



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXII No. 50 - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 25 JUNE, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**Thirty-Second Legislature****Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 25 June, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure this afternoon to inform the members and the people of Manitoba that today has been declared Senior Citizens' Day at the Legislature in recognition and acknowledgement of Senior Citizens' Month in Manitoba.

The contribution that senior citizens have made and continue to make to the Province of Manitoba is immeasurable.

Their wisdom, their hard work, their dedication to building a lasting heritage for us all deserves to be recognized.

The wisdom, the fortitude displayed by our senior citizens in building Manitoba is a source of pride to all Manitobans.

It is in recognition of their hard work, their ongoing contribution to the vitality of our province that today has been set aside for them.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is only fitting that the doors of the Legislative Building are wide open to our senior citizens so that the government and all Manitobans can pay special tribute to them.

I am sure that members will join with me in welcoming Manitoba's seniors here today.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

It's a privilege and a pleasure for me on behalf of my colleagues on the opposition side to join with the Premier and his colleagues in welcoming our seniors here today. We certainly want to salute them for all their many accomplishments and thank them for their contributions to our province and our country.

We're proud of our seniors and we want them to be able to enjoy all of the benefits that we have to offer in our society today.

We certainly want them to continue to enjoy a full and complete life in Manitoba with all of the many things that we have to offer. We're grateful to them for their efforts in building our country and our economy and then entrusting us with its care.

So we join with the Premier and his colleagues in saluting their achievements and thanking them for their contributions, and in welcoming all of them here today.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a Ministerial Statement.

It's my pleasure to present the honourable members with a catalogue featuring Manitoba Artists Overseas, an exhibition designed to strengthen our cultural base and promote our artists overseas.

I have tabled copies of this catalogue, and invite the honourable members to peruse it at their leisure. Manitoba Artists Overseas is an exhibition of painting, drawing and sculpture, which is now enroute for display in Canadian cultural centres in Britain, Belgium and France. The exhibition was financed by the Governments of Manitoba and Canada, and organized by the Manitoba Arts Council.

The five artists represented in this show have chosen to make Manitoba and Winnipeg their home. Together they are a living demonstration of a commitment to our artistic and cultural life, a commitment that acknowledges the encouraging trend of the past several years. Indeed, we have witnessed an increasing number of artists at advanced stages in their career choosing to remain in Manitoba where a stronger art market and and better access to major institutions is developing.

Don Proch, Jack Butler, Sheila Butler, Tony Tascona and Esther Warkov each deal with a different aspect of their environment, reflecting in his/her own personal style the two inescapable issues confronting one living and working in the Canadian prairie: space and climate.

They engage both our intellect and our emotions, whether through the investigation of new materials and techniques, or through the questioning of accepted definitions of what constitutes art.

We should be proud of these five Manitoba artists who are now our cultural ambassadors. I hope that this innovative example will be one of many opportunities to introduce the arts of Manitoba to an audience beyond our borders, one which will place Manitoba on the map, encourage investment in our diverse art forms, provide recognition and enhance production.

We welcome and support initiatives such as these that recognize the need for Manitoba artists to develop and to share their work with other Manitobans, their fellow Canadians, and now Europeans.

Manitoba Artists Overseas is on exhibit at the Winnipeg Art Gallery from June 21st to July 22nd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We on this side of the House would like to say how much we are in favour of this particular move being made by the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada to identify Manitoba artists outside of our borders.

We in Manitoba have had many fine and close to great artists within our province for many many years. I'm sure that this move will do an awful lot to see that these artists become known and, hopefully, future artists become known outside our borders.

I would urge all Manitobans to take the opportunity to view this art display that's available to them at the Winnipeg Art Gallery from June 21st to July 22nd.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a statement as well.

Mr. Speaker, before I introduce the statement, I would like to make mention of the attachment which is a press release as well, a release that will be issued momentarily. It's an embargoed statement as well, so that privilege of the House would not be breached.

As a result of discussions with the horse racing industry, the Assiniboia Downs and the Manitoba Horse Racing Commission, the Province of Manitoba will increase the level of grant assistance to the thoroughbred racing industry. This increase is in essence a rebate to the industry of tax revenues which it generates.

The government and the industry have jointly developed a proposal which will result in changes to the wagering pool.

The grant assistance to the thoroughbred racing industry will be limited to the 1984 thoroughbred racing season. The total takeout from wagering will be reduced by 5.16 percentage points with Assiniboia Downs contributing 1.00 percent point, the horsemen contributing 1.00 percentage point, the breeders contributing 0.16 percentage points, and the province contributing 3.00 percentage points. The 5.16 percentage points takeout reduction is directed exclusively to the benefit of the racing fan and will therefore stimulate wagering and the returns to the industry.

The Manitoba Horse Racing Commission undertook a study of the racing industry in Manitoba and the province is currently reviewing the findings of the study with a view to establishing a long-term policy which will nurture a healthy horse racing industry in Manitoba.

The Government of Manitoba views this arrangement as being an important step towards the revitalization of the industry through the joint efforts of the industry, the race-track owner and the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

We thank the Minister for making that announcement today. We have been aware and I know the Minister has been aware of our concerns about the healthy viability of the racing industry in Manitoba. There are many horse breeders and horse owners who contribute a great deal to the economy in terms of the employment and in terms of the investment which they have in Manitoba, and the race track in particular is perhaps the largest tourist attraction in Manitoba today. As a

result, it does have a significant economic bearing on our provincial tourist dollar spending.

We were aware that attendance was down, that wagering was down and as a consequence, the returns to horse owners and horse breeders were suffering. So we are delighted that the Minister, in co-operation with the various people who have a great deal to do with the racing industry, are looking at these alternatives and have taken some action to try and overcome the problems that are there. When we were in government, Mr. Speaker, you may recall, we had occasion to do something similar for the standardbreds, so we are aware of the various considerations that went into this decision.

We thank the Minister for making this announcement. We hope that he will continue, perhaps, to evaluate some of the other proposals that are before him, including that of non-profit ownership for the Assiniboia Downs, so that the returns would stay more in the industry and allow them, perhaps, to take advantage of certain tax breaks that would accrue to them as a result of that type of non-profit ownership.

So thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the announcement today.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. M.B. DOLIN introduced Bill No. 35, An Act to amend The Construction Industry Wages Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 36 students of Grade 5 standing from the École Centrale School under the direction of Mr. Chartrand. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Compensation re heavy rains

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

My question is for the Premier, and it follows upon the revelation during question period on Friday by the Minister of Urban Affairs that she and members of Cabinet would be meeting with officials of the City of Winnipeg today, and one of the items that we had requested to be put on the agenda was, of course, the topic of potential damage claims for the heavy rainstorm and damage that has occurred to property and persons in Winnipeg.

We wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Premier can indicate if the government is going to be participating in the compensation for some of the immense damages that have occurred throughout the city, the basement flooding and so on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that question. As the Leader of the Opposition indicated, we did meet this morning with Mayor Norrie and other members of the Executive Policy Committee. The item that was included earlier and, of course, had been anticipated, was the one of flood damage compensation.

As a result of the discussions that were held this morning, it was agreed that the city would be providing to us as early as possible a submission that would be the result of a survey that the city is intending to undertake in the next short period of time to ascertain the extent of damage within the City of Winnipeg, areas that are affected, and other pertinent information so that we, at the level of Cabinet, will be able to make a decision based upon the information that we anticipate the city will be able to provide to us very quickly.

MR. G. FILMON: As well, in view of the fact that we've had three storms in the month of June that exceed the 1-in-25-year storm frequency level and in view of the fact that there has also been even within the last few days substantial hail and wind damage to rural properties, we wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Premier and his colleagues are considering damage relief to rural properties and communities that have also been very adversely affected by the storms.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Leader of the Opposition is aware there was announced a short time ago by the Minister of Government Services a policy statement pertaining to criteria to be utilized insofar as declaration of disaster areas. We will, of course, be prepared to look at any submission insofar as rural areas are concerned with the same view as to examining the extent of damage, the breadth of the damage, in order to ascertain whether or not a request should be made to the Federal Government and a declaration on our part as well as to its being a disaster area.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Province of Saskatchewan, I believe, earlier today made an announcement with respect to storm damage relief for an area adjacent to the Manitoba border in the Roblin-Swan River area, I wonder if the Premier and his colleagues would take into consideration the criteria which they have established for such damage relief programs.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we'll be examining all pertinent information. I might mention to the Leader of the Opposition that the Minister of Natural Resources is not with us at this time, because he has flown North to the Garland area because of reports of very heavy flooding in that area to examine the extent of the damage in that particular part of the Province of Manitoba as a result of run-off, I gather, from the park.

Municipal Hospitals

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Health, I direct my question to the Acting

Minister or to the First Minister. My question is whether he/she can confirm that the province will be looking at a proposal this week to renovate the Municipal Hospitals very substantially to the degree of demolishing the King George and King Edward Hospitals.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm sure that all members of the House would join with me in wishing the Minister of Health well. He's in hospital for a brief stay; we expect him to be out within several days and soon he will be able to answer that question more fully.

But as I understand the proposal of the City of Winnipeg with respect to the Municipal Hospitals it is that there is approximately \$20 million worth of renovation that they would like to complete within the next five years of their capital programming, which would then in turn be repaid through the Manitoba Health Services Commission. I'm not sure as to the exact status of it, but the Minister of Health should be back later this week and provide a more detailed answer forthcoming.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of Finance for that information. On behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House, I certainly extend greetings and best wishes to the Minister of Health, best wishes for a speed recovery and a quick return to the House.

Might I just place a supplementary question on the record to be taken as notice on that same subject, Mr. Speaker, and that is a question as to what would replace the King Edward and the King George if they are demolished. Is it the intention of the Municipal Hospitals and the Health Services Commission and the government, to replace them with similar chronic-care hospitals? If not, what facility is being planned for the polio patients and what facility is being planned for long-term extended care?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will take that question as notice as well, for the Minister of Health.

Day care - Health Sciences Centre

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Community Services and I would ask her whether she can confirm that the Day Care Centre at the Health Sciences Centre is facing a budgetary deficit crisis and again facing the critical question of whether it will continue in operation or whether it will be phased out of the Health Sciences Centre budget.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we've been meeting with the Health Sciences Centre people in charge of their day care. They have been granted a 6 percent

increase for the upcoming year along with all other day care centres. With regard to their accumulated deficit, we have undertaken to do some consultation with the Health Services Commission about the issue and it has not yet been resolved.

However, the total amount of deficit is not an astronomical amount and it's been our expectation that the Health Sciences Centre would find a way of absorbing it within their total operation.

However, we will conduct ongoing discussions with them and do everything that we can to keep that centre viable.

MR. L. SHERMAN: A final question, Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Minister of Community Services, she may want to take it as notice for the Minister of Health. My question is whether the Health Sciences Centre has a budget and a budgetary position at the present time that would accommodate a \$400,000 deficit at the day care centre. I put the question, on the basis, Sir, that the Health Sciences Centre may well be running a significant deficit already on its basic operations.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Health Sciences Centre Day Care Centre has undergone some financial difficulty in the past because they were offering a special kind of care - they had more infant care than was common in other day care centres - and they were offering a very special service to their employees. So the question has been the extent to which they should fit into the general pattern of day care support that is equitable and equal right across the province, or whether there should be some special funding from the employer because the main purpose of the centre has been to enable the employees to retain their jobs or work for the centre; and that is an issue which we are discussing with them.

They have found a way to date to meet the deficit, and the question now is whether they can continue to do so or whether a new arrangement is called for.

Grasshopper infestation

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. This, Mr. Speaker, follows on a letter that I sent to the Minister some two weeks ago requesting that an immediate program be introduced for the control of grasshoppers in the western region of the province.

Following the meeting last week with municipal people in Melita last Thursday and numerous phone calls from councillors and concerned farmers about their pasture supplies and their feedstocks being severely affected, will the Minister reconsider his comments as of Friday, I believe it was, in question period, and will he now introduce a program to assist the farmers in the purchase of chemical to apply on those grasshoppers so they don't expand again this year and have a larger problem on our hands than is the case at this particular time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is aware of my remarks of last week where I indicated there is a long-standing program within the Province of Manitoba dealing with the outbreak of grasshoppers. The province has, in the past, and I will repeat to the honourable member, provided the chemical as a service to municipalities and to farmers when those types of chemicals were not readily available. During the last number of years, the province had a large supply of chemical on hand which had, in fact, deteriorated - some of the containers had deteriorated - and the province had to reformulate and change containers and eventually depleted its stock.

We made the decision not to replenish a stock of chemicals within the province because there was ample supplies of it available at what is considered a much reduced cost than was readily available in the early '70s. As a result, the long-standing policy of providing assistance to municipalities on all public grounds, the reimbursement of costs of chemicals on all public grounds continues and the treatment of grasshoppers is viewed no differently than any outbreak of other insects, whether it be beetles in the rape crops or whether it be some other insects which farmers are obligated to treat at their own expense.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm extremely shocked that this Minister of Agriculture is not prepared to take action in a critical issue.

Following on his comments, I ask him if he's now prepared to live up to his policy statement that he just indicated and provide spray to the municipality in the southwest, to spray the wildlife management areas that's one of the major causes, as well as all Crown lands, will he take action and clear that statement up, a commitment which his department made earlier this spring? There has been no action taken and the grasshopper problem is there now. Will he take immediate action and reconsider his comments?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member wishes to make much of a situation that is long-standing in terms of policy. We on this side, Sir, are not grandstanding on the basis of grasshoppers. The outbreak of grasshoppers in terms of the southwest corner is no different than the outbreak of cankerworms or infestations on rape fields, or of other infestations. And being that the chemical is readily available, the province's policy - which is long-standing, Sir - continues to be the same.

We will assist municipalities with the reimbursement of costs of the chemical for spraying on all public plans, whether it be their municipal roads or whether it be the provincial highways, as was raised last week by his colleague, the Member for Pembina. That policy stands and we will continue to assist the municipalities, both with those costs and with the technical help from our staff in the field.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Pembina last week did ask a question of the Minister of Highways as to whether or not the government wouldn't provide the cost of spraying, applying the chemical. Hansard, Page 2210, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways did indicate that they would pay

for the cost of application. Will this Minister of Agriculture now support the Minister of Highways, and go to his Cabinet and ask for the cost of applying the spray on municipal lands and as well on Crown lands, Mr. Speaker?

As well, I again request of him, Mr. Speaker, to reconsider his decision and introduce a program to help pay for the purchase of chemicals by farmers. They are having to apply one and two and three and four times the same fields, Mr. Speaker, to save their feed supplies. Will he reconsider his decision? Will he support the Minister of Highways, and provide the application costs?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member knows that he should not ask repetitive questions.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the repetitive question was with a false premise, Sir, because the premise that he indicated - and I was in the House when the Minister of Highways indicated to the honourable member - that the policy of paying for the spraying costs was not a policy of government. It has never been a policy of government. But this government, Sir, has extended and been prepared to extend the assistance to municipalities towards the cost of the chemical, whether it be on municipal roads, rights-of-way or on provincial roads, but the responsibility for dealing with the actual spraying rests with the local government, Sir.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In view of the contradictory remarks made by two of his Ministers in the supporting of municipalities and the farmers in this community, will he support his Minister of Highways and bring into line his Minister of Agriculture who should be helping the municipalities and farmers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Minister of Agriculture has dealt with the question quite well. The policy that is now being pursued is one that has indeed been the policy for quite some time. The Minister of Agriculture has described that policy, and that is the one that will be pursued.

Federal dividend tax changes

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance, and ask him whether he has received any indication from the Federal Government that they will be introducing legislation very shortly to block Provincial and Municipal Governments from taking advantage of federal dividend tax breaks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, there were indications to that effect, apparently, after the British

Columbia Government moved with respect to its proposal. So one could have read from that there may be some legislation, because the Government of Ontario was quite concerned that money was leaving Bay Street.

Yes, we are aware, and I have been in communication with federal officials who have indicated that there will be some changes. I find that regrettable. It's all right for the Royal Bank to get cheap money; it's all right for Dome Petroleum to get cheap money, but it's not all right for small businesses and farmers in Manitoba to get cheap money. I believe the Government of Manitoba disagrees with that policy of the Federal Government that provides for lower-cost money to big business and higher-cost money for small business and homeowners. But unfortunately, it is true that they are apparently moving.

Just incidental to that, as we met with the City of Winnipeg this morning, the City of Winnipeg indicated to us that they have been looking at this at the same time - and, of course, they appear now to be too late for this source of funding - so they could get reasonable-cost money to do the things that we need with respect to storm drainage and so on and the other projects that are so important to our citizens.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in these discussions, has the Minister or the government been informed by Ottawa that they consider the provincial actions as an abuse of the current provisions?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: We certainly have not been informed that is a position they take. We have had discussions where we've indicated that we were quite concerned that what the Federal Government now is saying, while they're saying that they are attempting to help the west - everybody is making great points about being out there trying to help the west - and when the west tries to get money at the same kinds of interest rates, the same types of costs that Bay Street people get money at, then suddenly we have the Conservative Government in Ontario saying, don't do that. We have the Federal Government apparently now agreeing with that and we take strong exception to that.

We, along with the Government of British Columbia, did arrange a financing which does provide for economic development within our own province at rates competitive with rates that large Canadian corporations can obtain funds for in order to take over other corporations and so on. We think that if they can do it, certainly we should be entitled to do it for our citizens.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, holding aside the Minister's political analysis, does he accept the federal position that the Provincial Government has secured a benefit at the expense of, first of all, the Federal Government and, secondly, the other provinces in which the investors reside - a sort of beggar-thy-neighbour policy? Does the Minister not recognize that this policy is not one of Manitoba only, but one that would apply equally to all other provinces and could not just be for the benefit of a single province?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, my staff, who analyzed this proposal very carefully before I took it

to Cabinet, indicated to me - and I agree with their analysis - that indeed this would not be a raid on the Federal Treasury at all because people would be buying - corporations, that is, insurance companies, trust companies and so on - these preferred shares either from us or from Dome or some other private sector corporation which would use the funds for other matters.

There is still only so much money out there, and it's a question of whether it will come to the benefit of the public or the west or to the benefit of the private sector in the east. The Provincial Treasury in the Province of Ontario, we do not believe will be affected in any way. They will be affected in terms of these arrangements either by having Dome take advantage of it for the Province of Manitoba. The issue is, does the money come to the west or does it stay over there?

We knew at the time we were doing it that there was a likelihood that the Federal Government might act to stop this. If they see this as an abuse, Mr. Speaker, then we believe that certainly it is an abuse as well of our taxation legislation to allow for large, private corporations to compete against small business and homeowners and farmers and so on at rates that are much lower than what those people are able to get under our current taxation regime.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would then finally ask the Minister whether there has now been a shift in New Democratic policy. The old tried and true policy, as I have understood it for the past 50 years, was to close the tax loopholes. Is the New Democratic policy of this administration now, to take advantage and run through and create all the tax loopholes that you can?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I find it peculiar that a member who represents a Manitoba riding would argue that we should, rather than taking lower-cost money, take higher-cost money, which means that we would either have higher taxation in this province or less programming in this province. He can take his pick.

If he thinks that we should just allow the large private corporations to drive through these loopholes, as he calls them, then certainly I think that the public has at least as much right to get low-cost funds as do Dome or the other major corporations who have been getting those benefits.

Compensation re heavy rains

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

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

My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture, and it follows on the questions earlier by my Leader to the Premier. In view of the fact that Saskatchewan has announced today acreage payments to an area adjacent to the Swan River Constituency, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Resources has been reported out in the Garland area, I wonder if this Minister can indicate what action he will take to assist the farmers in the Bellsite, Pine River, Pulp River areas who have also suffered great losses from excessive moisture in the last week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wish to indicate to the honourable member that it has been brought to my attention that Saskatchewan has announced some type of an acreage payment following some of the areas that were hard hit over the last number of years.

Mr. Speaker, it does, in fact, play against what is generally been known in the country and was talked about by his colleague that crop insurance schemes in Western Canada are among the best in this part of the country. However, notwithstanding that, we will want to review what is happening in Saskatchewan.

Since that province did not assist their producers who were having financial difficulty as a result of high interest rates, the program of Interest Rate Relief did, over the last two years, assist our farmers in the small and medium size. We'll want to look at that in light of what Saskatchewan is doing on an ad hoc basis dealing with acreage payments.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Agriculture be contacting farmers in those areas that have been hit for specific details? Will he be contacting the municipalities, or what will his plan of action be with respect to any assistance to that area?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, our staff, of course, have been involved in assessing the situation. In a general sense, the Crop Insurance Corporation is having their adjusters deal with the cases that they're involved in and once all that information is gathered, we'll have a better indication as to the actual losses and the insurable losses that were insured.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, makes it very difficult to ask the Federal Government for assistance on an ad hoc basis when they, in fact, are putting in millions of dollars into sharing a universal program, such as crop insurance, in disaster areas.

Areas of damage, which have not normally been insurable and covered, have been dealt with very substantially by the Minister of Government Services and the former Minister of Government Services in the agreement recently signed with the Federal Government where there is a participation at the local level, at the provincial level, and at the federal level dealing with damages and losses incurred by individuals on items that are not normally insurable in terms of disaster losses. Those areas are covered in the new agreement.

The question, of course, has to be raised as to what does that do to the universal programming of, shall we say, crop insurance, another program that is available for losses due to wet weather. We will want to look at it very closely as to what the implications are for us.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, the Premier indicated that the Minister of Resources would be in the Garland area today. Will he be going into other areas in that immediate area that have also suffered from excessive rainfall, or is he just limiting his visit to the Garland area?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, there are other areas of the province, as the member points out, which have

had excessive amounts of rain; and areas in my area north of Riverton and in the Hodgson area where there have excessive rainfall; the Elie area as well. I will have to take the question as notice. The Minister should be back tomorrow and we'll be able to report to the House.

But the extent of excessive rainfall was, in fact, compounded by the rising of the creek far beyond its normal banks which precipitated the call and the loss at the municipal level of bridges and roads in that area far beyond what has been the case in many other areas.

There have been pockets in the province where on an ongoing basis, for a number of years, there have been substantive crop losses as a result of excessive moisture and rainfall, and I doubt whether the Minister is viewing those. But this matter was the seriousness of the raising of the creek which caused extensive damage to bridges, municipal roads and, I believe, probably many farm yards in that area.

MR. D. GOURLAY: One final question to the Minister. Can the Minister indicate to the House today who is really assessing the total damage in the province? Is the Minister of Resources undertaking that role at this time, or is the Minister of Agriculture also assessing, or is the Minister of Government Services looking into it?

I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture can specifically say who is in charge of assessing the damage that we now see as evident in this province.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, in terms of disaster analysis, the first contact, as the member well knows, under the Emergency Measures Organization, is the local government in the municipality.

Our staff at the regional level have been involved with farmers in dealing and trying to assess the nature of the damages and assess the extent of the flooding; and the Crop Insurance Corporation, as well is involved in assessing the number of claims they have on a regular basis dealing with crop losses of those who are insured.

From all that information is compiled the extent of damage that is there in the province.

Sewer line breaks - responsibility for

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I've a question for the Minister of Urban Affairs. Last week, Councilman J. Eadie of the City of Winnipeg was quoted as accusing the government of dragging its feet in introducing legislation to deal with the problem of property owners having to pay the full cost of sewer line breaks where those breaks occur between the trunk line and the private property line. Could the Minister tell us what she's doing with respect to this problem?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to have that question because the report in the newspaper had some omissions in it. I don't believe that the reporter questioned anyone from either side of this House, or they would have known that that

amendment was coming forward. It's included in The Statute Law Amendments Bill which is before the House right now.

Provincial Roads - upgrading

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

MR. W. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Due to the heavy rains across rural Manitoba, and especially the P.R. roads, I wonder because of the fact we have all the senior citizens here, would the First Minister try and find some money in the Jobs Fund to bring these P.R. roads up to a standard that they used to be, so especially senior citizens can drive across the roads without some of the dangers they're facing at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we are, of course, just as conscious and just as concerned about the provincial roads of the province in respect to maintenance and upgrading of them. In fact, I think without any question that this government has continued, it's had to deal with some neglect in some areas in respect to our provincial roads from past years, we're doing that, Mr. Speaker, and with a full commitment on the part of the Minister responsible for Transportation.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, could I draw to the Honourable First Minister's attention the deplorable condition of some of the roads in Roblin constituency, such as PR 484 and, at the same time, while this road is in such deplorable condition, the Minister of Highways in his own constituency is paving two roads that certainly don't need paving at this time. Will the First Minister try and get in touch with the Minister of Highways and see if we can't fix up those PR . . . I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The honourable member knows that Oral Question period is a time for seeking information, not for supplying it. If the honourable member has a question, would he kindly ask it.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Can I ask the First Minister if he'll contact the Minister of Highways and see if they can find some money in the Jobs Fund or in the surplus dollars that's in the Department of Highways, the Select Fund, and fix up some of the roads in Roblin-Russell Constituency, the PR roads. Especially PR 484 which hit the headlines of the Roblin News last weekend with some glaring stories about the deplorable conditions that those people have to serve and face today with this government?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell can communicate and speak to the Minister of Transportation, just as I find I have to from time to time, with respect to the condition of certain roads in

my own constituency that require upgrading and improvement from time to time. I'm sure that the honourable member would find that the Minister of Transportation would be quite interested in any comments that he would like to make in respect to PR 484 and evaluate the need for gravelling or upgrading accordingly.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that my phone calls to the Department of Highways in Dauphin, my phone calls to the Minister's office, have failed, can I now ask a question of the acting Minister of Highways and see if he will defend me and get some work done in the Roblin-Russell Constituency?

Horse Racing Commission - Annual Report

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I just have a brief question for the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. He had an announcement today regarding the Manitoba Racing Commission. I wonder if the Minister could advise the House when we will be getting the Annual Report of the Manitoba Racing Commission? I believe the Minister said it was very close about two weeks ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to determine that later on today. Hopefully, before the Session is out I might be able to table it.

Bills - calling of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, just prior to getting into Orders of the Day, to the Government House Leader. I notice one additional bill was introduced for first reading today and two more are on the Order Paper as notice. Can the Government House Leader indicate whether or not that concludes the legislative load, the agenda, that the government intends to introduce during this Session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the questions from the Opposition House Leader. Mr. Speaker, the two bills on notice were bills that were noted in the Budget, they are not additional legislation over that forecast. The only legislation that's shown up in the last week which is new is Bill No. 35, An Act to amend The Construction Industry Wages Act which, as members know because of consultation we had last week, is legislation brought in on an urgent

basis in response, at least in part, to a court decision; it was not legislation anticipated. I expect that all legislation to be dealt with this Session, other than this one bill, members had advice of approximately two weeks ago and I do not expect any additional legislation.

Water Services Board

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Some time ago I requested of him the policies that Water Services Board used to determine the job allocation, the tendering process, does the Minister have that information available?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, that question was referred to the Manitoba Water Services Board, as soon as I have the information I'll make it available to the honourable member.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as well, when the Minister is getting that information I would like him to get the information dealing with the jobs that have been let in the last two or three years by Water Services Board; the numbers of jobs that have been tendered for and who they've sent those tenders to.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm assuming from the honourable member's question, that he is talking about construction tenders. Is that . . . ?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, yes, that information would be helpful but, more particularly, the drilling of water wells and the direction that the Water Services Board have given, and the allocation of jobs, particularly dealing with drilling or drilling activity.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice but if the honourable member wishes a detailed response, maybe it would be better that he put that information in the form of an Order for Return so that we'd know precisely the kind of information that he desires.

We did, during the Estimates process, provide him with all the lists of the projects, the amount of capital allocation on all those projects constructed, and the program that is intended for this year. The whole background paper that I had for my information was provided for the honourable member. He now wishes additional information, possibly if he could put it into an Order for Return and we'll assess it as to the length of time it takes to get that information and, if that information is available, we'll be pleased to supply it to him.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the Minister provided us with information that was detailed work projects coming up. I am more interested in the allocation of the work by the Water Services Program in the past, particularly the drilling of water wells, and

the allocation of that work, and the tendering process. I can put an Order for Return in but I think it would be fairly simple for him to bring forward both the policy and the past record of how those jobs have been let by that department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order. I take it from the Minister's earlier response there's no objection if the member files an Order for Return, and the information's available in the format requested be agreeable to answering it. I certainly have no objection to answering the questions with regard to policy, but the details of all tenders on water-well drilling in the Water Services Board for the last two or three years certainly may provide for a lengthy response in question period and I'm sure the Minister would not want to use question period, nor would the member to provide that kind of detail in question period. But if the member wishes to proceed by an Order for Return I think that information could probably be provided.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, just for the honourable member's information I can advise him that, in terms of his specifics of drilling of wells, that there's been no change in policy, to my knowledge, since I have become Minister on the well-drilling policy of the corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I did not ask the Minister whether there was a change in policy, all I asked him to provide was information, regardless of where the policy came from.

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

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: I wonder if I could have leave of the House to make a non-political statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize the achievements of two of our six excellent Pages who have served the House during this Session. Two particularly who reside within the St. Norbert constituency and who graduated from Fort Richmond Collegiate on Saturday, Mr. Speaker.

The first, who is not with us today, who has left to attend a Navy Summer Camp, Natalie Krawchenko, Mr. Speaker, was not only the Valedictorian of her graduating class, and won some individual prizes for scholastic achievement, but she established a school record of earning 29.5 credits in three years, Mr.

Speaker. That's four-and-a-half-years work in three years and she will be attending the University of Manitoba next fall.

The second Page, who is with us today, Mr. Speaker, and whose mother and grandparents are in the gallery, Jennifer Henry, has won a scholarship to attend the University of British Columbia next fall; and on Saturday she was selected by the school staff to receive the St. Norbert MLA's Speech Arts Trophy, Mr. Speaker, presented annually by myself. I want to warn all members, Mr. Speaker, that her ambition is to become the Prime Minister of Canada, and I think she will make it.

I'm sure all members wish to join with me in recognizing the achievements of these two Pages.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: A committee change, Mr. Speaker, on Public Utilities and Natural Resources. The Member for Churchill substituting for Inkster; and Rossmere for Seven Oaks. On Statutory Regulations and Orders the Member for Gimli for the Member for Dauphin.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a committee change. Mr. Kovnats to replace Mr. Orchard on Statutory Regulations and Orders Committee.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, before we call the Order of the Day on the Order Paper, I would ask honourable members if there would be an inclination to grant leave to proceed with second reading on Bill 35 that just received first reading today, but has already been distributed to honourable members. If there is leave, Sir, the Minister is prepared to give a brief statement as to the purpose of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

SECOND READING

BILL 35 — THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY WAGES ACT

HON. M.B. DOLIN presented, by leave, Bill No. 35, An Act to amend The Construction Industry Wages Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, the introduction of Bill 35 has been precipitated by a recent Manitoba

Court of Queen's Bench decision regarding the payment of minimum wages in Manitoba's construction industry.

According to that ruling, Sir, any Manitoba construction worker receiving less than minimum wage and not filing a complaint within 30 days after receiving his or her first pay is not entitled to make any claims for the difference. While the ruling may have been accurate in terms of the letter of the law, we feel that it clearly contradicts the intent of the law.

The amendment under debate today is designed to clarify The Construction Industry Wages Act respecting its intent and to ensure that workers in the construction industry be in the same position to recover wages owing to them as are workers in any other industry.

Mr. Speaker, the right to minimum wage has long been accepted as public policy. I don't believe that any government charged with the responsibility of administering that policy believes that individual employers should be able to override wage rates established by law. That, Sir, is the practical result of the court ruling I referred to earlier.

The Payment of Wages Act provides for an effective method for the recovery of minimum wages in other sectors of the economy. Under The Payment of Wages Act, there is a 60 day limitation regulating complaints to the Director of Employment Standards, but more importantly, the director has the discretion to proceed beyond the 60 day limitation where he is of the opinion that it is fair to do so. Therefore, the employee has a remedy under the act, but cannot unfairly take advantage of his or her situation by delaying the complaint unnecessarily.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 35 proposes to ensure that the right of workers in other industries applies as well to workers governed by The Construction Industry Wages Act. I believe all members of this House agree that Manitoba construction workers like their counterparts in other industries, are entitled to a minimum wage and to the enforcement procedures to protect that right.

By passing Bill 35, members will ensure that right is protected and that the authority to enforce regulations is very clear.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you please call adjourned debates on second reading on Bill No. 11, followed by Bill 28, followed by the balance of the bills in the order in which they appear on the Order Paper.

BILL 11 - THE CLEAN ENVIRONMENT ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of the Environment, Bill No. 11, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I took the adjournment on this bill on the assumption that all members who wished to speak on it had done so, so that the Minister would have an opportunity, if he wished, to close debate.

If no one else wishes to speak to the bill at this time, Sir, I will defer to the Minister of Environment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister for the Environment will be closing debate.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just a few words to close debate on this particular bill. I shall refer, naturally, to Hansard to glean the words of the members of the opposition for their comments on that in debate on second reading.

There are essentially four reasons why these changes are necessary at this time. A number of these changes, Mr. Speaker, are necessary just to bring about changes or repeal sections to accommodate the adopting of the transportation and handling of dangerous goods, Bill No. 6, which we dealt with in second reading debate last week.

Secondly, there are changes to Section 14(1), required in order to introduce the permit system which we have referred to in question period a number of times in this House and which was announced more than a year ago by the previous Minister of Environment, and was also a recommendation of the Clean Environment Commission.

As well, Mr. Speaker, changes are required in order to bring the waste disposal of water or sewage from the City of Winnipeg under the provisions of the act.

Those are the three main reasons for which changes are being brought in on The Clean Environment Act at this time, as well as taking advantage of the fact that we are amending the act to bring about certain other minor changes that are required at this time.

Mr. Speaker, having said these few brief words, I will terminate at this point in time and answer the specifics and the details of this bill when we deal with it in committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 28 THE EXPROPRIATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 28, the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few comments to make on Bill 28, An Act to validate an Expropriation under The Expropriation Act.

I would like to put a few things on the record that came out of the report of the inquiry officer, known as the Tonn Report. While I recognize that some of the statements have already been on the record, I think that they bear repeating.

On Page 86 of the report, Mr. Tonn says, "It is my conclusion that the expropriation of the specific lots which are subject to objection is not fair and reasonably necessary in order to achieve the objectives of the expropriating authority, at least not at this particular time. I come to that conclusion with some considerable reluctance."

Mr. Speaker, further down on Page 87, it says, "However, I am troubled by the fact that the detailed planning processes that have been undertaken by the Administrative Task Force prior to the filing of the declaration of expropriation, and by the North Portage Development Corporation after the filing of that declaration, have not included an inventory and assessment of the buildings, businesses and people presently in the area. It is apparent that such an assessment has been done to some extent."

Then it goes on to indicate that there were about four properties that were excluded. It was Isbister School, the YWCA and YMCA, the Gordon Downtowner Hotel, and there was another piece of property that was owned by the City of Winnipeg that did not have to be expropriated under the act. In these cases, cost seemed to be the measure, so certainly the other businesses in the area would have liked the same type of shake that these businesses are getting.

At the top of Page 88, it indicates, "But it appears that there has not been time to undertake a similar analysis of the other properties within the zone, properties which are presently occupied by the residents and businesses of the area. It seems to me to be unfair and unreasonable to have done only a partial assessment. For, in that way, the property owners in the area have been subjected to differential treatment.

I'd like to state that the North of Portage Task Force had 60 days to recommend a specific course of action. Now 60 days to determine the livelihoods of people in that area, the businesses certainly, is a very short time and, then for the government now to bring forward a bill to cover a mistake that was made under The Expropriation Act, I think, gives further penalty to the businesses in question.

I can't help but feel somehow when I've read this report, that if we hadn't had a federal election coming up, that maybe the great push to show something was being done in that area wouldn't have happened and maybe would have given the task force some time to take a look at these businesses and see if possibly they could have fit into the area; we're not just talking about land and buildings when we're talking about expropriation. The more I read about expropriation, the more I hear about it and see what happens, I think that governments should certainly give every benefit of the doubt to these people concerned.

Winnipeg's been around a long time and north of Portage has been here for a long time, and when I was reading the report it indicated that Toronto and Vancouver took a period of from 5 to 10 years for the planning process to come to the point of specific site development, and we're talking about 60 days in which to put the hammer on these businesses. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it's most unfair and that this bill is most unfair, and I think that the government should have taken a little longer and a closer look at what they are doing to these people.

There was an example in the newspaper on the weekend, I believe, of a business that was going under.

Now, this may not been the specific cause, but what it did bring out is some of the concerns and some of the things might happen when these people are under the threat of expropriation and you've got a business, and you're dealing with other businesses. They're selling to you; they're worried about getting their money. So, when you may have had 30, 60 or 90 days, these business may have had credit time of 30, 60 or 90 days, I imagine the lot of it's going to turn into COD and that's going to make it very difficult for these businesses to stay in business while under the threat of expropriation. I think that in many cases this has been a hasty action and I hate to see the government proceeding on this bill so quickly and not letting the businesses have that extra chance.

I want to go on to the Tonn Report and, further down on Page 88, he indicates: "Indeed, the corporation is not yet at the stage of knowing what particular development will have taken place on any given street." Now, I can understand that there's going to be problems in a development of this size, but I agree with Mr. Tonn that in the context of the fairness and reasonableness, which I understand to be contemplated by The Expropriation Act, I cannot find that level of planning is sufficient to justify the taking of an individual's land, business, or home.

I believe that's a damning statement, Mr. Speaker, and when I questioned the Minister of Urban Affairs about the expropriation and about this report, that it was just a sham and this government had no intention really of listening to the people, they were going through the motions, and that's certainly what happened, the Minister said we may have some surprises. She indicated that there may be some surprises. With that I thought, well, maybe there's a bit of hope; maybe they are going to look at this and take into consideration some of these business people. Of course, that didn't happen. The report was looked at and there was a lot of hand wringing and oh, we're sorry, but nothing happened, except for this particular bill which deals retroactively with the expropriation.

I'd like to go on Page 89 of the Tonn Report, and he said, "However, in considering whether the expropriation is fair and reasonably necessary in order to achieve the objectives, the expropriating authority must attempt to carefully balance, as was stated by the Ontario Court of Appeal in the case of *Re: Parkins and the Queen*, the conflict between private and public interests which exists in every expropriation. In my view, this concept of fairness requires that the individual landowner who is faced with expropriation ought to be in a position where he can be confronted with the proposed use to which his property is sought to be put, and given an opportunity to convince the expropriating authority that that objective can be accomplished in some manner that will not require the expropriation of his property. In this inquiry such a scenario was not possible."

Mr. Speaker, the report goes on and it was indicated by Dr. Naimark, and this is on Page 90, that it may be that detailed planning would allow some of the parcels sought to be expropriated to remain in their present condition, or with some form of modification, other than demolition and replacement with a mall.

Now, that's pretty cold comfort to someone who is sitting under the threat of expropriation, and also may

be in the position of having their building or businesses damaged. I had one of the businessmen phone me who is a leaseholder and he said for them there is little, if any, consideration given. I believe that when we have a government who professes to be a friend of small business, I really feel that this act is in the contrary to that.

I can't help but be rather fearful for these businessmen and women that are in that area because the Deputy Minister, when he was questioned during this Report Stage, indicated that the province was anxious to provide increased employment activity, construction in the short term and, as a result of the redevelopment, jobs in the long term. Well, when there is no actual plan we don't know when this is going to take place. I think that it's dangerous for the government to be dealing with a bill such as this when there hasn't been time for any precise planning and most unfair to the businesses involved.

Some of the businesses have been there - well they've had businesses, this has been their lifetime business - and they're living in fear and uncertainty of what is happening here. I hear some questioning from the other side of the House on expropriation and what's happening on the north of Portage. — (Interjection) — No, they shouldn't have had to pass special legislation and, not only that, if this is such a long-term project, I think that then the planning could have been more precise and the businesses involved could have had more of a chance in the planning. I see, reading in all the different objections that were in here, that the different businesses, they're pleading for their lives. We're not just talking, as I've said before, about buildings and land, we're talking about people, we're talking about families, this is their livelihood; and to have this under the threat of expropriation, not knowing if their business is going to fit into the North of Portage development, not having any idea what is happening, and they haven't got any idea because the people that are planning don't have any idea and I think that's probably the most horrendous part of this whole business of expropriation. As I said, the more I hear of expropriation and when governments are dealing in it, they certainly have to be very careful how they're dealing with people. This isn't just land we're talking about.

I think expropriation is a mighty sword and I think that the government is remiss when they bring in this kind of legislation to further hinder the businesses when they have a chance to make themselves heard in court. These people are fighting for their very lives, and businesses can go steadily downhill.

There, you're ending up with not even something you can sell; you're in a business that you can't renovate; you can't plan on changes and I question the planning of the North of Portage when I see 60 days given, and then when I read about Vancouver and Toronto taking five to 10 years. So I feel nervous and I haven't got a property there, but I feel nervous for the very people that are there and that their businesses are being subjected to this type of tyranny by a government that really professes to be a friend of the small businessman and woman.

I'll go on to Page 92 of the Tonn Report. It says, "I am forced to conclude that I have not been satisfied that the expropriation of any of the properties subject

to objection is fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the objectives of the expropriating authority. It is my view that the expropriation is premature."

Now I don't know if the Attorney-General had a chance to read this report but if he hasn't I think he should look at it, because maybe it would give him second thoughts about this bill that he's bringing in. I think it's most unfair, and I agree with Mr. Tonn's assessment of what is happening North of Portage and what's happening on this expropriation. I am sorry that the Minister of Urban Affairs, when she said there may be some surprises in store, wasn't able to follow through with that.

I think she was probably under the threat that nothing would happen. That was not so. It's a threat because we've got a Minister of Transportation in the City of Winnipeg for the Federal Government who is anxious to see something happen there. So they're pushing it to an extent that needn't be at this time.

Mr. Tonn goes on, on Page 92, to say that: "I believe that fairness would dictate that an inventory of existing buildings and businesses be accomplished, and a more detailed site plan be developed before it is determined precisely which space is required for physical redevelopment."

On Page 93, he goes on to say: "It is my conclusion and recommendation that the intended expropriation is not fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the objectives of the expropriating authority."

Mr. Speaker, I don't agree with this bill that the government has brought in. I think it's overkill. I think there is plenty of time for the expropriating authority, for the task force or whatever corporation - I think it's the North of Portage Corporation - to have made an inventory of these businesses, to have been able to say to people, look, this looks like it's going to fit in; this doesn't and that's not happening. In some cases and in probably all the cases, these businesses are under threat of closure before expropriation comes along, because they can't make any plans for the future. They are left in limbo.

I think to have a bill to cover a mistake made by the expropriating authorities is unwarranted and I would think, not in keeping, as I said before, with this government's professed support for the small businessmen and women. I too urge caution and ask the Minister to take a good look at what is happening North of Portage, because I think that this is altogether premature, and to recognize that this is not just land and buildings but people that are having their lives changed drastically by this action.

In saying that, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to let the bill go to committee, and let the people involved have a chance to have their views heard.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. B. CORRIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I, too, want to join in this debate, not so much for the purpose of enjoining a heated political debate, but to put on the record my views in this regard. I have had some experience with respect to expropriation proceedings and, more importantly I think just by way

of background, I used to work as a lawyer for the City of Winnipeg and one of my jobs was, from time to time when my political masters required it, taking lands under The Expropriation Act.

Also, as a former city councillor and as a person who has had the honour, if not any success, the honour of running for Mayor of Winnipeg, I became involved in the public process which predated the decision to expropriate this particular tract on north Portage Avenue. So I was a participant in a fairly long-standing and a fairly specific and detailed debate on what would be in the best interests of Winnipeg from the point of view of redevelopment of that particular section of the city.

I should also say that, even before I was a candidate and while I was a member of the Legislature, I took the opportunity to express my views with respect to the redevelopment of north Portage Avenue to the North of Portage Task Force, which members will remember, was constituted by the three levels of senior government responsible for the Core Area Initiative, and which carried on some public inquiries in the City of Winnipeg with respect to this topic in the months of April, May and early June of last year. I was one of those who took the opportunity to make a formal presentation to this task force committee.

The committee, I might add for members' edification, was made up of the then Deputy Minister of Urban Affairs of the Province of Manitoba, the Chief Commissioner of the City of Winnipeg, and a representative of the Federal Government who is responsible on a seconded basis for the Core Area Initiative in Winnipeg.

At that time, I spoke very briefly, as I had before that on council and as I did during the mayoral election, on the need to introduce a housing component that would be viable and on a mixed basis to north Portage. I personally felt and I still feel that the downtown area of Winnipeg is satisfactorily complemented by the present commercial sector, and particularly by the large shopping complexes which are accorded public access on the south side of Portage Avenue.

I relate in this regard, and refer specifically to complexes such as Eaton Place with its 41 retail establishments; Eaton's retail outlet itself with, I believe, eight stories of commercial shopping which is among the largest, if not the largest in Manitoba; the Hudson's Bay Store again with, I think, seven floors of commercial retail shopping which again is certainly in the top three in terms of size and variety of outlets in Manitoba, and literally dozens and dozens of smaller entrepreneurs who apply their retail trades along the north-south streets of the central city.

So my feeling was, and it still is, that there is sufficient shopping, with one exception, in the downtown area and that the answer does not lie - and I felt this way during the campaign and before - the answer does not lie in any sort of mega retail project. I feel that what the downtown needs is a bright imaginative approach which will induce housing. Certainly, one of those mechanisms by which I think the lever will be tripped in this regard is the introduction of adequately and sufficiently well-priced - and by that I mean low-priced - grocery facilities.

One of the major problems which developers in the downtown area related to the task force and which

developers related to City Council was the absence of reasonably priced grocery outlets in downtown Winnipeg. For some number of years almost all of the outlets have now been closed down. As a result, and I think anyone who has lived in downtown Winnipeg on a full-time basis will attest to this, there is very very little an ordinary resident can do to find access to affordable grocery shopping of that nature and type. There are a lot of specialty stores but very few ordinary grocery outlets.

So my recommendation very simply was that we should save a lot of money and not try and introduce a wholesale development plan from on top at this point and juncture to the north Portage area. My feeling was that first there should be planning - and I want to indicate that the planning authority in the City of Winnipeg is the City of Winnipeg Government, not the Provincial Government or the Federal Government - first there should be planning and then, when adequate planning has taken place, then and only then should, if necessary, there be the introduction of wholesale expropriation of surface sites.

Now we have a very good example of what expropriation can do vis-a-vis downtown development in the small park which is adjacent to the south wall of the Free Press building. We have a marvellous, I think, and tangible example of the real bankruptcy of the expropriation approach when utilized in a rather undisciplined fashion by government authorities. It's a very good example of what happens when there is no planning and in the absence of any sort of appropriate consensus as between levels of government.

I have said I feel very badly about the absence of planning and I wish to note, because I think it's important for members' information and edification, that The City of Winnipeg Act makes very specific provision for the creation of action area plans or community plans for specific regions of the city by that municipal level of government. That legislation, as some members I think know very well, has been in place since 1971 when the Unicity legislation was introduced by the then Schreyer government in this Legislature.

The legislation has unfortunately not been followed in spirit or in any other fashion. Very few plans have been prepared by the City of Winnipeg following on that enabling mechanism and sorely, I think particularly, one notes the absence of any plan respecting the downtown of our city. I went around a great deal during the election and I spoke to people - and I am talking about the mayoral election - I spoke to people in the context of the expenditure of money that would be necessary to implement the Task Force Report. Some of you will remember that the task force made its report in the early summer of last year and just before the commencement of the fall election.

The task force recommended that the three levels of government come together in co-operation and create a rather unique concept in the heart of Winnipeg. It was a covered type of pedestrian mall which would include a glassed-in area that would completely cross Portage Avenue. The plan, if implemented, would necessitate the deviation and relocation of the Portage Avenue roadbed to the north and the expropriation of several dozen businesses in order to accommodate the jog in the arterial roadway.

As I think my colleagues on this side are well aware and I believe the public was made well aware, I hope

they were, I was adamantly opposed to that proposal. I fought that proposal because I thought that it was essentially inefficient from a traffic flow point of view, too costly insofar as it impinged on existing businesses, too costly insofar as neither the city, the province and the Federal Government could pinpoint exactly what the cost of the expropriation of those businesses would be, nor could they pinpoint the exact process by which the mall would be constructed.

We are now faced, through the auspices of this bill, with a very similar proposal, only I suppose in some respects worse - and I don't say that to be politically critical of my friends on this side - but in order to maintain my own integrity as a person who cares about the city, who has stood for office on numerous occasions as a city representative and who has strong feelings about the use of expropriation with respect to private landowners.

I believe that if it was bad to go into the unpredictable and unforeseeable waters of the Task Force recommendation, I think that it is probably more bad to proceed with the wholesale expropriation of the merchants and business people who are situated on north Portage unknowing of what the city and other levels of government plan to do with the expropriated sites.

In all good conscience, I have to agree with Mr. Tonn that it does not seem fair that government should use its authority and jurisdiction to take someone's private interests for a purpose which is not declared. Let me explain to all members that this is not the first time this has happened. So that members can understand and appreciate the significance of this, I will use an expropriation that they put in motion, the expropriation that took the so-called north Logan site for use as an "industrial park."

Members will remember that the specific purpose, as I have said was essentially - I think the year was 1980 or '81 when the declaration of expropriation was signed - was essentially to create an industrial park. I want you to know that subsequently when the industrial park was abandoned, that properties were taken for a variety of purposes, including the Salter Street Bridge, roadways, all sorts of things which were never envisioned by the original expropriators of that particular tract.

Now why do I raise that? I raise it because the assessed value of the expropriated properties was set when the original declarations of expropriation were confirmed; but notwithstanding the fact that the use to which the government wished to put the properties was changed and altered in the intervening two or three or three-and-a-half years, those people still were unable to seek compensation to a greater extent than they would have been able to obtain back initially in '80 or '81. To me, that seems unfair.

It seems to me that a government states a purpose. If government says that it is going to expropriate you for an industrial park and commences and then abandons, that the expropriation should be vetoed and at that point there should be a new expropriation process commenced in order to assure the owner that his or her or its value will not be reduced by that sort of technical advantage that the government has and this concerns me.

In the present case - and I say that because all members should be aware that no one group perhaps

is entitled to consider themselves wearing either a white or a black hat - of course, it's even worse because you're essentially losing your property. Your values are being established without even knowing what it is the government wants to do with you. You don't know what role you play in the final expropriation process. You have no idea whether your interests will be secured and ensured. I know there are platitudes which are mouthed all the time by people who are responsible for expropriation proceedings about compassion and about the provision of assurances to people who are expropriated, that their property losses would be properly compensated and that they would be relocated in new developments and so on, the reality is, that that doesn't happen.

The reality is that little people do get trampled in expropriation and they get trampled for very good reason. It's because the laws are not really built in this particular area for the little guy. There is indeed in this case a law for the rich and a law for the poor. You see, one of the things about being caught in an appropriation if you're a little guy is that you don't have the capital usually to be able to carry yourself through to be able to fight the expropriating authorities at the court level.

Even though you have the legal access and opportunity to do that which is enshrined and provided by the law, you usually don't have the money to be able to hang tough and hold out. So you have to make some pretty hard decisions about whether you're going to accept some offers of settlement, or goodly proportions of offers of settlement that are made to you, or whether you're going to try and take a business risk and relocate in the absence of knowing what exactly will happen and possibly go to court and challenge. These are very very difficult decisions.

The frank reality is that there is a long step between the intentions of legislators - and I say this because I don't think any of us here when we actually participate in the expropriation process contemplate doing harm to anyone - but there is a large step between what we contemplate and what actually happens on the streets. Tenants are particularly prejudiced by expropriation proceedings; tenants, because they do not have the same rights vis-a-vis the valuation of their business. Tenants are in a particularly vulnerable position.

I believe that if you took a breakdown of tenants versus owners and tried to establish levels of satisfaction and perceived levels of fairness you would find by and large that owners would indicate at the termination of an expropriation, they felt roughly that they usually had been treated fairly - usually. Tenants on the other hand, because of the differences in law, are put in a very different position. A tenant's only real right is to claim for relocation and for business loss but business loss can't be computed until you're taken away and removed. It takes quite a way, it takes quite a little journey or trip for the tenant to be able to establish what he or she has actually lost. Those are very difficult times because while the tenant is waiting, the tenant is going to the bank and the tenant is asking his or her bank manager to provide him with capital to sustain possible losses, and then the question always is, well is it bad management, and I've been through it with the bureaucrats who were responsible for expropriation.

Some of them will suggest it's bad management, that it has nothing to do with the expropriation at all. It's

just poor business judgment, imprudence that the business wasn't viable in the first place, that there are many reasons why that business is suffering losses. A poor relocation choice, not an appropriate relocation choice. Perhaps they'll distinguish and they'll suggest that if the tenant had chosen another building which was available instead of that one, there would have been no loss and therefore it's compensable loss that the tenant is complaining of.

These are all real problems. Psychologically, they're traumatic. For a tenant to be going through that is absolutely traumatic. Witness the case of the two Greek gentlemen who operate the Happy Penny Restaurant whose travails and plight have been oft retold in the newspapers of Winnipeg. They have been expropriated twice. They have been expropriated twice and they say that the first time they were offered, I think it was \$79,000 or \$80,000 for their business, and then it went to court and the lawyers got hold of it and suddenly the offer fell to some \$13,000 or \$14,000.00. They were told that it couldn't be sanctified, as it can't without going to the Land Value Appraisal Commission, the Attorney-General's staff participated in the process of taking it there and the property immediately devalued by some \$60,000 to \$70,000 overnight. It's not easy.

If you're a small business person employing maybe several other people, who are marginally employable often is the case particularly if they run a restaurant or a small retail outlet, it's not easy and I think we all know that. So I am suggesting that when we do participate in the process of expropriation we have to give consideration to exactly how it will affect people.

Now we've had a task force report, the task force report was scrapped. During the election - and I say this I think with as little malice as I can bear for the Mayor of our fair city - the Mayor was initially supportive of the garden mall approach to redeveloping downtown Winnipeg. By two-and-one-half-weeks into the campaign he had withdrawn his support; he was out of that; he wasn't for any jobs on Portage Avenue; he wasn't for any glassed-in malls over Portage Avenue either. He didn't know what he was for.

Now the concern — (Interjection) — I'm suggesting to the Honourable Member for Lakeside that his decisions in that regard and his judgment in that regard, seem to be very blurred and extremely subject to whimsy. I say that with respect because he has had an opportunity as a person responsible for the planning process, as a person leading the City of Winnipeg Council, he has had an opportunity for these last seven years to actually encourage the process of planning in downtown Winnipeg and he has failed to do that, he has not done that. He has been completely remiss in that responsibility, and I think that — (Interjection) — he doesn't speak well of me.

I think that it's sad to say that what happens is, by and large, is that other levels of government, federal and provincial because they are concerned about the redevelopment of downtown Winnipeg, do whatever they can to try and assist. They do, they co-operate. But I think what the problem really is, is we're too friendly. I think, and I say this with all due respect to the Minister of Urban Affairs, if I were in her shoes - and they would be uncomfortable because their heels are three inches high - I would certainly tell the Mayor of Winnipeg that we would not proceed with an

expropriation in the absence of a specific detailed downtown development plan for that area.

A MEMBER: Why don't you do that?

MR. B. CORRIN: Now, I don't say that, Mr. Speaker, to embarrass the Minister, or to embarrass the government.

A MEMBER: You should be the Minister.

MR. B. CORRIN: I say that, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that we have a responsibility to manage the fiscal affairs of the province, and in this case safeguard the fiscal affairs of city taxpayers, and federal taxpayers as well. I think that we're motivated by good intentions; I think the concept of redevelopment downtown is excellent; I think that the need is there but I don't think we should be doing anything until we define how we're going to deal with the need.

I also want to talk about who caused some of the problems on north Portage because we're talking about expropriations which are wholesale to redevelop that area. We should know that again the City of Winnipeg, because of their rather awkward and archaic tax assessment practices, have been partially if not wholly responsible for some of that blight. The fact that north Portage merchants for years have been beset upon by city tax assessors who have imposed unfair levels of taxation on them as a result of archaic rules, anachronistic rules, has resulted in the degradation and decay of that particular area of our city.

MR. H. ENNS: You're right again, Brian.

MR. B. CORRIN: The Member for Lakeside says I'm right again. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to tell you that it's not for the purpose of his approbation that I stand in my place today, but rather because I think that the City of Winnipeg is in a very very delicate and precarious balance. I think that we as members of the Legislature and people who are charged with responsibility, having been given a second opportunity to debate a very very important matter, in fact, given the only opportunity we will have to debate this matter because normally, as you know, expropriation can be ratified by Cabinet and does not normally have to come in the absence of a mistake to the Legislative Assembly for debate at all.

So in having respect for the fact that this is an unusual opportunity to soberly reflect on the decisions that have been made in this regard, I am encouraging all members to give consideration to the implications of this decision.

I also want to talk about the cost of expropriation because I'm not completely opposed to its use, but I want people to know that cost overruns and expropriation are legendary. No one can safely predict what an expropriation will mean in terms of financial consequence. If there is any member here who would like to stand in his/her place and do so, I would be interested to hear their views. I think anyone, and I look particularly at the Member for St. Norbert because he has had responsibility as the city's chairperson of the Works and Operations Committee, I defy anybody to say that with any safety you can predict the actual

cost implication to any government's budget of expropriation proceedings.

The costs are really as far-reaching in certain circumstances as the imagination of lawyers and the compassion and thought process of the courts. So you never know what the actual cost implications will be. — (Interjection) — Somebody says well if he's so smart, why isn't he mayor? That is not the point. The point is that we're all here — (Interjection) — I want to make this point because I think some members misconstrue their roles. We're all here to contribute to public process. The public will decide whether we're entitled to be here - I don't know which member shouted that from his seat - but not not any one given member but the public makes those decisions and I respect that judgment, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I continue to speak on this subject because I want the public to know my views on this important matter. I feel it's important because the future of our city, I think, hangs in the balance.

I am hard pressed, I must admit, to support this particular piece of legislation. I am extremely hard pressed to do it. I believe that Mr. Tonn has given due and adequate consideration to the position not only of the expropriated property owners, but also the position of the expropriating authorities in this respect. I must say that I can't really find fault or flaw with his particular point of view.

I might add for members' edification - because there are some members who seem to smirk when I suggest that I may not be able to support the bill and I suppose they see that as a breach in the chink of the government's armour - I should remind you that when you expropriated north Logan, and I remind the Member for St. Norbert particularly because I think he was the Minister of Urban Affairs who signed the documentation and the Attorney-General, that when those expropriations commenced, it was decided to use the special authority of the Province of Manitoba not to hold a public enquiry at all.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. B. CORRIN: So, credit where credit is due, because if you had heard from the people who were affected - and not only the residents, but also the small business people because anyone who knows the north Logan site knows that there are dozens of small business people and entrepreneurs who operate small factories and other sorts of operations in that area - if you had convened an enquiry, you may have gone about it in a different way because they would have said, did you know that we're here too and that we may be compatible with some other type of altered plan, but that opportunity was never afforded under the former Lyon Administration.

To the credit of this administration and I believe to the credit of the former Minister of Urban Affairs, although I'm not certain who was responsible as Minister at that particular time, the expropriations that we're now talking about was commenced but commenced with a view towards also convening and conducting a full public enquiry. An enquiry officer was appointed and a somewhat critical report was received.

Now, I think that stands this government well in terms of its integrity and its integrity of approach. I think that

one has to respect a government which is willing to bear itself and expose itself to that type of criticism. So I say that I respect, although I don't respect the way we're doing it in terms of the economics or the concept which is not defined as of now, I do respect the fact that my government cared about the wishes and concerns of the people enough to commence enquiry proceedings. That, I think is a gold star on the record of this government and witnesses its generally more caring approach.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the government in terms of confirming the expropriation. I will be supporting the government because I think the government is willing as a government to stand responsible to the people of Winnipeg in that respect.

If the government had not had an enquiry, then it would be a very different story, but since the government has been willing to bring this matter to a public enquiry, and since the government and the opposition have had an opportunity to debate - and I note that the opposition is supporting it and I'm not going to be the dog in the manger who simply out of any degree of recalcitrance registers one opposing vote against the confirmation of this particular expropriating act - remembering, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I would not have had the right to bring that vote or make this speech if not for the fact that there was an error and that this matter was brought here only as a result of that.

So I'm saying that I will continue to be vigilant and to do my utmost to watch progress with respect to this matter, to make whatever input I can at the caucus level and directly with the Minister or other members who are interested on either side of the House. I enjoin all members to give consideration to this matter because notwithstanding the deficiencies that I've related, as I've also related, neither government is exactly virtuous in this regard.

The plight of tenants was the same under the former Lyon administration. The Lyon administration didn't move to amend the expropriation law with respect to the rights of tenants. The Lyon Government didn't refrain from commencing expropriation proceedings without benefit of a public enquiry officers' hearing. The Lyon Government didn't do those things.

The Lyon Government also went into expropriations such as north Logan that were ill-defined and poorly drawn out. So they also embarked on co-operative venturing with other levels of government where there was no real definition to the plan.

So, having said those things, Mr. Speaker, I have expressed my views and I think I've done what I can as a responsible member today. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Member for Kirkfield Park in her remarks, at one point, talked about the expropriation being a mighty sword, in that way paralleling some earlier remarks made by the Member for St. Norbert. Indeed, perhaps it is, but it has been said that sometimes the pen is mightier than the sword and the Member for Ellice did us a service by reminding the House that with a sweep of the pen - the signature was not that of the Member

for St. Norbert but of Warner Jorgenson - with respect to all of those expropriations in the North of Portage, they wiped out the rights of the people North of Portage to bring their concerns forward in a public way.

So I say, Sir, that it lies ill in the mouth of the Member for St. Norbert and the Member for Kirkfield Park who probably didn't know this, to chastise this government with respect to this particular piece of legislation when they wouldn't even have an inquiry. Indeed, one of the first acts of this government when we took office was to order an inquiry into the Logan expropriation, so that the residents of Logan and the small businesses of Logan would have a forum in which to come forward and express their views; and as a result of those views we did a number of things that I think history will justify as being the appropriate way to deal with the concerns of the small businessperson.

With respect to North of Portage and the inquiry, and again the Member for Ellice did well to point out that we ordered and held an inquiry, that was an opportunity provided for us in which a number of things emerged. First of all, that with respect to the area under consideration, there is a fairly clear delineation of objectives.

Indeed if one looks at the Tonn Report, which was referred to, to some considerable extent both by the Member for St. Norbert and the Member for Kirkfield Park, there is on Pages 13 and following, a description of the evidence that was brought forward. Mr. Diamond indicated that the province's major objective was to encourage a major revitalization of the downtown.

Further at Page 15, there is the talk about the concept of a mixed development, anchored by existing - existing retail establishments - linked by a major new complex and supported by complementary development covering four distinct areas, and always emphasizing the housing component. So that much, at least, is clearly delineated.

What Mr. Tonn went on to say, and indeed as a matter of fact he was right, that what was missing at that stage of the development was a site-by-site analysis of whether or not any particular site would fit in to the components that were there identified. It was good and appropriate that the inquiry allowed the persons who were concerned about their future in that area to come forward and identify those concerns. And what did we say? We said first of all specifically with respect to the Gordon Motor Hotel, that that concern would be looked after. But I have no doubt, both from the evidence that was given and the way in which we addressed that evidence, that as the plan becomes more articulated, that it is more than likely that most of those small businesses who want to remain there will be able to remain there.

Let it be said clearly for the record. It has not been foreclosed at all that these people who are being expropriated, therefore will have to go. What we have indeed is what is the only possible way as I see it, given some of the time constraints particularly to articulate a comprehensive scheme, and that is for the expropriating authority, and we're expropriating on behalf of the three levels of government, to expropriate the whole area and then, having control of the area, see what can stay and what will not.

But I project that most of the businesses which came and made representations, the viable businesses not

only will stay in that redeveloped and revitalized complex, but they will thank us because they will be in a revitalized North of Portage and instead of living in a decaying area in which they could see their economic future going downhill, they will be living in a revitalized North of Portage with a strong housing component to anchor it. Again I think that fits in well with some of the major concerns that the Member for Ellice has and has raised.

So I should just want to point out the difference in the way in which we as a government operate with respect to expropriation, and the way in which the Tories when they were in government, operated and let the record be crystal clear on that. There is a major difference in our approach to the needs of the people in that area.

What Mr. Tonn did was to point out - indeed I think it may be said he perhaps didn't have any other choice - that with respect to each individual objector, it couldn't be said that the taking was fair and reasonable because the plan hadn't got to the point where, with respect to each individual parcel, there was a concept of how it fitted in. As a very responsible lawyer - I have nothing but the highest regard for Mr. Tonn - he came to one of the conclusions it was possible for an Inquiry officer to come to.

What he did not do - and he said specifically he would not do because it doesn't fall within the mandate given under the act - he didn't deal with some of the possible legal roadblocks which might be placed in the way which would not have anything to do with the fair and reasonable question, but might have something to do with apprehended legal defects in the process.

Recognizing that there was some need to make sure that this development plan took place in an orderly way, and not by fits and starts occasioned by the judicial process, this legislation was brought in. Let it be said, this legislation was not brought in to do away with a necessity, to make sure that any taking in the sense of an expropriation which might lead to the displacement of a tenant would be anything less than fair and reasonable.

So, Sir, in closing debate, I want to say that we welcome this going to committee and the opportunity again, the second opportunity for members of the public and small businesspeople North of Portage to come and make their concerns known, but I want to say and speaking for myself, the Minister of Government Services, the former Minister of Urban Affairs, the present Minister of Urban Affairs, the whole government and the whole caucus, that we are dedicated to listening to what people have to say either in a forum which we will provide such as an inquiry or a committee, and taking that into consideration, using our influence when it's a tri-level partnership, to make sure that the objectives which have been identified before the inquiry commission, have been identified for the North Portage Development Corporation, are lived up to. I am satisfied that following this route, those people, whether it's Hull Publishing or Judy's Shop or whatever, that their interests indeed will be looked after.

Finally in closing, we too are aware of a problem raised by the Member for Ellice concerning the rights of tenants. One of the things that was commissioned by ourselves - I participated in discussions on that following a look at what was happening in some of the

core area takings - was to take a look at some of the jurisprudence with respect to tenants' rights and to commission someone at the law school to bring in some recommendations of how we might, in The Expropriation Act, better protect tenants' rights. I want to assure members of the House that indeed that is one of our objectives.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 14 THE JOBS FUND ACT

MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Culture, Bill No. 14.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 14 is this government's second attempt to more formalize the Manitoba Jobs Fund. The bill repeals an earlier bill setting up the Jobs Fund, being attached as well to the Statutes of Manitoba.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that we can say or do that will prevent the government from exercising its will and its majority to proceed with the Manitoba Jobs Fund as one of its high profile, propaganda tools, I like to call it, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Who's the Minister in charge of the Jobs Fund? It's good to know you're listening, Harry.

MR. H. ENNS: We intend to allow this bill to pass, Mr. Speaker, having, as I said at the outset, recognized the determination that this government and this Minister has, to pull under The Jobs Fund Act any number of line department responsibilities that are not new, are not innovative, are not, in my judgment, being delivered any better under the present administration of the Manitoba Jobs Fund and/or under the expanded bureaucracy that will be developed under Bill 14 that the Minister is proposing in this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

What we are doing is ensuring that yet another bureaucracy is being created, yet another agency is being created to do what, in my judgment, as I said just a little while ago - I think a few days ago in dealing with the Estimates of the Jobs Fund - that was being done historically and traditionally by many of the line departments that have responsibilities in the area of job creation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the government well. I hope that perhaps if they do collect under the umbrella of the Jobs Fund the various efforts of government in creating economic stimulation to provide more jobs in Manitoba, more jobs for Manitobans, certainly it's difficult to oppose that, Mr. Speaker.

We need jobs in Manitoba. This government ought to be aware of it more so than anybody else because, despite their pleasure at announcing the Canada Stats on unemployment, the fact that we now are, or I so understand, amongst the lowest or the lowest in Canada, the truth of the matter is there are 20,000 more unemployed Manitobans walking the streets in the towns and communities of Manitoba than there were when the last Tory administration was in office. That's a simple statistical number that can't be denied.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to stand in the way of this government's effort to develop jobs and, if they are convinced that this act will help, well then God bless them. All I could say, Mr. Speaker, is that in my judgment we are not really making the access on the part of the average citizen and/or businessman easier; we are in fact making it more complicated.

What happened to the old Department of Industry and Commerce? If a businessman had a problem, he wanted some assistance, if there was a program available, if there was a grant program available, if there was an assistance program available, then he knew where to go. He walked into the front of the building, looked at the directory and looked for his Minister of Small Business.

This government, Mr. Speaker, has in this very Session, in this Throne Speech, made a great ado about their emphasis on business development. We've got a new Minister responsible for Small Business Development - we've still got some remnants of the old Department of Industry and Commerce, or Industry and Trade - Industry, Trade and Technology, I believe they call it - we've got a department and a Minister of Small Business and Economic Development and we have, of course, the head honcho himself, the Honourable Minister responsible for the Manitoba Jobs Fund who brings in this Bill No. 14.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's all a fine little game of smoke and mirrors in terms of internal gratification, and it fills out Throne Speeches and it puts more people into the telephone directories of the Manitoba Government Telephone Book as to all the places that are responsible for administrating the various programs to enhance job opportunities in Manitoba.

But, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is, is it any easier for the average citizen, for the average small businessman to know which door to knock on? What we, in effect, have, Mr. Speaker, is a highly politicized effort on the part of the government to gather unto themselves, closer to themselves politically, under the heading of the Manitoba Jobs Fund, those kind of tangible programs from time to time where they can direct monies and they can set up a big green sign and say this is what the Honourable Eugene Kostyra, the Honourable Minister of the Jobs Fund, is doing for you today.

Now whether that was normally done by the Department of Highways, which this fund has robbed by \$25 million or \$26 million; whether that was normally done by the Minister of Natural Resources in the development and improvement of drainage programs, that doesn't really matter to these Ministers, Mr. Speaker. They are in political trouble and they have to try to recycle the same public dollars that were normally spent on these various programs, put them up on a little higher profile, surround them with a green sign and label them as programs being carried out under the Jobs Fund.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's essentially what this bill does, it doesn't really change a great deal except set up a new bureaucracy to handle the efforts of the Jobs Fund.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain sections of the act that we will watch with some concern. There is a particular section in the act - I respect, Mr. Speaker, at second reading we don't deal clause-by-clause - but there is a principle that is involved here that I always

find of concern where they exempt municipalities or other organizations from certain regulatory obligations that they normally would be under. I don't know whether that is particularly in the interests of the persons or organizations that are involved in developing a project in conjunction with the Jobs Fund.

After all, Mr. Speaker, if a municipality enters into an agreement with the Manitoba Jobs Fund to do something and that something that they are proposing to do would normally call for them to request approval from the Municipal Board or other regulatory bodies before borrowing or expending monies, they can now be exempt from going to the Manitoba Municipal Board.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that there is a reason why municipalities had to go to regulatory bodies for approval from time to time, to make sure that programs entered into were indeed programs that served the public interests of that particular municipality or that particular organization. For the Jobs Fund, under this act that now is being proposed, to have the power to exempt themselves from that supervision always bothers me a little bit because all too often Crown corporations, governments, like to leave, in my judgment, a bad example. We say to the others out there, to the private sector out there, you all have to be regulated, you all have to be supervised, you have to be checked, but when we, a government agency do it, we exempt ourselves from that same supervision, from those same regulations in some instances.

So, Mr. Speaker, I find that objectionable in this act. I think it is removing a safeguard that for good reason is there, particularly when they are dealing with public bodies, particularly when they are dealing with municipal organizations.

I would suspect that the act, Section 8(1) is specific that the Jobs Fund wants to be in the business of being able to enter into joint ventures, I suppose you could call them, with the municipal organizations from time to time. It could be for an expanded version of a Main Street Manitoba Program or such other kinds of public works type programs that may be laudable in themselves, but I see no particular reason for the exemption clause to be in the act, Mr. Speaker.

I see the only redeeming, or one of the few redeeming features of the act is that it does repeal a number of acts. It repeals The Winter Employment Act; it repeals The Act to amend The Winter Employment Act; it repeals, as I said earlier, the original Jobs Fund Act. So what we see here at least is some diminution of old statutes and I would, in fact, encourage the Minister and the government, if indeed this is to be their vehicle - well, Mr. Speaker, I shouldn't really encourage them because it is going to be their vehicle for just a short time anyway - 18 months at the most. So it doesn't make that much difference, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to have said, because in the interest of efficiency, in the interest of accessibility on the part of the citizens that want to and ought to be able to know exactly where to go when making enquiries with respect to assistance, advice, general counsel, in terms of employment opportunities, in terms of taking advantage of the different programs that are available to them by governments, that they should perhaps be, not only repealing those few statutes that are being listed in the last section of this act, but they should be repealing many more sections or indeed responsibilities - they

may not be separate acts - that are currently housed in other departments.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, and of course, the Minister will tell us that the fact that the Manitoba Jobs Fund has been singled out as the program with the highest profile and that receives the greatest public relations effort, in terms of advertising, in terms of general promotion as its vehicle for job creation, as its vehicle for economic development, that in no way means that the Minister for Business Development doesn't have his programs that he hopes to create jobs with or encourage business development. That doesn't mean that the Minister of Agriculture doesn't have continuing programs, continuing grants, continuing job-creating activities in that department.

Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that in the Department of Labour, I would suspect that in the Department of Community Services, a host of other departments have similar functions. I might have asked that the Minister might even have considered a greater pulling in of the various programs that are available for job creation and economic development into the Jobs Fund if we deem it necessary to pass this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there are some specific areas with respect to responsibilities of members of Executive Council, should they be placed in charge of managing property that could come under the jurisdictions of the Manitoba Jobs Fund? There are other details that we will be interested in pursuing at committee stage but, with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to see this bill move down to committee for further consideration.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 18, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, could I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 20, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 21, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to see this bill go to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 22 THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, Bill No. 22, standing

in the name of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Member for La Verendrye when he spoke on this bill, he referred to his - well, let's put it this way - he referred to the reasoning of why the NDP Government wanted to pass this particular piece of labour legislation.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we have to wonder why, because the Province of Manitoba has had one of the best labour relations histories and records of any province in this country. I am not particularly too concerned about what other provinces do, I'm mainly concerned about Manitoba, and our record has been excellent as far as the labour relations has been concerned in this province. So we have to think of the old adage that we say, if it's working, don't fix it. But, of course, this government is one that has to meddle with everything that it can, regardless of if it needs fixing or not.

They decided to have hearings on the labour bill and they have had a report come through on the labour bill, as we call it; the White Paper was put out, it had references come back from industry, there were some public hearings on it. There was another White Paper put out, and then there were changes to the first and, of course, there were more hearings again but, unfortunately, this government didn't listen.

Now they listened to some. The first one that they sent out to the industry generally was looked at by everybody and when it came back to the Minister there were some major changes made before we saw the next White Paper on the labour legislation.

Mr. Speaker, they didn't really listen to the important parts of what was said by industry and by business within this province. They had responses from the White Paper from the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, and much of that has not been listened to. The Manitoba Fashion Institute has submitted the apparel industry position on proposed changes, and much of that has not been listened to.

So, Mr. Speaker, they then present the bill to the House, and we have in our mailboxes last week a statement from the Manitoba Chambers and the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce that starts out by saying: "We have been hoodwinked, missiled and zapped."

Mr. Speaker, when the business community reads a bill that they're very concerned with and makes this type of statement, I think we have all got a lot to be concerned about, but this government does not seem to be concerned. They weren't concerned about the language issue, the changes to the Constitution; they were prepared to push this through when they found out that over 80 percent of the population in Manitoba was opposed to them. Now they are finding out that the large percentage, and I guess I have to say about 70 percent at least, of the businesses within this province are opposed to what they're doing. They're saying, we have been hoodwinked; we have been misled; we have been zapped.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for a Minister of Labour to have those charges laid against her . . .

A MEMBER: By the business community.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes, by the business community, but by anybody in this province, I think, is a major charge, in other words, the people, the businesses of Manitoba. Let me just read to you: "Small business in Manitoba . . . "this is the statement from the Honourable Eugene Kostyra, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. It says that "90 percent of the businesses in Manitoba employ fewer than 20 people" - 90 percent of the businesses. Those are the small businesses, and it's the small businesses that are going to be harmed by this legislation, they are going to be hurt badly by this legislation.

Let me just read another statement that was made by the Chamber of Commerce. They said: "We listened and we complimented the Throne Speech." They felt good, and they said so. The introduction of Bill 22 is a complete contradiction to the positive ideas of the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, in July, 1983, they said: "The most important test of all, new legislation affecting the working family, is how does this law or regulation affect the security of my job? How does it affect the businesses that create jobs? The loss of jobs and the loss of opportunities in the provinciewide scale is a total disaster." You will lose jobs on a provinciewide scale, because 90 percent of your businesses in Manitoba are small businesses.

One year later and, in spite of repeated warnings, the appeals to government, not only by business associations, but by individual businessmen, that the proposed legislation was not only unnecessary but harmful. We saw the introduction yesterday of Bill 22 and that to undermine job creation initiatives of the government and they said the job creation initiatives of the government.

I read again from the statement when the Jobs Fund Estimates were presented. Mr. Speaker, it says, "These incentives could include loans or guarantees, provision for training, equity investment, or individual development. We will offer incentives to encourage the establishment of expansion of facilities in our province."

So, Mr. Speaker, those particular incentives that they . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

When this bill is next before the House, the honourable member will have 33 minutes remaining.

The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, there may be, I believe, an inclination to dispense with Private Members' Hour today by leave, so the honourable member may resume debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting we dispense with Private Members' Hour today then, and continue with adjourned debates on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave having been given, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has 33 minutes remaining.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: So, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the incentives that were presented to us by the Jobs Fund and the Venture Capital Program that the Minister of Small Business Development and Tourism has, you get up and you brag about what you're doing and then you have the Chamber of Commerce referring to Bill 22 - "an act to undermine job creation incentives of the government."

Mr. Speaker, we have somebody that has analyzed this, probably 70 percent of the business people within this province, and they're saying that you're undermining your own incentives. They say they've been hoodwinked. I think the government has hoodwinked and misled themselves. They really don't have the brains to realize it.

Mr. Speaker, we wonder very sincerely why this government would come along with this type of legislation. Well, it's obvious it's to appease the union bosses of the Province of Manitoba. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that anybody that misses their own particular incentives must be being pressed by a very powerful force.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would refer to the Canadian Labour, January 22, where it starts out, "Building a better Manitoba." It comes to Page 11, it says, "How sweet it is; Manitoba Victory; how sweet it is. The Manitoba election on the on-the-job canvasses done by the labour unions for the NDP Party. All of the federal canvass in Manitoba done by the labour unions of the party, the phone canvass and other success story by the labour unions for the NDP Party."

Mr. Speaker, here is an interesting little statement: "Manitoba New Democrats saw and participated in the kind of partnership with labour and people dreamed about in '61. I hope that the spirit of that partnership will continue in the months and years that follow ahead." That's by Howard Pawley.

Mr. Speaker, but here's a more interesting one: "The CLC, the MFL campaign was an important and integral part of our election effort. The labour movement has identified a whole new team of activists who will, no doubt, contribute to the growth and vitality of their unions. At the same time the NDP benefits by having a group of over 500 activists who are willing to discuss issues with their co-workers and have a grassroots interest in the good government." That's by John Walsh, the provincial secretary of the NDP Party.

Mr. Speaker, it's very obvious why the NDP is putting forward this legislation. It has to be obvious because the largest individual group of businesses, the small business community in Manitoba, say they're being misled and hoodwinked and zapped. Mr. Speaker, it says right in the beginning, right in the beginning, hoodwinked, and then misled. Mr. Speaker, if I wasn't reading from this and said that the Minister misled, you would have to correct me, Sir, but the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce and the Winnipeg Chamber have said we have been hoodwinked, misled, misled, and zapped. Mr. Speaker, I think that's a very disgraceful thing on the part of the government.

Mr. Speaker, there's another thing that they said - just a minute, I'll find it in a minute - they say in this that even after the White Paper was put out and there were discussions on the legislation, the Minister said there was discussion on the legislation and in this statement they say there are things in the bill that were

never discussed with the Chamber of Commerce anywhere or the business community. So much for your consultation, Mr. Speaker, and that is the reason for this payoff to the unions for what they did the last time and what they will have to do this time. Well, Mr. Speaker, there's no question, the NDP are paying off a political debt and laying the foundation for assistance from the labour unions in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, the members, they can't really hide from the fact of what their association is with Mr. Martin. Mr. Martin, if I can find it here and I have it here. They just held a roast for Mr. Martin, they held a roast. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, is it tomorrow night? Well, they're going to have a roast for Mr. Martin. No, Mr. Speaker, I would no more go for a roast for Martin anymore than I would for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I can't be bothered with that type of person.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Martin's roasts, the proceeds of which are going to be donated to the Federal NDP Party election campaign, so, Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's any doubt whatsoever why this legislation is being passed.

To top it all off, Mr. Speaker, the Chamber of Commerce are correct. It is bad bad legislation for small business. Well, you see the unions today, they're having trouble with the larger companies. I'm not worried about the larger companies. They all have their lawyers and they have their personnel people and they have their trained people to deal with the union lawyers, etc., and they have now become within their industries, the large industries, very apt at dealing with the union legal people, lawyers, etc., that are trained from the union halls.

So while they find themselves in a losing position in many cases, they have now decided to turn to the little man who doesn't have the access of lawyers; he doesn't have the access of having personnel managers; he doesn't have any of that. So they said, there's our gain. We can get him pretty quickly if we can just get the government to practically legislate the fact that we can go after them without any problems whatsoever and before they know what's happening to them, they'll be certified.

Mr. Speaker, we have a group of people that will be going into the small businesses in the rural areas and within the city. They will be discussing with these people that work in these businesses, how will they get them into signing a card, getting 55 percent to sign up. Will they be saying, I won't get you more? Will they be saying, your employer is treating you marvellous? No, they won't. They will be going in on a selling pitch saying, we can do this for you.

Mr. Speaker, they don't have to have any real reasons to be out of the business. The act says that the man can go in there. I believe it says, disruption in the operation is caused thereby. How are you going to prove whether the fellow is disrupting operation or he's not? They now take away the situation where the act has said, where they had reasonable . . . I don't think those are the words, Mr. Speaker - "undue influence" - they've changed that. They've changed "undue influence" to read "coercion and threats." How does anybody prove that in front of the Labour Board?

You know, coercion and threats is really something that is hard to prove but undue influence, if somebody had placed undue influence, it was broader and at least

the owner or the other people that weren't signed up, would have something to say.

Mr. Speaker, this person who goes in, he's like a commission agent. He goes into these businesses. He certifies them. He gets 55 percent overnight. He doesn't have to talk to the rest of the people once he gets it and he can walk down, which is the usual practice, the next day and certify that union. He doesn't have to put up a sign saying, I'm having a meeting to talk to you. He doesn't have to tell the other people he was even there at the business or in town that night. He just walks in like a commissioned salesman, Sir, and they'll be all out there as commissioned salesmen because when they certify them, they become the bargaining agent for that union. So the more they get, the more they make, and the busier they are.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Baloney.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I hear, "Baloney," from the Member for Wolseley, and it's been going on for years and she ought to know about it.

He sells them on the fact that this is what he can do. Now that owner, that small businessman is now certified. He can't be decertified for a whole year. Then they whip it into the final offer setup, and it will be two years before you can get out of it. If the man finds that he just can't handle this situation, if he really finds that he cannot cope with the expenses that have been put upon him that he knew nothing about; it was done overnight. It was done without any discussion with him or even part of his employees, what does he say to the other people that didn't sign up? He says, well, I'm sorry. Once he got 55 percent, he didn't have any reason to talk to you. Nobody could force him to talk to you.

That's NDP democracy? That's NDP democracy with small businesses within the Province of Manitoba? Those 45 percent of the people come forward and they say, we don't want this, and they can't do anything about it? Democracy? My God!

Mr. Speaker, she should at least have to put up a bulletin that he's been in the business or that he's there. The people that don't sign up should, at least, be able to have their seven days which is usual to be able to get out of it.

They have taken away the dollar charge. You know, the dollar charge was there and it really is nothing, I guess, the dollar charge. But you know, even to join the NDP Party, you have to pay something. Most people have to sign up for something and pay some nominal fee to be a member, but not anymore. This fellow just waltzes into town, and he does it.

Mr. Speaker, we have situations in this province where the bankruptcies are increasing. They definitely did for the first two months of this year, and I am patiently waiting for the new stats. We have a situation in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, where manufacturing shipments within the province are up between January and April, 1983 and 1984. They're up 9.4 percent. You know, Mr. Speaker, that is seventh in Canada. We now stand behind Saskatchewan, Alberta, which we were traditionally always ahead of them.

The interesting trend line, Mr. Speaker, is that between April of 1984 and March of 1984, our manufacturing shipments dropped by 8 percent. So the trend line is

moving away and this government is doing everything possible to try to deter small business.

Mr. Speaker, if they think the small business won't go elsewhere when you have a payroll tax; you now have this type of legislation. You have the northern States holding out their hand and asking them to come down to develop and establish in those provinces. You have Saskatchewan. There is tourism and small business with programs there to attract - there they are - programs there to attract small businesses but, on the other hand, they are not misleading them or zapping them, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, the statistics in Manitoba show that we can't do this type of thing, whereas we know interest rates are starting to move up a little bit. If you have a situation where the interest rates start to move up, certification starts to cost the small businessman some money, he will either close or move elsewhere or go bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, the costs of lawyers alone for the small businessman once he's certified will be an expense that he probably will have trouble handling. He doesn't know the labour legislation, and he is going up against unions that have professional lawyers to fight them and he's going to have to have lawyers also. Every time there is a grievance, he has to drive back and forth to town and pay lawyers to put these things forward. Mr. Speaker, the "Member for Baloney" over there knows it's been going on, and it has been happening for years.

Mr. Speaker, then we have the situation when a business is failing or is in receivership. Now, we have that business going into receivership or it's failing because of financial reasons, and the new buyer can't get out of that contract that 45 percent of the employees really didn't have to be involved in any way; that was done overnight, and who is going to buy a business that's failing and he can't get out or renegotiate contracts in any way, shape or form? Mr. Speaker, the government has really gone a little out of their mind. As I said they're paying off the political debt that was given to them by the labour unions.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague mentioned the small store in Steinbach, or Beausejour, that had six people. I will mention the hundreds of small business within the City of Winnipeg, and they'll at least have a chance because they do have people around them to be of assistance to them when they're in it; I will mention hundreds, I think it's 480-something, small manufacturers within the Province of Manitoba rurally, and I don't know the figures for the small businesses out there, but let me tell you the service business in both Winnipeg, and the province, is very large. They can all be unionized overnight without, let's put it this way, with 45 percent of the people never having to have been contacted. Do you think that's democracy?

How would the Member for Wolseley feel if she wanted to have it and 55 percent said no and she wasn't brought into the conversation? Just reverse the situation and ask her how she would feel. We know how, we know what her expressions are of that type of thing, we've heard them. Mr. Speaker, strikebreaking, one whose primary objection is to strikebreak. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the members of the House, can anybody define what one whose primary objective is to strikebreak? You know, if they happen to decide to go to work.

A MEMBER: They'd have to break the strike.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well that could be defined as it. That's democracy? That's your democracy? Everything your way is your democracy.

Mr. Speaker, employers, he has no right to explain to the employees what the problems may be. That has been in legislation in this province and other provinces for a long time, but you might have thought, after all of the discussion with the industry that they said they would have, there might have been some consideration to at least leaving the seven days in there for somebody to change their mind.

Mr. Speaker, I've mentioned democracy. You buy a car, as the Member for LaVerendrye said, you can change your mind in seven days, but you know you don't have the right to change your mind under this legislation. The government is legislating the unions into being. You don't have the right. Now, really is that the NDP thinking? That's what it says in this bill. Mr. Speaker, you don't have the right, you're certified the next day if he takes it in. He signs, gets 55 percent that night, or that afternoon, the next morning you're certified and that's what usually happens.

Mr. Speaker, then we have something like the Labour Board. There's no longer an appeal to the courts. It appears that's the way it is in the legislation. In fact, I believe, that's the way it is because that's the way I'm advised it is by legal people. The courts - there can be no appeal to the courts in the Province of Manitoba. It's very strange that the NDP like that sort of thing.

The other night we were sitting in committee and the Licence Appeal Board in that legislation; no appeal to the courts. You know it seems to me that the NDP want all of their appeals to take place by their NDP-appointed commission. Why? We have a democratic court system that is in this country and in this province. You tell me why there can't be an appeal to the courts. Do you know that I would even think that if there was an appeal to the courts on this, and the judge were to look at the democratic privileges that were taken away from people under this legislation, they would probably lose cases.

Mr. Speaker, they don't seem to realize what they're doing, they were just told by Mr. Martin that I want this done before I leave. The roast for Mr. Martin which is being held, is the money being donated to the NDP Party coffers for the Federal Election? All of the people that they have put in place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where you could have a lot of small businesses go bankrupt or decide not to continue to operate in this province. You know, Mr. Speaker, whose the first one that wants to buy the businesses in this province. We've seen this with the Venture Capital Program, they take 7 percent equity. They bought up farms in the previous government; they now want to have a half ownership in a smelter, and we get down to that great big arm around you attitude of the NDP is we'll be involved, we'll step in, and we will be in part control of a lot of the small businesses within this province.

Mr. Speaker, they don't kid the people in this province anymore. The government has made it known that they have absolutely no regard, or didn't have any regard,

for what 80 percent of the people thought on another issue. By the Minister's statement 90 percent of the businesses in the Province of Manitoba are less than 20 people. The Manitoba and Winnipeg Chambers of Commerce who the Minister of Energy says they could never be wrong, but they are the closest people to the small businessman in this province, bar none. They have meetings everywhere, all the time. They have discussions all the time. In the rural area their relationship between employee and employer is very close and now, all of a sudden, this happens and this organization says we have been misled, hoodwinked, and zapped.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they now have approximately, I would suggest, 70 percent of the small business community opposed to them. They have probably at least, although it doesn't affect them greatly, they probably have 90 percent to 100 percent of the large businesses opposed to them because the large business, as I said, take care of themselves and they negotiate, they have their negotiators and they come to an agreement, but they do that on the basis that they know their employees and the unions know the employees, and they come to an agreement which is decided on both sides to be bare. There is a meeting called to decide, or to vote whether there will be strike action or whether there won't be strike action, etc. — (Interjection) — "Oh, yes, it's still there," I hear the Member for Wolseley say, but that's the large corporations.

But you know, now we have a situation where the democracy is now being taken away as far as certification is concerned. The decision on people's lives is being taken away. The religious clauses within this bill are changed to the point where they are not good and now this government says we are for democracy. For who? For this commission agent of the employee of the unions to go walking out into the business world, to walk into a business, and as long as you can't define that he isn't disturbing business, can talk away to them, they can go in their houses at night, and in 24 hours have certification after only seeing 55 percent? My God, Mr. Speaker, if they would make it 75 percent, you could at least see some sense in it; but 55 percent and you are certified, you can't get out of it for a year, there is no turning back. That's democracy?

Well, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — I heard the Member for Baloney again say 50 percent to get in here. Mr. Speaker, I am here by that majority, I guess. I personally didn't have 50 percent of the vote. I mean many of us didn't have 50 percent of the vote; we had the majority, Mr. Speaker. But the fact that we are here, doesn't it mean that we should uphold the rights of people?

This is the group that says minorities have to be considered. You are making 45 percent of the employees of a small business - they are the minority - and they don't have any rights. This is the government that says minority rights and this is the government that is now saying in this legislation, you don't have any rights. You can't change your mind if you did sign and if you didn't sign, you are 45 percent. You weren't even talked to by anybody, but you don't have any rights.

Mr. Speaker, what this will do to the business community in this province is going to be disastrous. I sometimes think that we shouldn't even be putting

up an argument because it's just another step to kick this government out of office. With all of their advertising on the Jobs Fund, with all of their incentives they are talking about, I will guarantee you - I shouldn't guarantee - but I will say that our side of the House is very sure that the polls in three or four months will be just as bad as they are now because you haven't fooled the people one bit.

They know that you put all these big flowery signs and advertising out, give us a lot of talk, give us the "fraud" fund as we call it - and it is a "fraud" fund because it comes from all the departments and could have been done at other departments - but then you come forward with this legislation and as the Chamber of Commerce says, we have been hoodwinked, misled and zapped. That's what you are up against and you won't kid the people. They will find out that democracy is not spread or handed out by this government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak today, Mr. Speaker, on this particular bill and I follow what I would consider is a very good speech by my colleague who made some excellent points. I think that the explanation that he gave as to why it was moved, why the government is introducing it, I think will be well understood by the public, but I think there are certain areas that I would like to elaborate on today.

Some of it will as well come from the background information that we have received from the Chamber of Commerce, the Manitoba Chamber and the Winnipeg Chamber, regarding this particular act.

But I go, Mr. Speaker, first of all, to the Minister's explanation in the Manitoba News Service. The Labour Minister indicates in her press release that the bill has been introduced to amend The Labour Relations Act designed to promote industrial harmony and economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, one has to ask at this particular time in Manitoba, is there not harmony and is there not a good working relationship between the labour and the industry in this province? Where have been all the difficulties that she speaks about that she is going to improve? They have not given us or the people of Manitoba a very good explanation for the background for such a statement.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that there has been less than the desirable effect as far as the job opportunities created under this government. We are seeing a massive amount of closures. One really has to say at this particular point, and again this was made by the Chamber of Commerce and by many people, they have just come through record high interest rates, extremely high record interest rates; they have had imposed upon them a payroll tax; and now they are having to struggle with the imposition of a change to The Labour Act in Manitoba.

You know what a lot of the business people will say? They will say, who needs the hassle in Manitoba? They will say, who needs the hassle in Manitoba under a New Democratic Government? Why are they trying to

continually pick on one group of people in society? And that's the people who are providing the job opportunities.

I am not, Mr. Speaker, against the labour movement. I am not anti-labour; I believe that there has been a balance created in this province to a large extent that hasn't been all that bad up until this point. It's taken some work, but I think both sides have, to a large extent, been able to resolve their difficulties and come to grips with the situation in a meaningful way, although we do have some current problems within the packinghouse industry that have to be mentioned. I will deal with those in a few minutes.

I always ask the question when legislation is introduced, Mr. Speaker, as to why the need for the legislation. The only thing - the main point that is being made to date - is a payoff to the support that the New Democratic Government got during the last election. It's as obvious, Mr. Speaker, as the nose on your face, that it is strictly, totally a payoff to the former leader of the labour group in Manitoba, Dick Martin - who has gone on to a greater reward, I understand, within the labour movement - and the fact of the matter is that he has now, I guess, accomplished what he had to do in Manitoba and is proceeding to go to greater things in the national picture.

But, Mr. Speaker, when one asks the question, why the labour legislation is brought in at this particular time when we are in such a delicate situation or position with all business in this country, with again the high interest rates, the sliding dollar, then I think the government should reconsider their actions to move such legislation, in particular, Mr. Speaker, the document to which my colleague from Sturgeon Creek has just referred, that there is an extremely strong opposition to it and I would say unwise to move at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, as well, I think we have to point out the problems that the party itself has had, the New Democratic Party, goodness knows. Where is Sid Green today? Why is not sitting with the New Democratic Party? Why did he leave them, Mr. Speaker? Because I believe that Mr. Green was not an unfair person. The job of a legislator, Mr. Speaker, is not to pick up with any group in society in particular, but to create and keep a fair balance in society, to be fair to all groups and all peoples, to create and to provide equal ground rules.

Mr. Green is not with the New Democratic Party because what did he say, Mr. Speaker? He said they were bowing to the needs and to the wishes of large organized labour; that they were taking away, Mr. Speaker, what he believed in and that was the fairness of their party to represent all groups in society. Mr. Speaker, they will pay the price for what they have done and what they are doing. They will pay the price because you cannot legislate fairly, honestly and openly if you're in the pocket of organized labour, and that's what they are, Mr. Speaker, they are in the pocket of organized labour. They are paying off the support they got during the last election. That is the truth of it and they cannot deny it. I don't know why they won't complain and stand in their place and do so.

Getting back to the business environment in this particular province, I am somewhat reminded of the story that Rich Little told the other night when they

were paying their great accolades to the Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, and he used the story that Ronald Reagan was asking Pierre Elliott Trudeau, how do you start a small business in Canada? Well, I think it fits pretty well for the Province of Manitoba under the New Democratic Party as well and I want to share it with the members of this Assembly.

The best way to start a small business in Manitoba under a New Democratic Party is to start a large one and wait. That's how you start a small business in Manitoba, you start a large business and wait. Under policies implemented and introduced by the New Democratic Party, it won't be long until you have a small business. But what about the small business? They can't wait, Mr. Speaker, they completely disappear.

How many jobs - again I go back to the Minister's great announcement that it's all in the best interest of jobs, it will mean economic security for Manitobans and economic growth - Mr. Speaker, what evidence are they able to provide for that kind of a statement? What evidence are they able to give this Assembly when they're passing legislation that really, as I understand it, is not supported by any one business person or persons in this province. They are the people that generate the income, the wealth and the job opportunities, and this government has the nerve to stand and confront them with a piece of legislation that they can't work within, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, why don't they back off? Why won't they give a little bit of fresh air and room for these people to breathe after having gone through, as I said earlier, high interest rates, the imposition of a payroll tax on them, and now imposing legislation upon them which could, in fact, be the final nail in their coffin?

I cannot for the life of me understand why this government would continue to take the path of confronting as many groups of people in society as they have. It's the total population they took on with the language issue. It's the anti-business environment they're now creating for those people who are trying to make a go of it, and they're bound and bent, Mr. Speaker, that they're going to continue on such a path. Mr. Speaker, when are they ever going to listen to the more seasoned, I would say more more seasoned and respected voice within their Cabinet and caucus? I make reference, I'm sure, to members probably have been around this place for quite a lot longer than some of them will be although he'll probably exodus this next time, and that's the Member for Lac du Bonnet, who has been certainly known to hold the same views as Sidney Green, who has left their party.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't a partisan situation at this point. It is a matter of business and jobs and continuing on with the provincial economy and strengthening our economy, not weakening it by giving any group in society an advantage over the group for which they work. It is not in the best interests of labour to give them an advantage, because the population and the public will not stand for it over time. It has to take the test of time and it will not do it as this government are trying to impose it on the people of Manitoba.

She, again, in her press release makes reference to the fact that she attributed much of the bill's volume to technical changes required to bring greater consistency to the act and to the consolidation of parts of the Department of Labour into The Labour Relations

Act. Mr. Speaker, why is it such a high priority to make that kind of a move at this particular time? Is it not running well? Has she got major problems? Particularly, Mr. Speaker, when her First Minister . . . what is he doing with the Department of Economic Development and Industry and Trade?

As was mentioned earlier by my colleague from Lakeside, that has been split up into three divisions. We see part of the government department being split, the Economic Development going into three directions, three different ministries, but the Minister of Labour has to have everything gathered into one. To diversify and to weaken the strength of the economic community, the business community, they have given them a great bureaucracy, three different ministries to report to or to ask for support from, but Labour, no - they have to concentrate it all into one to give it strength. Is that what they're up to, Mr. Speaker? One has to ask those kinds of questions.

When are they going to consider everyone's interests? I believe by giving too much power, too much strength and by giving too much of an advantage to one group, you take away the kinds of service - and I use the word "service" because, speaking from the agricultural community, we depend to a large extent, we are the third party involved normally when a labour dispute comes up. Mr. Speaker, whether it be a packing house strike, whether it be a grain handlers' strike, the third party who are the agricultural community in this particular case, are hurt. But in all other cases in society, it is the consuming public-at-large, Mr. Speaker, that loses. The consuming public-at-large normally pays the cost of the kinds of support that this government are giving to the labour movement.

I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is the time to make the kind of move that this government is making to really erode the strengths that are starting to reappear within some of our delicate recovery from a recession. I am reminded of a particular situation that I think is worth referring to, and it's important.

The government were bound and bent during this last particular Session, the Session before this one, that they were going to live up to something they had pledged during the election of 1981. They were going to take away the Enabling Legislation - I'll use this term - to allow the cattle producers in Manitoba to organize. That was an election promise. It wasn't a matter of principle, Mr. Speaker. It was an election promise because they felt that because we had passed a law giving a voluntary Cattle Producers' Organization to the cattle industry in Manitoba, it was bad for the New Democratic Party, not because those people were doing good for the cattle producers, not that they were doing good for the total industry in trying to give support to everyone. No, Mr. Speaker, it was simply an election pledge that they had made to get rid of it. The same as it was an election pledge to pass this kind of legislation in support of the labour movement and Dick Martin.

You know, it's strange to see the government making the moves that they are. I would have to suggest that they will only have to answer for their actions when they go to the people the next election.

I think it's as well important to note that in the actions of this government in moving towards the kind of labour law that they're suggesting, that they are going to have

improved relationship. I, Mr. Speaker, for the life of me have yet to find where they are going to improve the kind of relationship that has been developed over the past few years. I challenge him to point out specific situations that will be improved because of this. They make specific reference to the greater enhanced independence and greater responsibility for the Manitoba Labour Board with an increased emphasis on settlement. The Manitoba Labour Board, a politically-appointed board, Mr. Speaker, I can't see where that board will be anything more than carrying out the wishes of this particular government in this regard. I don't think the employers are going to feel all that comfortable going before, what could almost be considered as, a stacked deck. I don't believe that they will expect to get fair play and again, weakens their position. That's not the kind of a province that we need. We need a province that is strong in both the management and the labour side, and we need a working relationship.

How does this relate to the total of all of Canada? Well, Mr. Speaker, one has to look at what has happened totally within our country, the fact that we're seeing our dollar continuing to erode.

It's surprising, and I'm going to suggest to the Federal Conservative Party, that one of the best political statements or challenges that could be made to the Liberal Party right at this particular time, because of our past performance and some of the labour problems that we've had as a nation, but certainly haven't been as evident here in Manitoba, but there's a point that has to be made.

They make a lot to do about a new Liberal Prime Minister. Normally, with a new Liberal Prime Minister you would think that the international market, the confidence of the United States, the confidence of other jurisdictions that they would have in Canada, would immediately either underpin the dollar or see it strengthened, but the selection of John Turner hasn't done that, Mr. Speaker. The international market are continually pointing out that we haven't got our act together and that they don't expect to get our act together as a nation under John Turner.

I would say it's a vote of non-confidence in the selection of the Leader of the new Prime Minister of Canada and anyone who thinks that there isn't going to be a change in government, I think have to think differently. However, it isn't directly related to this, but it has quite a lot to do with the labour policies that this country's had over the past few years.

I will conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by indicating that I don't support this law. I don't support the changes to The Labour Relations Act. The opposition has been spelled very well by the Manitoba and Winnipeg Chambers of Commerce, as referred to by my colleague from Sturgeon Creek. I think there is lack of support demonstrated by this government in what the Minister has said to this particular point. There is an extreme lack of detailed support and need for this. There has never been the rushing forward of business or labour, or business publicly, to say we want changes to this particular act. In fact, they are very much the opposite. They would like to try and hang in there under the current act and the current laws without seeing anybody shake the boat.

This could well, Mr. Speaker, reduce the job opportunities, remove the kinds of security that

employees have had in the past. I don't think the government is wise to continue on. Therefore, in the best interests of a good working environment, job opportunities and future relationship between the working people and management, they would be wise to withdraw this bill and would suggest that they do that at this particular time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will accept a motion to adjourn.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Would you please call Bill No. 24? I believe the debate on that may be short.

BILL NO. 24 - THE CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 24, the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, we have perused this act, and are prepared to pass it through to committee. I would like to just put on record one or two questions that we'll be asking at committee, and will do so now so that the Minister will have notice of them, Mr. Speaker.

We understand that these amendments to The Civil Service Superannuation Act are primarily being brought forward at this time to bring it into line with The Pension Benefits Act that was revised in 1983. There is a particular question that we have. The Minister indicated that the benefits could be paid out of the \$27 million surplus that has accrued in this fund. Is the Minister prepared to explain how the surplus was calculated?

We have a further concern with respect to the fact that there is no mention made of additional cost to governments of these improvements in benefits. Does the Minister know what the additional cost to government is? Does he have a projection of the additional costs, say, over the next five years? These are some of the concerns that we have. We would like to find out from the Minister where he anticipates the additional revenue to come from.

I should note that a number of the amendments refer to employees in receipt of long-term disability benefits. These don't seem to fit into the category of administrative or housekeeping amendments; would the Minister care to enlarge upon these, Mr. Speaker? I'm referring to some of the notes that my colleague, the Member for La Verendrye, prepared for second reading of this bill.

With these few short comments, Mr. Speaker, we look forward to discussing the details of the bill at committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Prior to moving adjournment of the House for the day, I would just like to review the committee meetings that are scheduled for tonight. Public Utilities and Natural Resources, both this evening at 8:00 and tomorrow morning at 10:00 with respect to the Manitoba Energy Authority and the Annual Report of Manitoba Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, as well, the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders is meeting this evening to consider bills referred of which, I believe, there are now nine. Sir, I understand that, with respect to Bill No. 28, there may be some difficulty on the part of some witnesses to attend at the hearing tonight, so it's suggested, Sir, that by agreement, the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders also

be scheduled to meet tomorrow evening for the express purpose only of hearing representations on additional bills referred, perhaps tomorrow, and also on Bill 28.

Sir, in the event that Statutory Regulations and Orders does not finish with the bills that are referred this evening, that it would meet again only if necessary with respect to bills, other than Bill 28, tomorrow morning at 10:00 to run concurrently with Public Utilities and Natural Resources. So Statutory Regulations and Orders may not necessarily have to meet tomorrow. We'll know that when the committee concludes this evening, but that time slot will be available if necessary.

If there are no questions, Sir, about that order of business from honourable members, I would then move, seconded by the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security, that the House do now adjourn.

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