvantaged and unfortunate and I'm pleased to note that in our budget we have provided more monies for dealing with people who have difficulties, whether they're disabled, whether they're physically handicapped or whatever their condition may be, that we are indeed making an effort to be our brother's keeper.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a different level of outrage this year on the part of the Minister of Community Services now that his position has changed with respect to the side of the House that he sits on.

Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister on the remote possibility, the remote possibility that President Reagan is not able to do anything about the Salvation Army soup lines in Winnipeg, what is this Minister and his colleagues going to do about this?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we will do everything in the power of the Provincial Government to ensure an adequate rate of economic growth and within my department we will do everything we can to help those who are less fortunate than ourselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Natural Resources responsible for the Gull Harbour Resort Hotel. I'm in possession of a letter as, indeed, is the Minister and, I believe, the First Minister, sent to them by a long-time

manufacturer of kitchen food equipment in the Province of Manitoba that recently unsuccessfully tendered on a substantial order of kitchen equipment in that resort hotel, that charges the government with unfair tendering practices. Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate to me, has he had an opportunity to acquaint himself with the issue and is he satisfied that the tendering practices followed in this instance were correct and normal?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. AL MACKLING (St. James): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it is usual that the opening of tenders are done in a public way that other persons tendering for the business are apprised of the successful bid. My understanding, and I think it's the information that the Honourable Minister has, that has not taken place in this case. It is also unusual and I find it unacceptable, particularly having listened to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the last few days in the Committee of considering of Estimates that a clause that absolutely prohibits any substitution of product other than those designated, and they happen to be mostly of U.S. manufacture, when we have a number of them being manufactured here in Manitoba. Is that, indeed, in the interests of Manitoba manufacturers competing for government business?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I was advised that the normal practice had been followed; I haven't made personal inquiry myself. I indicated the other day when I was apprised of this concern that a complaint had been registered with the department, that I would be taking a look at it. I've been assured that the practice is one that has been followed in the past. However, I will endeavour to look at the matter personally but I have had that assurance, that everything was as it has been in the past.

MR. ENNS: I asked the Minister or perhaps I'll direct the question to the Minister of Government Services, is it not normal procedure - and the Ministry of Government Services does have on staff a sufficient number of architects and other persons knowledgeable in setting out the design specifications for government purchases - to, in fact, have a government, a government person set the design qualifications rather than the architect in question that was selected to do the job?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I believe that either option has been used in the past, although I'm not certain of it, but I will undertake to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. (Dave) BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minis-

ter of Government Services responsible for Transportation. At the close of his Estimates he indicated that by the end of last week he would have a decision on those parcels of land representing abandoned rail beds on rights-of-way that have been abandoned, he would have some decision on the transfer of title to that property. I wonder if he could give us an up-to-date report.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I've had an opportunity to review a number of the applications, in particular the correspondence that was referred to in questions that were put to me a couple of weeks back and I have instructed the department to carry forward with the transfer of those properties.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism. The Minister of Resources says, as the practice has happened in the past. Well, the practice in the past, Mr. Speaker, has been that if there has been a complaint regarding the quotation system or the purchasing system of the province that the Minister of Economic Development investigate it. A copy of the letter went to Mr. Ellis Shippam of the Department of Economic Development and Tourism, has the Minister or will the Minister have Mr. Shippam investigate it and give the Minister a full report as to the purchasing of this equipment at Hecla Island? And maybe the Minister could find out why a Manitoba manufacturer has been unable to acquire the other tendered prices? He doesn't even know why he didn't get the job, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. MURIEL SMITH (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to follow up that case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of the Environment. I wonder, can the Honourable Minister of the Environment advise the House if poison bait is still being scattered on the roof of this building to eliminate or cut down the hundreds of pigeons for years that call that their home?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. JAY COWAN (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I cannot provide any detailed information to the Member for Roblin at the present time and I would only ask him if he could be more specific in respect to his concerns. If he can be I'll be pleased to attempt to provide him with the detailed information which I know he wants and he deserves in respect to that question. If he, in fact, cannot be more specific then it may take me a bit longer to provide that information to

him, but I will certainly undertake to do so by way of this commitment. I'll take this question as notice and will await further information from the Member for Roblin, or failing to receive that will proceed on my own to provide him with the type of detailed information which he deserves.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm sure the Member for Roblin-Russell has been a member of this House long enough to know that items termed as exhibits are not allowed within the Chamber. Does the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell have a question?

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, it was the Honourable Minister that asked me to produce the evidence and, Mr. Speaker, since pigeons are better known in Ottawa circles as "doves" on some special occasions, it was found on the west side of this building early last evening. I wonder would the Minister make sure, I'll give him the carcass, he can conduct an autopsy and advise this House what was the cause of its death.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. COWAN: Well, I can't undertake specifically to conduct the autopsy on my own. I would be pleased to receive the carcass which the member has been keeping in his desk for sometime now — I'm not certain how long — however, without wishing to treat this subject lightly as some of the members opposite are intending to do, I do in fact wish to review the questions which he has asked and ask my department to —(Interjection)— and ask my department if, in fact, they will undertake the necessary investigations and examinations which will allow them to determine as much as is possible the cause of death of this apparently deceased pigeon. Having asked them to do that, I will endeavour to report back to the Member for Roblin with whatever information is available in respect to that distinct cause of death of this bird.

I hope to be able to do that in the near future. However, I must warn the Member for Roblin that these sorts of investigations do take some time and therefore I would just ask his patience in this regard.

However, in the meanwhile I will check with the other Ministers responsible for the building and I will check with my department. I will also check with the Minister of Health whom I correspond with and communicate with on many occasions on subjects such as this and the Minister of Natural Resources, who obviously has some role to play in the protection of wildlife in this province as well.

I will provide the Interim Report back to the Member for Roblin in great detail, as soon as I have it available to me.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Honourable Minister if he'll be very careful with this case because a similar case likely caused the political downfall and demise of the former Member for Elmwood, when he was Minister of Government Services.

MR. COWAN: Well, I appreciate the member's advice and I only want to assure him with any questions that he provides to me — and I take this in a very serious

way — because there is obviously something which has affected this poor bird. We will want to find out, in fact, what that could be and provide it to the member and to the House, so that we can have the type of information available to us, which will allow us to make the type of decisions which we as decision-makers wish to proceed in making as part of this government.

We will get the facts and figures on this and we will provide it to the Member for Roblin and to members of the House and tell the members who are interested, at our earliest convenience.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General in his capacity as House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks there have been a number of oral questions for which we have not received answers. They've been taken as notice. There have also been several questions in a written form placed upon the Order Paper.

I wonder if the Attorney-General could advise when we might have answers to some of our questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the second part of the question, there will be filed in the House tomorrow the reply to the Order for Returns of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

I have had members of my staff going through Hansard to correlate notices taken of questions and answers given. I expect to have that completed by Friday and will give the answer to the Honourable Opposition House Leader at that time.

We're trying to keep check of those things and I assure the Honourable Opposition House Leader and the other members of the House that we will not leave questions unanswered.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, during the review of the Estimates of the Department of Highways and Transportation and in the review of the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, a number of questions were taken as notice by the Ministers at that time and were not responded to prior to the passing of those Estimates.

I wonder if the Government House Leader would undertake to speak with the Ministers of those departments and assure that those questions also are answered.

MR. PENNER: Yes.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines.

Some days ago I asked the Minister of Energy and Mines about the possible action by this government to reduce royalties, which might lead to a further production or exploration of oil in this province. Since that time, I understand the Saskatchewan Government has taken some action in this regard and although the Minister of Energy and Mines has said

that he has had no representation, I wonder if the Minister of Energy and Mines has given consideration to the fact that there are over 100 oil wells in Manitoba that are capable of production but are not producing oil because of the royalties structure.

Has that matter been brought to the attention of the Minister and is he considering taking some action?

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

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I've had consultations with people in the industry and they've never, to date, raised the whole matter of our royalties or taxation being too excessive. In fact, I asked them specifically about that and again they commented at that time, that they didn't feel that it was a critical factor.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the statistics indicate that from January 1st to April 5th, 1982, we've had 19 wells drilled in Manitoba compared to five being drilled between the January 1st and April 5th of 1981. So it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that we are having an increase in activity in Manitoba, in part because of increased prices for new oils. So far, Mr. Speaker, I think I'm pleased with the rate of activity in Manitoba.

The only problem that the junior oil companies have is a cash flow problem, Mr. Speaker, caused in large part by high interest rates. That has been the pressing problem being faced by not only the juniors, Mr. Speaker, but even larger Canadian companies like Turbo Resources, which now has to go through a very critical refinancing and Dome Petroleum which apparently is having difficulty because of the massively increased interest rates, caused again by an economic policy that isn't working.

So if the Member for Turtle Mountain has concerns about the state of the oil industry and future possible action, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that he would join with my Premier and our Minister of Finance in urging the Federal Government to lower the interest rates, so that we can stimulate some economic activity in all spheres within this country.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, indeed we have been pleased that the response of the oil companies in terms of new exploration, which came about as a consequence of our government returning to a policy of leasing Crown land and to bring our royalty structure into line with other provinces. What I'm concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is the question of those oil wells that are capable of production, but are not now producing because of the royalty structure - and this is not something that has come about within the past few months, this is an issue that has existed for some time. I would ask the Minister, specifically, if he would consult with his department and see whether he has received any communication, whether the department has received any communication from Hendy's Production and Management Ltd. requesting that the government calculate their royalties in a different manner in order that some of these oil wells might be put back into production?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I will, in fact, look into the matter raised by the Member for Turtle Mountain. If indeed, there were some problems with the royalty

structure of the previous administration that created some anomalies, certainly, I would like to hear about those and I will look into those to determine whether, in fact, any action should be taken especially in light of the fact that there has been some incentives provided through the oil pricing arrangement with Ottawa. But, I will certainly look into the matter.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's partly a question of the royalty structure and partly a question of the Federal Government application of their royalty structure. Has the Minister made representation to Ottawa to the effect that provincial royalties should be made deductible as an expense when calculating federal royalties?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, we have been in negotiation with the Federal Government on all of these matters. We certainly have been raising these points in the past. Indeed, I can recall it was the previous New Democratic Party Government that raised very serious objections to the actions of the Federal Government when they, in fact, made provincial royalties non-deductible from Federal Income Tax claims by Manitoba companies. We found that was an anomalous situation, then an unacceptable situation; we continue to find that. I will have to determine whether, in fact, the previous administration, under the Conservative Government, made representation during the course of the last four years with respect to this matter and I'll check to determine whether, in fact, that was the case but I know certainly that we have been making representation in this matter, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G.W.J. (Gerry) MERCIER (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Attorney-General. Could he indicate whether he will be introducing legislation at this Session, amendments to the Human Rights Act dealing with mandatory retirement pursuant to the Rothstein Inquiry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PENNER: No, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of introducing such legislation in this Session. I have asked the members of the Human Rights Commission to review the whole Act. I think that it may need revision and that will be one question that the Commission will be looking at. There is also a Cabinet Caucus Committee that will be looking at the Rothstein report and expects to review it very closely over the summer.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister of Labour indicate whether he will be introducing any amendments to the Civil Service Act dealing with mandatory retirement pursuant to the recommendations of the Rothstein Inquiry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. VIC SCHROEDER (Rossmere): That is under review and there is no present intention to introduce

any legislation that would be awaiting the report of the committee that is looking into it.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Education. Could the Minister of Education indicate whether or not she will be introducing any amendments to the Public Schools Act dealing with the question of mandatory retirement pursuant to the recommendations of the Rothstein Inquiry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. MAUREEN HEMPHILL (Logan): No.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister rose to answer the question.

MRS. HEMPHILL: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the First Minister and, in light of the election promise in which he stated that the NDP Government would provide security of layoffs and 12 months compensation to employees would be required in the event of shutdowns or layoffs involving more than 50 people, I wonder if he could tell the House what he and his government are doing to avoid the layoffs and possible shutdown and the putting out of work of some 300 people at Victoria Leather.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is referring to legislation that involves layoffs, notice of times in regard to layoffs, and certainly it is our intention to deal with those issues during our term in government. Insofar as the question of Victoria Leather, that pertains, as the honourable member knows full well, to the general economic circumstance that all parts of Canada are presently affected by.

MR. BANMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Then in light of the promise that there would be security of layoffs and that 12 months notice or compensation to employees would be required in the event of shutdowns or layoffs involving more than 50 people, in this particular case that particular election promise does not apply to the 300 employees at Victoria Leather.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member for La Verendrye should be conscious of the fact that this was not a layoff but, indeed, was termination or employment as a result of the actions of a receiver. This is quite a different item than that which occurred as a result of layoffs under the provisions of The Labour Relations Act.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if a company that goes into bankruptcy or is put into receiver-

ship is considered in the First Minister's terms as a shutting down of the operation. As he points out in his promises during the election, he did not only refer to layoffs he also refers, in his document which he signed, he refers to shutdowns, not only layoffs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is quite a difference, and the honourable member knows, between what occurs as a result of receivership when there is an automatic termination as a result of the economic circumstances, opposed to that which occurred in respect to Maple Leaf and to Swifts.

Let me assure the honourable member that this government, unlike the previous government, is examining the provisions of The Labour Act in order to provide greater security in the event of layoffs. This is an area that, yes, has been neglected over the last number of years and this government is quite conscious of that.

MR. BANMAN: So, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question then. The Minister is saying that, as far as the promises were made, they do not apply to the 300 people that face layoffs at Victoria Leather, however, after the government introduces legislation this type of thing will never happen again. Is that what he's telling us?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I regret that again we have to inform the honourable member that what we are dealing with is not layoffs but we are dealing with a receivership, a bankruptcy which is quite different. What has occurred, as a result of economic circumstance across the country; what has occurred because of economic policies that are not serving the public interest at the present time in Canada. What we're dealing with is a need for action on the part of governments, Federal, Provincial and elsewhere in the world in order to establish a better economic climate. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we will do all that we can within the provincial jurisdiction, although it be limited, in order to assist during this most difficult time pertaining to economic circumstances. We are most concerned in regard to men and women that are laid off. But what we need, Mr. Speaker, is the assistance and co-operation of the Opposition of other levels of government at the senior level; indeed, what we need is a realization that there is a requirement for more positive, direct, activist government in Canada and elsewhere in the world in order to reverse the economic results of fiscal conservatism in the world.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines. Can the Minister of Energy and Mines advise the House whether or not this department is undertaking leasing of potash in the McAuley area?

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

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, right now we are not undertaking leasing but I'll check with the departmen-

tal staff to see whether, in fact, they've received any enquiries.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Can the Minister of Finance advise the House whether he plans to be going to the markets with another bond issue shortly?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the question is one that the former Minister of Finance should well know the answer to. When we came into government, because of the fact that there hadn't been sufficient borrowing to keep up with where we were, we were several hundred of millions of dollars in short-term loans for the year 1981-82. We had the Minister in charge of overdrafts down here and when we went to the market although he was asking the press when we did go to the market to New York, what is this person doing? Although he was asking that, he should have known full well that what we were doing was converting those overdrafts and promissory notes into long-term loans. It was his government, Mr. Speaker, that put us in line last fall before the change of government, for instance, to Japan to see —(Interjection)— yes, exotic dollars that the former First Minister likes to refer to. It was when he was Minister of Finance that the government entered the line-up for the —(Interjection)— yes, for the Japanese money market, so he should well know the answer to that question.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, we're becoming accustomed to this battle gab that we keep getting from the Minister of Finance. My question was, does he intend to go to the market with another bond issue shortly?

MR. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I expect that over the course of the next number of years, we will frequently be going to the bond market.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions having expired, Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to announce a change with respect to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for tomorrow; the Honourable Member for Flin Flon substituting for the Honourable Member for Springfield.

Mr. Speaker, would you please call second reading Bill No. 15?

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. ROLAND PENNER (Fort Rouge) presented Bill No. 15, The Marital Property Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, Bill 15 is a bill intended to amend certain provisions of The Marital Property Act. Presently, rights under pension plans, annuity policies, life insurance, and accident and sickness policies are defined in The Marital Property Act as commercial assets. As a result of that particular definition the courts have a wider discretion to depart from the very important principle of equal sharing where such assets are divided. Bill 15 defines these rights under pension plans, annuity policies, life, or accident and sickness insurance policies as family assets, thus restricting the discretion to vary equal division of these assets.

Bill 15 also deals with issues raised in the decision of the Manitoba Court of Appeal in *Isbister versus Isbister*. The court in that case considered the issue of the division of rights under a pension plan between spouses and decided that although pension benefits were, as then defined, commercial assets falling within the scope of The Marital Property Act, that such benefits consisting of rights arising in the future could not be included in the accounting and division of property under the Act, on the grounds that present market value for these benefits could not be determined and also on the further ground that, subject to certain exceptions applying mostly to pensions such as CPP, that such assets could not be split. This decision, that is the *Isbister and Isbister* decision created a serious problem, as in many marriages a pension plan is the only valuable marital asset.

Now, in response to the problem arising from the *Isbister* decision, Bill 15 provides that an asset is to be divided between spouses even where it consists merely of future rights, and even where there is no certainty at the time of separation, at the time of the division, as to whether this right will be received in the future. Further, where a present market value cannot be determined for an asset because of the peculiar nature of such assets, the court shall nevertheless attempt to determine a value by using whatever other, that is other than market, valuation method the court deems appropriate.

The present Act empowers a court to make an order preserving an asset, but only where it can be established, by the applicant in the particular proceedings, that one spouse is - and these are legal terms - dissipating or absconding with that asset.

Now to ensure that the purpose of The Marital Property Act is not defeated by any prior disposal of asset - that is prior to the court having a chance to adjudicate - before a division of property can be made, Bill 15 contains a provision which extends the power of the court and allows the court to make an order for the preservation of assets providing, therefore, this relief to a spouse who may not be able to prove that the extreme situation of dissipation or absconding actually exists but may be able to demonstrate that there is an apprehended danger of the dissipation of that asset.

The provision also provides that a certificate of what is called "lis pendens," that is, it alerts any potential purchaser or mortgagee of an asset, it alerts that person to the fact that there may be litigation pending; that a Certificate of Lis Pendens may issue to ensure

the preservation of an asset, even where the title to real property is not in issue; to further protect the rights of the spouse and to prevent disposal of an asset before a court order could be made as to what the respective portions of the marital assets are. The Bill will provide that such an application for the preservation of an asset can be made on what is called an ex parte basis, that is by the one applicant appearing in court without notice.

Ordinarily, Mr. Speaker, new legislation does not apply to court actions already in progress, however, to overcome as far as possible any hardships that have resulted from the application of the unamended Act and the effect of Isbister-Isbister has been to create a great many uncertainties and hardships. To overcome that Bill 15 extends these amendments to any court proceedings where no final order or judgment was given before the date of the first reading of the bill, namely, March 12, 1982.

I'm, therefore, recommending that Bill 15, to amend The Marital Property Act be enacted as proposed.

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

MR. MERCIER: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance that Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider and report of Bill 18 referred for Third Reading, The Pari-Mutuel Tax Act.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Flin Flon in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

BILL NO. 18 THE PARI-MUTUEL TAX ACT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): Committee come to order please. The Bill before the committee is Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Pari-Mutuel Tax Act. We will proceed section-by-section. Section No. 1—pass; Section No. 2 Imposition of tax.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, and he possibly may have to defer to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism. The Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, I believe, Monday night in Committee said that there hadn't been any decision made as to the distribution of these funds that the Provincial Government collects from the racing that go back to Horsemans Association and the Horse Breeders' Association. I wonder if the Minister of Finance is able at this time to tell us what the distribution of funds will be of

this tax as the races do start on Friday night?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. VICTOR SCHROEDER (Rossmere): The monies will be applied, as I understand it, to the Thoroughbred and Harness Racing Industry Support Programs originally in the amounts collected. The details of the program as to how the monies will be applied, as between purse supports, breeders supports, or other programs, will be based upon recommendations of the Manitoba Horse Racing Commission and is approved by the Minister responsible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Virden): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has indicated that the Horse Racing Commission has not made any recommendations to the government as yet. We're being asked to pass a measure which gives them additional money, some \$948,000 estimated, I believe the Minister said earlier. I think it's only fair that members of the Opposition should know specifically how that money is going to be apportioned? Is it going to be 65 percent to the thoroughbreds and 35 percent to the standard breds? Is it 55-45, or is it 50-50? Surely the Minister could give us that kind of information at this time; it's fairly important to the horse racing industry.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I recognize the importance of the question. I just would like to say, however, that this tax is just like the other portion of the tax, that is it goes to General Revenue, to the Consolidated Fund. It's not a trust fund type of situation. There will be discussions, as I understand it, with the industry as to the split and I understand the Minister of Economic Development may have some additional comments on that question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development and Tourism.

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, we have in fact received a letter of recommendation from the Horse Racing Commission as a result of the process which I have described before. The new Commission has met with the groups that are affected in a mixed group and then heard their positions separately.

They have come to a consensus but we are not announcing it until we get a written confirmation from each of the groups, just to eliminate any possible misunderstanding. But I've been very pleased at the process they've gone through and the fact that the conclusion they've reached is a unanimous one. I'll be happy to give the details of that.

But I think as you know, when we pass a Tax Act, the specific purposes for which it's to be used are not part of the bill. I'll be happy to give that information though within a few days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. GARY FILMON (Tuxedo): Mr. Chairman, if the

Minister could indicate who the groups were who participated in this unanimous decision or unanimous recommendation to the Horse Racing Commission.

My concern is that the wording used by the Minister of Finance is rather wide open and our original understanding was that the distribution of the funds that were generated from this additional tax would go to the horsemen themselves, i.e. the breeders and owners. When he refers to development in the industry it could in fact involve capital investment and a variety of other facilities that may not necessarily serve to enhance the breeders and the owners who have a fair capital investment in this province, in order to develop horses themselves, both thoroughbred and standard bred for racing in Manitoba.

I wonder if the Minister could just give some clarification so that we might feel a little more comfortable about it.

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the groups that they've met with are the breeders and the horsemen in both the standard bred and the thoroughbred areas, as well as representatives of the track.

I don't feel free to give the conclusions that they have reached but I think they do match the spirit of the comment made by the member opposite.

The reason I have confidence in what's being recommended, is that the groups have sat down together and they have listened to the needs as identified by one another for a good and healthy track period and the concensus they've reached, shows that they have recognized the needs of the respective groups.

As I say, I could jump the gun and give the information but we did undertake to wait until we had the written letters from those groups.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, we have now seen a third component thrown into this mix.

When the bill was first introduced, it was only the breeders and the horsemen and now the Minister has indicated that the operators of the track are involved in this as well. I think we're getting into an entirely different, almost a misrepresentation of what the tax was meant for.

I was under the impression that it was entirely for the horsemen and the breeders. Now, can the Minister confirm that the \$948 million or thousand or whatever the amount is, will go entirely to the horsemen and the breeders?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I repeat that when the tax bill is presented, the specific purpose for which the money is intended is not part of the bill. The intent of the bill is to be an industry development levy.

As I say, if it weren't for the agreement we'd made with the groups that we'd wait for the written confirmation, I wouldn't be hesitant to tell you. I don't like to anticipate but I think you'll be pleased, impressed, surprised perhaps, with the degree of consensus and with the way in which the groups have decided to use the industry levy money. I have confidence in the

recommendations they're making.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Continuing with Section No. 2 — the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would hope the Honourable Minister would refer to her speech, or the speech that was made when this was introduced on April 8th, because I believe — and I'm going by memory, but perhaps I should go back and read it again — but I believe there was no reference made at that time to the track, it was purely to the horsemen. I would not want to pass a bill under those purposes, when it was explained that it was only for the horsemen and now we find a third component being brought into the mix.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, if the member is referring to the introductory remarks that I made, I stated as follows: "As I noted, the revenues will be used in Horseracing Industry Development Programs. These programs are designed to make our industry competitive with the industry in other provinces and to stimulate the growth of a strong local horsebreeding industry."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Continuing with Section No. 2. No further comments? Preamble—pass; Title—pass; Bill be reported—pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ellis, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

THIRD READING

BILL NO. 18 THE PARI-MUTUEL TAX ACT

MR. SCHROEDER (Rossmere) presented Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Pari-Mutuel Tax Act for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In my constituency and in my period of time in this House I have had the privilege of representing constituents who have been involved in the horse racing industry and

several of my constituents have distinguished themselves through the years and have provided a very valuable contribution to the entertainment of people in Manitoba, both in Winnipeg and in rural Manitoba.

The racing industry is one that has been in the past, one of good entertainment in the rural circuit especially in the standard bred field. There have been good crowds of people that attend these races and they have enjoyed the performance of the Manitoba horses.

One of the problems we have seen in the racing industry is the intense competition that is created from other jurisdictions in the racing industry. The states, the American horses because they have not in the past had an opportunity to race in some of the states, have come to Manitoba but if racing changes in some of the northern states — and there is indications that might be occurring — we may be in a position where there would be a shortage of horses to provide the entertainment that the people are accustomed to enjoying.

One of the ways that this can be overcome is to encourage the breeding of better race stock in the development of the horse industry in Manitoba and this move of increasing the pari-mutuel tax could be very beneficial to that if all of the increased money was going to the breeders, in particular the Manitoba breeders, of race horses in this province. I'm sure the standard, the quality of horses would improve with additional support and I congratulate the government for doing that.

However, when it was mentioned here just a few minutes ago by the Minister of Tourism, there is a possibility the track might be also involved in some of the sharing of the revenue from this particular tax and I have to express my concern at this time in defense of the breeding industry in Manitoba, both thoroughbred and standard bred.

I say to the Ministers, and the Minister of Finance in particular, that in my opinion the revenue generated has probably some of the best return that the province could ever get in relationship to the money invested. So I would urge the continuation of support, and this Bill is part of it, for the racing industry to ensure that we have more Manitoba bred horses, better quality Manitoba bred horses for the enjoyment of all of the people of Manitoba who wish to attend the races and see some of our finest quality Manitoba horses competing on the race tracks, both in Manitoba and in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to set the record clear. I was asked the question earlier about what groups were consulted in the decision about how the levy was to be divided and that's when I listed the breeders and horsemen both standard and thoroughbred and the track. I didn't say that those were the groups that were to receive a share of the money. So until I can make the announcement I thought it important that that clarification be made.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, would you call the motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation and Highways standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Niakwa.

ADJOURNED DEBATES - CROW RATES

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed Resolution of the Honourable Minister of Government Services, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Niakwa.

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. ABE KOVNATS (Niakwa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again the press has found out that I'm going to be speaking this afternoon and they are here in great numbers.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this Resolution with a little bit of intrepidation and some concern. Inasmuch as I am an urban member, I represent an urban constituency and my background really isn't that much about the rural area and really that's the main effect of this Resolution.

Before I get right into the meat of the discussion on the Resolution, I would just like to bring to the attention of the honourable members the very last paragraph of the Resolution, it says:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House express its strong disapproval of the unilateral and socially and economically unacceptable proposal by the federal government to remove the statutory rates on grain."

I don't really have any difficulty with that statement. Now, I'm going to get on to the discussion concerning my being an urban member.

People have come to me and said, Abe what is the Crow rate, and I said well I'm really an authority on it because I have happened to be on the CPR and I've gone through the Crow'snest Pass so it makes me an authority, almost as much an authority as the honourable members on the government side of the House that have spoken on this matter. But basically it gets right down to when they ask you, what is the Crow rate? How does it affect us? How is it going to affect the price of bread? That's what the people in the Province of Manitoba, particularly urban members want to know. They really don't understand the Crow rate and I do try to explain to them what the Crow rate is.

Now, just as a little bit of a lesson, without too much background, my understanding of the Crow rate is, that the railroad by legislation has been advised and that they must transport certain types of grain at a reduced rate, and it's just by legislation and for no other reason. How does that affect the railroad and the farmer? Well, it affects the farmer because any increase in his costs lessens his profit, lessens the possibility that he's going to stay in business and at this time of the economy he's got to be given every bit as much help as possible.

So, therefore we must maintain the benefits of the Crow, otherwise the farming community, and not just in Manitoba, but Saskatchewan and Alberta will run

into great difficulty, so we're really protecting the farmer and that's what we have to do without hurting the consumer or the railroad. You've got to look at the overall picture. You can't just make up your mind on one aspect and say, all right, I support this resolution blindly. There are many aspects that have to be taken into consideration.

First of all, can the railroad afford to ship grain at the Crow rate and give the service that we want them to give so that the grain will get to market on time? No they can't; they need the help. The Federal Government must give them that help. If the Federal Government doesn't give them that help, they cannot maintain the railroad. It affects many other aspects of it.

It affects the employees of the railroad. If the railroad is losing money it lessens the opportunity of job security for the people of the railroad, and that's a big concern to me because I've got many people that work for the railroad, that live in my constituency. They're not complaining, but they do mention it to me. "Abe, you know, we really can't see that the railroad can ship grain at a greater loss every year because that's what it's becoming." They have to be given some compensation, and the Federal Government is the one that has to give that compensation.

I'm very very unhappy with the attitude of the New Democratic Party inasmuch as their feeling towards the Crow, not that they support maintaining the benefits of the Crow, that's all right, I accept that, but the manner in which they go about in a political manner, trying to get across to the farmer, playing with the important aspect of supporting the farmer and using it as a political ploy, under the guise of defeating a Federal Government, which under the guise of an increased gasoline tax, the New Democratic Party defeated that Progressive Conservative Government that was, in all intents and purposes, going to maintain the benefits of the Crow. The New Democratic Party without thinking ahead at all, just for the sake of defeating the government, supported the Liberals and out they went.

Now, we're stuck with the Liberal Government and here's the New Democratic Party on one hand saying, defeat the government that's going to give us the Crow and support the government that is not going to maintain the Crow and that's what they've done.

I have a few questions to ask and a few answers I need to be given to me. It's quite an emotional issue this Crow. It affects the future of the farmers in the Province of Manitoba and I can tell who are the farmers — the ones with the dirt on their boots and it's good clean dirt — so I would accept that the honourable member and I keep forgetting — The Pas, Flin Flon — it's quite an emotional issue and I think that we've got to look at it rather than on an emotional issue we've got to look at it, the facts the figures and take in the whole picture.

We can't keep blaming the previous administration; we can't keep blaming the CPR railroad for all the things that happened in the past, it's over and done with. Can we keep blaming the people that we had —(Interjection)— you'll have to speak up because really I have a little trouble hearing and actually I don't want to hear but I have trouble hearing anyway —(Interjection)—

Some of the questions that have to be answered are, who's going to pay for the transportation of grain? I guess there's no other question that could be so important. Who's going to pay for the transportation? I'm a consumer. Am I going to pay for it? Maybe I should pay for it a little bit. I think the railroad has to take their chances and be given some subsidy. They should be transporting the grain and not at a loss.

They shouldn't be going into the business and transport it as a loss because I hear of all the benefits the railroad has got, the land and all the different businesses that they've gone into. But really, should we be holding that against the transportation system of the railroad? I say no, there's no reason to be doing so.

Should we be blaming the people that we fought in the last war? We're friends with them now, it's over and done with. I think the benefits that they received are long gone and we have to look on the basis of what's happening today. Let's not criticize the railroads for the things that happened in the past.

I think I've got to go back a few years — particularly the CPR — I think that there's a bit of a conflict concerning the CPR inasmuch as a few years back my mother was telling me that my grandfather helped build the CPR railroad hotel here in the City of Winnipeg, The Royal Alexander Hotel — it's gone now — but just as a passing remark so there's a long ways back with the CPR.

The things that have happened in the past have been corrected somewhat. We've learned to live with it but we do have that basic decision that we have to make right now and our decision in Manitoba and Saskatchewan isn't going to be that important. We're going to tell the Federal Government how we feel —and the Resolution isn't that bad — we're going to tell them how we feel in the Province of Manitoba, how we feel as farmers, how we feel as consumers, how we feel about the solidarity of the east and the west because it's developed into a fight between the east and the west because of the advantages that they have over in Eastern Canada. These are all the things that have to be considered.

The employees of the CPR railroad have to be considered; the farmers have to be considered; the consumer and all of the people in the Province of Manitoba. Rather than make it into a political ploy, let's all work together in this regard like the Minister had suggested; he's certainly going to have my support in working together for the benefits of the Province of Manitoba, particularly the farmer in the Province of Manitoba, but, I'm not going to turn against the railroad, the employees of the railroad. You can't do that; you've got to take it all into consideration. The Federal Government has to be encouraged to support the railroad in subsidizing the shipping of grain so that the benefits of the Crow can be maintained. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. PHIL EYLER (River East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it's urban day today, the Member for Thompson says. Like the Member for Niakwa, I too, am an urban MLA and this is not simply a rural issue, it

is an economic issue of vital importance to everyone in Manitoba. So, I would like to take this opportunity to add a few words of support to this side for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we're all aware that the Federal Government has proposed the removal of the Crow rate, that special freight rate for grains which has applied in western Canada since 1897. But what we don't really know is why. The Federal Government has given us a few reasons and we've all heard the statistics. By 1990 it is expected that coal will increase in freight traffic by 278 percent; potash will be up 150 percent; sulphur will be up 25 percent. Mr. Pepin tells us that the railroads are going to have to expand and upgrade their facilities throughout the west. That's true, I have no quarrel with that. If there is an expenditure of \$13 billion required over the next eight years to upgrade rail facilities, let them invest it. My problem is why do you ask the farmers of Manitoba to pay for this?

Last year in 1980, CPR had internally generated investment capital of \$2.3 billion. Over the next eight years, that's certainly enough to pay for all of the investment which is required to upgrade the rail facilities through the Rocky Mountains. That's where all of this is going. Four percent of that investment will be in Manitoba. Almost all of it will be in the Rockies, in Alberta and British Columbia. So, why are the farmers of Manitoba asked to pay for that investment?

Furthermore, for the Member for Morris, a lot of the federal position is based on dubious studies. Mr. Snavelly, a highly paid Washington consultant was brought in to do a theoretical study of the costs of the railways and his theories just didn't coincide with reality. Mr. Speaker, the Snavelly Report estimated costs for CN-CP for 1980 and that estimate was \$1.3 billion higher than the actual costs reported by the railways in 1980; \$1.3 billion of fictitious costs invented by Mr. Snavelly. Furthermore, Mr. Snavelly said that the CN would lose \$724 million in 1980 and the auditors said there was a profit of \$250 million. Mr. Snavelly said that CP would lose \$194 million and the annual report for CP reports that there was \$277 million profit. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris says it's a long way from \$13 billion, but those are the profits, those are not the capital reinvestments.

Mr. Speaker, what will happen if Mr. Pepin gets his way? The value of agricultural products in Manitoba will drop by \$61 million; net farm income will decline by \$40 million; the secondary impact on the economy will result in a further loss of \$62 million and the net result for Manitoba will be a loss of 2,200 jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Opposition work so hard to get 600 jobs for Alcan, certainly we should be working three or four times as hard to save 2,200.

Mr. Speaker, exactly what is the Crow rate and where did it come from? This is something that's been dealt with in a certain superficial way and no one here has ever considered Manitoba's role in this. We've always had a role in freight rates in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the Crow rate was a transfer of public money and lands in return for lower grain rates to the east. I won't belabour the point that the CPR got \$25 million in subsidies and 25 million acres of land to help them build the railway. The fact is, the Crow rate was an agreement between the government and the CPR. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't even a favourable agree-

ment at the time it was signed. People all over the prairies complained that the government got a bad deal. This is what Frank Oliver, an Alberta MLA, had to say in the House of Commons. The company gives slight reductions in certain freight rates, greater than which would have been secured from less money in other ways, and gets a further and more complete assurance of monopoly throughout the great Canadian west.

Mr. Speaker, throughout Manitoba there was an uproar about this. It was too high; freight rates were still too high and there was a party at that time which took some action and that party was the Conservative Party of Manitoba. In 1900, the Conservatives were elected to rule in this province and the first thing they did was pass a resolution in this House asking for the complete and more effectual control of rates, the right of acquisition of such lines of railway by the province on equitable terms based on the cost of construction, and that the province shall have the first option to purchase these railways.

Mr. Speaker, in 1900 the Conservative Party was on record as favouring the nationalization of railways if freight rates were out of line. Where are they today? Do they still favour this position from 1900 or have they abandoned it? Mr. Speaker, these weren't just brave words. The Manitoba Government acted. In 1901, they leased for 999 years the Northern Pacific Railway lines in Manitoba and turned that lease over to the Canadian Northern Railway. They assisted the Canadian Northern Railway in building another line from Winnipeg to the Lakehead and in return for this assistance, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba got a 30-percent reduction in the Crow rate from Winnipeg to the Lakehead; a 30-percent reduction because the Crow rate was too high when it was signed. So, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the members on the opposite side to continue in the progressive tradition of their forebears and support us in this measure to keep the Crow rate where it is.

Between 1901 and 1918, the farmers of Manitoba and everyone to the west of us enjoyed these favourable rates. In 1918, rising costs and The War Measures Act brought an end to the Crow rate. But, by 1922 world prices were falling, freight rates were rising and the government dropped the provisions of The War Measures Act and the Crow rate was reinstated. It was made statutory in the 1920s and this is the rate, Mr. Speaker, the rate of the 1920s which we wish to keep, not the rate of 1897 which was artificially high in terms of the purchasing power at that time, but the rate of the 1920s which was the actual market costs for this sort of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, setting freight rates has always been a complicated and difficult procedure. The Member for Morris is an agricultural economist and I'm sure he can appreciate this point. When you're building a railway you have to look at the cost of construction; it obviously costs more to build a railway in the Rockies than it does on the prairie; it costs more to build it through the muskeg than it does on the prairies, and originally the freight rates were higher in the Rockies than they were on the prairies. So, there are differential problems to consider. Mr. Speaker, another factor is competition that other carriers may offer. Trucks for instance, offer a great deal of competition these

days and railways have had to lower their tariffs in order to compete with trucking. Mr. Speaker, the density of traffic is a factor. It obviously is cheaper to run a unit train on a main line than a few boxcars on a branch line.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the ability to pay has always been a major factor in setting freight rates; the ability to pay is the key issue in the Crow rate debate. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Manitoba can't afford it. Mr. Speaker, the provincial economy cannot afford it. That's obvious. Here we are struggling to maintain status quo and the Federal Government is threatening to bring a decline of 2,200 jobs and a net loss in gross provincial product. We can't afford that, we have to keep the Crow rate to help preserve the farm economy of Manitoba and to keep the provincial economy of Manitoba healthy.

Mr. Speaker, the ability-to-pay has another aspect which I would like to go into. The whole railway network of Western Canada has been geared towards one objective and that is the export of natural resource products from this country. If you look at the resource producers in this country, and again I would draw the attention of the Member for Morris to this, there are two sets of producers - there are the price givers and the price takers. Mr. Speaker, a price taker has no market power in the world. The grain growers are price takers; they may work through the Wheat Board but the Wheat Board cannot influence the price that they get for their wheat more than a couple of percent. They may even-out the fluctuations and benefit the farmer in that way, but there is no market power. Therefore, if the price of grain rates rises, that is a deduction from the farmer's income, not an increase in world price.

In contrast there is another set of resource producers and these are the price setters of the world; the potash producers, the coal producers, the sulphur producers - sulphur is a by-product of oil and gas and we know their price setting. Mr. Speaker, these people have the ability in the world market to set prices and, by setting prices, if there is an increase in freight rates they pass that along to the world market; they don't deduct it from their income. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is a principle of cross-subsidization which is essential in this argument and that is that the price setters subsidize the price takers in the rail freight structure of this country. This has got to be related to the cost of construction of the CPR through the Rockies. There is no reason why the price takers, the grain growers, should subsidize the construction of the CPR lines through the Rockies. At the same time, when the resource producers of coal, especially, which is the CPR in many cases, are not investing in it. Mr. Speaker, we have to keep the Crow in Manitoba in order to keep a healthy economy.

I would invite some of the members opposite to stand up and say where they stand on the Crow issue. I've thought about it a great deal and I can see there probably are three problems here. Either, one, they are continuing in the footsteps of their radical predecessors who wanted to nationalize the railway and they are embarrassed that their position is too far to the left of ours. After all, it was only last week that the Member for Arthur got up and asked why we didn't want to nationalize the railways. Was that his posi-

tion? I'd like to hear him stand up and talk about that. Or perhaps, Mr. Speaker, they support the Federal Government, perhaps they support the elimination of the Crow. Are they in bed with Pierre Trudeau? I would like to know that and I'm sure that their constituents would like to know that. Are the Conservatives and the Liberals in agreement on the Crow? That would be very interesting indeed to the farmers of Western Canada.

Or the third alternative, Mr. Speaker, perhaps they support us, perhaps they support us. And here they're on the horns of a dilemma, Mr. Speaker, because all through the election it was "me tooism." We introduced a dental plan, they introduced a dental plan; we have mortgage assistance, they have mortgage assistance; we support keeping the Crow, they support keeping the Crow. It makes them look foolish and uninnovative, Mr. Speaker. They can't come out and support us now, it would be another case of "me tooism."

So, Mr. Speaker, what do they think; do they have any views at all? I would encourage them to stand up and make their views known to their constituents. The people of Manitoba have a right to know what, if anything, they think.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Morris that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Flin Flon in the Chair for the Department of Health; and the Honourable Member for The Pas in the Chair for the Department of Economic Development and Tourism.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry Harapiak (The Pas): We'll call the Committee to order. Economic Development and Tourism. We're on 2.(c)(1) Salaries.

The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, on this subject Small Business Enterprise, I've been informed that the Minister of Highways and Transportation has written to small businesses throughout the province on his let-

terhead as Minister of Highways and Transportation inviting small businesses to participate in an Inventory and Computer Seminar, I take it, in order to attempt to provide some management advice to small business on how to control their inventory which is obviously a laudible objective in these and perhaps any other times. I'm wondering why the Department of Highways and Transportation under the letterhead of the Minister, is inviting small business to participate in that program and not this Minister's Department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, the Enterprise Manitoba has one sector that is called the Transportation and Distribution Sector and that is being administered under the Department of Highways and Transportation. So, I guess they connect the distribution with inventorying and marketing. I suppose technically you could say it is an overlap.

MR. MERCIER: I don't think I got that explanation, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister run through that again?

MRS. SMITH: There is a section under the Enterprise Manitoba Subsidiary Agreement with the Federal Government that has to do with distribution of goods that is related to Transportation and that part is being administered under the Department of Highways and Transportation.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, as I understand this seminar, it's not with respect to distribution, it's with respect to control of inventories through the use of computers, not distribution of goods.

MRS. SMITH: This physical distribution includes inventory management. I guess since these activities are — how should I say — connected, the fact that it's being done under one department rather than another isn't a concern to me so much as the fact that a good program is taking place. Inventory management has some connection with your physical distribution plans. How much you choose to order. How much you have on hand and the speed with which you distribute.

I suppose you could stretch a point if you were defining it. Is it more management and therefore small business in our sector or is it more related to transportation? In this case the program has grown out of that department and I, for one, am quite happy to see that type of initiative.

MR. MERCIER: As I said, Mr. Chairman, I'm not disputing the objectives of the program, I'm just wondering about the responsibility. Is that a recent transfer of responsibility?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, that part of the Enterprise Manitoba Program was transferred about a year ago.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1) Salaries.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this department is for counseling of small business and in previous years there's been creation of jobs and jobs saved. Have the inquiries for the department increased with the present economic condition that prevails in Manitoba?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, the inquiries are increasing but changing somewhat in focus as more people are looking at how to survive rather than how to expand and I think that's a reflection of the macro-economic conditions that we find ourselves in. We have, as a department, just developed an outreach program as well to try to make more readily available to small business people who may find themselves trapped in the current economic hardships, to enable them to get counseling before they're at a crisis state. We have yet to see how effective that can be but we feel it's a program that should be tried.

MR. JOHNSTON: As I mentioned, the department used to report on the number of jobs they felt that they had saved during a year and I imagine they saved jobs. It's people who are trying to survive. The outreach that the Minister is speaking of, when a company goes into bankruptcy or receivership as we've heard of with Victoria Leather over the past weekend, there are a lot of people or businesses that can go out with them or go down with them because of the fact that they don't pay some of their suppliers, or they're not able to pay some of their suppliers.

As a matter of fact I was speaking to a gentleman the other day who really had to quietly fold up his business and walk away from it because he had had three bankruptcies which meant that he would not be paid his money. Is there going to be an effort made when we learn of receiverships such as Victoria, is there a way that you can learn who they may owe money to and in some way start to move towards assisting those businesses that may go down with a company such as Victoria? I'd like to say here that Victoria has not gone down yet and I believe the work that's being done by everybody that's trying to keep it going is exceptionally admirable and I sincerely hope they make it. But if they don't they could be a situation of quite a few people being taken along with them. Is there a possible way that the department could start immediately to follow up on some of those situations and maybe be able to give management advice ahead of time which hasn't been possible before. The Minister has said it's very hard to know who is going to be in trouble. Could this be a way of them finding out so that they might head some of it off?

MRS. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, the program I was just outlining that we initiated just last week called Business Alert is our effort to reach out ahead of time and try to catch businesses while they are beginning to encounter financial difficulty and see if by timely consultation, assistance with management and financing, we can perhaps save a few. The next stage, of course, is when a receivership is actually occurring and we have to walk the tightrope between respecting the confidentiality of that process and

being of help if and how we can. We rely on our consultants in the field to be close to their particular industry sectors. Very often because they're well-known in their industrial sector, they are a trusted advisor and consultant during a receivership process. Our concern during a receivership, of course, is initially to see if there's any alternative structuring or refinancing that's possible so that the company can be revived. Second to that, our concern has to be for the creditors and the employees.

We've structured into our Business Alert Program a component that will meet with the employees again wherever possible prior to a crisis, but certainly in the event of a crisis, to give them whatever insight into the problem we can and to assist them in co-operation with a representative from the Department of Labour and Manpower, some assistance in going about dealing with Unemployment Insurance, social assistance if necessary and a job search so that they can find alternate employment if at all possible. We still recognize that these are still in the realm of remedial-type activities. We feel that given the current economic crisis, the deepening depression, that for the time being that's probably the best we can muster but we are casting about consulting, brainstorming, trying to find just what is within the realm of possibility of a Provincial Government to do something more constructive and certainly our longer-term economic policies are designed to try and minimize this kind of vulnerability in the future. But those are the improvements we can expect from that kind of policy are not going to appear immediately.

I do have a bit of information that was requested earlier. Our enquiry rate is up 10 percent over last year in this small business sector.

MR. JOHNSTON: Is this the section that we could ask the number of enquiries, the number of actual applications and the number of approvals of the Interest Relief Program for small business?

MRS. SMITH: I guess you're free to ask that question anytime you like. I'm certainly happy to answer it in this section.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, I would ask the question. I had waited. I thought that probably Small Enterprise Development would be a logical place. I couldn't really pin it down anywhere else. If the Minister has that information I would like to have it.

MRS. SMITH: Yes, as of April 16th, we've had a total of 839 enquiries; 99 applications have been received; 14 recommendations completed. Of these, 7 have been rejected and 78 are pending and 6 are undergoing further business counselling.

MR. JOHNSTON: Maybe I can just see if I have it - 839 enquiries, 99 applications, 14 approvals?

MRS. SMITH: Recommendations completed.

MR. JOHNSTON: 14 recommendations completed, and of the 14, what has happened? Seven?

MRS. SMITH: I am told that 7 have been rejected and

6 are getting ongoing counselling but official approval is delayed until we actually have the program legally in place and have official ratification of the board. It's a technical situation that we find ourselves in with no projects approved.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, I think I have it correct. The Minister said 14 recommended and of the 14, 7 have been turned down and 6 are for further counselling.

MRS. SMITH: I think we have to divvy up the 99 of the applications received and that's where we have 14 recommendations completed.

MR. JOHNSTON: Okay - 14 out of 99; so we have 85 left, and of the 85, 7 have been rejected and 6 . . .

MRS. SMITH: Yes, they're undergoing further counselling and a decision has to wait; the program being legally in place.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the 14 that have been recommended are going through when the technicalities the Minister is speaking of are solved. Is that it?

MRS. SMITH: The 14 includes the rejections of 7, and the other 7 we can assume there is no decision on as yet, but 6 of the ones we have are going through ongoing counselling.

MR. JOHNSTON: So it's only 6 that have been approved?

MRS. SMITH: Well, technically we don't have any approved because the legislation isn't official. So, I suppose you could infer but some are receiving further counseling so I suppose that means that there's still either uncertainty or there are other things that are being looked at and a final decision hasn't been made.

MR. JOHNSTON: So, out of the 99 of the actual applications, we really haven't got any approvals as yet because the 14 that were recommended, 7 have been turned down and 6 are having further consultation.

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, it's because there is the legal technicality, the board is not officially empowered until the legislation passes. I would remind the honourable member that one of the values of this particular program can be not just in the monies paid out to those who qualify but in the consultation service that can be offered the applicants by virtue of them going through this process. Many can probably be enabled to carry on with just some additional help either in dealing with the current problem or perhaps by being referred to a service where they can get further information or management skill.

MR. MERCIER: The Minister referred to legislation. What legislation is she talking about?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, we're just in the process of completing the OC. The board will in fact be

notified. It has been named and the first meeting will be held next week.

MR. MERCIER: Is the Minister saying that the reason that's holding up the program at the present time is for the Cabinet to pass regulations?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, it's for the Cabinet to complete the OC for the board.

MR. MERCIER: When does the Minister expect that will happen?

MRS. SMITH: The next Cabinet meeting.

MR. MERCIER: The procedure then is that the departmental recommendations will go to the board that has been appointed?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, yes and then that board recommends to the Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Does that board have the power to —(Interjection)—

MRS. SMITH: No, pardon me, there's a delegation of final authority to that board.

MR. MERCIER: Does that board have the power to reject a recommendation of the administration or bury a recommendation?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, they can open up any application and also they can hear appeals of anyone who feels that they need a second chance.

MR. MERCIER: I take it that sort of information will be in the Order-in-Council and the regulations that are to be passed?

MRS. SMITH: I have the regulations in front of me if you'd like to hear them.

MR. MERCIER: Perhaps we could have a copy. These are regulations not yet passed by Cabinet?

MRS. SMITH: Yes, I have the date here. It was passed as an OC on the 14th of April so I'm one week out on it. That means the regulations are public and I will distribute copies or read them to you as you prefer.

MR. MERCIER: Is the Minister now saying the regulations were passed on the 14th of April and the Board will not meet until next week?

MRS. SMITH: Well, Mr. Chairperson, the function of this Board is to deal in batches with the applications as they've been dealt with by the staff and it seems only reasonable to allow a certain period of time to go by so that there's a considerable afternoon's work, if you like, to review the staff recommendations.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister, without revealing the names of the applicants and I certainly don't want any confidential information released, but I would like to know the reasons why the

seven that have already been rejected, the reasons why those applications were rejected.

MRS. SMITH: Well, Mr. Chairperson, there is an asterisk by the projects rejected saying that there are no formal approvals and rejections. Now the explanation given here is, before the program is legally in place, well that has occurred. The second qualification is that there be Board ratification and until the Board meets, that final technicality has not been completed.

MR. MERCIER: The Minister is saying that there's no formal rejection yet because the Board hasn't dealt with the application, but the administration is recommending rejection in seven cases?

MRS. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, but there is an appeal procedure if the applicants wish to pursue it.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, in order that we could get a perhaps more thorough understanding of the program and its effect on small business, could the Minister indicate why the administration is recommending rejection in those seven instances?

MRS. SMITH: Well, Mr. Chairperson, I'd be happy to take that under advisement and report on it at the next Session. It's very early in the program to have a meaningful analysis of the pattern that's coming in, but if the members opposite would like that, really it would be more meaningful to wait till the Board has had its first meeting and have me report through the normal procedures in the House.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I can't accept that answer. This is consideration of the Estimates. This item may be passed today or tomorrow. We have a situation in which the Minister has said that there have been seven decisions made by the administration recommending rejection. In order to get an understanding of this program and have an opportunity to discuss it, I would like to know the reasons why in those seven instances the administration is recommending rejection.

MRS. SMITH: Well, Mr. Chairperson, the Estimates contain the basic program and this is a new program that's sort of gone through this Session. So with its official birth, if you like, being somewhere between last Wednesday and the first meeting of the Board next Wednesday, it's premature really for me to give too much information about it. As we've said in the House we've designed the criteria as carefully as we can from the information available about the nature and scale of financial distress that businesses were encountering, a number of businesses of the size we were looking at and we've designed it as best we can with available data recognizing that the data is not complete that there are not in place, Mr. Chairperson, the data collection directives for that to be available and that makes it a more complex task to design a program. We've undertaken to review the criteria as the program moves along, and if we feel they're too stringent or ineffective, they don't match the need that we're discovering, we'll review them. So far, the analysis by the work group has been that some of the

applicants do not fit the criteria as they were laid out.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I have to remind the Minister that at the end of next week her government will have been in place for some five months, that they made important promises to not only homeowners and farmers, but to businesses in Manitoba to provide an Interest Rate Relief Program to ensure that small business stays in business. Perhaps the Minister doesn't realize it, but the economic climate in this province at this particular time certainly is the most depressing and discouraging that I've ever seen in my lifetime. If the Minister is going to wait much longer I don't know who's going to be left to pick up the pieces.

Now, she has a program and she said that of the 99 applications, the administration is recommending 7 be rejected. I would like to know in order to understand this program and in order that small business in this province can have some understanding of this program, why the administration is recommending that the 7 applications be rejected. I'm not trying to be difficult on the administration. Perhaps it is the qualifications that have been set out in the program. But it's extremely important, Mr. Chairman, that small businesses have some understanding of what relief is available to them because these are very, very difficult times.

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, the criteria are spelled out clearly in the pamphlets. Anyone who has had any experience with these admittedly complex operations knows that sometimes applicants are not perfectly clear as to whether they qualify or not, but they do have a right to apply. There was no legislation provided by the previous government to enact such a program; this required the planning, the analysis, to go into it. We couldn't legally launch it until the first Session was in place and we had to amend The Small Loans Act in order to have authority to make monies available. Now, these technicalities are frustrating but they are necessary hoops we have to go through in our system of government.

I sincerely wish that the previous government, that seems to be so very concerned about the economic downturn and the distress being encountered by increasing numbers of small businesses had, indeed, put their thinking caps on a great deal earlier and had done some of the groundwork for us. Perhaps then we wouldn't have found ourselves with such a backlog of data collection and program design to carry out. We can continue to disagree as to whether we are going to get the prize for the winner of the race or only get the second place in terms of speed. We were concerned to get the thing in as quickly as was reasonable but we wanted as well thought-out a program as we could have. The honourable members know that the procedures of government are not quick and easy and we've worked on this as effectively as we've been able to.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I could very easily get into a long argument with the Minister on her comments about the previous administration, but I'm interested in this program. She said there are 14 recommendations on the 99 applications that have

been made, and the board is meeting next week. Can she indicate how many recommendations will be before the board when they meet next week?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, I'm not a seer. The group we have put together is working full-out and they expect to have about 20 that will be complete and ready for that board. But I commit myself to keeping the honourable members up-to-date with the progress of the program and I'd be more than happy to report as the program proceeds giving an update on what's being found and what monies are being paid out.

MR. MERCIER: Will the board be meeting on a regular basis after their first meeting next week?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, we've set it up expecting weekly meetings.

MR. MERCIER: Can the Minister indicate how long it will take to process the balance of the applications that have been made?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, I can't give specifics on that. We've assigned seven staff to work on the program, subject to review, to see whether that's overstaffed or understaffed. They're dealing with the new program and I know are working conscientiously. When new programs come in, the usual pattern is for the thing to move fairly slowly at first as people get used to the criteria and get used to processing the applications. Programs usually have their heaviest take-out in their middle life, as it were, and tend to taper off towards the end of their life. I think that's a usual pattern for programs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there are some 839 enquiries as the Minister indicated, only 99 applications have been made, 7 apparently have recommendations to be rejected, apparently none have been approved; in the light of those facts is the Minister now considering changing the requirements or the qualifications for assistance under the program so that somebody, hopefully, will get some assistance?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, I really think it's premature to change. The thing is being watched closely by us but until we get a considerable sample in to deal with, I think it's quite premature to make significant changes. I want to emphasize to the honourable member that one of the important activities that is going on as these applications are being processed is that each staff person is acting by way of consultant to an applicant, so that as they go through their application it's not being treated simply as a request for quick money, it's being treated as an opportunity for the businessperson to have the benefit of a skilled consultant in looking at their situation and it may be that the most significant part of the program is not going to show up in the stats of money paid out; in fact, there may be the kind of advice given to small business people that enables them to cope quite nicely with a few modifications in their management approach, in their financial record-keeping, in their financing, in

their marketing plan or whatever. I think that may turn out to be the chief virtue of the program. As I say, I think it's quite premature to try to evaluate the criteria or program or recommend alterations in it at this point in time.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister seems to think it's premature even though no money has yet been paid out. How long does she intend to monitor the program before considering a change in the qualifications?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, at the first meeting on Wednesday, next week, we'll have an initial important bit of feedback. It's going to take us about six weeks to catch up with our current backlog and we'll be then in a better position to know the rate of applications coming in and to make adjustments accordingly.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I've been listening to the Minister and I have serious doubts whether she wants to provide any assistance at all into this program, financial assistance.

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, you're entitled to your opinion. I happen to disagree with you. I don't know why we would have gone through all the commotion of putting together a program and assigning funds to it. We are not speaking with forked tongue. We wish to assist but we don't want to promise or overextend ourselves beyond what our capacity is. That's why we took a while to design the program carefully and to target it to the people we felt we could assist, and to target the scale of the assistance within our means.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. JOHNSTON: Did I understand the Minister to say that the final decision will be the board's and the final approval is not the Minister's signature, it's the board's signature?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, I, as Minister, have delegated that responsibility to the board

MR. JOHNSTON: And the board will make the decision as to whether they receive any assistance or not is the same board that will hear the appeals?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, they will hear the appeal if the staff have rejected them.

MR. JOHNSTON: And there's no appeal if the board rejects them?

MRS. SMITH: They can resubmit an application if they wish and I suppose there's always the open-door policy in our office if someone feels they've been unfairly treated, but I expect the criteria have been carefully spelled out and that the consultants will be taking time to ensure that people, if they are turned down, understand on what basis it is. You know, we could sit back and say because a program like this is difficult, that we shouldn't do it at all. Now, we've chosen the other path; we've designed it the best way

we can and we're going to learn as we go along if we encounter snags. We've built into it everything we can to make it fair, as fair and efficient and accountable as possible, and if we find there are flaws we will move to remove them.

MR. JOHNSTON: If my memory serves me correctly, the approval of funds in the Legislature was \$9 million for the three programs this year. I'm not sure I'm being accurate; I could look it up in my files. How much of the \$9 million has been appropriated to this program?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, this program is somewhat more costly than the other two so it's in the neighborhood of \$6 million. The overall program is in the \$23 million to \$28 million range and it's expected to extend over two years. The reason for the small business component having a slightly higher cost is because the administration of it requires that more factors have to be taken into account than with a homeowner or a farmer. That's one reason for the slightly uneven, if you like, allocation.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, the Minister says \$23 million over two years and if you break down the \$23 million you're looking at \$11.5 million in this fiscal year and you're saying that \$6 million of that \$11 million is going to this program.

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, the program is a little late in the year starting. I guess it depends whether you're looking April to March, or January to December. It is a special program; we've made a commitment to it and if it requires more funds we'll do it by a Special Warrant.

MR. JOHNSTON: The enquiries, I'm sure, started to come in as soon as the program was announced, I believe the first part of January or before the House opened I believe, and the applications, I think, were placed on our desks approximately two weeks ago. You're saying the 99 applications have come in during the past two weeks.

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, regarding the figures for the number of applications, some people jumped ahead of there being actual application forms to fill out and wrote in a story of their situation, if you like, not knowing what the criteria were, and that's why there's a certain amount of difference in the numbers between the ones that actually qualify and when the actual criteria of the program were defined. But as I said, every one of the people who applied or made a special request to the department will receive a consulting visit from one of our consultants, and as I say, that may be the iceberg part of the program that is really going to enable a lot of firms to take preventative action, which is really the most desirable result.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is 4:30. We are interrupting proceedings for Private Members' Hour.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): Call the

Committee to order. Continuing with the Health Estimates, Page 74, I believe there was an accord that we would not continue with (h) Dental Services until another time, instead, continue with Item No. 4. Mental Health Services, Resolution No. 77, particularly 4.(a)(1) Salaries.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, speaking to Resolution No. 77, 4.(a) generally. Appropriations (a) and (b), Administration and Forensic Services appear to be a new section in the print presentation. Last year there was just Forensic Services cited in the print layout in the Estimates book.

I know that under the restructuring of the Department of Health it has been organized in three divisions, Administrative Services, Community Health Services and Mental Health Services with an Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of each division. So I recognize that is the reason for the new layout in the print presentation, however, if you check with last year's Resolution, the 1981-82 Estimates showed the appropriation for Forensic Services at \$576,000 - some of that may have been underspent but the total was \$576,000.00. Now the new 1982-83 layout show the new sections, 4.(a) and 4.(b) combined totalling \$1,130,000 for March 31st, 1982 - \$444,300 in Forensic; \$691,800 in Administration - and the projected appropriation for the coming year, in the request for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983, for those two sections is approximately \$1.25 million - \$479,500 for Forensic and \$735,100 for Administration.

So I'd ask the Minister if he can just check with his officials - I see the Deputy Minister is here - and just satisfy the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that this doesn't represent a major administrative or bureaucratic expansion of any kind. I would assume that most of the items listed under Administration were accounted for under different headings and under different listings in last year's Estimates but you can't compare the print presentation from last year to the print presentation for this year, so I have no proof of that.

What we're looking at here, at the beginning of our examination of Mental Health Services, is a request for \$1,250,000 - approximately \$1.25 million. The comparison for last year was simply the request for \$576,000.00.

Could the Minister just explain what has taken place with respect to restructuring and with respect to apportioned appropriations for administrative duties that has resulted in this new presentation? I presume, as I say, that a number of appropriations and budgetary items have simply been transferred out of other parts of the department and now incorporated into the Mental Health Services Division including its administration component, but could he explain that please?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's a little difficult to give these answers. Apparently, the format has been changed. I think that the best bet and if this is not satisfactory, I'm sure the member will ask more questions.

I would like to give you the comparison for what we have now and try to explain what is being done at this time, but I can't really point out and say well this is

where it was last year.

The first one, the Administration, that provides for the operation of the Office of the Chief Provincial Psychiatrist. Now from the same comparison, I don't say on the same item, but the same comparison last year was seven staff man years and it's the same now. There's no change at all. The seven of those consist of the Chief Provincial Psychiatrist and I've already explained that we haven't filled that position, that we're looking with keen interest; administrative assistant and two secretaries.

Also paid from this appropriation, there's one staff member, formerly with the Winnipeg Psychiatric Institute, but now seconded to the Health Science Centre, and two staff located at Eden Mental Health Centre. I think that was mentioned yesterday by my honourable friend. The latter three previously appeared in the appropriation for forensic services. So that might give my friend some information. Now that is the first with the Salaries.

Other Expenditures, either I give this now or wait — well it might help, we can go back, we're not passing it — Other Expenditures then, we're asking for \$69,000.00. The comparison for the same thing last year was \$55,100.00.

Now the general operation cost of the office, that was \$25,400; the grants to the Manitoba Mental Health Foundation, but this grant is not for administration cost. It's for funding certain projects selected by the foundation and that is \$15,000; and then the Eden Mental Health Centre, expense may occur for the two staff members who are civil servants, it's to help their expense, that's \$3,800; and the Mental Health Review Board and I'm sure that my honourable friend will remember. Now we have the same concern as my honourable friend. We're looking at the situation. Well, I'll come back to that. I know we're trying to sort something out and we're looking at the review to see if we could phase it in somewhere.

Now that would be for two under Administration, and then there's professional training. I'll just say at this time, the provincial training last year the amount was \$339,900 or close to \$340,000 and now it's \$419,100, and later on we'll get back, I'm sure to that and I'll give the information.

Now on forensic, I think forensic was the other one that my honourable friend used? Forensic then was a total of — excuse me, before I leave this — Administration was then a total of \$691,800, what I've covered already, the same staff man years. Now it's \$735,100.00. Now under forensic, it was nine staff man years, the comparison last year, now we're asking for one more so there would be an increase of one. The salary was \$358,400, now \$385,000.00. So I would imagine that's the normal increment and also that added staff man year.

The Other Expenditures were \$85,900 and that now is \$94,500 and the Other Expenditures are the non-salary cost of operating forensic services. The difference of \$8,600 represents a price increase of 10 percent. So I didn't do the calculation of the two together, but this one, this last forensic service was \$444,300 going to \$479,500 and we could elaborate a little more. The Administration was \$691,800 going to \$735,100; last year seven staff man years; forensic, 9 and 10 for \$16,000 against \$17,000, an increase of one

if we take the two of them together and that's in forensic.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that explanation from the Minister. It answers the questions that were in my mind I believe. Those questions arose out of the different design of the layout of the presentation of the Estimates which really result from the reorganization of the department and the restructuring of it, but it just wasn't apparent on the comparison of print to print whether there were expansions at the administration level that were not accounted for. The Minister's explanation satisfies me on that point.

A number of services that appeared elsewhere in previous years' Estimates have simply been reallocated to this section of this year's Estimates. So we're looking at a total of approximately a \$100,000 increase to appropriation for the composite services here that we're talking about. This year's request as against last year's is approximately \$100,000 greater. I see that, Mr. Chairman, and appreciate clearing that point up for the record.

Mr. Chairman, under 4.(a), I'd like to explore for a moment with the Minister the office and position of Chief Provincial Psychiatrist. Who is operating and functioning as Chief Provincial Psychiatrist at the present time?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, at the present, Dr. Tavener had that position of course and the position has been vacant since June, 1981, but there had been an agreement with the former Minister that we continue for a while, but he was on sessional, or so much a day, or whatever. Now, Dr. Varsamis is acting on a part-time basis to take over this responsibility and this is what I mentioned earlier that we want to recruit, we're looking at the whole situation with, as I mentioned yesterday, with Dr. Prosen and other groups. We have some people that, for some reason or other, seem to lack interest a while ago and now I understand they might be more interested and then of course we're looking to see if there's anybody else that might apply and once we've received this study by Dr. Prosen, I think we'll be in a better position because Dr. Prosen would also — and his team I should say, he's not alone — I call it the Prosen because I don't know all the members. I know that Dr. Kovacs is one of them and I think that Dr. Varsamis is also. I think they would want to look at the situation to see if we could work something out with university also and then also with the Health Science Centre who has that centre there and they're not too happy. The same thing that my honourable friend mentioned about the Children's Hospital, I've had the same kind of complaint over there so we're trying to look at the situation. It might be that we'll work something together that one good man that could work for the province also and maybe with the university. So, we're waiting for these recommendations, but in the meantime we're very happy that Dr. Varsamis was able to take it on part-time to help us out.

MR. SHERMAN: Is the Minister's office and the Committee receiving applications, or submissions, or recommendations for a permanent appointee as Chief

Provincial Psychiatrist?

MR. DESJARDINS: We had a search committee; in fact, the former Minister I believe had a search committee. I think that they've advertised in different reviews and it wasn't too encouraging the response that they had. The search committee recommended one person who did not see fit to accept it and there's others that have applied. We felt that we should re-advertise, and as I say, during that time there was a change of government and this discussion that I related to that we've had with Dr. Prosen and that's the stage we're at now. We're going to re-advertise and look at it, and I hope that we might be able to bring something in to encourage people to come in with a better package that we can offer. I hope so anyway.

MR. SHERMAN: Is Dr. Varsamis finding it possible to devote the necessary time that both he would desire and the Minister and the department would desire in fulfilling the Chief Provincial Psychiatrist's role on an acting basis?

MR. DESJARDINS: I might say that, if my memory serves me right, I think that Dr. Varsamis was the one that was recommended by the search committee at the time and unfortunately couldn't accept it. With the staff that he has, he has agreed to do this until the end of April and after that it is our intention to designate Dr. Kovacs as acting until we try to recruit and decide.

MR. SHERMAN: Is Dr. Roy Tavener associated with the department in an official way any longer or is he fully retired?

MR. DESJARDINS: As far as the department, he's fully retired but I think he's busy on a Mental Health Review Board.

MR. SHERMAN: Is the committee that is being headed at the present time by Dr. Prosen looking at the site and location and design of the proposed Central Psychiatric Services facility on the Health Sciences Centre campus?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, very much so; that's certainly one of the things they are addressing and I hope they'll make recommendations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(1)—pass.

MR. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, just one very quick question and it's not a flighty question. But on watching television I see this Dr. Quincy and he's involved with forensic services and - no, I'm leading to a serious question. Now, this is a coroner's office that's associated with the forensic medicine, where would we discuss a coroner's office or something similar in this department?

MR. DESJARDINS: Find out who Dr. Quincy is and discuss it with him. I think that it's a little bit of a different format. I think that series is modelled after some Japanese doctor who, I understand, was the chief coroner somewhere in California; in fact, I think I saw him interviewed not long ago. They have - and

now I'm guessing it might be correct, but they have such a thing as - I don't have to guess anymore. Yes, I'll start giving you the description of the Forensic Services. It provides expert psychiatric and psychological assessments of persons who are in conflict with the law, and are believed to be mentally disturbed and provides opinions to the courts, correctional institutions, probation services, the police and social agencies. There are two sections, adult forensic and children.

Of course we're ahead of ourselves, we're on Administration. I think that it is, I don't know if you'd call it forensic; forensic is mostly people that are in trouble with the law and Dr. Quincy would be, what we used to call the old coroner and now it's the medical examiner, and there are certain laws and when any foul play is suspected, or sudden death somebody who dies under certain conditions there's a post-mortem and the medical examiner or the coroner can order an inquest and that's, I think, what Dr. Quincy is, a coroner who is, in a large area like this, faced with some murders and suicides, and so on. This is actually what he's doing. The medical examiner would be the coroner now.

MR. KOVNATS: To the Honourable Minister, all I really wanted to find out was where would this come in? Do we have such a comparable type of an operation here in Manitoba and under what medical department would it be? I don't think it would be under this Section (b) but just where would it be? How is it financed? Do we have so many people in this department? What sort of protection does the public have from wrongdoers? Or are my sights all up in the sky in this regard from having watched television?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, most of the hospitals have coroners; some of them are occupied and of course in the lab and also in conducting postmortems. But there is a medical officer - it used to be the chief coroner - and I believe that would be under the Attorney-General; he's in charge of that situation for the province. They might, I don't remember exactly what it is, but I'd have to refresh my memory, they have regional coroners or assistant coroners.

For instance, if there's a death in a private home and if it's not somebody who's been sick for a long time that the doctor came in; if you have no doctor then you have to call the police. You're not supposed to move the body without calling the police and the police will probably call, in most instances when it's sudden death, the coroner or an assistant coroner and he will come in and pronounce the person dead and then he will send him to a hospital and request an autopsy or a postmortem. It could be done now if they suspect foul play and so on, they'll probably have an inquest. That's exactly what Dr. Quincy was doing; he's a coroner. That would be under the Chief Medical Examiner now.

MR. KOVNATS: Yes, not to pursue this much farther, to the Honourable Minister but what had been going through my mind was like crib deaths and things of that nature, how are they investigated to see that there's no wrongdoing? It's through the coroners who could be just a doctor at any hospital then, but really

does he come under a government department? But under what government department, I just haven't been able to follow.

MR. DESJARDINS: I guess the member missed that, I said, under the Attorney-General. Any doctor could be the Chief Medical Examiner but if he asked for a postmortem, of course, it is the pathologist, the coroner. It used to be named the coroner, and the body could be sent, if they suspect anything at all, in fact, there are certain laws that say they have to go that route, the remains will be sent to the hospital and the examiner will order an autopsy and the pathologist will perform that and give his report to the Chief Examiner who then will decide if they should go a step further and have an inquiry, or an inquest. But it is under the Attorney-General; not the pathologist, that will be mostly the hospital, but the Chief Medical Examiner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(1). The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, just as a point of interest on that subject, even though it can be asked under the Attorney-General's Estimates, but we just asked the Minister whether he can advise us whether or not a new Chief Medical Examiner has been appointed, a successor to the late Dr. Bill Parker?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, it is not under this department, I will try and get the information. I don't have this information at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(1)—pass; 4.(a)(2) Other Expenditures.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, one of the major items for consideration under Other Expenditures, as the Minister mentioned a few moments ago, is the Mental Health Review Board. In the 1981-82 appropriations there was an amount of \$25,000 voted in order to start the wheels turning on establishment of Mental Health Review Board, could the Minister advise the Committee what the amount is for 1982-83; where does that project fit into this Other Expenditures item?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, yes, the Mental Health Review is \$25,000 for this year. Now, as the Member for Fort Garry knows, the pilot project was initiated in June of 1981 and whereby a review of cases in Brandon, Selkirk, and Eden Mental Health Centres would be undertaken in order to develop policy and procedure for implementation of Mental Health Review Board. We are expecting a report in the very immediate future. I am told that it is written now and we should get it any day. I will review the report with my staff and consider all the implications arising from it and then we will report. If we are not in the Estimates I'm sure we will find a way to inform the Members of the House.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, did that also involve a sort of assessment or evaluation of the availability of psychiatrists, trained psychiatric personnel, to serve

on these boards? I understand the review essentially was aimed at reviewing the caseloads of Brandon and Selkirk to determine how the promised annual review of individual situations could be implemented and expedited, but part of the quest, of course, is for the actual personnel necessary to staff the Mental Health Review Board and the sub-committees of same if, as and when it becomes practical to introduce it and it is certainly, I would expect, the ambitions of both sides of the House to introduce it as soon as it is practical, both professionally and fiscally. But, has that review that Dr. Tavener has been undertaking looked at that side of the question, too, the availability of psychiatrists?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure, without knowing fully the terms of reference, I would be very surprised if Dr. Tavener did not identify the problem that we already do know exists when we talk about the lack of staff and the difficulty in attracting staff. But I am sure that if this is not in that report that we will seek the solution. I think the problem would be identified and through the Prosen Committee and how we follow it through will be the way to try to solve that problem of replacing and coming in with a new package to recruit the psychiatrist that we need and the staff that we need.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(2)—pass; 4.(a)(3) Professional Training.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Could the Minister review for the Committee, please, Mr. Chairman, the status with respect to professional training in this field? I understand that the program at the Manitoba School for the Retarded no longer falls under the aegis of this department, it is part of the Department of Community Services now but the training of psychiatric nurses at Brandon and Selkirk still is certainly under this department. I would appreciate a review of the situation in terms of numbers, in terms of the kinds of enrolments that the two schools are experiencing, the whole field of supply where psychiatric nurses are concerned. How do we compare, on this date or on the most recent viable date, let us say, December 31, 1981, with the situation in previous years?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, yes, funds are used for payments, stipends and, as necessary, bursaries to student nurses, plus other training costs, such as those for field training, university curriculum course, the Crisis Intervention Clinic, etc. The amount last year was 389.9 and this year it is 419.1. Both Schools of Nursing have been encouraged to increase enrolment and at the end of 1980-81 academic year, August 1981, the number of nurses in training was 89; in January 1982 the number was 129, an increase of 40. And if enrolments projected for September 1982 are realized the number then under training will be about 160; the increase in funds 6.1 million at Brandon Mental Health Centre and 23.1 at Selkirk Mental Health Centre will be needed to support the larger classes. Now the psychiatric nurses, the amount in Brandon Mental Health was 185.4 and then 86 at Selkirk for a total of 271 and that has gone to 191.5 in

Brandon and 109 in Selkirk for a total of 306.

Now, for the Committee, although I imagine the Member for Fort Garry knows of the Bursary Program that we have, every student psychiatric nurse receives a monthly stipend of \$100.00. Any student who can show good reason for additional funding, in order to continue in training, may apply for a bursary and usually such applications are not entertained until the student has completed three months of training, and if approved by the Mental Health Centre Manitoba School authorities, the bursary will be paid at the following rates: Student nurse, \$100 per month; student nurse supporting one dependent, \$170 per month; a student nurse supporting two dependents, \$200 per month; student nurse supporting three or more dependents, \$230 per month. All amounts quoted are in addition to the monthly stipend. The stipend carries with it no obligation for return of service. As far as the receipt of bursary, it does result in an obligation for return of service. With a bursary of \$100 per month the repayment is one month of service for each month of bursarized training. For all other levels the repayment is one-and-one-quarter months of service for each month of bursarized training.

As a general rule, repayment is to the institution at which the school of nursing is located, or to a program administered by that institution. Variations to this may be made by the Medical Director concerned and repayment to other institutions and community programs that have been approved. Permission to repay service outside of government programs is not normally given. As of mid-December, 1981, of the 174 students in training, 42 are in receipt of a bursary.

The nursing training, I think I have in January, 1982, the first-year course, the Brandon Mental have 35; the second-year students, 31 for a total of 66; in Selkirk, the first year, 35; the second year, 28 for a total of 63; total, 70 first-year, 59 second-year, 129 total. — (Interjection) — that's the combined. The total combined, 129. Now the projected first-year enrolment of September, 1982, Brandon, 40; Selkirk, 90. The Mental Health workers — I might as well give you that, it's still in the professional training — there were 118.5; the same amount this year. No expansion in training is projected. In the first nine months of the fiscal year, 39 days of training were conducted; 192 Community Mental Health workers; 109 institutional staff and 27 other staff attended.

I might as well give the rest. The student nurse in residence is charged \$10.00 a day and \$1.00 per meal.

MR. SHERMAN: I thank the Minister for that information, Mr. Chairman. Projected first-year enrolment for September, 1981 at Brandon was 40, I believe, and at Selkirk it was 40. — (Interjection) — I beg your pardon? For September, 1981, not 1982. For September, 1981, I believe was 40; that was the projected first-year enrolment so it would have made a total of 80 at the two facilities.

The figure that the Minister gave me for nurses under training as of January, 1982, this past January, for those two facilities was 35 and 35, for 70; those figures are fairly close. Could the Minister advise whether that was because the projections on first-year enrolment were higher than anticipated or because there were approximately 10 dropouts in the

first three or four months of the course?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I don't know if I should take the first year. If they were in training at this time it could be the second year. But I think where the difference is that during that time the program included the school for retarded at Portage and that's no longer in there. I think that's where you'll find the reason for the difference.

MR. SHERMAN: The figures I'm using, Mr. Chairman, are just for Brandon and Selkirk. I've subtracted the Manitoba School figures out of there. In any event it's not a major discrepancy. The projections were for 80 as of September, 1981, 40 in each facility. The figures that the Minister has provided for the Committee of nurses under training at the two facilities in first year as of January, 1981, add up to 70; 35 and 35 at the two facilities. So there is a discrepancy of 10. That needn't necessarily reflect any great difficulty. The first-year projections might have been overly optimistic.

But what I'm trying to get at is whether we're getting enough psychiatric nurses into the courses available at Brandon and Selkirk to meet the need in the psychiatric services field; the front line troupes as the Minister would agree. In fact, they're not only troupes they're also officers, the front line personnel. Mental Health Services and Psychiatric Services consists of the psychiatric nurses. We don't have enough psychiatrists — I want to discuss that with the Minister when we get into the Commission section of the Estimates — but a great great deal of the challenge and the responsibility has to be taken up by the psychiatric nurses and certainly some efforts have been made in recent years to encourage young people to go into psychiatric nursing, to attract young people into it, and I would hope that the figures provided by the Minister are such that we can derive some satisfaction from them. They demonstrate that enrolments are up, enthusiasm for that career and participation in those training facilities is on the increase. Can he comment on that?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think you would probably see this more in psychiatric nursing than just those enrolling for R.N. I think there's quite a few that might leave. I understand that there's about 15 each year that leave. Now, that's the first and second year and I imagine that many of them would leave fairly early. They realize that this is not for them; that's a possibility. I agree that we certainly are not dragging our feet on that; we'll accept all those that can graduate and we're going in that direction. Also, we're continuing this bursary program.

If there is any other way that we could improve that we will do it but I have no fight with this. I agree with the Member for Fort Garry that we want to get as many as possible, especially as he mentioned that there are so many people in that field of psychiatrists and so on, that we can't get enough and we're having an awful lot of trouble.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if you take the figures for January, 1981, the Minister has provided the figures for January of 1982, and take those nurses under

training at Brandon and Selkirk in first year, the total was 74, and in second year the total was 28. So, we're looking at a combination of 74 and 28, which is 102. The figures, I believe, for nurses under training in January of '81 at Brandon and Selkirk in second year totalled 28, and in first year they totalled 74, which would make a total of 102 psych nurses in first and second year under training as of January, 1981. The figure for January, 1982 provided by the Minister, indicates a total combined in first and second year in training at 129. So, what is reflected there is an encouraging trend of 27 more in training in January, '82 than there were in training in January, '81. Provided that trend is continuing and provided that there aren't too many dropouts out of the course, are the available facilities at Brandon and Selkirk to accommodate increased enrolments and to train psychiatric nurses at hand? Can we accommodate and enrol and train more psychiatric nurses at Brandon and Selkirk than is currently being done?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I think that as far as these numbers, my honourable friend compares 70 to 90, those in training in '82 now; 90 was projected first-year enrolment; that's in September; that's to come. Now, my honourable friend talked about last year, those nurses in training in January, 1981, and the second year was 28; well, they'd be graduated by now. It would be the 74, the first year in '82. It would be in the second year. So, I guess you'd compare the 74 to 59. So, it would be 5. Now, yes, I'm informed that we certainly could accept all the nurses that graduate and then some. As I say, we're not closing the door and putting the no-vacancy sign yet.

MR. SHERMAN: Why would the projected first-year enrolment for September '82 be so much higher at Selkirk than it is at Brandon, Mr. Chairman? Not that it isn't encouraging, it is. But, it's more than double the projected first-year enrolment at Brandon.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think there are probably more in Selkirk because Selkirk has the responsibility also of training psychiatric nurses for Winnipeg psychiatric wards in acute hospitals. So, that might be one of the reasons.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I don't think previous years' statistics bear that out, Mr. Chairman. The two schools in terms of graduates, and in terms of nurses under training, and in terms of projected nursing enrolments have not demonstrated any statistical and continuous preference of Selkirk over Brandon. In some situations they've been almost neck and neck. In others, there might be a slight excess in Selkirk over Brandon, and in some a slight excess in Brandon over Selkirk. This year we're looking at a projected September enrolment in first year according to the Minister's figures of 40 at Brandon and 90 at Selkirk, which is a substantial discrepancy. Does that mean that the capacity and the capability of the Brandon Mental Health Centre to accommodate and train psychiatric nurses has diminished or deteriorated?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee will come to order. The time being 4:30 p.m. — (Interjection) —

MR. DESJARDINS: Was that passed or is that being held that item? No, okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time being 4:30 p.m. and therefore being time for Private Members' Hour, I'm interrupting the proceedings.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Resolutions. On the proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Gimli.

The Honourable Member for Virден has two minutes remaining.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I think it's significant since this issue was raised that the last two days in the Winnipeg papers there has been articles on metrification and the costs that are attributed to it. One of the concerns that has been the stumbling block in the American conversion has been the cost. The American people have pretty well stopped completely their conversion. The United Kingdom has ceased their activities in that field, in fact, have rolled back on one or two occasions and yet we here in Canada seem to be ploughing ahead regardless of cost and regardless of the consequences. The Honourable Member for Thompson has urged us to continue in that direction. He has suggested that we go ahead and support the White Paper, and the White Paper told us that it was in the best interests of Canada. So, I have to assume from what I heard the honourable member say that the purpose and the intent of the members opposite is to proceed with metrification regardless of the cost and regardless of the consequences. That, Sir, is the reason why I cannot support the proposed amendment that was put forward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. GÉRARD LECUYER (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, as I begin my remarks on this topic I wish to first of all draw to the attention of this House that the Member for Virден is badly misconstruing the remarks that were made by the Member for Thompson when in his amendment he is proposing that we abide by the White Paper. The White Paper is not one that says we just go full speed ahead and we go roughshod over

the desires of the people. In fact, the White Paper which was introduced and passed with the approval of all parties in the House by the Federal Government stated that it should be on a voluntary basis. Besides, it also added many other factors which stated that it had to be in consultation with the people; that it had to be flexible; that it had to go along pretty well at the rate that it was applicable in the United States, all these things were stated in the White Paper and — (Interjection)— never mind what's happening. What we're stating on the amendment now that we are introducing is we're saying that we should be doing it on that basis of the White Paper, not on what the Member for Virден is saying.

Mr. Speaker, the change to metric is part of a worldwide trend which Canada can no longer afford to ignore. More than 90 percent of the world's population lives in metric countries or countries which are converting to the metric system. Unfortunately, much of the information now being generated by editorial writers and the most vocal opponents of metric conversion has been somewhat misleading.

I have heard repeatedly as indeed I heard again two days ago from a member of the Opposition, that metric conversion was never debated in the House of Commons. In point of fact, while metric conversion was first introduced to Order-in-Council and the tabling of a White Paper in 1970, legislation approving metric has been debated in the past in the House of Commons with the support of all three major parties three times since 1971.

The January, 1970 White Paper tabled by Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin states in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 the following which I quote:

"The government believes that adoption of the metric system of a measurement is ultimately inevitable and desirable for Canada. It would view with concern North America remaining as an inch-pound pylon in an otherwise metric world, a position which would be in conflict with Canadian industrial and trade interests and commercial policy objectives. The government believes that the goal is clear. The problems lie in determining how to reach this goal as to ensure the benefits with a minimum of costs. It is appropriate that the Federal Government should assume a leading role in the planning and in the process of change. The government accordingly accepts eventual conversion as a definite objective of Canadian policy and proposes means of study and consultation, whereby the pace and the methods of change may be determined in the national interest."

That's from the White Paper for the Member for Virден's benefit. Further it states:

"No legislative action is contemplated which would make mandatory a general use of metric in place of inch-pound units, although, some legislation may prove desirable to foster familiarity with metric units." That's not what the Member for Virден said awhile ago.

As Canadian consumers are faced with their last stage of metric conversion, I agree I am sure with all the members of this House that more care needs to be taken to ease the confusion of consumers and the hostility of small business people and workers. With regard to the matter of penalties, as far as I'm given to understand they are not intended as part of the metric

conversion, nor intended for use against private citizens or consumers.

These measures are spelled out in The Weights and Measures Act and are applicable no matter what system of weights and measures is used and are designed to protect consumers by ensuring they are presented with the standard system of measurement regardless of where they are in Canada. Penalties under this Act apply only to businesses that refuse to conform to the national standards of weights and measures. In its White Paper the government stated and I refer to Page 16 of the White Paper:

"Wide flexibility and timing would appear to be necessary."

Further on Page 21 it states again:

"Special regard, however, must be paid to the decisions of the United States and to maintaining the ability to serve remaining inch-pound markets. Correct choice of pace of conversion allows costs to be minimized. It is believed that the determination of methods and pace of conversion can best be accomplished in consultation and co-operation with all sectors of the Canadian economy. This would involve development of programs capable of flexible adjustment to the evolving situation in Canada and abroad. In this process the views and proposals of all concerned would be considered."

Mr. Speaker, that is what we're saying has not been done. That is what we're proposing should be done. I remind again that all parties voted on this White Paper.

Mr. Speaker, these are provisions of the White Paper along with other sections quoted by the Member for Thompson which the Federal Government seems to be disregarding and on these grounds, provincial governments, businesses and individuals all across Canada should pressure the government to relent the pace of the conversion process, not stop it, as the members across would propose. Therefore, the amendment introduced by the Member for Gimli makes a great deal of sense.

The implementation process is almost completed in Canada. In fact, the costs to Canadian industry, if a moratorium were to be imposed now would be greater than the current costs of completing the process. I heard the Member for Morris state a few days ago and I heard him a while ago repeat that. He states that it was too late for this amendment which puts pressure on the Federal Government to apply the recommendations of the White Paper, recommendations which called for consultation and gradual implementation closely tied with the decisions made in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if it's too late to indicate our desire, indeed our will, that the Federal Government abide by the recommendations of the White Paper then the resolution, in its original form, makes even less sense; obviously we can't turn back the clock. The Member for Virden the other day said that we must be realistic and live in the present. I agree. The facts are that Canada has been gradually converting to metric for the last 10 years.

I would like to review only briefly what the facts are and what the reality is. For that purpose I will use this little review which was published in 1980 called "Moving to Metric." The background in the section called

"Background to the Change" states: "The Metric Weights and Measures Act, 1971 made the metric system legal for use in Canada." In the White Paper on metric conversion of January, 1970, the Canadian Government stated that metric conversion is both inevitable and desirable for Canada. The Metric Commission was set up by the government in 1971, about 100 sector committees made up of volunteers covering all sectors of the Canadian economy embarked on a four-phase program of investigation, planning, scheduling and implementation of the metric conversion.

The investigation phase begun in 1972 is ended. The planning phase was initiated with the formation of the first sector committee in April of 1973 and was 90 percent complete in 1979. The scheduling phase, when all concerned reached a consensus on the timing of the changeover, was substantially completed in 1980, and I repeat, this is a review from 1980.

Again it continues: "In some sectors implementation is almost complete. In the health sector, for example, most Canadian hospitals are using metric measurements. In other sectors the implementation phase peaked by 1977-79 and should be substantially complete within a few years thereafter."

On Page 3 it states, under the heading, "Simplicity," "Most provinces in Canada have been teaching metric since September of 1974. All provinces have run metric workshops for their teachers and metric conversion is virtually complete at the primary and secondary school levels." This is no different in Manitoba, all curriculum programming and textbooks have been changed over to the metric system.

On Page 5 it states: "Almost 95 percent of the world's population live in metric countries and among the non-metric industrialized nations there is a widespread trend to convert to the metric system. Canada must convert or it's damaging its international trade position."

On Page 6 it states: "Many of the things you deal with every day are measured in metric units; drug prescriptions, speeds and distances, gasoline, camera, films, etc. For example, toothpaste and liquid shampoos have been converted to metric standard sizes and measurements; they have been since 1973. Before conversion toothpastes came in over 30 sizes; now there are only six standard sizes, all in millilitres. All pre-packaged goods have had metric content declarations on their labels since 1974. The conversion of pharmaceuticals began more than 30 years ago and is now nearing completion. About the only change not completed is in the sale of meat, fish, poultry, fruit and vegetables weighed over the counter." I repeat, this is from 1980.

"April 1, 1975 was the date when temperature forecasts in degrees celsius began. Rainfall has been given in millimetres and snowfall in centimetres since September 1, 1975. Wind speeds have been given in kilometres per hours since 1976."

I could go on and on showing that this is a matter that has been a gradual implementation. Textiles have been labelled in widths and measured in centimetres and sold by the metre since 1978. The conversion of the Canadian highway system began with the placement of kilometre distance signs on main roads in some provinces in 1974. Across Canada all highway

signs indicating legal speed limits and distances were changed by 1978 and gasoline began being sold by the litre in 1979.

"In conclusion therefore," it states, "Each year we get closer to living in a metric world. The food we eat, the tools we use and the cars we drive are measured mostly in metric units. The change has come gradually over the last 10 years."

Finally, it concludes by saying: "The sooner we all begin to think metric the sooner we'll feel at home with the metric system."

Mr. Speaker, the conversion to metric in Canada is basically an accomplished fact and is currently used by 150 countries throughout the world, including the U.K., Australia, New Zealand and Japan, and perhaps that's one of the reasons why we're finding ourselves at a disadvantage when it comes to competing in the world market.

The metric system has been endorsed by many associations in Canada and I wish to name but a few: The Canadian Cattleman's Association; The Canadian Teachers Federation; The Canadian Construction Association; The Canadian Pharmaceutical Association; The Canadian Council of Professional Engineers; The Chemical Institute of Canada; The Engineering Institute of Canada and many others. In fact, many of these even endorsed it before the White Paper was adopted in Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from a review which states, from 1981, and the review itself is called "The Metric Monitor." I wish to quote from the statement prepared by PASCON, which stands for The Public Awareness Sub-committee on Construction, and I quote: "The longer the transition period to metric measurements the more the switch is going to cost. Those who have made the change in good faith are beginning to get angry and argue that it's time the government legislated to enforce metric construction. Don Bracken, Operations Manager of Nelson Manufactured Homes, a division of Nelson Lumber Company, says: "Personally, after five years of this, I think the government should legislate. Those who haven't converted yet aren't going to until they're forced. Nelson Manufactured Homes have totally switched the production line in its Lloydminster, Alberta, plant to hard metric dimensions. Bracken explains. This meant a complete redrawing of more than 60 plans for 1979 home designs and shop drawings. Some new equipment and retooling was also necessary.

He says the switchover went without a hitch. "The company spent a summer preparing for the change and then we did everything simultaneously so we were never doing conversions back and forth. We went totally metric." He says even their sales brochures are in the metric and there has been no problem, dispelling the myth that the public isn't ready for metric yet. Bracken explains. "The manufactured homes are sold to homeowners and contractors. The company ships its products," and listen to this, "The company ships its product from Winnipeg to the West Coast into the Yukon and the Northwest Territories." He says the company is saving on drafting time working in the metric system and the man on the erection side is making fewer errors because he's just having to add multiples of 10 and 100. The only problem has

been caused by the reluctance of others in the construction field to switch.

"Our retail lumber operation is having to carry dual inventories" explains Bracken. "One is for our retail operation which is almost completely imperial and one is for our manufacturing section which is metric." This article states further, "Champlaire Products, a division of Compo Corporation, in Ottawa, has changed its product line to metric, including windows, awnings, woodslider Pasha doors, stairs and roof trusses." Code Larkey, managing director, explains that the company switched in order to standardize sizes. "There was no standard for windows in imperial. Our awning window was 36-1/8 inch by 43-1/2 inch. Most windows were around 48 inches, but not exact. Now we have an even size of 1,200 mm."

Further on, it states, and he's angry, that some builders are getting away with soft conversions for Canada Mortgage and Housing projects and he quotes: "To me, as long as this is tolerated, you might as well forget about metric." Ellis explains that the size of products has to be changed because the metric system is dimensionally coordinated which means, everything in the building is designed to fit together, size of blocks, panels, light fixtures, and so on, are all based in increments of 100 mm. building module.

Further he states, "The longer the conversion to metric takes, the more it will add to everybody's costs in terms of dual dimensioning, pricing and costing."

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the members and further I would like to add some of the benefits which are quoted in a review called, Canada's Approach to Metric Conversion, which dates from 1974.

"Organizations which have converted or are in the process of doing so, give the following as examples of opportunities they have explored and turned to their advantage.

"One, rationalize products into some more logical range which fits new markets; two, extend detail standardization to reduce stocks after initial changeover period; three, expand sales to previously unpenetrated export markets; four, advance technological capabilities to redesign older products and techniques and innovate in existing or new fields; five, simplify administrative procedures and details."

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is time that the members opposite go on with the times and realize that to be realistic is to support this amendment introduced by the Member for Gimli. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Community Services and Corrections.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I only want to say a few words in this particular debate.

I cannot but help be amused by the efforts of the members of the Opposition in introducing this Resolution on metric conversion and indicating their concern about the effects of the mandatory metric conversion system might have on the economy and on various segments of the economy and I'm sure they're thinking particularly of farming. I will admit, as an average citizen, that I find some of the metric terminology rather confusing. I still have great difficulty even in thinking of temperatures in Celsius rather

than Fahrenheit.

But really, Mr. Speaker, the activities of the former Minister of Economic Development, the now Member for Sturgeon Creek, in promoting metric conversion in Manitoba would make me feel that really at least that member could not support this particular Resolution. Maybe indeed others on the Opposition side could not support the Resolution and I say that because the previous government asked for monies and received monies to promote metric conversion in the Province of Manitoba.

In fact, when the Member for Sturgeon Creek was Minister of Economic Development, under his direction, they were busy promoting it in various ways using taxpayers' money to promote metric conversion information in the province. I'm not criticizing him for it, but I'm just pointing that out. Maybe he's not aware of it. He should be, if he isn't aware of it. — (Interjection)— You are aware of it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer the honourable member to the annual report of his department for the year 1981. On page 32, this is for the year ending March 31, 1981. So this is a report of his department when the Conservatives were in government and the Member for Sturgeon Creek was the Minister. It states on page 32, under Report of the Manitoba Research Council which is an agency responsible directly to the Minister of Economic Development. It states that:

"On a demand basis, 133 people were provided information about standards in metric conversion." Well, that's fine, but then, get this, — (Interjection)— yes, get this, "A proposal for a metric information centre at the Industrial Technology Centre," that's here in Winnipeg in the St. Boniface area, "was also submitted to the Metric Commission in Ottawa" — (Interjection)— well, Mr. Speaker, whether it was approved or not is beside the point, that's beside the point. Is the Member for Sturgeon Creek now telling us — (Interjection)— well, I quote again, Mr. Speaker, from page 32 of the Official Report of the Department when this Member for Sturgeon Creek was the Minister responsible: "A proposal for a metric information centre at the Industrial Technology Centre was also submitted to the Metric Commission in Ottawa." For years the Member for Sturgeon Creek was telling his department to go to Ottawa, make a proposal because we want to have a metric information centre here. Well, that is the proposal; either he approved of that or didn't approve of it. If he — (Interjection)— well, it's wrong. I don't know — (Interjection)— yes this report was tabled by our Minister, but that's simply because we're now the government but this is a report for the year ending March 31, 1981. So, sometime in the Year of our Lord April 1, 1980 to March 31, 1981 the Member for Sturgeon Creek approved initiative by his department to seek and to locate in the City of Winnipeg in the Province of Manitoba a metric information centre.

I simply say that the words of members opposite are rather hollow and really we can't take them seriously. Surely, we cannot take the Conservatives serious because for four years they came to this Legislature and asked for monies to assist in the process of metric information dissemination and they got money from the Legislature and, indeed, they carried on and they

had staff engaged in this. So, I simply say, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Sturgeon Creek and the Conservative Government of the now Leader of the Opposition was sincere with their concern about the metric system, then I would say they would not have come to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Minister keeps on insisting that the previous government put money into the promotion of the metric system, that is absolutely wrong and if he says it again he is misleading the House. It is wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: That dispute over the facts does not amount to a point of order.

The Honourable Minister of Community Affairs.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that there are staff engaged in metric conversion information dissemination and as we said they answered inquiries and so on and I'm not criticizing the dissemination of information. I think it's a reasonable thing — (Interjection)— well, of course not, but what I am pointing out, Mr. Speaker, is the hypocrisy, the sheer, total, unadulterated hypocrisy of the Conservative opposition when they bring a resolution like this in. It's ridiculous, totally ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe that the words hypocrite and hypocrisy are generally considered unparliamentary within this Chamber. I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that he not use them, reconsider his words in the future.

MR. EVANS: Okay then, Mr. Speaker, if the word hypocrisy is not suitable we'll certainly withdraw it. I can simply say that they're engaged in a great pretense, an exercise of pretense, surely they don't . . . you know, the Member for Roblin, very fine fellow, good fellow and certainly he does a good job in representing his riding, but surely we can't take him serious and we can't take members opposite who support this resolution, serious. If we look at the activities of the department, when the Member for Sturgeon Creek was the Minister you'll see that they were engaged in activities; this cost the taxpayers money to have staff in that process. And do you think you can go to Ottawa and make this proposal without any expense whatsoever? And if I had the time I'm sure I could go through other reports and dig out other specific references to metric conversion information being disseminated when the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek was Minister. So, I repeat I'm not knocking the efforts of the Member for Sturgeon Creek when he was Minister, I'm not at all. I simply want to remind him, and I want to remind his leader, and I want to remind his colleagues that for four years we supported the metric conversion system in this province by supporting the Estimates of the Department of Economic Development.

Mr. Speaker, we reviewed the Estimates of the Department of Economic Development, ultimately

they were passed by this assembly. But the point is it was the Member for Sturgeon Creek, the Conservative Government of the day, that came to us and asked us for certain sums of money and this Legislature did vote certain sums of money and a portion of those sums of money, maybe a very small amount, perhaps an insignificant amount in the total spectrum of things, but nevertheless the principle is important. The point is that they were just as active in promoting metric conversion as any government was in Canada from my perspective and I say therefore any words from the members opposite are purely hollow; they cannot convince me; they cannot convince the people of Manitoba that all of a sudden that there is something wrong here and we've got to slow down the system. Well-meaning as the Member for Roblin may be, he simply doesn't know what has been going on in the past four years.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

QUESTION put on the amendment, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Ayes and nays.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Gimli as follows:

That the proposed motion be amended by deleting the last paragraph thereof and substituting therefore the following:

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this Legislative Assembly urge the Government of Canada to honour the main tenets of the White Paper on metric conversion in Canada, and that attention be paid to the warnings and cautions contained in the white paper.

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

YEAS

Messrs. Ashton, Cowan, Desjardins, Mrs. Dodick, Messrs. Doern, Evans, Eyer, Harapiak, Mrs. Hemphill, Messrs. Lecuyer, Mackling, Pawley, Parasiuk, Penner, Ms. Phillips, Messrs. Plohman, Schroeder, Scott, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Storie, Uskiw.

NAYS

Messrs. Brown, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Mrs. Hammond, Messrs. Hyde, Johnston, Kohnats, Lyon, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Ransom, Sherman.

MR. CLERK, Jack Reeves: Yeas, 21; Nays, 18.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is carried.

On the proposed resolution, as amended. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I was making reference to the metric system the other day and when I made reference to it I said that the honourable members on the other side have always been for the metric system and that creates quite a bit of turmoil. I did say that it was the Member for Elmwood who had made statements trying to convince us to get going with the metric system in Manitoba and I said the Member for Brandon East had made that. I made a mistake it was the Member for St. John, the previous Member for St. John I might add. He's not here now but he has more influence in that party than anybody else sitting over there I can tell you that.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Doern happened to say on April 23, 1979: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour, in view of some of the strong comments made by the City Manager saying that Manitoba is acting like a metric ostrich and that we're clinging tenaciously to the old Imperial units. I would ask him whether he had any comments on his government's intention to introduce metric building code in Manitoba?"

The accusation in itself which says that we were being like ostriches is really saying that we weren't moving ahead with the metric system in the Province of Manitoba. You know, Mr. Doern, after Mr. MacMaster, said he had no correspondence or no comment on it. He said, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Attorney-General, since one of the measures that would encourage metrification in the province would be the acceptance of metric measures in the Land Titles Office, whether he intends to introduce legislation this session to allow that type of procedure in the Land Titles Office? Well, the Attorney-General at that time answered, Mr. Speaker, and he said that they have always accepted metric in the Land Titles Office.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we always accepted both. We didn't believe it was illegal to do one or the other the way the Federal Government believes it's illegal, so we made it a freedom of choice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood also said perhaps the Minister of Northern Affairs could pass it onto the City. I would like to ask the Minister of Economic Development whether he has any comment on the City Manager's remarks that Manitoba, as the result of dragging its foot on the metric system, will be left out of the national economy and that we'll pay a premium price for non-metric products. Mr. Speaker, I answered him, no, we won't be. So, the Member for Elmwood again is saying, he said we are dragging out foot which is an insinuation which contradicts the Member for Brandon East, the Honourable Minister, that we were not moving fast on the metric system when we were government. Mr. Speaker, the same year we made it very clear, on March 29, questioning in the House, the Honourable Member for St. John, he was very concerned about the remarks I had made regarding the metric . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30 when we next reach this resolution the honourable member will have 16 minutes.

The Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would move,

seconded by the Honourable Minister of Government Services that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)