



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. 54 - 10:00 a.m., FRIDAY, 29 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	Virten	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 29 June, 1984.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions
. . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Fourth Report of the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your Committee met on Thursday, June 28, 1984 at 8:00 p.m. in Room 254, Legislative Building and heard representations with respect to the Bills before the Committee as follows:
Bill 7 - The Central Trust Company Act, 1984;
Loi de 1984 sur la compagnie du Trust Central,
Mr. Bob Smellie, Central Trust Company.
Bill 17 - An Act to amend The Dental Mechanics Act,

Mr. Ted Hechter, President, Manitoba Dental Association,
Mr. Mel Myers, The Dental Mechanics of Manitoba.

Your committee has also considered:
Bill 7 - The Central Trust Company Act, 1984;
Loi de 1984 sur la compagnie du Trust Central,
Bill 29 - An Act to amend An Act respecting The Agricultural and Community District of Newdale,
And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered:
Bill 17 - An Act to amend The Dental Mechanics Act,
Bill 26 - The Chiropractic Act; Loi sur la chiropractie,
And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Johns that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Industrial Relations.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on Wednesday, June 27 at 8:00 p.m., Thursday, June 28 at 10:00 a.m. and

8:00 p.m. in Room 255, Legislative Building and heard representations with respect to Bill (No. 22) - An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act and Various Other Acts of the Legislature. Prior to the representations being made, the following motion was passed in Committee:

"THAT in view of the number of delegations that are before the Committee, that each presentation and any subsequent questions and answers be limited to a period of one hour."

Representations on Bill No. 22 were made as follows:

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 1984 - 8:00 p.m.

Messrs. Keith Godden and Bill Gardner, Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce,
Pastor Don McIvor, Seventh-Day Adventists Church in Canada,
Mr. Dennis Sutton, Canadian Manufacturers' Association,
Mr. Sidney Green, Manitoba Progressive Party,
Messrs. Blunderfield and Dennis Stewart, Prairie Implement Manufacturing Association,
Messrs. Blunderfield and Dennis Stewart, Prairie Implement Manufacturing Association,
Messrs. Al McGregor and John Pullen, Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers and Manitoba Federation of Labour.

THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1984 - 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Ray Winston, Manitoba Fashion Institute Inc.,
Mr. Daniel Quesnel, Private Citizen,
Mr. David Newman, The Task Force of Employers Association,
Mr. Andy Dawson, Manitoba Health Organizations Inc.

THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1984 - 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Dick Martin, Canadian Labour Congress.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:

Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties,
The Mining Association of Manitoba.

Your committee has considered:
Bill 22 - An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act and Various other Acts of the Legislature,
And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your committee has also considered:
Bill 35 - An Act to amend The Construction Industry Wages Act,
And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. H. ENNS: On division.

MR. SPEAKER: On division? Do the members wish to vote on the matter?

MR. H. ENNS: On division, Mr. Speaker.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to table the Annual Report of the Co-operative Promotion Board for the fiscal year 1982-83.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'd like to table a return under Section 66 of The Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 19 students of Grade 6 standing from the St. Vital Immersion Program at Norberry School. They are under the direction of Mr. Boris and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Riel.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Board of Revision - cost to city

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister, with respect to the decision by the Board of Revision to roll back, to order a tax roll back for 69 downtown businessmen, resulting in an increase in expenditures of approximately \$5.1 million to the City of Winnipeg.

My question to him, Mr. Speaker, is this: Was the Minister of Municipal Affairs, when he said that the province won't help pay for the tax roll back because the city is entirely to blame, and that the City of Winnipeg got itself into its current tax mess because of neglect of its responsibilities, was the Minister of Municipal Affairs speaking on behalf of the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, of course he was.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the decision by the Board of Revision, on Page 4, states that at the present time, the law which this government passed prevents the Assessment Department of the City of Winnipeg from conducting a reassessment of the whole of the city, in the opinion of the board, this places the City of Winnipeg in a difficult position, etc. Would the First Minister not be prepared to review the Board of Revision report which clearly indicates that

it is the province's law which has placed the city in this difficult position that they find themselves?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think, so that we can probably assist the honourable member in having a clear understanding, I would call upon the Minister of Municipal Affairs to review the present situation with the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the suggestion by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert that a reassessment of the city is not possible contradicts the board's own direction that a reassessment of the whole of the central business district be done.

Sir, the key phrase in the decision of Justice Estey in the Supreme Court last December which indicated that the Board of Revision activities were not frozen by legislation introduced by the honourable member who asked the question, and subsequently reconfirmed by this government, allowed the Board of Revision to proceed with its activities and issue the order it did, which allows reassessment, either on a district basis or on a broader basis, to take place.

The key phrase, Sir, and I'm reporting from Page 13 of the Supreme Court decision of, I believe, December 13th last year, Morguard Properties et al versus the City of Winnipeg - the amount of the assessed value is not, in terms, frozen. The new legislative program is aimed at the technique to be applied in determining the assessment. In short, the yardstick and not the assessment is frozen.

The city, by its neglect, has for 22 years frozen assessment and reassessment in the City of Winnipeg on 1957 values. This government, and I am sure, the previous government would never have intended to bail the city out of that neglect. Assessment reform must proceed, but the City of Winnipeg's neglect cannot be piggybacked on assessment reform. They have to clean their own nest first.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Before proceeding the honourable member should bear in mind that questions should not be argumentative or make representation to the government.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

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

In view of the fact that the Board of Revision report indicates that there was an indication by the assessor of the City of Winnipeg that much of the work required to conduct such a reassessment has been completed, and it is the law that prevents the Assessment Department from conducting the reassessment of the whole city, would the Minister of Municipal Affairs not be prepared to review this matter with the City of Winnipeg, the official delegation, and change his position and consider providing some financial compensation to the city in view of this government's wilful delay and negligence in not dealing with the Weir Report on assessment?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I accept none of the assumptions contained in the question. Before answering the question I think I should address those assumptions.

First of all, the member may be asking for a legal opinion, but certainly the opinion of the City of Winnipeg contained in the Board of Revision order is directly contrary to the opinion I already quoted from Justice Willard Estey of the Supreme Court of Canada, last December. That decision and the statements in that decision are binding on the province and the city and the Board of Revision. If reassessment cannot be done, and if it is the Board of Revision's opinion that reassessments cannot be done then, Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the City of Winnipeg and the Member for St. Norbert, why does the board order say that the city shall, "conduct a reassessment for the 1985 assessment roll of all non-residential lands within the area bounded by . . .", etc.? I refer to the bottom of Page 4 of that decision.

Secondly, the member suggests there has in some way been neglect on assessment reform which is not tied to the city's obligation to reassess, but is a completely different issue. Sir, this government has been moving aggressively on assessment reform, held a series of committee hearings around the province, has issued reports, last year brought in Bill 105 . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: . . . last year brought in Bill 105 to provide for classification and portioning, has accelerated the assessment of all farm outbuildings in the province - that data being available in September 1985 - has hired, in addition to existing staff, commitment for four new staff for the computerization so that valuation can be up to date in accordance with the Weir recommendations; is moving on a public education campaign, Sir, has been working for the last six months in reponse to discussions with the City of Winnipeg which have been ongoing.

The member asked if we're prepared to sit down with the City of Winnipeg to discuss the implications of assessment reform for the city as well as its decision. We've been doing that. We last met at the most senior level with Counsellor Yanofsky and Mayor Norrie on January 9th when this issue of the Supreme Court decision came up and we agreed that staff should discuss all the options for addressing that. That hasn't occurred. The city's only option is to say that it's a provincial obligation. Sorry, Mr. Speaker, we do not accept that. We're prepared to work with the city to help them address the problem that they have, but we are not prepared to accept responsibility for their problem.

Assessment reform

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier.

In view of the fact that this item that we are now discussing was highlighted by a Supreme Court decision with respect to certain properties north of Portage Avenue, but taking it a step further there are many inequities that exist in the assessment throughout this province in many different areas, inequities that have been highlighted that are now being magnified as mill rates increase, at an unprecedented rate under this government. When will his government take action to remove these inequities and to start a system of assessment reform that will get things done and get equity placed back in the system in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Leader of the Opposition was listening or whether he was participating in the chorus of those that were asking the House Leader to refrain from further discussion, but the House Leader, only a few moments ago, was listing one by one by one the initiatives that were undertaken by this government in order to follow up in respect to the important area of assessment reform.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, indeed I was listening.

I don't consider a program of public education to be action. I don't consider a new series of meetings throughout this province to talk about the problem to be action. I don't consider leaving a report on the shelf to be action.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We are in Oral Questions.

The Leader of the Opposition preambled his first question. Preamble should not be necessary for subsequent ones.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is, when are he and his government going to stop all the talking and stop being a do-nothing government and start doing something about assessment reform that needs to be addressed immediately in this province?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is rather strange coming from a Leader of the Opposition that suggested that this indeed be a do-nothing government during the Throne Speech Debate. Mr. Speaker, this government is undertaking a number of initiatives and, again, because obviously the Leader of the Opposition has missed the comments by the House Leader, I'm going to ask the House Leader to outline one-by-one, step-by-step, the initiatives that have been undertaken by this government. Apparently the Leader of the Opposition chooses, Mr. Speaker, not to listen, not to understand the initiatives that are being undertaken by this government with respect to assessment reform.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think that the first point that must be made on this question is that in June of 1983, members opposite participated in, and in fact amendments were made to a report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs specific to this topic. Members opposite concurred in those recommendations which requested an acceleration of the assessment of all exempt property which the Weir Report recommends be addressed in terms of reform. They were told by the Provincial Municipal Assessor and they knew at that time that that could not be completed until the second half of 1985.

That committee recommended that Bill 105 be brought in to deal with classification and portioning. We did that. That committee recommended that liaison be established with the City of Winnipeg Assessment Department which has complete responsibility for assessment in the City of Winnipeg to establish uniformity in procedures, manuals, techniques of assessment so that a province-wide assessment reform would be applied to the same base. That has been established and is ongoing.

That committee recommended the establishment of a computerized system for updating valuations so that we wouldn't get 5, 6, 8 years out of date in the country, which we have been, or 22 to 27 years out of date in the city, which we have been, and that's happening.

I have been travelling throughout the province in the last two weeks, to Union of Manitoba municipal meetings and I have found tremendous support from local officials throughout this province on the need for assessment reform and on the fact that municipal people want to know what the impact of the implementation of those recommendations are. If members opposite are recommending to the people of Manitoba that this government should implement recommendations without knowing what the impact of implementation will be, then they're out of step with municipal officials across this province. They are asking this Minister and this government to tell them what the impact will be, to describe the options before the changes are made. Mr. Speaker, that is what we intend to do, respect their wishes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. I have due consideration, Sir, for his own health, which I hope is well repaired; and I know that he has health concerns at the present time, but he also has concerns and responsibilities, surely, as the Minister of Health. He lives in my constituency. — (Interjection) — Don't bet on it. Last time was last time. We've had our meetings about this time. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get to my question, Sir.

In light of the latest budgetary horror story to come out of the Health Sciences Centre, something in the neighbourhood of a \$2.2 million deficit for 1983-84, and in light of the assurances that the Minister gave me and gave this House, gave the Committee of Supply during the Estimates that review of the situation at the Health Sciences Centre was well in hand, well under

way and the problems there were being corrected, I want to ask him, Mr. Speaker, if he can assure this House this morning of things that are positively being done to bring the Health Sciences Centre under control in terms of fiscal, financial and medical management?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the Health Sciences Centre, of course, I don't have to inform the members of this House, is the largest hospital that we have in Manitoba and they are concerned. I can definitely state to the members of this House and my honourable friend that, although they are concerned, that everything is done to put it on a sound base financially and also with the service that it renders the people of Manitoba. There should be some announcement, some changes that should be forthcoming in the near future.

MR. L. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister advise how that \$2.2 million deficit is going to be accommodated and what the budgetary situation is for the current fiscal year, '84-85? Has the new budget been struck? Are we anywhere close to striking it and what accommodations are being made for the fact that there's an existing \$2.2 million deficit? Is the Minister expecting the taxpayer to pick up deficit after deficit, year after year of that magnitude over at HSC?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that my honourable friend knows the answer to that because there hasn't been any change. It's the same thing, year after year. There's bound to be some deficit at certain times.

The budget is approved by the Commission at the start of the year; then, during the year, it might be that the Commission will, for some reason, approve extra expenditures. Of course, that'll be part of the deficit; it will be recognized and the hospital will be reimbursed. After the year, there is always an appeal, first of all, to the Commission on any deficit. That is gone over by the members of the staff of the Commission and also with the hospital, and a certain amount might be allowed so that's deducted from the deficit if there has been some change or something, as I said earlier, approved during the year.

Now certain things will be further appealed and certain things will be refused. Anything that is refused will not be the responsibility of the Provincial Government. In the rural area, of course, that is their responsibility. If somebody, for instance, decides to staff over and above the approved staffing pattern of the Commission, then the municipality will have to take the responsibility. That is something that a municipality might want to do. Therefore they accept the responsibility.

In the case of the Health Sciences Centre, the city would then be obligated, or the Health Sciences Centre themselves might, through other funds or volunteers or fund raising and so on, that will be taken care of. But that same method of doing things has been in

existence for years, all during the term of my honourable friend, the term that I had previous to that.

So the situation is that I cannot give an answer immediately. As my honourable friend knows, if there's an appeal, it takes a while to review the appeal, then there is a further bill and I would imagine that we're probably looking at the final appeal of maybe two or three years earlier in the final appeal, which is something that might be under consideration. But we will not allow an expense that should not be accepted.

MR. L. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister contemplating any long-term plans to get this situation under control, such as long-term plans to get this situation under control and assure himself and the people of Manitoba that the Health Sciences Centre administration in the future is capable of meeting budgetary limitations and living within them? Is he considering any long-term plans such as reduction of the size of the hospital, such as any restructuring of the format at the hospital?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly will be candid and to say that we have concern about that hospital. I've said that before. There is a discussion now going on between the boards, staff and myself, the university, the Dean of Medicine. As I say, there could be some changes that might be announced in the not too distant future.

We are also looking at the situation as I stated during my Estimates of looking at the makeup of the board. Is it too large? Should there be a breakup of the board, for instance? Should there be an independent board? I'm giving that as an example, not an indication of anything to come, the Children's Hospital or the Cancer group and so on. This is something that we're looking at very very seriously because I think I know the concern of my honourable friend. I certainly share them and so does the government.

Federal policy re interest rates

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the First Minister. Yesterday the Canadian Council on Social Development released a report which shows one in four Canadians are living at or below the poverty line. I'd like to ask the Premier what steps he's taking to get the Federal Government to address this problem, particularly with respect to their support for high interest rate policies which definitely affect the poor in our province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable Member for Wolseley wish to rephrase her question to make it clearly on a subject within the administrative competence of this government?

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Surely, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, what the First Minister is doing to address the situation of the poor in our province is certainly within the jurisdiction of the government. I would like to know what the First Minister, what the Premier is doing to pressure the Federal Government or to get the Federal

Government to address the problem of their policies which are affecting the poor in our province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the question is certainly a very pertinent one because there is a responsibility on the part of all Provincial Governments and as you can recall, it was yesterday that I read a communique to this House in respect to actions being undertaken by the four Western Premiers to call upon the Federal Government to initiate certain actions, including Prime Minister-designate Turner.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of areas that are very important, in order to ensure that the Federal Government deal with the pressing problems of the economy and their major impact be on the poor of this country: No. 1, that there be a distinct turn and direction on the part of the Federal Government in respect to interest rate policy and that was the first item which we dealt with by way of the communique that I read to this Chamber yesterday, that the differential in fact between the rate of inflation and the interest rate is higher than it has been and in a traditional sense there must be an independent interest rate established, an interest rate policy that will reflect the Canadian scene.

No. 2, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that at this juncture, the new Federal Government examine employment programs. I say to this Chamber and I say without I trust, too much immodesty, that the Federal Government could do no better than to look to the motto of Manitoba as to policies that could be launched in order to confront unemployment in this country.

No. 3, Mr. Speaker, in respect to agriculture, again the motion that was passed unanimously by all members in this Chamber dealing with The Canada Stabilization Act, its unfair application to Western Canada, must be dealt with if the poverty in agricultural and farm areas is to be properly dealt with. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the opportunity, as well, of dealing with the matter of equalization, the impact in equalization, the have-not areas of this country and the need for improvement and reform.

Brandon General Hospital - waiting period re surgery

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health advised the House a few weeks ago that the waiting period for elective surgery at Brandon General Hospital has gone from a matter of six or eight weeks three years ago to perhaps six months or more now. Can the Minister tell the House when the people of southwestern Manitoba can expect that the waiting period for elective surgery will return to a more acceptable level?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, no, I could not give a definite date. I can only say to the members of

this House that we're looking at the situation. I think I explained at the time during the Estimates some of the reasons. We're looking to correct that working with the board of the hospital and the management of that hospital.

McKenzie Seeds

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney-General. Has the RCMP investigation at McKenzie Seeds yet been concluded?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: No, Mr. Speaker, it has not. It had reached a stage where the investigation to be completed required access to the records of four lawyers, and that required some legal opinions to be obtained by the RCMP in order to make sure that in carrying out their duty they did so consistent with solicitor-client privilege. That accounts for the little delay in the completion of the report.

However, I was advised at the last regular meeting with the RCMP that they expected that the matter would be concluded by the end of this month, the beginning of July.

Unsolicited membership cards

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and ask him whether it is legal for corporations, organizations or political parties to send out unsolicited plastic membership cards?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member should know that it is not parliamentary to seek a legal opinion from a Minister. Would the member wish to rephrase his question?

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the reason for my question and for my concern is that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. R. DOERN: . . . in the last month - I'm posing a question to the Minister - I've received two cards, one from the Progressive Conservative Party with my name, saying that I'm a 1984 sustaining member; that is cause for concern, Mr. Speaker. But the second card I received says that the Manitoba Legislative Assembly is a 1984 sustaining member.

So, Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is, is this an attempt by the Progressive Conservative Party to achieve electronically what they hope to achieve electorally? Is this the first recorded instance of a coup d'état by computer?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The subject matter of Oral Questions should be within the administrative competence of the government and I'm not sure that matter was.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

Peguis Indian Reserve

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the First Minister. IN view of the fact that charges have been laid against the members of the Peguis Band, is the First Minister recommending to his Highways Minister and to his Cabinet colleagues that action be instituted to recover damages from the Peguis Band for burning of the bridge and government property?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, first I want to take this opportunity too so the Member for Elmwood doesn't feel all alone, and just so I can reassure the members of the Conservative Party, I received one of those 1984 sustaining PC memberships, as well. So I think when they use membership totals, Mr. Speaker, they must be very much inflated by the likes of my colleague for Elmwood and myself and many others in this Chamber.

A MEMBER: Thanks for the cheque, Howard.

HON. H. PAWLEY: No, I haven't sent the money in yet. Mr. Speaker, the issue of the Peguis Band, I think at this point would be best dealt with once the court proceedings are finalized.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the problem with the Premier and the Peguis Band is that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. D. ORCHARD: What I would ask the First Minister in as direct a way as I possibly can ask the First Minister is, would he not consider recovery of damages for the loss of the bridge by wilful destruction to be the kind of indication he would like to give to those Manitobans, minority as they may be, who choose to take the law in their own hands because they are dissatisfied with the progress of government in terms of funding replacement of assets that they themselves deemed needed replacement? Would the Minister not consider an action to recover costs to be an excellent message to those Manitobans?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question seeks an opinion. Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

Agriculture Ministers - annual meeting

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Acting Minister of Agriculture. The Annual Meeting of Agriculture Ministers is being held in July of this year. In view of the fact there will be a change of Federal Minister of Agriculture, will that meeting be going ahead as scheduled; has the agenda been set; and will it be maintained as it was initially set?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister. Will the members of the Legislature be given a copy of the agenda that the Manitoba Minister of Agriculture will be presenting at that meeting?

It would be a fairly simple answer, yes or no, or he could ask the Minister to provide it.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask if any members of the opposition, because of their interest in the rural community in Manitoba and the agricultural community, will there be an opportunity for members of the opposition to meet with the new Minister of Agriculture federally and the counterparts from across Canada?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, I'll take both those questions under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Following on my last question, and unlike the members of the opposition, I don't think poverty is a laughing matter. I'd like to ask the First Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I ask you, I appreciate that you have the direction with respect to whom you recognize in terms of asking questions in this Chamber but I would ask that tradition should dictate that the honourable members opposite, particularly the member in question the Member for Wolseley, has had several opportunities to ask questions; an opposition member is standing on the floor at the same time attempting to get on the floor and one would think, Sir, that you would take that into consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would submit there is no point of order; that you have been recognizing members in the order in which they stand, or have indicated a wish to ask questions. The last three or four questions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Do you want to follow me or do you want to speak while I'm speaking?

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite have been asking questions throughout most of question period. Only one member on this side has asked one question so far. The Honourable Member for Wolseley gets up to ask a second question from this side of the House and the member objects. Mr. Speaker, I submit the distribution of questions if anything, has been fair and the member might have a complaint if all the

members on this side who had a right to ask questions were using a third or half of question period, but that has never been the case.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the member has the right to ask the question and has been recognized by you and the Honourable Member for Lakeside, Sir, I would submit, does not have a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the same point.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, on the same point or order, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that this is the last question period, possibly, of this Session. The fact of the matter is that if members opposite had any courtesy, they might allow members on this side to utilize the time to get some of their questions on the table.

They have all summer to discuss things together as they would in caucus and I believe, Sir, that it's an abuse of this question period for them, especially for one of their backbenchers, to be recognized more than once. That's no reflection on you, Sir, that's a reflection on the people opposite for their lack of courtesy this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

All members are entitled to ask questions and to seek to catch the eye of the Chair. The Honourable Member for Wolseley has been fortunate enough to do so twice. She has asked one question, she's recognized to ask a second question.

Canada Assistance Plan

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the First Minister and I would like to know . . . Well, I happen to represent a constituency, Mr. Speaker, who has, if there are no poor in Tuxedo, River Heights, or Sturgeon Creek . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the honourable member has a question would she please pose it?

MS. M. PHILLIPS: My question is, considering that one of the major supports for people at the poverty line are social assistance payments, I would like to know if the First Minister will discuss with the Minister of Community Services, renegotiating with the Federal Government the Canada Assistance Plan to assist people that are at or below the poverty line?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think indeed, the question reflects the importance of permitting all members to ask the questions in this Chamber because it is a question that clearly would be of major significance for the Member for Wolseley.

Mr. Speaker, that is a matter that will certainly be reviewed by the Minister of Community Services, as to further actions that should be undertaken by this government in regard to its renegotiations of the Federal Government and Canadian assistance.

Herbicides - dumping of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health. It's concerning the sewage lagoon and the garbage dump located at the northwest quarter, Section 8, Township 17, Range 4 East, operated by the Village of Dunnottar. Has the Minister received any reports on the complaints received by his department concerning the particular dump that I just made reference to?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you for the answer, Mr. Speaker. I want the Honourable Minister to advise whether he has any report on the dumping of herbicide cans not properly flushed, and what actions are being taken.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The members of staff currently have been apprised of the situation there. It's not, unfortunately, the only dump in Manitoba where herbicide cans have been dumped in landfill sites. As part of the ongoing pilot project that we have within the department that goes through the municipalities not only to recover the cans themselves to recycle them, but also to teach farmers how to properly proceed in washing them. We say that if they do so three times, then they have generally removed pretty well all of the residue from those cans.

Last year as I mentioned I gave, in some detail during the Estimates, an exact amount of the residue that was recovered, the total number of cans that were recovered. Unfortunately, there are still some who do not yet bring these cans to be washed out and recycled as they should be doing. But, hopefully, because we are getting more and more municipalities participating in the program, and as well we are enlisting the support of the chemical companies themselves to put on an education program to further develop this awareness among the agricultural users, that eventually we'll get full co-operation from the farming community in terms of making them understand that there are indeed after-effects to the environment that may be harmful, not only to the health of individuals but to the environment, so that this practice of allowing cans with residues to be buried into the landfill is indeed a dangerous one.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I would like to suggest to the Honourable Minister that action has to be taken right today because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want the Honourable Minister to advise what action is being taken by the effluent that is passing from this landfill site and this garbage dump into a ditch that runs close to and right next to a public highway? Has there been any checking of the contamination concerning this effluent into the drinking water and wells in the area?

HON. G. LECUYER: If the member is referring to the landfill site, I gather he is referring to the lagoon and that, Mr. Speaker, the member is making an incorrect statement or an incorrect assumption because that has been verified. I have been given the assurance by staff who have gone there this week and last week, that that is not happening. The lagoon is not in operation at this time.

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

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have the indulgence of the House to make a short non-political statement?

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

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, should the business of this Session of the Legislature conclude today, it would appear that it may well be the last opportunity to bid our colleague from Fort Garry a fond adieu from this Session, or from this Chamber at least, and to the extent that our respective political affiliation allows us I know that all members would want to join me in wishing him well.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think we'd have no problem at all associating ourselves with the House Leader of the Opposition. I think that the Member from Fort Garry has always done his work very diligently and I think it is a fact that he's been respected by the members of this House. I don't know if I'd want to go as far as wish him luck at this time, but we'll miss him.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Certainly looks hopeful anyway. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House to make a short non-political statement in reply?

MR. SPEAKER: Leave appears to have been granted.
The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd sooner give leave to let him make a political statement. I reside in his constituency and I'd like to hear him speak . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'll follow that admonition and I'll deliver the other statement to my honourable friend's front door.

I appreciate very much the fact that my colleagues on both sides of the House, my House leader, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and the Minister of Health, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, speaking for their respective caucuses and colleagues, should have acknowledged the occasion for me as it presents itself today, and I want to express my thanks to all members of the House, Sir, for that recognition.

I wish to have the opportunity for a moment to address the House through you anyway, Sir, to let all my friends know on both sides of the Chamber that I leave with great regret and great nostalgia and memories that shall stay with me forever. It's been a great privilege and honour to serve in this Chamber. When one looks over the history of Manitoba and reminds oneself of the great men and women who have served in this House, and served the Province of Manitoba over the past 114 years, it is indeed a humbling thought and a humbling experience for me to acknowledge the fact that I've had the opportunity to serve in that historical record and serve in a Chamber that has housed so many great Manitobans.

I must say that I'm reminded of the comment by the late Will Rogers, Mr. Speaker, that he never met a man he didn't like. He had never met a man whom he didn't like and I would say that my experience in this Chamber over the past 15 years applies to all men and women on all sides of the House who have served while I have been here.

We have had our differences in debate; that's democracy, that's parliament, that's politics. But in terms of my appreciation for them as men and women and Manitobans and Manitoba public servants, and in terms of our personal friendship, there has never been any question, Sir, but that in my 15 years in this Chamber, I've never met a Manitoba legislator whom I didn't like.

I want to say that I'm grateful, in particular, to the electors of Fort Garry who have been kind enough and generous enough to send me to this Chamber for 15 years as their representative and as MLA for that great constituency.

So, Mr. Speaker, I bid au revoir for the time being to my friends in this Chamber. I may be back, who knows, but I have to respect the constraints of The Canada Elections Act in order to contest Federal Winnipeg Fort Garry in the forthcoming Federal Election and that means that I have to resign my seat when the official nomination day comes, Sir.

A MEMBER: You'll be answering questions in the House of Commons.

MR. L. SHERMAN: That being the case, I have to relinquish my seat as such, but one never knows what the future may hold. I hope that I will be in another place, in another House, in the not too distant future answering questions rather than asking them, Sir.

May I just conclude by acknowledging the kindnesses and generousities of all who have worked and served in this building while I've been here over the past 15 years; that includes all the officers of the Chamber, the

servants of the Legislature, the members of the press gallery, the members of the maintenance and security and service staffs of this building. All have been very kind to me, I take very fond memories of all of them and all of you with me.

Anybody who would like to get involved in the Winnipeg Fort Garry Federal Conservative Election Campaign can reach me at my constituency office in Fort Garry and certainly their efforts and support will be welcome. I wish them all well in their political careers and in their home lives and family lives in the future. I shall follow the events of this Chamber with great interest all the days of my life.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I would propose that this morning our Order Paper deal first with two condolence motions and then we would proceed to Committee of the Whole stage on the bills which were referred to Committee of the Whole the last couple of days.

I believe the Premier has the two condolence motions to move.

MOTIONS OF CONDOLENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd first move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that this House convey to the family of the late Charles Edwin Greenlay, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that, Mr. Speaker, be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this morning, we recall to memory Charles Edwin Greenlay, a former member of this Chamber, a Cabinet Minister from the division of Portage la Prairie, and also later on Mr. Raymond Mitchell who represented his constituency for nine years.

Mr. Greenlay was a native Manitoban from High Bluff, Manitoba, schooled in this province, served this province with distinction in a number of capacities throughout his adult life.

Mr. Greenlay worked for the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie and in 1943 was elected to the Legislative Assembly as a coalition candidate. He was subsequently re-elected in the 1945 general election as a Progressive Conservative, and in the 1949, 1953 and 1958 general elections as a Liberal Progressive member.

During his service with the government, he held double portfolios, Minister of Labour, Minister of Mines

and Resources and following his service as a member of this Chamber, he worked as Secretary-Treasurer for the Municipality of Charleswood until 1968.

Mr. Greenlay was an avid hunter, fisherman, curler. He was a devoted husband and father to his surviving wife, Gladys, and their two children.

Mr. Speaker, I recall only briefly having the opportunity to - I never met Mr. Greenlay - I had the opportunity to watch Mr. Greenlay from the gallery on several occasions when he served in the government of his time and certainly during that period of time served the government quite well.

I don't know whether my memory is quite correct, but I believe he sat either where the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet sits or next to him during that term. It may be that some other members can recall having seen Mr. Greenlay in this Chamber, performing in this Chamber as a member of government and serving this province very well.

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

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure for me to have the honour of seconding this Motion of Condolence to the Greenlay family.

As the sitting member for the constituency of Portage la Prairie, I wish to express my personal condolences along with those of the constituents of Portage la Prairie to Mrs. Gladys Greenlay and her family on the death of her husband on May 27, 1984.

I knew Charlie Greenlay first as a friend, as a Brother Mason, a man who was interested, very much so, with his community and he served that community well.

As a young man following his graduation from the Portage Collegiate, he operated a garage before becoming Secretary-Treasurer to the Municipality of Portage la Prairie in 1930. Charlie took a keen interest in the Portage la Prairie Horticultural Society and acted as a director for that society for many years. As I mentioned earlier, he was a member of the Masonic Order, the Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of Canada.

I understand that Mr. Greenlay enjoyed the sport of golf and I'm sure, coming from the community of High Bluff, he had to be as well an ardent curler.

Charlie Greenlay entered the provincial politics in 1943, winning his seat in this Assembly as a Progressive Conservative in the coalition government under the leadership of Premier Garson. Mr. Greenlay remained in Cabinet when Premier Campbell succeeded the Garson Government in 1948. In 1950, the Progressive Conservatives left the coalition. Mr. Greenlay remained with the government, holding the Ministries of Labour and Natural Resources as well as the Provincial Treasurer until his government was defeated in 1959.

Following his defeat in 1959, Charlie Greenlay served as the Secretary-Treasurer to the R.M. of Charleswood until his retirement. He returned with his wife, Gladys, to Portage la Prairie in 1973.

So on behalf of my Leader and my colleagues in the official opposition, we wish to join in this tribute to him and extend our sincere condolences to his widow and to his family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the sentiments of condolence being expressed to Mrs. Greenlay and her family on the death of Charles Edwin Greenlay.

It was my pleasure to know Charlie Greenlay first of all as a friend; secondly, as a member of the Legislature of the party to which I belonged, he was a Conservative; thirdly, as an adversary in this House when I sat briefly in the House with him in the minority government of Duff Roblin in 1958-59. Mr. Greenlay at that time was a member of the front bench, having just been defeated as a member of the Cabinet of the Honourable Douglas Campbell.

He was in all respects a gentle man. We have heard the Member for Fort Garry this morning use the expression of Will Rogers, that he went through life having no enemies. I think that truly it could be said of Charles Greenlay that he did the same. He was extremely affable, extremely concerned about all of his constituents in Portage la Prairie, all of his friends as well, a great help to a number of young people in that community in offering them encouragement, sometimes other material help, or helping them along the way.

In the Legislature when he became a Minister in those days of relatively small government, he was very active in particular in the portfolio of Mines and Natural Resources. I can remember the stories being told of Charlie Greenlay getting into old talks and going with his Deputy down to Falcon Lake, which he and that administration started to develop, and Charlie would pitch in and do some of the work down at the lake: a) because he felt he had a responsibility to help a bit; and b) because he loved that part of Manitoba and felt, not only as a citizen but as a responsible Minister, that any time he spent there was probably time well spent in the service of the people, and he was right.

It has been said in earlier tributes to him that he left the Conservative Party in 1950 when the coalition broke up and joined the Liberal Progressive Party.

I think it would be rather more accurate to say that the Honourable Douglas Campbell, who to this day remains an extremely wise counsellor for all of us, who was carrying on as Premier after the Conservatives decided to leave coalition, saw that in that Cabinet there were three Conservatives that he needed to strengthen and to maintain his government and he asked Charlie Greenlay; and he asked Wally Miller; and he asked Bobby Bend to stay in the government with him to help to continue to give good government to the people of Manitoba. They responded to that request by Mr. Campbell, and stayed in the government.

I would like to suggest that their responsibility, their duty as they saw it first was to serve the people of Manitoba; secondly, if they had to become Liberal Progressives they would, and some of them did; but their first responsibility, in a very honourable way, was to respond to that call of the First Minister of the province to serve the people of the province, and they did well. I know, because I was one who campaigned against all three of them. I was one who stood in this House as a young Minister and was assailed by all three of them who remained in the House after the '58 election, and each of them was a man of talent whom Doug Campbell, in his wisdom, was wise enough to select from that coalition group and to keep in his Cabinet.

In later years, he could be found in retirement at Delta Beach and, very regrettably, in his last years he suffered from a number of illnesses which impaired his ability to enjoy life and friendship in the way which had become accustomed for him.

On this occasion, I should like to join with all of my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to Charlie Greenlay and expressing our condolences to his wife, Gladys, and to the members of the family.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the members please rise for a moment of silence to show their support for the motion?

(A moment of silence was observed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by The Honourable Member for Virden that this House convey to the family of the late Raymond Mitchell, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly in Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement, its appreciation of his devotion to duty, useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise in the traditions of this House to honour the memory of the late Raymond Mitchell who was born in Gilbert Plains, served this province and community with distinction and loyalty.

Mr. Mitchell was first elected as a Member of the Legislative Assembly in, I understand, the 1949 general election as a Liberal member. He was subsequently re-elected in the general election of 1953. In addition to his nine years of service in this Chamber he was extremely active in his community. He served as a councillor for his municipality, a reeve of the municipality and also as mayor of Grandview and district.

Mr. Speaker, my only recollection in respect to Mr. Mitchell is that area of his service. I recall the respect, the esteem that he was held in by his fellow municipal peers in the Province of Manitoba for his untiring effort in regard to municipal community contribution.

He served 50 years as a member of the local school board. He also served as a president for a term of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. His service also extended into other areas of community life as a founding member of the Manitoba Pool Elevators; a life member of the United Grain Growers Association; a board member of the Grandview United Church for, I understand, over 40 years. Mr. Mitchell is survived by his wife, Annie, and their children.

I'm sure that honourable members would wish to join with me this morning in paying tribute to a record of fine achievement, fine contribution to the Province of Manitoba by one that served Manitoba in pretty well every level of community activity, including service in this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

It's indeed an honour, on behalf of my colleagues and members of this side of the Assembly, to join with the First Minister in this Motion of Condolence to Mrs. Mitchell and the family.

I knew Ray Mitchell in many ways; I knew him as a farmer; I knew him as a member of United Grain Growers; I knew him for his school work, his municipal work, his community work. I also had the privilege of knowing Ray Mitchell while he did serve in this Assembly, although it was long before my term of office in this Assembly.

He was without a doubt a man who had the total confidence of almost every facet of society. He wasn't presumptuous; he was willing to listen to anyone, no matter how small a problem Ray Mitchell always had time to listen to people and their problems.

I think my first meeting with Ray Mitchell though came about through my wife, and my wife's aunt's was the place where Ray Mitchell's daughter boarded when she accepted a teaching job in the Village of Binscarth. Really, it was through Wilda that we first got to know Ray Mitchell.

So, I would like to say to Wilda and her sister Renee, and the four boys that it has been, indeed, a pleasure for me over the years to have known their father, to admire him, to have had the privilege of seeking his counsel from time to time. He was very generous with his time if it was in the interests of the larger community. He had interest in every level of government. He was keenly interested in federal politics, took an active part in provincial politics. His major contribution though was at the civic level where he has few equals in terms of length of service and variety of service.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great deal of pleasure to me to have known Ray Mitchell over the years, so I take pleasure in seconding the nomination and sincerely convey our best wishes to his wife and the family.

MR. SPEAKER: Would members please rise for a moment of silence to show their support for the motion?

(A moment of silence was observed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you proceed with the calling of the bills on Page 3 of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: I believe we had moved these bills into Committee of the Whole stage when last we met, and it's my understanding that a motion is now in order to ask you to leave the Chair and resume Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker, I move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the consideration of Bills No. 3 and 30.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, obviously there must have been some understanding arrived at between the House Leaders on both sides, and I would have to yield to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition if he has any information in that respect to so advise us. Perhaps it's unnecessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I'll gladly second the motion moved by the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider bills referred, with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

BILL NO. 3 - THE LOAN ACT, 1984 (2)

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: The Committee of the Whole House please come to order. We are here to consider Bills No. 3, 30, 31 and 32. We shall consider them in their order.

The Minister of Finance.

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

In respect to Bill 3, the most appropriate acts to which to compare Bill 3 to, are The Loan Act 1983 (2) and The Loan Act 1984. Section 2 of this act is the same Subsection 2(1) of The 1983 Act. Subsection 3(1) is new and authorizes the borrowing of an additional \$100 million for purposes that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may designate.

Section 3(2) requires, however, that the money not be spent prior to April 1, 1985, although commitments for expenditure may be made prior to that date as well as after.

The intent of Section 3 is to allow capital programs to proceed through the fiscal year end until a new source of capital supply is provided in 1985.

In the last Loan Act of 1985, in the event that there are more than one, the unused balance of this \$100 million in authority, will be rescinded and a similar provision made for 1986.

Subsection 4(1) through 4(4) of this act are identical to Subsections 3(1) through 3(4) of Bill 2, The Loan Act, 1984, passed earlier this year. These subsections are also to be found in The Loan Act, 1983 (2). Sections 5 through 9 are equivalent to Sections 4 through 8 of Bill 2, The Loan Act, 1984 and Subsections 3 through 7 of The Loan Act, 1983 (2).

Section 10 of this act provides funding for the Beef Stabilization Fund.

Section 11 provides advances to the Horse Racing Commission for the purpose of making loans to operators of race-tracks and, of course, there are a number of other items for which the appropriate Ministers will be providing information for which they are responsible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 3, An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and

authorize the borrowing of the same. Shall we consider the bill clause-by-clause, page-by-page or the bill in its entirety?

A MEMBER: In its entirety.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In its entirety.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs that I raised yesterday about money going to Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited, whether this money is to be used by way of a grant to Manitoba Forestry Resources, whether this is part of the equity that has already been taken in the company, or just exactly how this money will be used.

I also wanted an assurance from the Minister that he would provide for us information concerning the leasing of equipment by Manfor from North Point where they have apparently been in the habit of leasing equipment on a non-tendered basis for many years. I wanted the Minister to find out what pieces of equipment were being rented, at what rate, how the rate was determined, and over the period of time that they've been renting equipment on a non-tendered basis, how much money has been paid to North Point.

I would like the Minister to give me an undertaking that he will seek out and provide that information at the earliest opportunity because there is activity under way right now, or shortly to be under way concerning the construction of a road, where this equipment is being used.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The funds that are in the Capital Supply Bill (2) are funds that will be used for the upgrading and ongoing capital needs of Manfor, I believe. I don't have my information and the breakdown with me. I've just taken it upstairs as a matter of fact.

With respect to North Point, I did give the Member for Turtle Mountain some information when he asked the question on how North Point was chosen to be the firm from which equipment was rented. The rates that are being paid by Manfor for the rental of that equipment, are some \$6 to \$10 less per hour than the standard Department of Highways' rates. I believe that they're in the neighborhood of \$70 to \$80 per hour. As I indicated before, the equipment is available on an as-needed basis.

I did, as a result of the questions raised by the Member for Turtle Mountain, discuss with the chairman of the board the appropriateness of continuing that kind of arrangement over such a long period of time and indicated that in terms of good corporate relations with surrounding communities, that it would be probably in the best interests of the company once the immediate project is completed - and the member may know that there are some additional mileages due to be opened in the same area - that it would be appropriate in terms of not only seeming to be in the best interests of the company and the shareholder but to give us some security that that's the fact that we look at, even where the equipment is provided on an hourly basis and an

as-needed basis that we make an effort to get bids for that hourly rate or that per-unit price or whatever. So I have set things in motion so that we will rectify that particular problem and it may turn out, of course, that North Point in fact has been providing us with the best rate but I think it's certainly worthwhile to have that assurance.

The concerns that were expressed by an individual from the Thompson area, probably overlooked the fact that any contractor that works for Manfor is required to pay union scale and benefits which amount to some \$20 per hour. So some individuals from the outside aren't aware of that fact as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, that raises a number of other issues then. What is the Minister doing to change that situation? We've got a company here that's losing millions, and the Minister seems to be telling us that they can't hire contractors that can pay the same kind of wage that would be a going wage throughout the North, that they've got to pay union rates rather than be able to take advantage of competitive situations. What's the Minister doing about that?

I'm interested in how the company would determine in dealing with North Point that they're going to pay them a rate below the going rate for highways because of what that indicates. Has anyone else had an opportunity to say that they're prepared to do it for even lower rates?

I know that when Manitoba Telephone System undertakes to get equipment on even a short period of time, that they have either tendered it directly or they will take additional equipment at the same price as some that has already been tendered. This sounds like a situation that is certainly open to abuse. I would also like to know who determines the number of hours that the contractor gets paid for, because that's obviously a crucial factor as well, but the Minister, I'm sure, will find that out as time passes and will communicate it to me.

But what I'm interested in here and what surprises me somewhat, Mr. Chairman, is that here's \$14 million that's to go to Manfor and I can't seem to get an answer either from the Minister of Finance or the Minister responsible for Manfor, how this money is going to flow, whether this is going to be a loan; whether this is going to be a grant; whether it's going to be shares or just what, because the government has removed virtually all of the debt load from Manfor up until the end of the last fiscal year that we were dealing with.

The Minister indicates this might be a loan. Now, how is this loan going to show? Is it going to be just simply as an interest-bearing loan? Is it going to be non-cumulative interest debentures? How's it going to be handled?

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I should indicate that the loans that are going to be going to Manfor with respect to the costs of the upgrading, and I think we went through that during Committee, are being negotiated with the Department of Finance obviously in terms of the interest rate, and if the member wishes I will go and get it. I'm sure there are other

questions and I don't have the information in front of me but I'm certainly prepared to offer it.

MR. B. RANSOM: I don't care about the precise details, but I would like to know whether this is going to be an interest-bearing loan, whether it's going to be of the basis of debentures where there's no interest paid unless there's a so-called profit, if he could just indicate how it's going to be handled, Mr. Chairman.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, I think that it was indicated in committee that it would be debentures and that it would be interest bearing upon the corporation reporting in the black.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 3 approved in its entirety—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass; Bill be reported.

BILL 30 - THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: If members wish I could provide the section-by-section information on this. If not they might have specific questions I could answer. It depends on how they wish to proceed.

I'll tell you what. I could provide the Member for Turtle Mountain with my speaking notes and he can look at them while we're going over - the reason I say that is that there are seven pages - which seems to me a waste of time if there's no concern.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could indicate to us whether this is simply the standard kind of Supply bill that we deal with every year or whether there are some changes in it. If there are some changes, perhaps he could just simply point those out. If he can assure us that it's the standard format and doesn't contain anything new, then we don't need to have any details of it.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: There are, of course, in each year because of different timings of agreements and so on, changes for the new ones such as the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote and so on. But it is on the same basis as they have been done in previous years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Just for the record, Mr. Chairman, I suppose the unusual feature about this Motion of Supply is that for the first time, at least in my experience and I believe probably in the history of this province, this Minister and this government granted themselves an unusually large, unnecessary large amount of money by means of a Special Warrant which, of course, put aside the necessity and the tradition, I might add, of an Interim Supply measure. I think it's worthwhile at this stage just to put that on the record, Mr. Chairman.

I put it to the Minister seriously, that the practice of doing that is questionable for two reasons because, Mr. Chairman, it undermines to some extent one of the most, and indeed in the minds of some, the most important reason for why we are assembled here. It comes right down to the very roots of how the

parliamentary system developed, that is, to grant Supply to Her Majesty. If a Minister and a government treats that in a rather cavalier manner, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that is an abuse of the parliamentary system.

Modern times have provided the modern means and mechanics of overcoming any difficulties a government has when it find itself short of authority to carry on the business of government. That's why we have the mechanics of an Interim Supply Bill. We appreciate that timing of the Session will not always coincide with the government's obligations and requirements to be able to pay the bills and the obligations that they are charged with the responsibility of paying. Therefore, you have the measure over the years known as Interim Supply that a Minister will ask the Legislative Assembly to pass. But you see, Mr. Chairman, therein lies the importance.

It is important for the Minister of Finance to ask this Assembly to authorize expenditures of public tax dollars for government purposes. This Minister and this government avoided that by going off to Gimli and, in the privacy of their own membership, deciding to pass a Special Warrant of an unprecedented amount, over \$1 billion, I believe, well in excess of the normal 25 percent or 30 percent or 35 percent.

Mr. Chairman, our comments about that at the time that action was done, we recognized - I recall specifically the Member for Turtle Mountain saying that had the Interim Supply Bill been somewhat greater than normal because the Session started somewhat later this year because ongoing obligations of the government are such that bills had to be met, there would have been no particular exception taken to that.

I take this occasion, Mr. Chairman, just to remind all of us that one thing that we didn't have during this Session that we are about to conclude was the courtesy of the government to ask the authority from this Chamber for the necessary funds for Interim Supply. They just simply avoided that and in so doing, in my judgment, violated a very fundamental basic principle of parliamentary democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware that they had the technical authority and the right to do that, but Parliament runs and is operated as much by the principles involved in Parliament, the traditions built up in Parliament, and surely the question of a government at all times asking the Legislature to authorize the expenditures of funds is one that should not be taken lightly.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just put those few comments on the record, indicating to the Minister of Finance, that while the current bill before us may not have any unusual features about it, the unusual feature about the manner and way in which this government has treated this House and the taxpayers was in the manner and way in which they did away with Interim Supply during the course of this Session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether the Minister of Finance has tabled the prospectus for the recent preferred share issue. We asked to have it and I haven't seen it. He may have made it available while I wasn't here.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I'll send a copy to the member. I got my first complete copy this morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 30 be approved—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, just a few brief comments in response to the remarks of the Honourable House Leader of the opposition on the report of the bill. I would like to point out that there was absolutely nothing unusual about the use of Special Warrants to provide for government expenditures prior to the House coming into Session. In fact, just the opposite is the case.

Every time that the Legislature has begun its Session after the 1st of April, there was a requirement that a Special Warrant be passed. If members will review the Journals of our Legislature, they will find that in every case when the House began its Session after April 1st - and there haven't been many in recent years; the last one prior to this was in 1970, but there were many Sessions in the '40s and '50s when Special Warrants were issued to cover a good portion of the Supply Bill amount in late March, early April because the Session began later.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should also be pointed out, in response to the Member for Lakeside, that every penny that was in the Special Warrant and then some, is being voted on by this Assembly in this bill. So while I concur with the Member for Lakeside that there is no doubt that it's the largest Special Warrant, because the last time this mechanism was used was 14 years ago when government revenues and expenditures were much lower. But certainly every penny in that Special Warrant is covered in this bill and, although it has not been common practice in the past, it is not in any way unusual in that it has happened every time the legislative Session has started after April 1st.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, we have just heard an attempt at defence by the Government House Leader of a totally inexcusable action on the part of the government. They did not require anywhere near the amount of money that they passed in a Special Warrant. The act says that they can pass Special Warrants for amounts that are immediately and urgently required. There was absolutely no way that the Minister of Finance or anyone on that side of the House could demonstrate that the amount of money in that Special Warrant was urgently and immediately required.

What we had was a government attempting to avoid the opportunity for the opposition to engage in debate of Interim Supply, knowing that they themselves, in the last year that we were in government, had taken at least eight occasions to debate Interim Supply. They thought it was necessary, Mr. Chairman, under those circumstances to debate Interim Supply, and they thought that it was necessary for them this time to avoid having the opportunity to debate Interim Supply.

What the Minister has done is clearly to violate the intent of The Financial Administration Act, because there was absolutely no way it could be demonstrated that it was urgently and immediately required. I would

urge the Minister of Finance not to follow that practice again, because it is a bad practice.

What he should do is follow the traditional practice of the House. If money is needed, then he makes allocation for that amount of money, but he doesn't go out and simply pass enough to be sure that it takes every eventuality into consideration. I think there are several occasions, even in the short period of time that I've been in the House, where there was more than one Interim Supply Bill passed. They dealt with the traditional amount of approximately 25 percent; the Session went on longer than that; there was a second Interim Supply Bill brought in and the members of the Legislature once again had an opportunity to debate that.

I suggest to the Minister that he return to that practice and that he not engage again in the kind of activity that he did last year, because it clearly is a violation of the intent of the act. It's not a violation apparently of the legality of it because I am advised by the Legislative Counsel, the only recourse that we as opposition members have is through debate, is through the political procedures, Mr. Chairman. We can't take the Minister of Finance into court and charge him with violating the act.

It's curious also to learn that the Minister of Finance now just get a copy of the prospectus for \$150 million preferred share issue. There is something a little funny with the financial structure of things when the Minister of Finance gets the prospectus after the issue has already been sold out. It's able to be cleared through the Securities Commissions of the country, all very quickly.

I just urge the Minister to pay a little more attention to his responsibilities as Minister of Finance, to pay attention to the formalities of his reporting procedures and to be accurate in the kinds of things that he reports and he will find that he's going to earn more respect amongst the public and the financial community and maybe even from the members of the opposition, Mr. Chairman.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to explain. There seems to be some confusion about how these prospectuses come about and there seems to be an assumption, especially by the Member for Pembina, that the prospectuses have to be complete before the issues are sold. That in fact is not the case.

I had an incomplete prospectus on the day that the question was raised. I indicated that I would wait until I had a complete one, which does take a period of time. There was no complete prospectus in the sense that all the numbers were printed into it and so on at the time the \$150 million worth of shares were sold because it was a very simple transaction, as I had explained at the time.

That is the reason people are purchasing and there are two reasons: One is that it has dividends and it provides certain institutions with some benefits. The second is that it has the guarantee of the Province of Manitoba; that is what sold the issue. It's similar to bonds where a lot of the material comes out afterwards, so let's not leave the impression out there that somehow there was something done in an improper fashion. It was done precisely in accordance with the way it ought

to have been done and it was very successful. The people who were purchasing know full well how that kind of sale operates and didn't have those kinds of concerns and they're the ones who put money out.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, in the private sector, when the tax lawyers and accountants are looking at some possibility, they frequently go to the tax department to get an opinion, whether or not it's acceptable. Now I know that the Minister has received assurance from the Federal Government that they're not going to pass retroactive legislation to close the loophole that has been used for this preferred share issue; but does he have any assurance from the Federal Government that he isn't going to face some sort of a challenge under the federal laws governing this sort of thing because, for example, of the government's clear statement that they don't intend to show a profit in this corporation but yet the corporation has to be taxable in order to qualify? Has he sought a legal opinion from the Federal Tax Department or has he assurance from them that there will not be any challenge of this?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, we don't intend to pay any more taxes than the banks, than the federal Crown corporations that have used this mechanism, Polysar, Canadian Development Corporation and so on. The member must keep in mind that the tax treatment is that of the person who has purchased the bond or the share. We have certainly no reason to believe that the Federal Government would treat the dividend income in any way different from the way it would treat the dividend income of holders of Polysar or CDC or other federal Crown corporations. And, of course, we've had a fair amount of discussion and input from the law firm that was involved from the beginning, a firm probably known to at least some of the opposition, Tory, Tory and DesLaurier, who have a reputation in this country as tax experts.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, it's not surprising that the Federal Government would not move to close off something that's being used by a federal Crown corporation, because if the Crown corporation gets in any kind of difficulty the Federal Government is simply going to bail them out with tax dollars anyway. They're taking it out of one federal pocket and putting it into another, but they certainly moved very quickly on this once the provincial governments got into the scene.

If the Federal Government found it quite acceptable then they wouldn't have moved that quickly, but they clearly have moved quickly to shut it off now and the danger that the holders of these preferred shares may face is that they're not classed as dividends but they become classed as interest, because the Minister has clearly stated that he has no intention of showing a profit, that he's going to manipulate the cash flow through this company so there will not be a profit and therein lies the danger.

If the Minister is absolutely convinced that there's no possibility of that happening then we would like to know about it, but it seems to us that perhaps he's running a substantial risk here for the investors, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 30, Title—pass. Bill be reported.

**BILL 31 - THE STATUTE LAW
AMENDMENT (TAXATION) ACT (1984)**

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand there will be some amendments to this bill.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just to start off with that, I move,

THAT Clause 52(1)(i) of Bill 31 be amended by striking out the figures "24" in the 3rd line thereof and substituting therefor the figures, "25."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment—pass. Any other amendments?

The bill as amended—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass. Bill be reported.

MR. B. RANSOM: Wait, how many of these are moved? Just one? Were the two amendments moved?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only one. The amendment states, for the benefit of the Member for Turtle Mountain . . .

MR. B. RANSOM: I'm not interested in the amendment, Mr. Chairman. I'm interested in asking a question. I'd like to know how this bill or how this section dealing with capital gains, what is going to be the impact of that section? it's on Page 13 of the bill.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, we're referring to 11.1(4)? it's a new section creating the increased formula for the 1984 and subsequent taxation years.

The increased formula will allow a refund of the provincial share of capital gains taxes paid on a taxable capital gain of up to \$150,000, reduced by the amount deducted by the taxpayer as contributions to a Registered Retirement Savings Plan. In order to be eligible for the higher limit under this program an eligible taxpayer must have disposed of his farm or share in the farm property after December 31, 1983.

MR. B. RANSOM: Just explain to me, Mr. Chairman, what is the change here from what it was previously?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Previously, I believe, the amount was up to the \$100,000; this increases it to \$150,000.00.

MR. B. RANSOM: Was this registered retirement provision in it previously or is that new?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, it is not.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, that's one of the things I'm interested in knowing then. Why is that change in there now and what's going to be the impact of that on some farmer taking advantage of this capital gains refund?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I could get more specific information to the member in a few minutes. My understanding is that we expect that overall this provision will provide for a slightly increased tax expenditure in this area. Keep in mind that one of the purposes of these amendments coming along occasionally is to make sure that it conforms as well with federal tax changes that occasionally come along.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister seems to be indicating in his answer that this, in effect, will allow for a greater refund of the provincial portion of capital gains tax to Manitobans who have met the criterion, and I assume the criterion haven't basically changed, i.e. that the person disposing of the land or the shares must have been an active farmer in five or something out of the last 10 years, and that the buyers must be eligible farmers in Manitoba.

Under the old system, which I assume applies for the fiscal year 1983, a refund in taxation paid would be made - it's my assumption and the Minister can correct me if I'm wrong - for calendar year 1983.

I'll repeat the proposition. — (Interjection) — Right, I realize this is after, but under the existing system which will now be changed effective for 1984, a person disposing of land in '83 could claim up to a maximum provincial tax paid on capital gains and get a cash refund of tax paid. Under this system, is the Minister saying that you will be able to get a cash refund of tax paid, above and beyond the contribution which will be deducted up front to a registered retirement fund which will not be refunded, is that the concept being put out here?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, now what it will do is provide for a refund of taxes paid on taxable capital gains of up to \$150,000 as opposed to \$100,000.00. Whatever amount is paid out is reduced by the amount deducted by the taxpayer as contributions to an RRSP in that particular year. I believe that there are certain limits to the amount that you can get involved in with respect to RRSPs.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then the question I have to the Minister, he is presumably raising the amount eligible for refund from \$100,000 to \$150,000; do I assume that one making a claim under the provisions basis disposal of land in fiscal year 1984 will be able to get to do two things; first of all, any contribution of provincial tax will be paid back only after the upfront deduction of 3,500 maximum, say, in RRSP, then the balance after that will be refunded, is that the system that will be used?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'm getting more information but I believe basically that would be correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister contemplating any change to accommodate Hutterite colonies under the act as being eligible to purchasers of farm land. I understand that there has been some question about whether or not they qualify.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, my staff assures me that they do qualify. I know that the member raised the problem some time ago. I had meant to check back to see whether it had been concluded satisfactorily. If there are problems, then certainly we would be prepared to legislate retroactively in order to ensure that people

who sell to Hutterite colonies do qualify. As I understand it, on occasion, there are purchasers who don't like to fill in various forms and that puts vendors in somewhat of a difficult position.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I understand that there was a court case a few months ago whereby a prosecution for the use of purple gasoline was thrown out of court because the prosecution couldn't prove that it was gasoline that was in the tank, or hadn't proved that it was gasoline that was in the tank, and that the act may have been inadequate actually to provide that proof, to base that proof upon. Is there a change contemplated? The Minister knows that I've asked him whether he was still continuing to have prosecutions made against people using the purple fuel.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I actually was not aware, I had not been made aware of that court case, but I want to say that I recall about 10 years ago a case where an individual was charged with keeping explosives - there was a federal act - and not having proper signage and after all of the evidence was in about all the dynamite and so on, the sticks, the defence moved that the charge be dismissed on the basis that the prosecution never did prove that those red sticks that were located in that cabin were dynamite, and the judge threw it out. Somebody should have testified that they had done something or other.

Sometimes these technicalities are a real bother for prosecutions, but I presume that in this particular case it was simply another element that the prosecution has now added to the list of things that they have to prove in order to get a conviction. I'm sure that in the next case the fact that it is gasoline will be proved.

I can take that as notice and maybe get a fuller explanation back to the member some time after the Session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Title—pass; Bill be reported.
The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, I had that question with respect to capital gains on farmers. The reason we moved it up to the 150 is that the Federal Government announced a new program to allow farmers to roll up to \$120,000 in taxable capital gains into RRSPs, thereby reducing federal and Manitoba income tax. The new raised limit allows refund of taxes paid if capital gains are reduced by the RRSP, the top limit of \$150,000 is reduced by the RRSP contribution, and that federal RRSP rollover is limited to farmers owning property during certain years, I believe it's 1972-1983.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Does that mean then that if there's \$120,000 rolled into an RRSP because of the federal legislation, that there will only be 30,000 then that the taxpayer will qualify for a refund at the provincial level?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, in addition to the \$120,000.00. So they started off a couple of years ago in the provincial program of up to 100,000, now the federal program boosts it up to 120, and we're adding another 30,000 to make it 150.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill be reported.

BILL 32 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE HEALTH AND POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION TAX LEVY ACT

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment, I understand, to be proposed to this bill.
The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I move THAT Clause 6(b) of Bill 32 be amended by striking out the figures "24" in the third line thereof and substituting therefor the figures "25."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Amendment approved? The Minister of Finance, please explain.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I have been advised by staff that there was an error in the bill. It's a matter of changing the figures as indicated in the amendment. It has no impact on the bill, other than to amend an error.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a question regarding the \$50,000 limit. It's in the Budget, and I didn't take the time to dig it out, Mr. Chairman, but the Minister went to great pains in his Budget Address to indicate why he was bringing forward changes in the tax tables whereby there would be a gradual increase in tax payable, that there wouldn't all of a sudden be this major place or position in the tax table where an individual all of a sudden had to pay tax.

I'm wondering, using that logic, how he could then find it possible to bring in a provision within an act that does exactly that.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the provisions provide for an easing in between \$50,000 and \$75,000.00. We could have, for instance, said the way we do with the Corporate Capital tax, if you're above a certain limit you pay on everything. If you're \$1 above it, that's what happens.

With this, it doesn't happen that way. If you're a dollar above 50,000, you pay a number that is certainly higher than what you are paying below 50. At 52,000, for instance, you pay \$90, as opposed to, if we had done it the other way, \$750.00. So you see, there is an easing in.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, last year when the Minister brought in The Education Tax Levy Act, or the year before, at that time I indicated my concern about the number of monthly billings, many of them small in nature. Of course, my contention at that point was that there should be quarterly billing. I'm glad the Minister went to the extent he did and removed the total that the levy be applicable in cases of individuals paying under \$50,000 worth of wages.

In my particular situation, I can tell him, because I tend to forget things, that I submitted to his department six post-dated cheques covering one-half year of

remittance. My question to the Minister is, and he has indicated in other answers that he will not be considering paying interest, will he continue to cash all those cheques, and will I have to apply for refund for the total of those cheques under the procedures he's laid out, or will he in fact return to me those cheques that may not be required to have gone through the process of being deposited in account with the department?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I would hope that the department, if it was clear that you were going to be below 50,000 for the year, would not be cashing those cheques. I think I'm getting the indication from upstairs that, if they get cheques, they cash them. I think it's a good question, and I would be prepared to tell staff, where they have received those post-dated cheques and where they are clearly for amounts that are below what would be indicated for the 50,000, that they not cash any more of them unless there is some technical reason that I'm not aware of. They may have some concern that I'm not aware of, but I would certainly want to check that for the member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister of Finance to make the commitment right now that he is going to pay interest on the refunds that will be made at the end of December; that money belongs to people who are eligible for the exemption; that money is now in the hands of the government. I would like his commitment that he is going to pay interest on it when he makes the refund.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'm sorry, I can't make the commitment. I have not taken the issue to Cabinet yet. I can assure the member that I will place that issue before Cabinet for the consideration of Cabinet and for their decision. I will make a recommendation, but I am not at liberty to say what the recommendation will be because then people will say, if I won, that I always get my way and, if I lost, that I've lost all clout whatsoever in Cabinet.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate at least that much, but I want the Minister to realize that, if he doesn't do that or if this government doesn't do it, how this is going to be viewed by people who are now aware that what Manitoba Hydro is doing is going back, and they're trying to bill people for interest on the mistakes that they've made, something that had absolutely nothing to do with the ratepayer whatsoever. It had something to do with Hydro and with his department coming along and telling them that they haven't been collecting the right sales tax. So they're not only going to go back and collect the sales tax, they're trying to collect interest from those people.

Now if, at the same time, the Department of Finance is going to turn around and take people's money and keep people's money, knowing full well that it does belong to the private individuals, and not pay interest on it, Mr. Chairman, then I'll tell you there is absolutely no fairness and justice at all in the administration of this government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance, do you have any guidance from above?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that all of my guidance comes from above. That's why we are so successful.

I do want to assure the member that the issue he has raised is one that will be taken seriously by Cabinet. I would expect that there will be a submission prepared in the fairly near future to Cabinet so that it can be dealt with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 32, approved as amended—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass. Bill be reported.

Is there any other business of the Committee of the Whole? Hearing none, committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Chairman reported that the Committee of the Whole had considered certain bills, and reported the approval of same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Rupertsland, that the report of the Committee of the Whole be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, before I move third readings, which I believe is all that is on the Order Paper before us at this time, in view that the committee stages have all been dealt with, I think it might be appropriate to advise the House and advise you Sir, that I believe there will be leave granted to sit beyond the normal hour of adjournment today till approximately 1 o'clock, and that leave would be granted then to recess for approximately one hour and reconvene at 2 o'clock, specifically, in anticipation that we may be able to accomplish some additional business this afternoon. If there is leave, Sir, I would like, then, to announce that as our sitting schedule for the balance of the day.

I had not anticipated, in response to the questions of honourable members opposite, that there would be an additional question period at 2 o'clock; only that we would recess at 1 o'clock and reconvene and carry with the business as we do over a supper-hour recess, Sir. If there is such leave, Sir, I would announce that then as our timetable for the balance of the day.

MR. SPEAKER: The members give leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour today and to recess at approximately 1 o'clock until 2 o'clock?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, recess at 1 o'clock and reconvene at 2 o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Government House Leader have that leave? (Agreed)

That being the case - the Honourable Government House Leader.

THIRD READING

BILL NO. 3 - THE LOAN ACT, 1984 (2)

HON. A. ANSTETT presented, by leave, Bill No. 3, The Loan Act, 1984, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting to have followed some of the manoeuvrings of the Minister of Finance and the government in regard to the raising of capital and the expenditure thereof. I must say that although the Minister has tried to make a case for this new share scheme, or stock scheme, that has been concocted and may shortly be removed, I think that the government is involved in a very questionable endeavour. It goes, in my judgment, against the whole tradition and heritage of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, I can look at several articles that have appeared, and editorial comments, as well as having listened to the debate in the Chamber, and there seems to be almost no support whatsoever for the scheme of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, the Free Press, in their observations, said that at best that it was questionable. Their editorial on June 21st was headed "A Questionable Scheme" and raised a number of concerns about the manner in which the government is now resorting to raising funds. It seems that the name of the game is "anything goes" when it comes to looking for revenue, looking for tax sources and so on.

It will be interesting to see the impact that the Federal Government has on this scheme, whether it has to be eliminated, whether any more activities can be undertaken on the basis of this Manitoba Properties Incorporated and, of course, I think it's only a matter of a few weeks before the government itself, the Federal Government that is, eliminates that particular loophole.

Mr. Speaker, I dug out my copy of David Lewis's well-known book and his campaign, which is now out of the early '70s, "The Corporate Welfare Bums." All New Democrats were sent a copy of this book, I think. I may have purchased it but I believe we were all sent a copy.

It contained an introduction by Eric Kierans, and I must say, personally, that out of many people in Canada that I have a very high regard for, I put Kierans right near the top. I don't know what other members of the Chamber think of him but I think he is a brilliant economist, a man that was successful both in business and in politics; a man who became a millionaire, became the head of the Montreal Stock Exchange, was active in the Lasage Government. I think - I don't remember - did he go on federally? Was he not a federal member and a Federal Minister, and now is only heard on occasion. He has spoken in Manitoba; he has spoken under the auspices of the New Democratic Party. I remember Sid Green bringing Eric Kierans in for a particular conference, and I have also heard him with Stephen Lewis and with Dalton Camp - two other very capable commentators and Canadian thinkers.

So here was a campaign that was conducted by the New Democratic Party, by the highly esteemed David Lewis, and I just want to refer to a few sentences in his book about corporate welfare bums. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the government itself has become a corporate welfare bum. This to me flies in the face of a long tradition in the party to fight against tax concessions and loopholes and other methods, some of which perhaps are legitimate, and some of which are questionable at best, and others which seem to be downright devious.

Kierans himself, Mr. Speaker, in his introduction to David Lewis' book - I quote him from Page X, simply saying - "that most members would abhor the special privileges, exemptions, and concessions as much as I do."

Then there's a cartoon on Page 16 of Little David, of David and Goliath - a very small David, obviously David Lewis - looking up at a great big giant of a man with corporate bums on his belt and, obviously, David with a smile on his face, willing to take on these people. Well, it would come as a shock to David Lewis if he were alive today that he might be staring up at the latest corporate welfare bum, namely, the Pawley administration. That would come as a shock, or the Minister of Finance himself who would have to be standing in line with the other wheelers and dealers and, in some instances, connivers.

I read you two sentence, in particular, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the book which simply says this, and I say to the members on the government benches, how can they defend their government's actions in the face of the campaigns that have been conducted against this very kind of thing for decades?

David Lewis' words are as follows: "Tax concessions and loopholes must be eliminated. In principle they are unjust, and in practice they are ineffective as tools for desirable development and job creation." — (Interjection) — Well, that's true. We have a new breed of cat. We have the Minister of Finance who left us the legacy of the payroll tax and now leaves us a stock scheme. I always have to watch what I say, Mr. Speaker, because I'm tempted to say stock swindle or stock scheme or stock fraud, I'm just saying those are words that come to mind by way of association.

The point is that the Minister has concocted various schemes to wheel and deal. He left us the payroll tax, he's not leaving us a stock scheme. — (Interjection) — The Attorney-General says take the money and run. It doesn't matter what's involved; doesn't matter what the principles are; doesn't matter what the facts are. — (Interjection) — That's right, anything goes. The government is fluid, the government will move in any direction, the government will undertake any policy left, right or centre, as long as there's something new and cute and different involved.

Mr. Speaker, I see the party as evolving, but evolving in a very peculiar way. When you consider that the party began back in the '20s as the Independent Labour Party and evolved into the CCF in the 1930s and, then evolved into the New Democratic Party in the '60s. Now, we saw last year and this year certain signs, certain planks that could be, in my opinion, perhaps not in the opinion of the official opposition, but the last Budget was characterized by some people as a Conservative Budget. Maybe it was, maybe it wasn't, but some people

read the movement of the government in terms of tightening the belt, in terms of so-called fiscal responsibility, in terms of the type of program that seemed to be at least a reflection on what the Lyon administration did.

Some people said that the Pawley Government was becoming conservative. Mr. Speaker, I say that it's becoming Social Credit, that the direction is beginning to emulate the Bill Bennett Government in the Province of British Columbia. That certainly is true in regard to this latest scheme which I regard as an act of desperation.

Mr. Speaker, there are other concerns and I'll just allude to them briefly. My impression is that the government, first of all, will do anything to stay in power, anything. Mr. Speaker, the government will do anything that the womens' movement wants as explained by the Member for Wolseley or by some of the other women in Cabinet. The government we all know, we all know for sure will do anything that the labour movement wants. Whatever Dick Martin wants, Dick Martin gets. There used to be a song like that, whatever Lola wants, Lola gets.

In this case, Dick Martin . . .

A MEMBER: You sound like Sid Green.

MR. R. DOERN: Well, if I sound like Sid Green, I take that as a compliment. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's anybody who has been in this House who is as effective as Mr. Green. There are other people who are effective, but he is certainly one of the most effective. I didn't have the privilege of seeing him in Committee the other night, but I'm told by various people that he literally tore Bill 22 to shreds, and that was the impression.

So, I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, when you look beyond tradition, when you look beyond your heritage, when you are taking external influences and you're willing to move in any direction, then I think that does not augur well for the party and it's leaving a lot of the members in a state of confusion, and in a state of anger, and a state of anxiety as to what is happening to this government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'm confusing them. I'm trying to remind some of you that there is a heritage. Now, it's hard to do for some of the newer members. I'm not saying the Member for The Pas, but for somebody who just got elected the other day and joined the government and is willing to move in any direction at any time because somebody says there's votes in it, then those are the people that you have to be concerned about. It won't be the long-time party members who have some sense of history and some sense of heritage, they're not the ones that are going to take the party over the cliff, it's the other people who are suspect who are doing it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm just saying that we now get a situation where the Winnipeg Sun characterizes the latest so-called thrust of the Minister of Finance and the government in a headline of Sunday, June 20th, as quote: "Capitalism Ain't That Bad." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not the exact heritage of the party. In the Regina Manifesto, it was the eradication of capitalism that was the goal, and now the government is becoming no better than any other person in big business who is working full time to avoid paying taxes.

Who do taxes go to? They go to the government; they go to the Federal Government and then, through a distribution system, go through the provinces and municipalities and then back into society. Here's a government that's now going to spend time avoiding the payment of taxes - I'm going to watch my words here as well - but giving the Federal Government a hard time, doing them out of money and also, in effect, other provinces, because the money that comes out of the feds also comes out of the other provinces.

So, we wound up here with a caricature where the government sets up a phoney corporation, a paper company and, I think, the cartoonists have hit the nail on the head. The Winnipeg Sun shows an Arab investor, the shiek buying the Legislature through the stock company. I mean, who is going to own our assets now? We all own all our assets now; we all own our Crown corporations. Who really owns the Legislative Building and the Woodsworth Building and the MTS Crown corporation and the Hydro Building and so on?

Well, on paper, Mr. Speaker, they do not belong anymore to the people of this province. On paper, at least, the ownership has passed out of the hands of this province into some Investors, undoubtedly in Eastern Canada. We're willing to sell our assets for a buck or for a few million bucks. I think the best cartoon came out of the Free Press on June 22nd, where it shows the Minister of Finance - and a very good drawing of him too - looking a little seedy auctioning off the Golden Boy and he has his cane with the rubber tip and he's smacking the Golden Boy in the belly and saying, "A wise investor could turn this objet d'art into a dandy lamp stand and smoker. What am I bid?"

Mr. Speaker, I'm simply saying that that is nothing to be proud of, selling your soul for a dollar is not a very good scheme. I simply say that I think the party has fallen on hard times and the government has fallen on hard times, and by desperately looking around for some new way of propping up the government, I think, it is not the route to go. The government should strike its course, should set its policy and stick to it.

At the moment it's like a ship without a sail or ship without a rudder, looking for anything, looking for any new idea, willing to take ideas from anybody. Mr. Speaker, in the end it won't work, because the government, first of all, will lose the confidence of its own supporters and, secondly, will lose the confidence of the general public. I just think it's like the final gasp. It reminds me of Faust, who was willing to make a deal with the devil for a goal, willing to set aside all his principles, all his aims, all his aspirations for something for the quick fix.

Mr. Speaker, I think that that is what has happened. The explaining won't have to be to me, it'll have to be to the general public and it certainly is going to have to be to the people within the party who are going to say, what is going on on Broadway, what are these guys doing? They're acting like members of another political party. They are not acting as they should. They are not acting as the previous governments have. They are a government with which we don't want anything to do.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, before we pass this bill, I just want to remind members of the government and particularly the Premier, of just what he is doing in actions undertaken around the Cabinet table, in making some of the budgetary decisions in this province.

There is an industry in this province which has had good times and bad times but, in general, has enjoyed relative health in the Province of Manitoba and that's the heavy construction industry. In the last two years that industry has seen a government turn its back on them, a government abandon them, and leave them in the lurch and all, Sir, for the creation of a Jobs Fund.

Last year we identified monies that the government took from the Department of Highways to put into the Jobs Fund and this year we did the same thing, \$25 million from Department of Highways revenues, related revenues, taken, stolen if you will, from the Department of Highways and their spending budget and put into the Jobs Fund. Mr. Speaker, I don't have to remind any Manitoban as they drive on our highways in the Province of Manitoba, they notice that their condition is rapidly deteriorating and that, Sir, is because this government has insisted on pulling construction capital away from highways and putting it into the Jobs Fund - some \$15 million last year; this year, \$25 million. They put it into the Jobs Fund; they claim they're creating jobs, that they are helping the Province of Manitoba.

In fact, Mr. Speaker - and I posed these questions to the Minister of Highways and Transportation during his Estimates - in fact, what is happening by pulling that \$25 million away from the heavy construction industry, away from the construction budget of the Department of Highways and Transportation, two things are happening. First of all, our roads are going backwards at an alarming rate; they are deteriorating quickly. That means that future expenditures are going to be dramatically higher to rebuild them than simply injecting sufficient monies to keep the job up today.

So future costs are greater, but more importantly, Mr. Speaker, because this money was stolen from the Highways construction budget and put into the Jobs Fund to create jobs, more importantly, that \$25 million has cost in the neighbourhood of 750 to 1,000 jobs in the heavy construction industry in the Province of Manitoba and those are real jobs in the private sector. They are permanent jobs in the majority in the private sector. They're not part-time, make-work efforts like the Jobs Fund employment projects are.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that I broached that topic with the Minister of Highways during his Estimates. I asked him specifically if he disagreed with the figures that were presented by TRIP Canada, a group of heavy construction people that are studying the road construction spending and the condition of roads in all the provincial jurisdictions across Canada. I asked him specifically if the figures advanced by the Manitoba heavy construction industry were in any way incorrect, and the Minister said no, they were basically correct. I asked him if the \$100 million that they indicated was needed in terms of construction budget would in fact create the almost 3,000 jobs that the heavy construction industry estimated, and again the Minister didn't disagree.

So, Sir, by taking the \$25 million from the construction budget in the Highways Department - and it's not new

money, Sir, it is money they are currently collecting through gasoline tax, diesel fuel tax, licences and other revenues related to the Highway Department. It is not new money, it is money that exists, that is there, that is being bled off into the Jobs Fund. I asked the Minister would he then agree that that theft of money from the Department of Highways to the Jobs Fund meant a loss of 750 jobs minimum in the heavy construction industry and he did not disagree.

Any statistic that this government creates to justify their massive advertising campaign in the Jobs Fund, their proliferation of green signs in the Jobs Fund, must be discounted; any job number must be discounted by a minimum of 750 permanent jobs in Manitoba's heavy construction industry because the Minister doesn't disagree.

What this government should be doing, if they're willing to live up to some of the commitments they have made in at least two Throne Speeches, where they are going to use - where they have promised to use - government expenditures on capital projects which provide lasting assets to the people of Manitoba. If truly, Sir, they were going to live up to that promise that has been made by the Premier and others in his Cabinet, then they would return the \$25 million from the Jobs Fund to the construction budget of the Department of Highways and Transportation and let good, honest Manitobans get back to work, building roads and fixing roads in the Province of Manitoba, for the future benefit of all Manitobans who use them.

That's what they should be doing, Mr. Speaker, and get away from this phony Jobs Fund advertising that is so false in its presentation to the people of Manitoba, Sir, that it is not being truthful with the people of Manitoba, in the statements, advertising and signs they are putting out in the Jobs Fund. It is simply money that has been stolen from other departments, put in there so they can hang a Jobs Funds sign up on a project. That money, if it was left where it came from - \$25 million in the Department of Highways and Transportation - we would have real jobs in the Province of Manitoba. They would be private sector jobs in the Province of Manitoba.

The construction industry would be healthy, and the people of Manitoba would not be complaining in growing legions about the deteriorating conditions of Manitoba's highways and roads. That is a failing this government has given the people of Manitoba, one of a litany of failures. It is one of their greatest failures, predicated on a lack of honest presentation to the people of Manitoba of what they are doing.

They have not been honest in their presentation of the Jobs Fund, and where they have gotten the money and what they are doing with it. They would be more honest if they put the money back in the Department of Highways where it came from, where it belongs, so that the people could benefit from a heavy construction industry building more roads for the people of Manitoba.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on third reading of Bill 3 to express some of my concerns as to where we are headed as a nation, particularly in

regard to our exchange rate, particularly in regard to interest rates. What I would like to do for the next few minutes is throw out a challenge to members opposite to watch very carefully the events involving our economy over the next half-year.

Mr. Speaker, I am addressing the authorization of expenditures of money for capital purposes. I can't help but wonder what requirements there will be a year from now, given the fact that our dollar is depreciating at such a rapid rate. There are members opposite who have advocated for some time that the dollar be allowed to float and, for some time, have been chastising us and trying to force us to come out fully in the open as supporting high interest rates. Of course, we can see through their ploys and their attempts, Mr. Speaker, it's not too difficult.

I would like to turn the challenge on members opposite who have some understanding of basic economic matters to watch very carefully the price of food that they will be buying at our supermarkets almost immediately. I'm talking about the increases that will apply there to. I ask them to look very carefully at the price of vegetables and fruits. I tell them to look at the price of all imported goods over the next half-year. Then because I'm led to believe that this Session may be drawing to a quick close — (Interjection) — I know that's not certain. I am told there might be a high probability of that occurring, Mr. Speaker.

I challenge members opposite when we come back, whenever the government decides in their wisdom to call forward the Fourth Session of this 32nd Legislature, to tell us then if they believe that a deteriorating dollar is the best situation, the best economic medicine for this nation. I am strongly of the opinion that if this dollar continues to drop, particularly with interest rates continuing to rise, that a year from now the Minister of Finance will be laying before us similar requests for expenditures of money related to capital that will be significantly higher.

I would hope that the members opposite would have enough wherewithal and enough courage at that time to finally agree with those of us who have said that trying to make one's economy and one's nation competitive by allowing one's currency to float without taking into account basically our productive capability, is foolhardy at best.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise to put those few comments on the record. I suppose I could specifically draw reference to one item under Bill 3 which deals with the beef stabilization fund. I have some genuine concerns that our basic breeding herd within this province is diminishing in number. I have challenged the Minister of Agriculture on a couple of occasions to prove me wrong; he has seen fit not to do so. While we have the expert in agriculture, the Government House Leader, indicate to me that, in fact, I have been proven wrong by the Minister of Agriculture, I say to him that the Minister, in attempting to address my concern could talk about marketings only and never, ever did address the concern of mine regarding the female herd within our province. I questioned him specifically under the allocation of money to beef stabilization where our whole industry within this province is heading.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other matters under this particular bill that one could address. My main concern, though, is of a general nature, that members opposite

come to their senses over the summer and fall and realize that competing currencies and the wish on their behalf that our currency drop to some all-time low, really is a solution to nobody.

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

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of areas of concern that I want to bring to the government's attention. They just have to do with the financing of particularly the Minister of Agriculture's department. It could have implications on the Beef Commission and a few other areas.

Last night in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker, I have been made aware in the last day or two, the federal Minister of Agriculture has introduced amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act, the national board which will, in fact, give the Federal Government the authority to move into any province or all provinces and impose on those provinces a marketing agency or control of the marketing of those commodities.

I have a couple of areas of major concern, Mr. Speaker, because, first of all, it's a removal of power or authority from producer marketing boards within the provinces now and, as well, the Provincial Governments that have that authority.

I, first of all, do not believe that the federal Minister of Agriculture has the mandate to do it in the last hour of his job as Minister of Agriculture. He has no mandate, Mr. Speaker, when he is finished as the federal Minister of Agriculture. I do not believe that it is his responsibility nor does he have the mandate to impose what I would consider, heavy legislation on the agricultural community, Mr. Speaker. If he is doing it, Mr. Speaker, to say that that was his last act, that he thinks that he'll be able to impose a marketing board on the beef producers of this country or the hog producers against the wishes of the majority of the producers, then it's wrong.

I challenge this Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. I challenge him and the Premier of this province to speak out against what is happening in Ottawa in the last day or so, particularly on the fact, No. 1, that the federal Minister does not have the mandate to do it. What kind of a country do we live in, Mr. Speaker, when we have a man who has lost his mandate, both in the federal Ministry of Agriculture, the Prime Minister's job, what kind of a scam, what kind of an introduction is that for the new Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker? I am very much upset about it.

Yesterday in this Chamber, I don't know why the First Minister didn't stand in his place and say that we're sending a letter to the Prime Minister of Canada condemning their actions on the way in which they're leaving office, Mr. Speaker, patronage to the hilt, pork-barrelling that this country has never seen before - other than what this government has done.

A MEMBER: They put them in there.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they helped put them in there . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I am extremely concerned, and I say this as a Canadian, at the abuse that has been allowed to take place in the last few days in Ottawa. If the Prime Minister-elect, Mr. Speaker, thinks that this is going to do him any good and if this government here didn't have the courage to speak out against those actions, then it says the same for them that they aren't much better and don't think much differently of the parliamentary system.

I again go back to the point that I wanted to make, and I would request of this Minister of Agriculture to immediately - yes, Mr. Speaker, immediately - propose that a communication be sent to the federal Government, the federal Ministers, that they not support - right now, it has to happen right now, because it's before the House of Commons - that they right now oppose the passage of the amendments to the Natural Products Marketing Council. Right now it's happening in Ottawa, and I ask the Minister of Agriculture, wherever he be, Mr. Speaker, to send that communication to the Federal Minister.

I again point out the implications are its removal of power from provincial jurisdictions, it shouldn't be removed; its removal of power from provincial producers of agriculture commodities, it gives the Federal Government the authority to impose regulations and laws upon the people who are now not within marketing jurisdictions or marketing programs. I don't think that's right, Mr. Speaker. It's against the wishes of the majority of the producers in this particular situation. So I request of this government that immediate action be taken because we would support, Mr. Speaker, such a communication.

I would suggest, first of all, tell the Minister of Agriculture that he does not have the mandate to do it because he is on his deathbed, he's on his way out, he's finished. If he was going to do it, why didn't he do it six months or a year ago? Why didn't he do it with the support of the Ministers of Agriculture from across Canada?

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have just this morning talked to the Province of Saskatchewan, the Province of Alberta, and the Ministers have communicated their wishes to the national government. It's the responsibility of this government to put forward the wishes of the producer boards. I have had communications, Mr. Speaker, with producers who are within producer groups, marketing boards in Manitoba. They are extremely concerned where they are going to be left after this imposition of this new amendment takes place.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, it's incumbent upon this government to take action, and if it's the Acting Minister of Agriculture that I'm speaking to, that is in the chair, then I would suggest he take immediate action to do so.

I have a concern, Mr. Speaker. I am not so sure this government would support the opposition in their wishes. In fact, I don't think they will support the producers in their wishes because they are advocates of single desk marketing. They are advocates of national control for the commodities produced in agriculture. They believe in taking power away from provinces and from producers, Mr. Speaker. So I'm not so sure that we're going to get support from this New Democratic Party who have very little understanding for the farm community. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they take this request very seriously.

I, Mr. Speaker, realize that the time is about up for a recess and I will continue to make my remarks after 1 o'clock if that is satisfactory.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. As the House has agreed, by leave, to recess from 1 o'clock until 2 o'clock, this House will recess until 2:00 p.m. this afternoon.

RECESS

THIRD READING

BILL NO. 3 - THE LOAN ACT, 1984 (2) (cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is the proposed third reading of Bill No. 3.

The Honourable Member for Arthur has 35 minutes remaining.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, before lunch, was somewhat expecting probably that I might see the Minister of Agriculture back to make comment but possibly that will happen during the later part of the afternoon. However, the message can be given to any one of the members.

I would hope that, first of all, when we are talking about The Loan Act, the implications, that the actions being taken again, as I indicated yesterday, by the Federal Minister of Agriculture, who, Mr. Speaker, I deplore and I'm sure the people of the agricultural community deplore, that this Minister of Agriculture has not spoken out against what is happening in Ottawa that will impact on Manitoba farmers.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: That's not true.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Member for The Pas says that's not true.

Well, what did they say, and when did they speak up, Mr. Speaker? Has there been any member of this government stand up and protect the interests of our farm community against the aggression of a Minister of Agriculture at the national level who does not have the mandate to pass what he's passing, Mr. Speaker?

What kind of an example is that to set in a country like ours where we have the Prime Minister, we have the Ministers that are dealing before they leave office, Ministers that have been getting what - \$100,000 a year plus expenses - and they can't leave the public trough, Mr. Speaker? It's unconscionable, the slurping at the public trough. They are being heard right across to the west coast, Mr. Speaker.

The ironic part, Mr. Speaker, is who was it that put the Trudeau Government back in office and defeated the Joe Clark Government? It was the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, that put him in.

A MEMBER: No, it was the 18 cents a gallon that put them back in.

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Speaker, it was the New Democratic Party.

So I am speaking out on behalf of my constituents, on behalf of Manitobans and other Canadians who are

extremely upset at what is happening in Ottawa today. I say extremely upset and I'll tell you they'll correct it when they go to the ballot box if Turner can screw up his courage to go to the people, Mr. Speaker.

I will, in my concluding comments, say I am extremely upset that we have this action taking place in Ottawa, particularly with the Minister of Agriculture moving without a mandate to impose legislative change on our producers of regulated commodities and those that aren't regulated. It gives the authority to the National Government to impose a marketing board on the hogs and the beef in this country. As I understand it, I would have thought that he would have waited until the Ministers of Agriculture met this July with the new Minister to see if that was the direction that the country wants to go, but no, Mr. Speaker, he has to move.

One of the worst things that we have seen in this country is for a Minister to take that kind of action, and other Ministers who won't leave the public trough unless they assure themselves with a judgeship, with the head of a Crown corporation or a Senate position, Mr. Speaker.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Where is Eugene going?

MR. H. ENNS: Probably the Senate. Oh yes, it will be the House or the Senate.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs asked me where Eugene Whelan is going.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, wherever he goes, the important thing is that he's going, he will get out of the way and maybe some modern agricultural policy will be able to be implemented when the new Progressive Conservative Government forms the government in this country.

I would hope that this government, and I say this in all sincerity, as I did earlier, would make immediate communication to the Federal Government, to the Federal Minister - I would have hoped they would have done it during the lunch hour - to ask them not to pass the amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act because it does have major implications on Manitoba farmers.

I've had calls from those people who are producing, particularly, supply management commodities controlled by provincial agencies. I would request that they at least put their policy forward, but again one has to ask the question: Are they on our side or are they on the side of the Federal Minister who has no mandate in Ottawa? That, Mr. Speaker, is something that I think has to be brought to the attention of Canadians.

Again I will conclude my remarks by saying that if the Prime Minister-elect thinks that the people of Canada are going to swallow the final actions of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, the manipulations of the Jean Chretiens, the manipulations of the MacGuigans, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that the taxpayers look after them right into their final days of life, then he's mistaken.

I want to make one reference, Mr. Speaker, to Bruce Phillips this morning on Canada AM because I think he summed it up very well. He said, "What do we have in this country?" He said it was Jean Chretien who was

going around saying what a great Canadian and what he wanted to do for this country was the important thing. What kind of negotiations did he carry on with Turner? It wasn't what he could do for his country, Mr. Speaker. It was what he could do for Jean Chretien and look after the pork barrel in Quebec. That was his priority, Mr. Speaker, and it's a shame that the people of Canada have to be exposed to that kind of carrying on.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to take occasion in speaking to The Capital Loans Act to put a few comments on about perhaps a concern that certainly has, and should have, many Manitobans worried; one that we weren't able to examine to the extent that the subject matter deserves. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we were not able to conclude the traditional and historic examination by Standing Committee of the subject matter, and I am making particular references to this government's desperate - I can only describe it in those terms - policy of energy sales to the United States, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I remind honourable members opposite that we have not concluded the review of the Manitoba Hydro Board. We do have the assurance that we'll have an opportunity of doing that before applications proceed to the National Energy Board, and well they should, Mr. Speaker, because there are some very very serious questions involved about that sale of energy to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the act of selling power or energy to the United States that should be questioned. If we can, and we do have the surplus and it can be shown to be beneficial to us, then God bless the government in their attempts to help improve the condition, the human condition, economically and socially in this province, by earning those dollars that would make it possible for us to provide the services that all Manitobans want.

But, Mr. Speaker, the test, the acid test will be - and they are going to help provide it for us in a far better way than we can. Every time the Minister of Energy and Mines talks about the profits, the \$1.7 billion profits that are going to accrue from this energy sale, I won't even have to convince and tell constituents and Manitoba residents about what that should mean to Manitoba.

First of all, the one thing that it should mean to Manitoba is that if our major utility, Manitoba Hydro, is entering into these profitable, good business deals, then just like any other venture, Mr. Speaker. If I'm a shareholder in Great-West Life or if I'm a shareholder in Versatile or some other business and the business is doing well, I expect, as a shareholder, to receive some benefits from it; I expect to receive some dividends from it, Mr. Speaker.

The dividends the shareholders of Manitoba Hydro expect and they will get accustomed, they will anticipate expectations, the level of expectation will be there that there ought to be some benefits for the 288,000 hydro users in the Province of Manitoba - Mr. Speaker, by the way, that's all there are in Manitoba, 288,000 - and

when they hear their Minister and their government talk about the billions of dollars of profit they're going to make, they are not going to want to see their hydro bills double in the next five years. That's the very least, Mr. Speaker.

Indeed, in a more simplistic fashion, if Manitoba Hydro is going to make \$1 billion, \$2 billion, \$3 billion profit with these sales to the United States, then it would not be unreasonable to assume that perhaps our own hydro bills will go down, or at least remain stable, Mr. Speaker. I remind honourable members opposite, those four short years that we had the power of government, we were responsible for government, the hydro rates did not increase. We put a freeze on them and, to that extent, that we could help with the inflationary pressures of the time, we could take a basic utility requirement like that and assure Manitobans of stable hydro rates, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the committee meetings that we did have indicated to us, with the Minister sitting beside him, Manitoba Hydro officials telling us that following the 9.5 percent increase that we experienced in 1983, followed by a further 7.4 percent increase of April of 1984, they're asking for a 9.5 percent increase next April, and thereafter 6 percent every year for the ongoing future, at least for the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, that is unconscionable and if you think you're going to convince Manitobans that you've made a good deal, or that you're in the process of making a good deal, you'd better think again because, Mr. Speaker, as I said a little while ago, the more - and I'll tell you who's going to help me the most with this argument - every time a member opposite, every time the Minister of Energy and Mines gets up and boasts about the profit that they're going to make with Manitoba Hydro - those 288,000 customers are going to say, well when am I going to become a recipient of some of the benefits of that profit? When am I going to receive a dividend on my shareholdings of Manitoba Hydro?

Instead, Mr. Speaker, in three, four short years, in time - and by the way, long before a single kilowatt of hydro passes the border, long before one cent of energy is sold to Northern States Power in Minneapolis - this government will have inflicted on the 288,000 hydro users, increases ranging to 30-40 percent. You're going to have to live with that and no respite in the future. You are going to impose 100 percent increase on hydro rates on users. Yes, and I'm speaking to the Member for Rupertsland, that applies to the people that you represent on the reservations and other places, people that can least afford those kind of unconscionable hydro rate increases.

This government is standing up here proudly proclaiming we're selling power to the Americans that's going to provide lasting benefits to Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that if the government is at all feeling in any way buoyed up by these announcements, I remind them of course that we have essentially had announcements about discussions, we have had letters of intent, we have had letters of understanding. We have one firm contract signed and that, of course, has to receive approval from the National Energy Board and, Mr. Speaker, the benefits from that contract don't begin to accrue to Manitobans until the year 1993. Mr. Speaker, in the

meantime they'll have imposed 70, 80 to 90 percent hydro rate increases on the people of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am not at all concerned about the politics of that issue. What I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is that these decisions are of such monumental significance, they involve such massive amounts of dollars, at a time when dollars are harder and harder to find, that I have no confidence in this government, in this Premier who, as I have said before, would have difficulty running a peanut stand, to making these kind of commitments on behalf of, firstly, the 288,000 hydro rate payers and, more significantly, on behalf of all Manitobans that they represent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure honourable members opposite that they have little to rest their laurels on, there's precious little politics involved in the announcement of these sales today and I'm sure that that attests for some of their means. They've made these big announcements week after week, and then they go out among the people and what do they find? They still don't like them. Mr. Speaker, why were there 2,000 motorcyclists in front of the building last night? They weren't impressed with your power and energy talk and sales. They were worried about other things that affected them directly.

So, Mr. Speaker, let this government be served notice that their daily track record, their incompetence, their constant interference in the lives of so many Manitobans, whether it's telling the people how to run fowl suppers, to wearing seat belts and to wearing helmets, whether it is playing scam games and selling off shares and provincial assets to raise money on a short-term; for all these reasons, this government has nothing to look forward to in the future. I wish them well that they perhaps will find somewhere a cool spot in the shade of some kind of a tree to lick their wounds, Mr. Speaker, because they will need a great deal of recuperation to come back from the self-inflicted wounds that they have inflicted upon themselves from the day they took office.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

Bill No. 4 was read a third time and passed.

BILL 5 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

HON. A. ANSTETT presented Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to speak briefly to this bill because this bill has aspects that I support with respect to transportation mobility aids for the physically handicapped, but it has a section in it that repeals the right of a person to appeal from the Licence Suspension Appeal Board to the County Court.

Mr. Speaker, I opposed that bill on second reading. I had asked the Minister to provide some statistics to us in committee which would justify the taking away

of that appeal. it's interesting to note that in committee the Minister indicated that only 10 percent of the people who appeal successfully to the County Court have subsequently been involved in offences involving alcohol. That is a very small percentage of the people who have successfully appealed to the County Court, and I do not think that these statistics justify the action of this government.

We are dealing with a situation where people are appealing from the Licence Suspension Appeal Board to the County Court for work purposes, Mr. Speaker. They require their licence for work. In 10 percent of those cases, there has been some subsequent involvement of alcohol. Because of the 10 percent, 90 percent of the successful appellants are having that right of appeal denied to them. When you're dealing with this situation where people are appealing to the court for an order allowing them to drive for the purposes of work, and only restricted orders are granted on appeal, I just don't think the statistics support the action of the government.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm not going to vote against the bill because it has the other positive provisions in it with respect to the physically handicapped, I simply want to place on the record the statistics that the Minister cited which I do not believe are justification for that provision in this bill.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wasn't clear if there was a request for that last bill on division.

MR. SPEAKER: No.

Bills No. 6, 7, and 8 were each read a third time and passed.

BILL 9 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

HON. A. ANSTETT presented Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. it is my understanding that on Monday during committee, there was an amendment passed by the committee, and it was passed yesterday at report stage in the Legislature which will do away with the 6:30 to 7:30 supper hour closing in beverage rooms and hotels right across this province.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that this now puts Manitoba on an equal legislative status with all the other provinces. This is, however, a major change in legislation, and I would at this time like to urge the Minister in charge

of the Liquor Control Commission to monitor the effects of this new legislation. I am personally, and I'm sure all members of the Chamber are concerned about the problems of alcohol on individuals, the family and, in many cases, the innocent victims who suffer from the effects of being involved in an accident wherein someone is impaired.

The government has embarked on an extensive campaign to try and reduce the impaired driving problems in this province of ours. I know members of the opposition support any attempt by governments at any level to try and curb the incidence of the drinking driver.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I ask the government to monitor this new legislation. I'm sure that the hotel and beverage room owners will also take their new responsibility seriously, and I'm sure that they will ensure that this change will be implemented with a minimum of problems surrounding it.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by informing members of the Chamber that it is my intention to introduce a private members' bill next year or if the government calls a Session sooner, in the next Session, which would propose to raise the drinking age in Manitoba to 19. There is a growing concern, Mr. Speaker, that this should be done. In the United States, there is now a move to raise the drinking age in all states to 21. I would ask members, when they're out talking to their constituents during the summer recess, to discuss this matter, because I think the latest results of Gallup Polls done in Canada indicate that some 68 percent of the people are now in favour of seeing the drinking age raised.

Mr. Speaker, after talking to their constituents, I hope the members of this Legislature will realize that this is one step which should be taken to further ensure that the problems of alcohol are tackled and that this would be another step in trying to solve some of the problems with drinking drivers as well as problems with the youth.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to them supporting that particular bill when I bring it forward next Session.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

Bill No. 10 was read a third time and passed.

BILL 11 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CLEAN ENVIRONMENT ACT

HON. A. ANSTETT presented Bill No. 11, An Act to amend the Clean Environment Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, just a couple of comments on Bill 11 on The Clean Environment Act to do with the regulatory authority that's present in this bill and to give the Minister a very clear message, because I know that he didn't have the opportunity attend any of the regional meetings of the UMM, and I had the opportunity to attend the one in my area and it was no different than any of the other regional meetings, wherein Mr. Plews,

who was presenting the government's proposed regulation on pesticide application, received substantial criticism, substantial suggestion that it was an unworkable system that he's bringing up, that he's attempting to put on the users of pesticides in the Province of Manitoba.

I would urge the Minister of the Environment - we've given him free passage on his Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act - on this one, once again with the regulatory authority he is building in there, proceed very cautiously. There was some very pointed questions asked in Belmont on Wednesday of this week by councillors who are going to have to wrestle with the kinds of regulations you are giving yourself authority to bring forward. It won't work, it's impractical. Listen to the people that are in the field because they're not being irresponsible in their use of pesticides and they will be severely hampered by some of the regulation that you and your department are prone to put before them.

Be very cautious, Mr. Minister, because you will cause yourself and the government untold problems and, in the meantime, leave the rural community who have been operating quite well under the present system and doing their jobs on behalf of their ratepayers quite well - they need no interference from this government and from this Minister.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried

BILL 12 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

HON. A. ANSTETT presented Bill No. 12, An Act to amend the Public Schools Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to put a couple of comments on the record before this bill is passed.

Mr. Speaker, as the Minister knows, we did not bring forward amendments within the committee and, I think, our line of questioning and our responses are on the record as a matter of record, of course, would indicate that we support basically the intent of the bill.

One of the areas that I found most interesting through the committee hearings the other evening, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that the Manitoba Teachers' Society found very little in the bill to support, although, in principle, they did support the fact that freedom of information in a financial sense should be available to all area residents. I found it very interesting that they felt they should have access to that information at a much earlier date.

I suppose at this time, I, personally, commend the Minister for not caving into that type of request and giving some support to elected representatives of the community who have to deal with budgeting procedures. I would only be fair if I gave her some credit in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, also with regard to the change, as is required under the statutes to change the formula of

education financing, we are fully cognizant of the economic pressures that the government and particularly the Department of Education were faced with. We still feel that there were priority areas that obviously could have done with more funding. Nevertheless, at this point in time, we saw fit to also support that change as intended by way of Bill No. 12.

A broader issue, Mr. Speaker, that comes out of Bill 12, I would suggest, might be a question on our part as to when the government will see fit to bring forward a whole new education finance type program. I know that's out of the purview of Bill 12, but, nevertheless, I'm hoping that the Minister early on in the new Session will give us some indication as to when there will be laid before us a new formula for education support that can be used in this province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL 14 - THE JOBS FUND ACT

HON. A. ANSTETT presented Bill No. 14, The Jobs Fund Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but laugh when I hear the Minister for Health say "not again." I didn't realize that I was overstaying my welcome in some respects.

Mr. Speaker, my comments, as usual, will be quite brief. I'd like to indicate that I haven't decided yet whether I will be in the House for this vote or not if one is forthcoming.

I have some difficulty with the Jobs Fund - not in any one specific area, I might add - but there's something very wrong in my view with the government and its whole approach and the high profile that it gives to this particular aspect of creating jobs.

A large number of speakers from our side on many occasions have drawn to the attention of members opposite our basic concerns with regard to advertising and with regard to the great play of politics that is used within this whole area of job creation. Mr. Speaker, of course, how does one vote against a bill that provides a few hours or a couple of weeks of work for an individual within one's area? That's, of course, what the members opposite attempt to do by bringing forward this whole area under one bill.

But let me say, Mr. Speaker, in spite of that, in spite of finding myself at times on platforms with the Government House Leader in opening a new facility, or the grand opening, people aren't readily fooled. They are well aware of what the government of this particular day is attempting to do with their very own money, much of it borrowed, all of it to be repaid back in some point in time.

Mr. Speaker, we're all aware of the great needs within our communities, both rurally and within the City of Winnipeg and, of course, we will reach out for anything that is offered to us. But I still must say that I find the principle under which the government attempts to sell

their efforts in this whole area of job creation is most unacceptable. As a matter of fact, as my colleague says, really it is devoid of principle. It is really one just completely moored on the dock of pure political gain.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel I have to make those general comments regarding Bill 14.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to place a few thoughts on the record about the Jobs Fund, about certainly having to do with the act and with some of the initiatives that the government is taking. But before recognizing what the act involves, what it provides for and what indeed is its intent in terms of a shift in direction and an opportunity for the government to be able to do various things, I'll say this, that the government in the past has demonstrated by their Jobs Fund that they didn't know how jobs ought to be created or where they ought to be created in our economy. They concentrated totally on the public sector where, at best, only 50,000 of our 450,000 people in Manitoba are employed ad yet they insisted on shifting their entire focus on that area, saying that we in the public sector are responsible for the job creation.

In fact, we heard the Minister of Labour say it in committee the other evening. She said, "I have created thousands of jobs in Manitoba." That's what she said; she's the one. She didn't talk about the fact that she had used taxpayers' money. She didn't talk about the fact that she is the steward of the budgetary income of the province and allocates it in certain areas as any Minister of Labour has in the past, as any Minister of the Crown does whenever he or she decides to invest public dollars in goods and services that are required to be purchased by the government.

They are the stewards of the public's money and indirectly and directly, by virtue of their investment decisions and spending decisions, create jobs. But, Mr. Speaker, that's not new; that has always been. Everyone who has ever served on the Treasury Bench in government has had that opportunity, indeed that responsibility.

What is unique about this government is that it will go to any lengths to try and take credit for jobs being created by the expenditure of public funds on areas that are the responsibility of government in any case, at any time. Mr. Speaker, successive governments have always recognized their responsibility in the Department of Natural Resources to spend tax dollars in order to provide for the facilities and the services that the public expects of the Department of Natural Resources.

But, Sir, it is an absolute sham to go by Birds Hill Park and see a sign that says that it's the Jobs Fund that is causing this bicycle path to have been created in Birds Hill Park. I recall, as a member of government many years ago, that the bicycle path in Birds Hill Park was a part of the development plan of Birds Hill Park, should and would have come out of the funding of the Department of Natural Resources.

But what does this government do? It strips away the funding of the Department of Natural Resources, denudes their budget and then, later on, funnels the money back through the hands of another Minister,

through the hands of many many more in a bureaucracy, trying to take some extra credit, some false credit for creating the jobs that would have been created by the Department of Natural Resources in the expenditure of those funds.

What an unbelievable process, Mr. Speaker, that this group would go to such convoluted efforts to try and somehow shed more attention and take more credit on their efforts, the responsibility for which they have been charged by the electorate in the carrying out of their affairs in government, but yet to try and funnel it off into a third-party endeavour, and then put it back into the same department and create the very same facilities that they were committed to by the master plan of development of that particular park for many years, but today we are led to believe that it is only occurring because of the Jobs Fund. What nonsense, Mr. Speaker! What absolute nonsense!

That is just one of many examples. The Highways Department was the same thing last year - \$8 million or \$10 million or \$12 million stripped away - \$20 million last year - I don't know how much it was this year . . .

A MEMBER: \$26 million.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . \$26 million this year, my colleague tells me. Then what we do is we have projects that are now with these green and white signs of the Jobs Fund doing work for the Highways Department, but somehow magically that work is more meaningful and that work seems to create more jobs because it has come through the hands of the Jobs Fund. What absolute bunk, Mr. Speaker - b-u-n-k - bunk.

A MEMBER: \$7 million or \$8 million in water resources; farm lands now need drainage.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, we have farm lands all over the province that are in bad need of assistance in drainage. We have had all of the rains that the Minister of Agriculture hasn't reported to us about in the House. They have come and they are flooding farm lands throughout the province. Then is the Minister of Natural Resources talking about massive drainage projects, assistance in all this? Yes, yes, but only if he can get assistance from the Jobs Fund.

He should have had that money in his budget, Mr. Speaker. He should have had it as part of the long-term planning and development of the projects that are required by his department, but he doesn't have it. Today he's got to go cap in hand, on bended knee to his Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and say, "Please may I, Mr. Minister, have some money back through the Jobs Fund to do the work that I should have been doing in any case in my department."

On and on and on - I could go through every department. I could talk about the work of the Minister of Education in her department, some of the capital works facilities that are being created. I could talk about the work that should be done by the Department of Labour out of her budget, but today she has to create those jobs by going to her colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, to ask him his permission to have her do the work that her department ought to be committed to.

A MEMBER: Well, he's Eugene the Czar; he's the czar.

MR. G. FILMON: Of course, it's the czar, not bizarre, but it's the czar of job creation that has to be put over top of all of these other departments, Mr. Speaker. That's what we are faced with because of this fraudulent Jobs Fund concept they are trying to promote.

Having promoted that concept, Mr. Speaker, we are now faced with a bill that is now going to take, presumably, the focus off the short-term, make-work projects that this government has had a fixation on for the past year or more - you heard about it, of course - all of us have heard about it, the fact that out of all this \$200 million expenditure that we had during the past year, we had, Sir, jobs that lasted, on average, 13 weeks in length, jobs that were as short as one day in length.

Included in the statistics that these people want people to believe are a credit to them for their job creation activities. We found them taking credit for 100 percent of the jobs created by a particular project when they contributed less than 5 percent of the funding. Unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, but that's the kind of concept that they have about taking some sort of additional false credit for job creation activities.

Mr. Speaker, further to that, civil servants who point out the truth of that statement and of those facts find themselves in danger of being fired, find themselves having to appear before an appeal committee of the Public Service Commission of Canada, and about to be fired, about to be fired because they had the audacity to point out the truth of the facts and figures with respect to employment in the Jobs Fund. That, Sir, is the tragedy of this kind of endeavour, at any cost to take credit for these job creation activities that ought to have been performed in the natural course of government investment. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a sad state of affairs.

But, on the other hand, I will say that some of the proposed initiatives of the government today with respect to the Jobs Fund may indeed signal some new found wisdom; may indeed signal that this government now realizes that what it has been doing for more than a year isn't working and wasn't, in fact, the right approach. It took them more than a year but, of course, we have to realize that they have a planning time frame of a matter of a few months. They don't know what they're going to do one month to the next, sometimes one day to the next but, nevertheless, they're now looking at an entirely new concept that focuses in on investment in private sector job creation, and they have created a mechanism by which they can participate in a variety of ways.

They can help with respect to research and technology support for new businesses coming into Manitoba; training contracts for the staff of the people who will be employed; infrastructure, interest free or forgivable loans for infrastructure development. All of those things that may in fact be an improvement and, I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that it will be an improvement. But you have to say, where is their commitment to their old-time philosophy?

Where was the Member for River East when they were deciding that they could be more effective in real long-term job creation in this province by contributing to jobs in the private sector on so much per job created

would be allocated to these new businesses to be used in these various ways that I've just described. Well that sounds like a flexible concept, that sounds like a reasonable concept, but doesn't it smack of the old-time David Lewis, talking about corporate welfare? Isn't that exactly what they used to pound about on the stumps, talk to people about the giveaways of government to private sector; isn't that what the Member for River East said, you know, is corporate welfare and subsidy of the private sector? — (Interjection) — The Minister of Government Services says it still is. Well then why have you clutched it to your bosom as an answer to the province's problems? Why are you allowing your Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology to do this if you still think that it's corporate welfare, that it's giveaways to the private sector? I guess I've made the Minister of Government Services speechless; he has no answer to it.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this bill may indeed have the potential to help in the formation and the establishment of new business in this province and we must say hallelujah, it's about time. It's about time that this government got away from its attitude of confrontation with the public sector that they've been on before.

A MEMBER: Private sector.

MR. G. FILMON: With the private sector, I'm sorry. Strike "public sector," read "private sector." This government, it's time they got off their tack of confrontation with the private sector. But, Sir, have they really done that?

Well in the last two or three days of committee hearings where we've been sitting in listening to the presentations on the labour law review and the new labour legislation, it's obvious, Sir, that they've only gone a certain distance; that they're prepared perhaps to throw a little money into the private sector, but ideologically they're still hidebound by the people who are pulling their strings, the big union leaders. Sir, I say to you that as long as that happens, and as long as that continues to be, that we will never change the climate for investment for real job creation in this province; that this will be a step in the right direction, Sir, that is totally negated by the two or three steps that we're taking back with respect to the labour law legislation in this province.

So, although this has the potential to help, what about the other side? What about the payroll tax? What about first contract legislation? What about your changes to the labour legislation that are going to be the most damaging, the most disincentive kind of move that you could have made toward real long-term job creation in the private sector of this province; what will they be able to do and withstand against even something like this that, as I say, has the potential to help?

So, Mr. Speaker, although this bill has the potential to help and although we see it as an improvement over what this government has done, as long as it is only one small step, as opposed to two large steps in the opposite direction, it's not going to have the desired result of helping out in terms of real long-term job creation in the private sector of Manitoba today.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Minister of Culture.

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

I hadn't intended to speak on this bill but I was so shocked, so amazed by the comments of the Leader of the Opposition that I felt compelled to make some comments, Mr. Speaker. I'll be very short, Mr. Speaker, because I believe in action, not on words, and I believe that has been the case with respect to the Manitoba Jobs Fund in the first year; it's been action, Mr. Speaker, it's been action.

You know the Leader of the Opposition talks about the fraud fund. Well I think that's an insult to the people of the Province of Manitoba. I think it's an insult to the very many organizations that have co-operated - church organizations, ethno-cultural organizations, municipalities, other levels of government, the Federal Government, private sector. To suggest that those organizations, those people are frauds, Mr. Speaker, is an insult and I'm saddened to hear those kinds of comments.

But you know I think very simply, Mr. Speaker, the proof is in the pudding. Manitoba is now in a situation that it has not been for many many many years. We now have the lowest unemployment rate in all of Canada, the lowest, not the second lowest, not the third lowest, but the lowest, at a time when we had the highest population increase in respect to any other province in Canada. So we've got more people coming into the province; we've got more people working in the province; we have less people unemployed and I simply ask the Leader of the Opposition the question that this government must be doing something right. We must be doing something right if Manitoba is in that position.

He talks about the private sector, Mr. Speaker, and he tries to show some contradiction behind this government's action with respect to the private sector. This government, this party has never said it is opposed to private enterprise; it has indicated that in this country, indeed this province, that we have a mixed economy where there is a significant and important role for the private sector in job creation. This is something that's been recognized all along by this government and this party and our actions and our efforts in the Jobs Fund I think are showing that we can work and we can co-operate with the private sector, because just about every one of the economic indicators show that Manitoba is leading the way, Mr. Speaker, leading the way right across Canada.

So I don't want to suggest that the Manitoba Jobs Fund, I don't want to suggest that this government's action is the reason for all of that, but it had to have some impact, Mr. Speaker, because if it was the other way around, if we were in the worse shape, that member there and other members there would be saying it's this government's action that caused the decline in employment or which caused the decline in the economy. But when it's the other way around, they talk all over the place and on all sides of the issue.

I would suggest to the members that if they are opposed to the efforts of the Manitoba Jobs Fund, if they are opposed to our efforts to continue to improve the economy in the Province of Manitoba and, I might

add, in a very comprehensive and integrated way through many means, the Jobs Fund being one of them, the major energy projects another and other efforts, if they are indeed opposed to the Jobs Fund, vote against this bill.

Get up and say that they are opposed to job creation in the Province of Manitoba. Don't talk on both sides. Don't say it's a "fraud" fund on one side and on the other side say, well it's a good idea that this government has taken, and ask for money.

I had even one member standing up and talking about the virtues of the Jobs Fund in his constituency, the Member for Emerson was proud, saying, look at what the Jobs Fund has done for our constituency. I have other members saying, well, can we get some more Jobs Fund in our area, we've got this project that our community organization wants to get in our area.

I mean, if they have any credibility, if the Leader of the Opposition has any credibility, Mr. Speaker, he should get up and vote against this bill and say that they are opposed to the Jobs Fund. Let them have the right to call it a "fraud" fund, but if it is a "fraud" fund, if it isn't working, if it is having no impact on job creation in the Province of Manitoba, then get up and vote against this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this final opportunity that I have on third reading of Bill 14 to reiterate and put on the record some of the comments that I made to the Minister when we dealt with this bill in committee stage.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, from comments made from this side of the House, there is a great deal of reservation about how this government is handling the Jobs Fund, how many hands the money that used to be housed in line departments now has to pass through before a delivery of service - in this case, jobs - is indeed provided. But it is our attempt and it is our responsibility to try to encourage a Minister, to try to encourage a government to improve on their programs, improve in their efforts to accomplish at least their stated convictions, and that is to create jobs because, Mr. Speaker, despite whatever stats the Honourable Minister wants to put before this House, the truth of the matter is there are a lot of unemployed Manitobans . . .

A MEMBER: More than there were in 1981.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . more unemployed Manitobans today than there were in 1981. I won't argue with the validity of the stats that the Minister has just put before the House, but that doesn't change the fact that there are a lot of unemployed Manitobans. It doesn't change the fact, and I am prepared to believe when this government has on numerous occasions indicated that its No. 1 priority was the creation of jobs, finding jobs for these unemployed Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, during committee consideration of this bill, I suggested to the Minister that he look seriously at how he can remove some of the shackles of the bureaucracy perhaps that are housed in the Labour Department, in the Standards Division, etc. I say this

with all the more reason because of the action taken by this government and his colleague, the Minister of Labour, with respect to Bill 35.

I say to him seriously, he can do something at the beginning of the week. He can look at how he can create the largest number of jobs for the dollars that he has available to him. Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to him that he can create additional hundreds of jobs at reasonable pay if he will sit down with the Minister of Labour, sit down with the directors of the Standards Division in the Department of Labour, and realize that there are many youngsters, there are many students right today still looking for a job.

Mr. Speaker, this is June. We're looking through July and August and half of September for university students where any number of jobs could be created, jobs that would be willingly accepted at reasonable rates of pay, \$4, \$5, \$6, \$7, \$8 an hour, but, Mr. Speaker, they aren't available, in some instances, if rigid administrative standards have to be maintained.

The Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, is really being grossly unfair. She was unfair to us last night in the committee. She was unfair in her initial explanation of Bill 35 when she tried to colour these kinds of remarks as an attack on minimum wages. Mr. Speaker, that is unfair. I know I can't call her anything more harsh but, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is, she is doing it deliberately. She is playing on the word "minimum" which in the minds of most Manitobans means the minimum wage, the \$4 minimum wage. She knows full well and, Mr. Speaker, it's not because the opposition didn't bring it to her attention.

My colleague, the Member for La Verendrye, brought a specific case, a clear example of what I'm talking about, a minimum wage of \$13.60. The employer was prepared, could have hired two students at \$7 an hour, but not one at \$13.00. Mr. Speaker, if you want to hide behind the bureaucracy, if you are really not interested in providing jobs, is there anybody in this Chamber that tells me that a high school student or university student that is out there looking for a job right now isn't prepared to accept a job for \$7 an hour? Is there somebody in this Chamber that will tell me that - someone that has no prospect for a job is going to reject a job for \$6.50 or \$7 an hour?

Well then, stop that hiding behind bureaucracy. Stop that hiding behind rules and regulations that you've imposed yourself. Listen to some of the constructive advice that you're getting from the opposition. Mr. Speaker, I want this government, this Minister, on Monday before they take a little bit of time off, to really examine whether or not they can stretch the dollars available to them in the Jobs Fund, see whether or not they can for the same amount of dollars get a better bang out of it in terms of creating jobs. Then, Mr. Speaker, we could vote with more enthusiasm and support more energetically the efforts of this Minister and the purport of the bill that is currently before us, Bill No. 14, the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to place a few comments on the record with regard to

this particular piece of legislation. The government, in their overzealous drive to beef up their public image and public relations, has created the Jobs Fund, and I think the majority of people in Manitoba recognize that.

They have here today, of course, tried to use another tactic, namely, to taunt the opposition into voting against this particular piece of legislation. I can tell the members opposite that, No. 1, I don't agree with the establishment of this Jobs Fund because we have said time and time again, that it is taking existing programs and putting it into another appropriation. Mr. Speaker, I have no problem in supporting programs such as the Community Assets Program which really is - what? - it's the old Municipal Loans Fund. That's really what it is.

Mr. Speaker, they are using dollars that would have been used in the Highways Department, and then they go ahead and say that that's a new program and something is going to happen with it. Mr. Speaker, our highways are deteriorating and, if they want to try and take some more political credit because they're going to spend more money on highways, I'll support that move because I think, in the final analysis whether it be in the Highways Department Budget, in the Jobs Fund or wherever it is, as long as those certain things that are required by the people of Manitoba are done, and monies are spent on infrastructure, on things such as community assets and other things, I think is the type of thing that I can support.

So while I have no hesitation in saying that I think that the Jobs Fund is taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another and really all we're doing is transferring it from one line in the Budget to another one, I don't think that's the way it should be done. However, the members opposite want to try and beef up their image that way, and as long as they spend monies on capital programs which are needed by municipalities, which are needed on highways, Mr. Speaker, they can talk as much as they want about the publicity of it but I want to tell members opposite that I for one, in this particular case while I don't like the Jobs Fund, will be supporting some of the expenditures that they're making on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to spend a very few moments addressing some of the comments that have been made by members opposite in respect to what is probably the most significant and innovative program for job creation activities that this province has ever seen.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: That this country has ever seen.

HON. J. COWAN: As the Member for The Pas says - that this country has ever seen. And in fact if the other jurisdictions, the other provinces, and the Federal Government would undertake programs like this in their own areas, the country would be far better off for it and there would be a much lower unemployment rate across the land. We've asked them to do that. We've suggested it, and we've requested their assistance in

making this a nationwide program, but the fact is that Conservative Governments in other provinces, and a Liberal Government at the Federal level have refused to see the significance and the value of programs such as the Jobs Fund.

The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology indicated exactly why it is that we have such a program as this and I think it's worth repeating the fact that we, as a result not only of this program but of an innovative focus on job creation activities in this province, on work by the average Manitoban, hard dedicated commitment to the economy and by co-operation with the private sector and the co-operative sector, have been able to do what that government wanted to do during the four years they were in power and were unable to do and that is to bring us into first-place position in respect to the unemployment rate in this province.

I remember, in opposition, encouraging members opposite when they had the mantle of power and the opportunity to do something to undertake programs exactly like this and they would not, and because they would not provide the type of opportunities that exist within the mandate of this program, we were never able to reach that position of being in the best position in respect to unemployment in this province.

It's not good enough to have the levels of unemployment that we have even although we are No. 1, Mr. Speaker, and that has to be repeated time and time again. The levels of unemployment that we have today are unacceptable. — (Interjection) — As the Member for Ste. Rose indicates, the NDP has consistently promoted the concept of full employment and we will not move away from that goal and objective. But in the meantime, it is programs like this that provide the type of economic opportunity that the young people of this province need, that those who are out of work because of conditions not of their own doing, and who want to have work have an opportunity to participate in a meaningful way in the economy.

So don't let them stand in their place day after day and talk about a "fraud" fund, and talk about the type of activity such as bicycle paths that are, in their minds, indicative of this program and then turn around and vote in favour of it.

That is why we are requesting the vote today. We are requesting the vote today because they should not be allowed the luxury of saying out of one side of their mouths that this program is unacceptable to them, but at the same time attempting to leave the impression in the public's mind that they support many of the activities within it.

So we're giving them opportunity when we're calling for the vote on this particular issue, and that opportunity is to be truthful with the people of Manitoba and indicate where it is they stand on this sort of a program that has provided the benefits to the province that it has. If they believe it is a good program, and if they believe that there is some reason to have a program such as this, then they'll stand and vote in favour of it and they can do no other. If they believe that it is not a good program, and that's what they've been saying inside this House and outside this House, then they will have the courage of their convictions to tell the people of Manitoba exactly where it is they stand on the Jobs Fund.

So I don't want them to look at it as something that is meant to embarrass them. It is an opportunity that we are providing to them to allow them to have a chance to tell the people of Manitoba exactly what it is in a definitive way yes or no, aye or nay, how they feel about the Jobs Fund of Manitoba.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I want to address this bill and the remarks that have been made by the Ministers, and speak to the challenge that members of the government have offered to this side.

I want to say, first of all, Mr. Speaker, that the biggest problem with this government and the biggest difficulty we have with this bill is that you can't believe that government. They have no credibility. Aside from the incompetence that they have shown day by day since they were elected, they simply lack any credibility. Now why do I say that? This bill refers to - it's the purpose of the act to mobilize available resources, to support improved co-operation among all sectors in the economy, and additional private and public investment in the province.

Mr. Speaker, this follows along the comments in the Throne Speech back on April 12th where they said that one of the most important prerequisites for a stable long-term economic development is a healthy co-operative relationship between labour and management. Manitoba has benefited from an excellent industrial relations climate, etc. They went on to say, my government has emphasized that the development of our province is a shared responsibility of all sectors, all partners. They've gone on to talk about, my Ministers will bring forward proposals for extending and strengthening consultative arrangements with the private sector.

They emphasize co-operation and consultation with the private sector, Mr. Speaker, but then they introduced Bill 22, The Act to amend The Labour Relations Act. What did the private sector say, Mr. Speaker? The Canadian Manufacturers Association said, we believe this bill will serve as a deterrent to harmonious labour-management relations, individual freedoms and rights in the potential to attract new and additional and outside investment to the province.

The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Speaker, said - the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce calls on the Government of Manitoba to return to the publicly proclaimed policy of the Premier of Manitoba, namely, to improve economic performance by sincere attempts to achieve consensus as a foundation to progress. They asked the government to defer passage of the bill.

The Mining Association indicated that they're extremely concerned as to the negative effect on the industrial sector and citizens of Manitoba by Bill 22.

Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Fashion Institute . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. MERCIER: . . . I appreciate your concerns, Mr. Speaker. I'm speaking to the statement in this bill, the principle in this bill, where the government talks about improved co-operation among . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I note that Bill 22 is on the Order Paper for debate this very day and the fact that the bill before us is Bill 14, the honourable member shouldn't stray too much from the point.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your concern. What I'm trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is show how the statement in Bill 14, The Jobs Fund Act, where the government talks about improved co-operation among all sectors in the economy, consultation with the private sector, etc., they simply cannot be believed because they said those things in the Throne Speech, then they introduced Bill 22 contrary to those statements. There is no co-operation with respect to that bill, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, this government cannot be believed when they make these statements in Bill 14. The fact of the matter is that this government simply cannot be believed. It has no credibility aside from being incompetent, Mr. Speaker.

Members opposite, if they're asking me, as a member of this Legislature, to stand up and vote for this statement by this government, Mr. Speaker, I can't do that because I don't believe that they will do that, that they will co-operate and will support the private sector. They haven't with respect to Bill 22 despite what they said in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is the proposed third reading of Bill 14.

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

YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Banman, Blake, Bucklaschuk, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Dolin, Downey, Enns, Eyler, Filmon, Fox, Hammond, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Hyde, Johnston, Kostyra, Kovnats, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Oleson, Parasiuk, Penner, Phillips, Santos, Sherman, Storie, Uskiw.

NAYS

Graham, Manness, Mercier, Nordman, Orchard.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 35; Nays, 5.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly passed.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

Bill No. 15 was read a third time and passed.

BILL NO. 16 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CHILD WELFARE ACT

HON. A. ANSTETT presented Bill No. 16, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a few comments with regard to this particular piece of legislation and generally the way the government has handled the Children's Aid Society. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has happened in the last year is that I believe all members of the Legislature suddenly have received calls from people who are involved, in one way or another, with the operations of the Children's Aid Society. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in the many years that I've been here this has not been a contentious issue out there. But what has happened with the government's mishandling of this particular situation is you've created a problem now which didn't exist before.

So it's one of these things where the watch was ticking fairly well until somebody decided to take it apart and see what made it run, and now is trying desperately to put it back together again. For some reason they've forgotten a few parts and it's just not working.

I've had calls, Mr. Speaker, from foster parents who are unhappy the way the system works. I've had calls from caseworkers who will tell you that the situation is such that the turmoil there really leaves everybody in a state of flux and nobody really knows what the next move is going to be. The management doesn't know what's happening. You've got a situation which was raised by the Member for Rhineland here the other day where at an annual meeting there were only what? Four or five people showed up to administrate a multi-million dollar budget.

So I say to members opposite, if this is indeed another example of how you're trying to streamline the operations or make something work better, I want to tell them that they're making a dismal failure of this particular thing also. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the problem that we've come down to, the caseworkers will look after themselves, the foster parents will work out their problems, but the people that really suffer in this whole government debacle is, of course, the children and those are the ones we seem to lose sight of when we deal in legislation of this nature and deal in a loose way with the agencies that are supposed to No. 1, have their priority based in trying to help the children who are, in many cases, being deprived of either a good home, are being abused, or just cannot be looked after properly.

So I say to members opposite, let's get on with looking after the people who this particular act is supposed to help, and that's the children. It's The Children's Welfare Act that we're dealing with and we're not dealing with the welfare of people sitting on the boards or people who have their own axe to grind because of certain things happening in society. It's the children that should be our main concern and I say to the members opposite that in the last year-and-a-half that has not been the guiding force in dealing with this and, as a result, Manitoba and the children that really need the attention of foster parents, need the attention of caseworkers, and need the attention of a society, have really suffered.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

**BILL 17 - AN ACT TO AMEND
THE DENTAL MECHANICS' ACT**

HON. L. DESJARDINS presented, by leave, Bill No. 17, An Act to amend The Dental Mechanics' Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to register objections to and criticisms of this act before it receives the guaranteed passage that I'm sure it's going to get due to the numerical makeup of the House.

We on our side have serious concerns about The Dental Mechanics' Act and they were voiced at second reading by my colleague, the Honourable Member for River Heights, in part; voiced in part by me and then raised again last night in the Committee of Statutory Regulations and Orders during which the bill was considered on a clause-by-clause basis by others of my colleagues, including the Honourable Member for Minnedosa and myself.

It is not my intention to repeat those criticisms, Sir, but if I may just take a minute to capsule our basic objections lie in the fact that this piece of legislation seems to be placing in the hands of some 52 dental mechanics in the Province of Manitoba, complete control over their licensing, their admissions, their regulation and the affairs of their organization.

I think that it contains the potential seeds of extreme difficulties for any Minister of Health to vest that much power and authority in an association of that size. I don't think that the numerical strength of the association is there to supervise and administer and regulate its affairs in the way that we Manitobans have come to expect regulation and control and responsible conduct of affairs among our health occupations and disciplines and professions. So I think there is a clear warning sign there for the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the changes contemplated by this act do not bring difficulty and grief to the Minister, whoever he or she may be.

We don't like the proposed makeup of the board. The fact that the makeup of the board is being changed to exclude dentists, or at least if it doesn't exclude dentists in specific wording, it excludes them by implication. The previous wording stipulated that dentists had to be on the board. Now that is changed to specify four denturists and two other persons, Mr. Speaker.

We don't like the fact that there is no qualified, established program of training, program of achievement of excellence that can be guaranteed that would enable the public to have the kind of professional faith in the organization that we believe is necessary.

We believe that the title, dentist, should be reserved for those dental mechanics who have, or who in the future do complete a qualified training course. So all those objections are objections that we want to note once again for the record, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, we found so much difficulty with Bill 17 that we found the only way we could deal with it at committee

stage was simply to vote against each page of the bill, to deal with it on division, because any amendments would have necessitated sub-amendments and further amendments of such a sweeping nature that it would have decimated the whole bill.

In our view, the best position taken on this bill was that expressed by Dr. Ted Hechter, the President of the Manitoba Dental Association, who suggested that Bill 17 should be scrapped and the whole situation with respect to dental mechanics and their legislation should be reviewed, examined very thoroughly and that new proposals, new legislation should follow from that kind of exercise, that the current legislation is fraught with difficulties.

So we want to place those concerns on the record, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, because I was in another committee and was unable to attend the committee regarding Bill 17, I wasn't able to put my opinions or thoughts on the record regarding this bill. I voted against it in second reading.

I am very surprised that this bill is in this Legislature at the present time. I'm surprised at the member that introduced it to the Legislature, and I'm surprised at the Minister of Health.

When this bill was introduced several years ago, The Dental Mechanics' Act, there was a committee of this Legislature that worked for close to six months examining all the aspects of this particular subject. It was very thoroughly worked on and there was a lot of thought went behind it. Quite frankly, I don't understand the Minister of Health allowing this bill to come to this House after the period of time that has passed without a lot more further study before he agrees to allow somebody without the proper training to work on live teeth within the mouth.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to explain it is, the dental mechanic is a man trained to work with almost pottery or clay. He has no education whatsoever to work on live teeth within the mouth.

Mr. Speaker, I assure you that this piece of legislation should not be brought forward. There should be a much more thorough study done before it's allowed and, Mr. Speaker, I think it's an absolute shame that the Minister of Health would allow it.

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

MR. B. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I only have a couple of minutes of remarks to make, not because this is the most fundamental philosophical difference between the two sides, but because the preceding two members who have spoken, I think, have misdirected themselves. It should be a part of the record that they are with respect to one point - and it's a very substantive and fundamental point and if I agreed with them I would vote with them - but I have checked the law, and I have checked it carefully with Mr. Tallin and Mr. Balkaran the legislative counsel; I asked questions last night at committee, and I am satisfied and I believe that

legislative counsel are satisfied that the amendments to this particular piece of legislation will not confer the outright privilege upon a denturist - formerly a dental mechanic - to work in a situation where there are live teeth present in the mouth.

Those of us who were present last night and heard Dr. Hechter speak on behalf of the Manitoba Dental Association, I think were at least moved to concern about some of the representations he made respecting the possible consequences that could flow from that type of situation.

I am satisfied that the Minister still has final regulatory authority with respect to his jurisdiction, to set standards. Subject to the Minister doing that, I am satisfied that he has the authority to do that. So I don't feel that the members are correct in their assumption that somehow there has been a derogation or a reduction of jurisdiction or authority on the part of the government as represented by the Minister of Health in this regard.

Secondly, there is a clear proscription against a dental mechanic working in a situation where there are live teeth in the mouth without a prescription given by a dentist. The Member for Fort Garry who is showing a fine, I might add, mouth of teeth at the moment should be aware that that section - I don't have the act before me but I think it's under Section 6 of the now Dental Mechanics' Act - makes provision for that protection; that only a dentist can give a prescription which would authorize a dental mechanic - now to be called a denturist - the right to work in a mouth where live teeth are present. I was going to say something that was absolutely uncalled for, I'm sure, which would only protract and prolong this Session for at least another four hours. In this case, discretion will be the better part of valor, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I am satisfied that we have regulatory authority, Mr. Deputy Speaker, through the Minister's office and I'm satisfied that we have not given that sort of wide authority to dental mechanics with respect to live teeth in the mouth.

The other remarks that were made with respect to the capacity of this particular profession or trade to be self-governing are, I think, generally true. There, I concur with my learned colleagues and friends from across the way, I don't have the same concerns about the implications but, I think, that the Minister of Health should be vigilant and should be watchful. I think that if there are circumstances or cases that arise which indicate that because there is an absence of proper certification process in this province, that demonstrate that there have been cases of negligence or improper training or negligent conduct, the Minister of Health may have to intercede and either change the legislation or take some dramatic course of action in order to make sure that the public interest is protected.

Thank you.

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

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of minutes, I don't want to prolong the debate, but it scares the living daylights out of me, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I've got to agree with the

Honourable Member for Ellice in a lot of the things that he has just said. That really does bother me, but I do have to agree with some of the things that he did say.

I have spoken in favour of this bill before and I'll speak again in favour of this bill, if I can get it out through all of this marble and clay pottery in my mouth. Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting this bill. I can't see anything wrong in calling a dental mechanic, a denturist. What's in a name? I think, by and large, that's the whole of what the opposition has been and some of the thing of working with live teeth in the mouth - I really just don't think that is the problem. I think that they are not given complete authority to become makeshift dentists. That's not what this is about and I will be supporting this bill.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. H. ENNS: On division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On division? Passed on division.

The Honourable Minister of Health.

Bills No. 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 26 by leave, 28 on division, 29, 31 by leave, and 32 by leave were each read a third time and passed.

BILL NO. 35 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY WAGES ACT

HON. L. DESJARDINS presented, by leave, Bill No. 35, An Act to amend The Construction Industry Wages Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a few brief comments with regard to this bill. My colleagues and I have repeatedly over the last few months drawn to the Minister's attention some of the areas of this bill which are so inflexible that they really act as a barrier for people who wish to hire young students to work in their workplace.

Mr. Speaker, we noticed yesterday when we went out to look at the yard here with the Government Services Minister that, in talking to some of the employees that were working on this yard, they are receiving - the one student we talked to - \$4 an hour. Mr. Speaker, while he would of course like to paid more, he was happy that he had a job. What I am saying to the Minister is that certainly there should be some way that we can be more flexible to accommodate the employer and the employee so that, upon a mutually agreed upon wage, those particular people can work and employment that is much needed for the youth of this province is created. So I plead with the Minister to look at this section, and put in some flexibility to deal with these number of items that we have raised.

The other item, of course, which has been raised by some of my colleagues is the one dealing with the problem the municipalities are having. It doesn't deal with this specific amendment which he has put forward, but it does deal with The Construction Wages Act.

So I would encourage her to try and accommodate and be flexible enough so that it isn't the rule per se and just the bureaucratic way of doing things just because it's easier and, just because it's there, we're going to have to do it that way. Surely we can be flexible enough and give some of our young people in this province an opportunity to work, an opportunity to make a few dollars during the summer holidays or during the recess out of the university.

So, Mr. Speaker, I implore the Minister to employ some flexibility when dealing with The Construction Wages Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few comments, the Minister of Labour might recall in her Estimates from a year ago that I brought to her attention a problem that the municipalities were having in terms of their contractual arrangements, their hiring and wage schedule arrangements with their employees. At that time a year ago, she said that she would take that under advisement, and I know that the municipalities, the UMM, have been meeting with the Minister of Labour over the past year.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, is a circumstance where the municipalities will make a monthly salary arrangement with their employees. Part of the time those municipal employees will operate equipment which will cause them to fall under the wage schedule of The Construction Industry Wages Act because they operate bulldozers, maintainers, road graders, etc. Now the municipal employees don't work year-round at that, but they want 12 months' employment so they accept a prorated salary year-round.

The Minister's department started last year going out to the municipalities and because, at some point in time, probably each employee of the municipalities was operating a piece of equipment which fell under this act, the Minister's department required them to pay, retroactively, substantially higher wages, and you had the incredible circumstance where 20-year employees were being paid only about \$500 per year more than an employee that was hired for his first year, because it just so happened they operated the grader or they operated the bulldozer and because of that both of them fell under this wage construction.

Now unbeknownst to the municipalities and to everybody until Monday of last week no one knew that if you made a wage arrangement and it wasn't protested within 30 days that wage arrangement would be quite legitimate. The municipalities didn't know that. Now that they do, they would like to see the Minister simply leave this clause in place because this solves their problem. All of their municipal employees are under an agreement in which they are satisfied with a 12 month prorated salary. But the Minister doesn't want to listen to the municipalities, and the Minister has been working with the municipalities for over 12 months now and she probably will continue to do nothing for

them, but it is a serious problem they're faced with. It is one they have been after this government for better than 12 months.

Mr. Speaker, from time to time, we get terribly frustrated with this Minister of Labour that purports to be such a resounding wealth of knowledge. She doesn't understand that it was regulation changes that have taken place very recently that have rolled municipal . . . and she is correct when she points her finger saying they were passed in 1981. That's right. They were interpreted by her staff in 1982 when we started asking her to change it. It is now 1984, and she has done nothing.

The municipalities are not pleased with this level of inactivity by this Minister and this government. They talk over there; the Premier stands on his feet and talks about us being the knockers and them being the doers. They have been asked to do something for the municipalities for over a year-and-a-half, and they have done nothing. This amendment would suffice if it was removed, because the clause that's in the act allows this arrangement on payment to go on unchallenged by the Heavy Construction Wage Board.

But what is this Minister doing? Deleting that protection. Is she replacing it with any recognition of the municipalities' problems? Absolutely not, because this government doesn't listen to people from rural Manitoba. This government doesn't listen to the municipal councillors.

The problem this government has is that they've got an incompetent Minister of Municipal Affairs that can't talk to the Minister of Labour and explain the problem they have to her so she does something for the municipalities. That's a shame, Mr. Speaker. They're going to have to wait until the government changes to get something done to help them and to benefit them and their employees.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

A MEMBER: On division.

MR. SPEAKER: On division.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

REPORT STAGE

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, when we reconvened at 2:00 p.m. this afternoon there was distributed a Report Stage amendment for Bill 22. We have not had sufficient notice of that Report Stage amendment, Sir, so I would ask leave to move it.

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

The Honourable Government House Leader.

BILL 22 - THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour

THAT Bill 22, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act and Various Other Acts of the Legislature, be amended by striking out Section 47 thereof as amended in the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations, and substituting therefor the following section:

Commencement of Act

47 This act comes into force on January 1, 1985.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you require the amendment read? Does the House concur in the amendment?

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the mover of the motion, in view of the fact that the proposed amendment was in the bill approximately 15 hours ago and was amended earlier this morning in committee, and in view of the fact the Minister now wishes to revert to what was in the Bill 15 hours ago, could he explain the reasons for this motion and could he inform the House as to whether this Minister or this government or this Minister of Labour have any idea what they're doing with respect to this act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, there originally was an intent to have part of the act come into force upon Royal Assent, as the members know. The Member for La Verendrye made some comments on this and "upon sober second thought," if I may quote some of the members opposite, we believe that he may have been correct and it would be best to provide a good, thorough knowledge of the various facets of these amendments to The Labour Relations Act, to all of those who will be affected by them and we will be doing this between now and first of January.

QUESTION put on the amendment; MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The question on the bill, as amended. Is it the pleasure of the House to concur in the bill, Bill No. 22?

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, for clarification, are we on third reading of the bill now?

MR. SPEAKER: No.

QUESTION put on the bill, as amended, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

THIRD READING

**BILL 22 - AN ACT TO AMEND
THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT AND
VARIOUS
OTHER ACTS OF THE LEGISLATURE**

HON. A. ANSTETT presented, by leave, Bill 22, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act and Various Other Acts of the Legislature, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I was to sum up in one word the underlying concern by everybody and the question most often asked of me and by the different people that are concerned about this bill, the word is, "why?"

Mr. Speaker, it came out clearly during the committee hearings. It came out loud and clear in almost all the presentations that we heard, even from the people presenting briefs on behalf of labour, that Manitoba does have and has enjoyed over the last five years, relatively good labour relations in this province. We have a record which many provinces in Canada would be envious of. The question then of course arises and has arisen is, why tamper with the legislation when it's working? If it's working, why try and fix it? That, I would say, was probably the most common thread that ran through all the presentations that we heard in the committee.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, the one thing that people of Manitoba are starting to find out, and it was highlighted back about a year ago when we went through the one major issue which has really dominated the last two years in Manitoba, and that, of course, was the French language issue, but there were two things that happened at that particular time which I think I would like to just touch on briefly now, because I think it might shed some light on why this government has adopted this approach at this time.

When we were in the final months of dealing with the French language issue, the extension of services in Manitoba, what happened was that the public suddenly realized that there were two other issues that flowed from that one that they were concerned about. No. 1 is the people out there could not understand why the government, when knowing they had 85 to 90 percent of the people against them on that particular bill, would proceed. They could not believe, they did not understand the system where a group of individuals who were elected could go ahead and fly directly into the face of what the people really wanted, and how the members opposite - the question we were all asked - how can they really do this when so many people are against it? That was the one issue.

But one which is more important and I think which was much more subtle and one which a lot of people on the street would have a hard time explaining until you would sit down and talk to them about it, and that is the one where they couldn't understand that the government was so out of touch with what the people really wanted - in other words, they did not read the mood of the people - that they became somewhat frightened that individuals across the way, the New Democratic Government of the day, was so out of touch with the true feelings of the people that they would move on this before really sensing what kind of pitfalls they were going to be involved in.

Mr. Speaker, what happened in that issue is that there was an agreement struck by a few people to bring in that legislation. One of the things that I believe we have seen happen with the labour bill, to compare that type of mentality of members opposite, is precisely those two areas again dominating the thoughts of the average person on the street. Mr. Speaker, they have once again misread the mood of the people. They have, I believe, made a deal with a handful of people who wanted to see some labour changes and those people were

identified by several of the individuals that made presentations before the committee. Those were the large labour bosses and that I believe is what is at the crux. The government has paid off a political debt to those people, but the thing that they have misread is that, No. 1 - and you can talk to anybody that's doing national polling or trying to read what consensuses are in this country - is that the mood is not for more and tighter authority being granted to labour leaders in this country. The swing is the other way, and they have misread the mood of the people of Manitoba and the mood of the country by introducing this legislation. It is another example of how this government has lost touch and lost the confidence of the people of Manitoba.

What I'm saying to members opposite is that you have, I believe, made a deal with a few individuals and really have gone ahead and betrayed the trust that the majority of people in Manitoba had put in you three years ago. This will be another nail in the election coffin of members opposite, and goodness knows, Mr. Speaker, I think there's hardly a place where another nail can be driven into that coffin because it's so full of nails and one of the biggest problems I guess anybody's going to have is trying to move that thing around because it's so full of lead by now.

But let's deal with another concern that people have. They purport that one of their biggest election promises was that they were going to listen. We saw a classic case of listening this last couple of days. They went ahead and set up public hearings to hear representation. Then what did they do? They had the person that was conducting the public hearings go ahead and make a private report to the Minister. We haven't even seen that report. As we've mentioned often, we think since it was a public hearing, it should be a public report.

So they went ahead and then put out a White Paper. Fine, the people had a chance to respond to the White Paper and then, of course, they used a trick that their union boss friends like to use. They put a lot into the White Paper and said they were going to do a lot of things and then, of course, withdrew the final-offer selection package and said, "Look, we were way over, now we've given them this much, so you should be happy." That, of course, Mr. Speaker, is one of the tricks that we have seen this government employ several times. Now, we've got a situation where people are, as I mentioned earlier, asking the question, "Why?"

I will not this afternoon, even though I'm tempted to, Mr. Speaker, deal with some of the aspects of the bill which I think will serve to, rather than enhance labour relations in this province, cause more friction between the employer as well as the employee.

I want to reiterate one thing that I said last night at the closing of this bill just before it passed through Committee, is that one of the things Manitoba has constantly been able to do is maintain a relatively good labour calm in the province. The labour relations in this province have been pretty good. One of the reasons for that is that the labour relations bill is not changed substantially when successive governments come in.

We saw some fairly substantial changes made in '72. The bill worked into the system. The previous Conservative Government did not make any substantial changes to that bill, and there was a reason for that, Mr. Speaker. There is a danger that if different governments start making radical changes to labour

legislation, we will have the pendulum-swinging effect. Then, from time to time, you'll have a government in that will change the legislation dramatically in favour of the labour movement because they owe them some favours for past election work.

Then, of course, when a government that is not, Mr. Speaker, in the direct influence of the labour union, they will swing that pendulum back somewhat. So that instead of creating a good labour relations climate, all you're really doing is, No. 1, creating more divisiveness within society and within the management and labour fields.

Of course, the other thing which some of my colleagues pointed out last night and some of the labour lawyers that appeared before the committee readily admitted, that really everytime that happens it's a gold mine for anybody in the labour relations field. Some of the lawyers that specialize in that, of course, as Mr. Gardner put it last night, would probably make him even richer.

I say to members opposite that there is really nobody that benefits from this type of legislation except really the big union leaders, the multinational unions who want an ever-increasing hold not on the membership per se, but on the bureaucracy that they build.

Mr. Speaker, I hasten to add that I have mentioned in this Legislature time and time again that when you're looking at big governments, big unions and big business, they are all tough and they all have to be controlled to a certain extent because they become so big, so large that they lose sight of why they're really there and what their real purpose is.

One thing that this bill does, I believe, is it loses sight of the fact that Manitoba is basically a province of small employers and this bill will allow the larger multinational unions, it will make it easier for them to organize those small employers, and it pits an individual who has relatively no knowledge about unions, about the complicated acts that are before us, he or she will now have to deal with somebody who, of course, has the money and the wherewithal to put them at an unfair disadvantage.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe the government has not listened to the people. I believe they have once again portrayed and displayed their lack of understanding of what the people of Manitoba really want and what they really need. This bill is not needed at this time; statistics prove that out. The majority of people of Manitoba do not want this bill. I think that is going to be very evident in the next little while when people start dealing with this bill because a lot of them aren't aware of how it's going to affect them right now.

I will say to the Minister that it is my belief that this bill should not be passed at this time. It should, as pointed out by the Chamber of Commerce, have been introduced, it have been held over till the next Session of the Legislature so that some consensus could be arrived at in dealing with this bill.

We have said that some of the bill has been drafted very hastily. We talked about that yesterday. We had 40 amendments last night and here we are making another amendment today which last night, at 2 o'clock in the morning, I suggested and I say to the Minister that I am glad with regard to that - they saw the error of their ways - but we had an amendment last night to change it and this morning we are changing it again

a mere 15 hours later. It shows how hastily this particular bill was drafted and put through without enough thought going into it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to members opposite that they do the people of Manitoba a favour and support the motion which I am about to put forward because it will be in the best interests of the people of Manitoba; maybe not a few small pressure groups that they want to cater to but, in the final analysis, it's in the best interests of the people of Manitoba.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Morris, that Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act, be not now read a third time, but be read six months hence.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel compelled to speak on the hoist motion on Bill 22 because I believe, Sir, that it's the best and the only answer to the dilemma that the government has placed us in today.

That, Sir, is the position of having for the first time, perhaps, in a decade to consider legislation that would throw out the balance of equality that exists between employers and labour in Manitoba today; that balance of equality, Sir, that has been acknowledged as existing by almost everyone who appeared before the committee over the last few days; those long hours of sitting that many of us attended and listened to briefs that were well-documented, well-presented and well-thought out, Mr. Speaker, over and over and over again.

In fact, members who were there will recall that members on either the government side or our side invariably asked the presenters, "Do you believe that over the past while Manitoba has had a relatively good climate for harmonious labour relations in this province?" One after another, they said, "Yes, yes, yes."

The only one who hedged on that, Mr. Speaker, was the president of the Manitoba Federation of Labour because he knew that he couldn't say an unqualified "yes" because if he did, he would have cut the ground out from under his stand in support of the legislation. So he said, "Yes, it has been very good up until recently." I asked, "What happened recently to change that?" He said, "The Chamber of Commerce started running these full page ads and that has destroyed the harmonious climate that existed in Manitoba up until this point on labour management relations."

Well, Mr. Speaker, you have to say to yourself then, "What caused the ad?" The answer very simply is that the ad was caused by Bill 22. If that ad, caused by Bill 22, destroyed the harmonious climate of labour relations in this province, then Bill 22 destroyed the harmonious climate for labour relations in this province. That, Sir, is the inescapable conclusion.

That, Sir, is why this government continues to demonstrate that it's unfit to govern; that it takes a situation that exists today, a situation that, for the most part, serves people well, and it insists on getting involved. If something works, don't try and fix it. This

government takes a look around to find whatever works in society and is determined to destroy it. It is determined to ruin it. Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what we are faced with with respect to Bill 22 today.

When you consider how this government has pulled in its horns, how this government, that pro-activist group of people who told the people of Manitoba that they would turn around society; that they would change the economic structure; that they would solve all the problems; that they would not stand by idly and just allow Manitoba to continue in it; that group of people, Sir, who have turned into pussycats, who have turned into a do-nothing government; a government that put before us the lightest legislative load in over a decade because they were terrified of doing anything that might invoke any negative public response that might invoke a negative reaction from the opposition - the opposition that had blackened their eye, that had rubbed their nose in the dirt for two-and-a-half-years - they did that. They decided that they would do almost nothing.

The one major exception, aside from the housekeeping changes, Mr. Speaker, they chose to be Bill 22. Well that has to tell you where their priorities are. That has to tell you where the IOUs of the ND Party rest. That has to tell you who is holding the markers.

The markers, as was indicated in the committee on labour relations, are being held not by the workers of this province, not by the employees of this province, but by the bosses of the big labour unions, the executives of the labour organization in this province, Mr. Speaker.

We saw them come out to committee. We saw the fact that in the first two days, in the first two sittings of the committee, they were getting devastated; they were being hammered; they were being tarred and feathered and drawn and quartered.

So what happened on the third session? The clean-up hitter came out all the way from Ottawa. Dick Martin came in to save this government again, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I am having some difficulty hearing the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: I am having some difficulty hearing myself speak, Mr. Speaker. I realize, Sir, that my words are falling on very sensitive ears. They are falling on the ears of people across the way who realize, Mr. Speaker, how divided they are in their own caucus; who recognize, Sir, that . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

May I remind honourable members that they will have the same opportunity to put their opinion forward as the present member.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, so here is this group opposite who couldn't decide whether they do nothing, or whether they would try for one home-run pitch, one

home-run ball this Session, and they chose this labour legislation. As I say, it demonstrates where their priorities are; it demonstrates where their obligations are. Mr. Speaker, this group opposite of course were terrified of even this bill. It passed their caucus, as we understand, by a narrow margin - two or three.

Mr. Speaker, they are putting on a brave front but, of course, they have adopted the "What, me worry?" attitude, the Alfred E. Newman approach to government. They are so far down in the polls. — (Interjection) — We have Alfred E. Newman from the back row pointing at me, on the far side.

The Member for Thompson, Mr. Speaker, is indicating that he's very much in favour of this legislation, and that this is going to be his salvation when he campaigns in the next election. Well, I can tell him, Mr. Speaker, as I can tell anybody in this room, that nothing will save him from all of the sins of this government, the sins of omission and commission that have been visited upon all of them that are evident to all of the voters in this province today. Mr. Speaker, that's why they are so far down in the polls that nobody even knows where they are any more when it comes to government in Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that they have chosen as their priority, of all things, to change the balance of relations that exists in labour today in Manitoba. They have done it contrary to the wishes of the vast, vast majority of Manitobans, Mr. Speaker. They have demonstrated that they don't care to listen any more to ordinary Manitobans who have ideas, who have concerns that must be listened to, that must be shared, and they no longer care.

Mr. Speaker, when some of those ordinary Manitobans, through their various organizations, come forward with legitimate concerns, present their views in a public forum, try and discuss them with the government, what happens? They become attacked in public.

The Minister of Labour says they are crazy. Crazy, she says, about the Chambers of Commerce and the employer groups in this province. She said there will be no negative impact on job creation when all of the various groups of people who are involved in job creation in this province say to the Minister unequivocally that this cannot help job creation, that this will provide a further roadblock, a further disincentive.

Mr. Speaker, all of these people speak, and the Ministers of the Crown close their ears and shut them off and say, "It's ludicrous; it's just a fear campaign; it's crazy." All of those wonderful accolades for the people who really want to take risks, to invest, to create jobs to get people working in this province, and they get slapped in the face by the Ministers of this Crown.

Well, we know exactly what we're dealing with. Of course, we have known for the better part of two-and-a-half years, but the interesting thing about this particular issue is now the public knows what we are dealing with in government. They know that we're dealing with some ideologically, hidebound people who care not for the wishes and the interests of the average Manitoban.

Mr. Speaker, despite the onerous time constraints of the past week, I have been trying to keep up with the correspondence and the contacts in my office with

people from throughout the province. Of course, the members opposite would like us to believe that it is only just big business and sort of the organization of management people in this province who have expressed concern. But I can tell you that many of the contacts that I have had, literally tens and twenties and dozens of contacts, have been with small business people: the owner of a small convenience store, the owner of a small manufacturing operation, owners of operations throughout the province who have been absolutely flabbergasted by this government's intense desire to destroy job creation in this province.

They can't believe, Mr. Speaker, what they are seeing in this government, because they know that the government is inept. They know the government is incompetent. They know the government has demonstrated over the past two-and-a-half years that they are totally incapable of managing the affairs of this province. At least, Mr. Speaker, they believed that this was a government of people who would listen and translate what they heard into actions on behalf of the populace of Manitoba. But my, how they have been betrayed!

They are saying to themselves now, will this government now not show us anything of which we can be proud, anything in which we can have confidence? Now they won't even listen. That's what it has gotten to, Mr. Speaker.

When you look at their incompetence and the evidence of their incompetence, I just want to tell you for the record, Mr. Speaker, about this series of amendments that they presented us with last evening, something over 40 amendments that had been drafted prior to the committee hearings because they bear no relationship to the presentations to committee over the last two days. They are amendments that are before us, or were before us last night in committee, for one reason and one reason only. They are amendments of a technical nature that have to do with picking up drafting errors, that have to do with changing mistakes because of the haste with which this bill was brought forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Member for The Pas is unable to listen to my remarks, because he said that these amendments last night prove that the government was listening. He didn't even know what these amendments were about, because they have nothing to do - he wasn't listening - with the presentations before committee over the last three days; absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker, all to pick up errors and mistakes of shoddy draftsmanship because of the haste with which this government proceeded on its ill-starred course on this legislation.

This legislation is devastating, Mr. Speaker, to the cause of small business development and small business operation in this province. This makes it easier to certify bargaining units, more difficult to decertify, and it puts everything in the hands of the might and power of the organized labour unions, the big labour unions in this province. All we have to do is just look at what we are putting together and see who is possibly going to come out on top on this confrontation.

Well, we've got a small employer with perhaps 30 employees who has worked and struggled and saved to acquire something that he has built upon and that he has expanded to create jobs in his community, and

he is going to be faced with a move to certify by a multinational labour union.

Just the night before last, we were told about the size and the might of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union internationally, 1.2 million members, Mr. Speaker. Do you know what legal, financial and organizational power they have? They can come into this province and they can overtake any organization regardless of the size. They have the might and the vested interest to be able to come in and overcome the wishes and the will of the any small employer in this province. I can assure you of that. There is no contest.

You want to talk about an even battle, an even fight. There is no contest whatsoever, and that's who is going to be hit: the little bakery shops, the independent grocers, the small general stores, the small manufacturers. They are now totally at the mercy and under the might and power of the major multinational unions of this country.

If you want to talk about good faith, because what the members opposite say when they are put into a corner on this thing is: Why are you so concerned about the power of unions? Why aren't you concerned about the power of business? This is all good faith. This is all based on the good faith of the people in the union. They, too, act in good faith. They, too, want to be able to create employment and expand and do things in the interest of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you why we are concerned, because the statistics that have been put forward in committee and in discussion in a public forum about this show that almost all of the days lost due to strikes and labour disputes in this province in the past two years have to do with only one union and its affiliates. That union that I just happened to mention with 1.2 million people in North America has caused almost all of our work disruptions in this province over the past two years.

Now you're going to tell me, Mr. Speaker, that we should make it easier for them to come in here and organize and certify and gain more power and more strength because of their good faith in dealing with the people that they deal with, their demonstrated good faith. That's what they are going to do for us is give us more of the same good faith.

Multiply the days lost; multiply the work disruptions; multiply all of those anxieties and all those problems that they have visited upon the labour management relations of this province, they will now be able to do with greater openness and with greater government support because that's what this bill does is to give them the free hand that they need.

We had Sid Green before the committee two nights ago, and he listed, case-by-case, the cases that led to the changes in this legislation. I said at committee, and it bears repeating, that the legal phrase that's used by lawyers is "hard cases make bad laws" and they have changed every one of the hard cases that caused a problem for various of their union leader friends into a change in legislation that found its way into Bill 22. They have collected on their IOUs and they have ensured that they will never again have to have a problem with respect to particular parts of the labour legislation of this province because their friends in government have repaid them with all of the things they've asked for in Bill 22.

So even though things were going well and even though these labour unions were having their way for the most part, and they were winning most of their cases - Mr. McGregor said he won far more of his cases than he ever lost - but he wanted to make sure that his record went from 90 percent to 100 percent by changing the legislation even more in the favour of the people that he represents in labour negotiations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a sad, sad day for Manitobans when they would take every single opportunity for the things that they believe in, for the right to free speech, those things that I have heard New Democrats talk about for years and years and years; the right to free speech, the right to equal opportunity, the right to balance equity and fairness and justice, all of those things taken away bit by bit, piece by piece, by changes to the labour legislation of our province. That's what we've got in Bill 22, Mr. Speaker.

They've taken away any opportunity for a cooling-off period after somebody comes in for a certification drive. No opportunity for the employees who had no idea that there was an attempt being made to certify a bargaining unit in their operation. They don't even have a voice in this process now under the new set-up, because once the cards are in and the numbers suit the numbers that are in the bill, it doesn't matter what anybody else who works in that business thinks. They don't have an opportunity to talk about it with their fellow employees, to counsel them about the pros and cons of a union certification, they don't have an opportunity for free speech; they have been disenfranchised by this government and Bill 22, Mr. Speaker. That's what they believe when it comes to free speech, that's what they believe when it comes to fairness, equity, and justice, Mr. Speaker.

Further to that, of course, the employer has no status to go before the Labour Board, even if he is aware of unfair labour practices that led to the certification process and application, he can't go there. The only thing that could happen is that a member of the firm could go to the labour union and charge certain things; coercion, intimidation, fraud, or imposition of pecuniary penalties, something like that. That kind of thing is all that can happen is that they can go to the Labour Board. Now, who is going to do that, Mr. Speaker? Who's going to go to the Labour Board and say the union organizers use coercion, intimidation, or fraud in organizing my fellow colleagues for this union? They're not going to do it, because they're afraid of the might of the big unions, the power of the organizers, and all of the things that they have behind them, including government support, Mr. Speaker.

All the way through, we have heard people like the Member for Thompson, the Member for Concordia, and others say this is what was said in 1972. I want to tell them, Mr. Speaker, that we heard last evening that in 1972, at least there was some consensus of the Labour Management Review Committee, some consensus to go forward with the changes that were there. Despite the fact that some employers and some employer representatives did criticize, did object, and did say strong things about that bill, there was still consensus from the group that is represented in the Labour Management Review Committee that said that we don't agree on everything, but we agree that both sides aren't going to be satisfied by this, therefore it's probably a balanced presentation.

In fact, over the past 14 years that's proven to be the case, that both sides have been not totally happy with the legislation as it existed. So, we have had equity, and we have had balance, and we have had both sides not totally happy with it. That led to equality and that is usually a good sign, because when people get together to negotiate whether or not they're going to make any sort of an agreement or an arrangement between two parties, whether it's talking with your children about what time they can come in at night and they have one idea and you have one idea and you arrive at something that isn't quite satisfactory to either of you, but it's an accepted thing and it's a consensual agreement. You go and try and buy a car from the Member for La Verendrye and he'll tell you that the best of all possible worlds is when each party goes away saying, well, I didn't do too badly. They both acknowledge one would have liked to have made a little more on the deal, the other would have liked to have gotten a better bargain, but they both come away from it saying, well, I'm relatively satisfied, that's the best that you can normally hope for.

It's a win/win situation, Mr. Speaker, but this government has insisted upon putting into place legislation that makes it win/lose.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, what a despicable attitude to take by the Government House Leader, to say that I'm equating used cars to the people of this province. I'm equating bargaining and agreements on any numbers of different issues upon which people disagree. I'm talking about people disagreeing on labour legislation, I'm talking about people disagreeing on rights and responsibilities with respect to contracts, and I'm talking about negotiations with respect to employment.

I'm telling him, just as one of his colleagues said the other evening, Mr. Speaker, when I was talking about the provisions that are in this bill and he said, well, if you don't like this then you're anti-union. I said absolutely not, I'm pro-jobs. I'm concerned about this legislation because I believe that there should be more opportunities for everyone in this province to have a job. I'm on the record as to what my feeling is for unions, what my background and history is with respect to unions, about my father having been a member of a union, and I am not anti-union. I am pro-jobs and pro-employment and I will stand up on any forum at any time and tell the people of this province that if they have sensible legislation, if they have a sensible approach to labour management relations, they will also have more jobs and more . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . benefits for all of the workers of this province. That's what I'm concerned about, Mr. Speaker, and I won't have the kind of nonsense given to us by the Government House Leader. — (Interjection)

— Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Thompson who was born with a silver spoon in his mouth wants to tell me about class relations in this province . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Our white wine socialist sitting in the back row who grew up having all of the benefits of society for him, and much more so than I did when I was growing up, wants to lecture me now about the status of people in this province.

Mr. Speaker, since 1972, we have had the situation where people on both sides of the equation were not totally happy with the legislation with respect to labour law, but it worked. The proof of the pudding was that we have had relatively harmonious labour relations in this province and both sides agreed before the Committee over the past two days. So, the question has to be if it's working, why are you changing it?

They're changing it because they have to remain in the good graces of the big labour leaders who support them, who work for them, and who are their muscle in this province, Mr. Speaker, that's the only reason. They have thrown away the concept of consensus of the Labour Management Review Committee that has existed in this province for almost two decades. They've thrown away the principle that was acknowledged for a decade and a half of having agreement, of having consensus in that Labour Management Review committee and, now, they have brought in things such as first contract legislation, such as these changes without having the consensus agreement of that Labour Management Review Committee.

Mr. Speaker, they're on the slippery slope to destroying labour-management relations in this province because they have made it abundantly clear that they no longer care to have consensus as long as they can favour their unions, they can fulfill their commitments to the small special interest groups who put them where they are. That's all that matters and that is a sad state, Mr. Speaker, that's a sad state of affairs.

So, they've taken away the discretion of the Minister or the Labour Board, no discretion with respect to first contract imposition, time limits that will lead to bad faith bargaining, Mr. Speaker, time limits placed upon it that will ensure that people on either side can say, depending on what they think will happen with the first contract, well I don't have to bargain because I'm going to get what I want. That's what they've done, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say this, that they keep saying first contract legislation is working in Manitoba. We don't much of a history, we don't have much to go on, Mr. Speaker, and we don't have any assessment of what will happen over a period of time. Mr. Speaker, in other jurisdictions where they have first contract legislation, in more than half of the instances in which first contracts have been imposed, they have eventually led to a decertification of the bargaining unit, because the unit was found, in some way, not to be operating in the best way of the people they represented. The use of force and coercion, the use of imposition of a first contract never did turn

out to be in the best interests of those people who are represented by the union. That's the assessment that should have been told about first contract legislation, not what the Minister of Labour has been telling us.

Mr. Speaker, they go so far as to even overrule or override the reasonable requests of people of religious faiths who want, as conscientious objectors, not to have to join a union. They won't even listen to them. These are the people who say they stand for minority rights. These are the people who say that they believe that people of all backgrounds, of all religions, races, creed, colour, whatever have you, should have fair and equal opportunity in society today and they totally ramrod and steamroll over top of the wishes of religious minorities, who, because of their teachings and beliefs, would choose not to join a union and they won't even listen to them. They won't even make even make provision for them in their legislation, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of insensitivity that we're dealing with in this government.

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader says that's not what the religious groups said in committee and he has just been informed of that by the Minister of Labour, who last night made an error when she made that statement and who is still wrong and I've got the transcript here that I'll read to her and the Government House Leader. Because clearly Pastor McIvor, when he appeared before committee, said, in response to the Honourable Minister of Labour who asked him the question, "Would a member of your faith who belonged to a union that had binding arbitration, would that be satisfactory membership in the eyes of perhaps your members?" He said and I repeat and I quote, "The teaching of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church is from our long relationship with labour unions, that we ask our members not to belong to labour unions. In every province across here," speaking of Canada, "as far as I know, in all of the experiences I've had, especially I should say, subjectively lately, I've had to appear many times before the Labour Board in Saskatchewan on behalf of our members and on the strength of the teaching of the church and of the conviction of the individual, they were awarded what you are seeking to come to here, but it doesn't quite state that the belief that members of the group are precluded from being members of."

So he is saying that the fact that this legislation says that the teaching must be that you're precluded from being a member of a union and he reconfirmed that that is not part of their teachings, you're not precluded, but they teach that they do not agree with or believe in being members of unions. That's their belief. That's the tenets of their faith and that he says is good enough in almost every other province of this country, but it's not good enough in Manitoba.

In Manitoba it is narrowly defined so that it satisfies the needs of the Plymouth Brethren, who are one group who obviously should be considered, but it also ignores the Seventh Day Adventists, the Mennonites and others who similarly believe, because of their religious teaching, that they should not have to be members of unions and their views and their feelings and their concerns and their religious beliefs are being steamrolled over by this insensitive government. That's what we have to deal with in this province today, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say that this bill does not come into effect until January 1, 1985, so we indeed, as of today, still

have more than six months before this bill comes into effect. I urge members opposite and all members of the House to vote for the six-month hoist, to delay it, to allow for the Labour Management Review Committee to arrive at consensus, so that we will continue to have the good harmonious climate for labour relations that we need in Manitoba, so that we will continue to have the climate that will attract job creation in our province for the benefit of all Manitobans, Mr. Speaker. I urge all members of the House to support the motion of the Member for La Verendrye and let this bill go aside until we can achieve the consensus we need for the betterment of all the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have no intention of going into any great length about this bill. I did so on second reading, however, I would like to respond to some of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition, particularly his personal comments, his reference to my being born with a silver spoon in my mouth. I found that particularly fascinating. I'll have to tell my father that. You know he goes to great length to try and establish his humble background. It's not difficult to see why it's a political thing. Sir, I don't bring in my background; I don't bring in his background; I don't bring in anybody's background.

Sir, I made reference to his speech maybe selling in Tuxedo, but not in the rest of the province. That is no reference to his background. I would like to say though, Mr. Speaker, that for him to get up and make that reference, Sir, I consider an insult, not just to myself but to my father, who grew up in a time when he couldn't go to university because he couldn't afford it. He went to night school for seven years to get where he was. He emigrated to this country in his thirties, started from nothing to get where he is today. Sir, I feel that that is a personal insult and I would really ask the member to stick to the issue . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point or order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the rules of debate on third reading of the bill are of considerable latitude, but they do have to relate to the bill at hand. We are dealing with Bill 22, having to do with labour relations.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question before the House is the proposed amendment to Bill 22. When the Honourable Member for Thompson has concluded his introductory remarks, would he speak to the motion before the House?

MR. S. ASHTON: It does relate though very much to the debate on this, because I really find it frustrating to sit here and hear some of the false debating techniques that are used by members opposite. The bogey-man techniques of the Member for Tuxedo, his developing skill for personal attacks which we saw earlier this week with the Minister of Energy and Mines and we saw it today with myself. Sir, I think there are

certain boundaries of debate which have to be followed and that is that people stick to the issues and not bring in personal insults.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I, at no time, personally attacked the Minister of Energy and Mines in the House this week.

MR. S. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, I think when you look at a bill of this importance that you should not get into those kind of techniques, as I said, particularly the scare tactics that have been used by the Leader of the Opposition, by other members, Sir, in this House. I think this bill stands on its own merit, Mr. Speaker. If you look at it clause-by-clause, there is nothing scary or dangerous or radical about it. Most of the clauses that are in this bill exist in many other jurisdictions throughout the country. They're related to very specific problems in many number of cases and members opposite, they say, there is no problem in Manitoba at the present time. Well they should talk to some of the workers who have waited an average 300 days to have grievances heard, 300 days, ranging about a year, Mr. Speaker, in having their grievances heard. That's not measured by strike statistics. That's not measured by some of the references they made, but that means a lot to those individual employees.

When they're talking about union organizing, Mr. Speaker, I wish they would have a little more respect for the intelligence of the average worker in this province. I think they can make a decision, Mr. Speaker. They realize it's a serious decision and I think the provisions in this bill protect them from undue harassment and undue influence from outside parties, Mr. Speaker. I'm willing to stand by that. I think it's a fair clause. If you go through it, as I said, clause-by-clause, you will find it is a good bill and there is really no need for the low level of debate that we've seen. I must say I'm very much surprised that it's particularly coming from the Leader of the Opposition who I would have thought would have set an example for his colleagues, rather than get into the political gutter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to support the hoist motion as presented by my colleague, the Member for La Verendrye.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated speaking on other occasions, I felt a little leery moving into this whole labour area. Therefore, I must say that Bill 22 has presented to me my first opportunity to determine and grasp some type of feel for this whole area.

Mr. Speaker, it was only about two weeks ago in committee where the Member for Ellice, on one of his few occasions rose to attack some comment I had made in question to the Minister of Industry and Technology regarding Superior Bus in Morris. At that time, he severely chastised me, as I remember, for rushing to the support of the company in total disregard for the employees who had worked for such a long period of time to develop their own rights and benefits under a

collective agreement. I took some exception to that, Mr. Speaker, because, as I indicated in rebuttal at that time, my main concern as a matter of fact was the long-run future and the stability of work for those employees in question.

It was on that basis that I thought I had probably better attempt at least to find out a little bit more about collective agreements, so I went to Superior Bus and found out what the basis of the agreement was between that company and its workers, the agreement by the way, Mr. Speaker, which became a major case before the Labour Board. My intention is not to make any specific comment regarding that decision.

But in asking some questions, I was presented for the first time with a contract, with a written agreement between an employer and an employee group, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — well I'm chastised now by the Member for Flin Flon saying, well you're pretty old for the first time. Well I guess that says something about, I suppose, my, in their terms sheltered background. I never was a union member, so I don't apologize for that, Mr. Speaker.

Nevertheless, I spent some considerable time going through the agreement. Certainly as it covers areas of bargaining agency and management and grievance procedure and grievance and bargaining committees and wage rates, obviously many hours were spent on both sides coming to this type of agreement. With that, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel - absolutely not. As a matter of fact, if both parties to an agreement come to a table and basically decide that these are the rules under which they want to maintain a management working relationship, well fine. I can't see where anybody, either a legislator or any individual in society, should feel free to criticize.

Mr. Speaker, it's with this background that I became more interested in Bill No. 22 and some of the things that were being said about it. I was in the committee that heard representation on this particular bill only for a brief time, but on that one occasion I did hear Mr. Newman make a presentation. Mr. Speaker, I was very impressed with several aspects of his particular brief. I suppose the main one might not even be the content.

The main area that I was impressed with was the passion plea on his behalf that the government and the Minister of Labour, in particular, wake up to what was being done by her efforts to poison the relations that had developed in this whole area, that exist in this whole area over 20 and 25 years. Again if anything impressed me about his presentation, it was the genuineness and the plea to the Minister that she take seriously what he was saying and had been saying for some periods of time.

Mr. Speaker, I felt that the whole process was cheapened to some regard when the Minister saw fit for either something he had said or for some other remark that had been made to her to sort of shrug off and maybe laugh at some of his comments. But as a neophyte to this whole labour area, I was very impressed by the passion plea of his to the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Newman reviewed the responsibilities of management and, during that time, he indicated quite forthrightly that they were basically twofold: to be responsible to the shareholders; and, of course, to the consumers at large, people who use products of production from that particular plant. Mr. Speaker, he indicated, I believe, that also.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that's the part that I can't get through my head yet, that there seems to be this warfare mentality that emanates from all the members opposite about this warfare mentality between labourers and employers. I can't understand that, Mr. Speaker, because my background - I don't know whether I'm an employer or whether I'm a labourer. In my mind, I'm both. So when I hear these barriers put into place between these two groups and that you're on one side or the other, then I can't accept that. I have some difficulty accepting it, and I believe that any rules that come into place that build up those barriers to a higher degree are, for the most part, wrong, and they spell bad things for our whole economy in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Newman also reviewed the process leading up to Bill 22 being introduced, and he indicated at that time the number of hours that people that he represented gave to the whole process of trying to work through the Review Committee - I believe it's the Labour-Management Review Committee - whereby they could try to reach consensus in a number of areas, particularly in those areas of concern to, I suppose, both sides. He indicated how people that he represented had talked to the Minister at great length, how they had talked to her staff, how they had talked to her commissioned inquiry officer - I guess an individual who had prepared a large, concise report, one which at this time we have not seen. Yet in spite of that all, he indicated that there was no attempt made other than some small areas to reach a consensus, to try and work toward some agreement.

Mr. Speaker, that impressed me as to how the government then sold out specifically to one specific area of thought and thought process. Mr. Speaker, my concern is, in doing so, that they certainly didn't harm the people with horns on their heads, as indicated by the Member for Concordia every time we speak to it, but in my view how they possibly have harmed the labour movement.

Mr. Speaker, it confirmed my suspicions in two senses. First of all, they are after small business, and yet they do it all under that stated goal and objective of harmony; that stated goal of maintaining those harmonious relationships which they claim are in such broad existence at this particular point in time.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Minister to dispel the argument used, firstly, by my colleague, the Member for La Verendrye and, secondly I suppose, by Mr. Newman in making his presentation when he used as an example the hardware store operator or owner in Plum Coulee. I haven't heard that explanation yet as to why the certification process as outlined within the legislation, why the examples that we used that would bring forward certification under again the conditions that we spell out, why that is unrealistic, why it's foolish.

Why, Mr. Speaker, again we have challenged the Minister on a number of occasions to tell us why it couldn't happen in that sequence of events, and she has failed to put our minds at rest, to put us to ease in that area.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you know I find it particularly interesting on the small business side where we just passed here a few hours ago, Bill No. 32, exempting two-thirds of the businesses of this province from having to pay the 1.5 percent payroll tax, and Sir, that doesn't say that the very nature of the economy in this province

isn't totally based, or for a large part based upon small business, then nothing else will. Yet by Bill 22, as indicated on many occasions, the machinery is being placed in the hands of larger unions to go out and attack small businesses if they wish in a much more violent manner than the payroll tax of 1.5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 22 worries me specifically on two accounts - first of all my vested interest. It worries me because my constituency does not have one large employer, it has hundreds of small employers. The backbone of the industrialized economy of this province; the backbone that helps the members opposite to get up and boast that we have the lowest unemployment rate within this nation; the backbone of the economy that allows the members opposite to get up and boast that we have the best economy within this nation.

Sir, that's my vested interest about Bill 22 because I don't want to see that harmed to any degree, not to one degree. I have my concern, which has not been dispelled by the Minister of Labour, I have my concern that the Co-op store in Rosenort, the management of that co-op store is not going to be able to stand up to any union organizer that is going to bring about, in due course, a collective bargaining unit. That's my concern, and that's my vested interest, Mr. Speaker, and for that I make no apology.

My second concern, of course, is the provincial scene. What I see as happening is that this province, by way of this legislation, is going to allow the economy as a whole to move out of synchronization with labour management understandings and agreements in other jurisdictions, particularly at this point in time the United States. Sir, I see absolutely no moderation within Bill 22.

You know, the members opposite chastise us on many occasions for wanting everything for the farmers, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you, as a farmer, I'm not one who wants to see \$10 a bushel wheat prices, because I honestly believe that what destroys high prices more quickly than anything are high prices. Sir, I'm saying that if you're a strong supporter of the union movement what's going to destroy the union movement in time, more quickly than anything, are strong, strong powerful unions and rules that favour their development. Nothing is going to destroy that whole concept, which members opposite hold so closely to their breast, than that. So, Mr. Speaker, it's my view that the members opposite take that into account but what's the net result?

Well, I wonder if member's opposite have ever, ever in their own caucuses, when describing or discussing this bill, have ever for one moment brought any discussion forward as to whether potentially the results of Bill 22 would contribute more so to our loss of productivity within this nation. I wonder because I didn't hear it once addressed by the Minister or members of the government who spoke to it. Not on one occasion, Mr. Speaker, did I ever hear that the concept of where we as a basic economy and, Sir, an economy with it's management, it's capital, and it's people working together for the sake of producing. Not on one occasion have I heard the Minister, in her remarks, indicate whether Bill 22 and it's potential implications will have any direct effect on the productivity of not only our province, but our nation as a whole, Sir, because I'm convinced that it doesn't. I'm convinced that members opposite have lost total sight of the fact that we, as a

nation, are falling totally out of an area of comparable productivity with those other nations that would want to have our standard of living.

Sir, in my view this government is absolutely gutless. It will not even address the question as to where we're headed as a producer of goods and services in this nation. Their indication on Bill 22 spells it out most definitely.

Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that Bill 22 is nothing more than a political pay off to those who supported them in the past and I think they will reap the whirlwind of this particular action, because in time the intent of Bill 22 will come back to haunt them, but unfortunately it will haunt the whole province. I appeal to them to see the merit in supporting the six-month Hoist Motion and putting Bill 22 behind us for a considerable period of time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be brief.

I just want to comment on the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition when he rested his case on - and this was his term - ordinary Manitobans. I'm reminded in that context of something that Abraham Lincoln once said when he said that, "God must have loved the working people, he made so many of them." The working force in Manitoba, comprised of approximately 480,000 people together with their families, it is clear that they constitute the vast bulk, the vast majority of the Province of Manitoba.

These indeed are the ordinary people. Not the Chamber of Commerce, and not those for whom the Chamber of Commerce speaks. The Chamber of Commerce does not represent the little people of the Province of Manitoba. It raised the question of why change, and evoked the notion of harmonious labour relations. Labour relations must always, at every time be put in a particular context, both with respect to the composition of the working force and changes in the objective situation.

One can hearken back, I won't take the time to do so, to 1944, other than to say that at that time when the nation, and particularly the employers, required industrial peace, at that time they made the first concession to organized labour that was made in a long and bloody history in this country and in this province - remembering 1919 and the strikes of the '30s, only because they wanted industrial peace at that time and after the Second World War when the economy was booming and profits were multiplying in order to maintain that boom and those profits.

That was the context of the development of labour legislation as we know it in this province today, but the situation has changed and it has change drastically from 1972. That must not be lost sight of, because we are living at a time of high unemployment, even though relatively we are well off in the Province of Manitoba. Because of the technological revolution and for a whole number of other reasons, that pool of unemployed upon which the unscrupulous will rely - I'll come back to that theme in a moment - that pool of unemployment constitutes a new factor in the labour force market. It

constitutes the kind of thing upon which an unscrupulous employer who wants to stop unionization or to bust the union if one is there, can rely to a much greater extent than was the case at any other time in the last - well, since 1944, actually, if you look at the situation objectively. And it's with respect to the unscrupulous employer, the anti-union employer, that this legislation is directed. The honest employer, in fact, most of the big employers who have come, albeit perhaps not happily, but nevertheless recognizing the situation to live at peace with the unions and their labour force, they are not the ones who need and have any particular concerns about improvements in the labour legislation. It is those who would break unions who are alarmed and it is for those that the Chamber is speaking and it's for those that the Leader of the Opposition is speaking.

The Leader of the Opposition says, indignantly, "I am not anti-union." Then why does he use language like, "they come in here," speaking of the union movement as if it was an alien force, if he isn't anti-union? We shall judge you by your words, because that is an anti-union statement. It brings back the spectre that has been used by anti-union employers, from the time of the Knights of Labor in the 1880s, that unionism is an alien force, when he uses that language and I wrote it down, "They come in here to Manitoba," which is marvelous - "these big unions come from the outside . . ." "Mr. Speaker, the union movement in Manitoba is a product of Manitoba's labour history. Let there be no doubt about it and these changes, which this government in 1972 and 1984 are bringing in, are the product of the labour movement of Manitoba, representing the vast majority of the working force in the province.

So I say and I wanted to rise to make these two points, that the notion that the union movement is alien, is clearly a reflection of the way the Leader of the Opposition and his friends think. It is that which informs their biased view of the labour movement, is that which informs their hysterical attack on this legislation, but if they would look and stand back objectively and realize that the vast majority of employers who have learned to live in industrial peace with the unions and their organized workers, have nothing to fear from improvements in labour legislation. The labour legislation which is being brought in by this government, by the Minister of Labour, is designed to cope with a new feature of the market economy in terms of the labour force and that's why it's here. Not because we have a debt to pay. That language about doing something because you have a debt to pay may be a reflection of how they think and how they work, it's not the way we think and the way we work. This is brought in on principle, Sir, and that's where we stand.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer firstly to the comments made in the Throne Speech with respect to this legislation. The government had indicated that one of the most important prerequisites for stable, long-term economic development is a healthy co-operative

relationship between labour and management. It went on to say that my government has sought to provide leadership in encouraging the kind of improved consultation and co-operation which are essential to make the partnership among business, labour, government and other sectors successful and constructive. Finally they indicated they wished to bring forward proposals for extending and strengthening consultative arrangements to ensure regular advice from the private sector on economic priorities and programs.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the representations made from the private sector with respect to this bill which is presently before the House. I don't believe there's any need for me to again repeat the comments made by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, made by the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, made by the Manitoba Fashion Institute, made by the Mining Association, made by the Manitoba Health Organizations, Mr. Speaker.

These are, Mr. Speaker, the people that the government referred to as the private sector in the business world in the Throne Speech. These are the people that this government pledged to develop co-operative programs, consultation, improved private sector consultations and that's why they're not credible. That's why they lack credibility, Mr. Speaker, because this legislation - and we sit here as observers - has provoked confrontation with the private sector.

Certainly, we on this side of the House, and speaking personally, Mr. Speaker, this is not what I believe my constituents want to see, or the vast majority of Manitobans want to see. They want to see those objectives implemented that the Throne Speech referred to as co-operation and consultation between labour and management. They want to see harmonious labour relations, but you can't have harmonious labour relations and this government can't consult and co-operate with the private sector when they bring forward legislation that is objected to so severely by the private sector.

What, Mr. Speaker, are they objecting to? I am not going to refer to all of the sections of the act, but there are principles that are referred to in this bill where the Minister of Labour clearly, for example, indicated that the definition of dependent contractor was being changed to include many more employees.

There are amendments, Mr. Speaker, that extend the time for decertification which is objected to by these management organizations. There are amendments whereby the standard of proof has deleted undue influence which was previously in the act, which was a lesser standard of proof which, by taking it out, makes it much more difficult to prove unfair labour practices.

They have removed any limitation on time for either an employer or an employee to file complaints with respect to unfair labour practices. I would like to know if the Attorney-General, for example, agrees with that particular section, Mr. Speaker.

There are great expansions of the authority of the Labour Board to make interim orders which possibly could be very very severe pending any determination of a complaint of an unfair labour practice, Mr. Speaker.

There are sections of this bill which give the right to the Labour Board to certify a union even though there is no evidence of a number of employees wishing to

form a bargaining agent, Mr. Speaker. That is a discretion which has concerned many people. There are sections of this bill which, if the certification process is brought forward in a certain manner, would not give an employee any time to change his mind about whether or not he wishes to form a union. The status of the employer before the Labour Board has changed significantly.

There are some sections here, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the sale of business that I would like to speak to because, Mr. Speaker, with the economy being what it has been over the last number of years, there have been many situations where individuals or companies have moved in to rescue failing or insolvent businesses. There are expanded provisions in this act which will oblige the purchaser of a business, and the definition is being greatly expanded which will oblige the purchaser to take over a union agreement. We questioned the Minister at length on that particular matter, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that the amendments in this section, particularly, are going to impede or prevent or certainly discourage the purchasers of businesses, particularly those which have been in difficult financial circumstances and somebody wants to take them over and operate them as a going concern and create a viable business. These sections are going to deter and act as a disincentive, Mr. Speaker, to anybody who wishes to do that.

There is information that an employer has to provide to the Labour Board with respect to the cost of their providing benefits. After questioning, the Minister of Labour admitted that there is no similar legislation in any other jurisdiction in Canada.

There are amendments again, Mr. Speaker, with respect to first contract. We tried to point out to the Minister that in every other jurisdiction that has first contract legislation, in B.C. and Ontario and federally, the Labour Board has the discretion not to impose a first contract where they determine that a party has bargained unfairly. That is not present in this act, so even if, Mr. Speaker, a union, for example, one of the parties was bargaining unfairly, the Labour Board is still compelled, despite that bargaining in bad faith, to impose a first contract. We suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is not a reasonable way in which to proceed.

We asked her to consider other sections of the act, Mr. Speaker, because in other sections the board is given the discretion to dismiss applications by the employer if the board determines the employer is not acting in good faith. So there doesn't appear to be any justification for this particular provision, Mr. Speaker, particularly after the Minister has taken such great pride in the Labour Board and its ability to handle the vast discretionary powers that have been given to it in this legislation.

First contract legislation, Mr. Speaker, is something that can, it certainly has been proven in the studies that it is not effective; that certainly you impose the first contract, but there are not that many second contracts, because there simply are no agreements afterwards. So we're suggesting and I'm sure all members of the House would agree that the best agreement is one which the parties agree to themselves, not one that is imposed. That's why we believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Labour Board should be given the discretion not to impose a certain first contract where

it determines that a party has been acting in bad faith. That discretion is not given to them in this act.

Those are only some, Mr. Speaker, of the provisions that have concerned us, and which we proposed to amend last night, and which the government members defeated.

Mr. Speaker, we suggest, and I say to the Attorney-General, we do not say, certainly I do not say and I don't believe any member of this side of the House says that people don't have the right to form a union, to bargain. Unions have proven over the years to be very valuable tools for working people, Mr. Speaker. It's just that there must be some balance between unions and between management, because that has such an important effect on the growth in the economy and the development in jobs. I think that's what the government was referring to in the Throne Speech when they talked about labour-management co-operation and improved private sector consultation. But, Mr. Speaker, they haven't lived up to those statements in the Throne Speech.

To create the confrontation that they have done by introducing this act, by not arriving at a consensus with the employer organizations, and certainly the employer organizations, Mr. Speaker, indicated that's what they wanted to do. The Labour Management Committee has not been used, except with regard to some specific items, it is being used, and that was the information before the committee, Mr. Speaker, but it has not been used with respect to the balance of this legislation before the House.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, to members opposite that if they would use a body like that, with representations from both sides, to arrive at a consensus on improvements in labour legislation, that would be in the best interests, not only of the government but of the people of Manitoba. That's the kind of procedure that should be used, because this type of confrontation that the government has created is not, in the end, going to help the workers. It is not obviously going to be of any assistance to employers, but in the long run it will harm the workers' interests.

The way to proceed, Mr. Speaker, would be to proceed by consensus, not to attempt to rush this through this Legislature at this Session, bringing in these outside lawyers, that the Minister has referred to, by drafting it in haste, with undue haste.

The Minister has referred continuously, and people before the committee have referred continuously, to the good record that this province has had. That's something we should all take pride in, Mr. Speaker, but let's continue that record, let's improve on it. Certainly improvements have to be made in this type of legislation. There are new problems facing unions and facing the employers that have to be dealt with and resolved and there must be changes to the act. Let's proceed in a way in which there is a consensus, and that is the way the lot of workers and of employers and of all the people of Manitoba will be improved, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we are going through an exercise that we have gone through many times

before with an NDP Government that makes it very obvious that they don't intend to listen to anybody. They intend to push legislation down people's throats. They do it on the basis of, if that's what they believe, if that's what they think, that's what they think should happen, and they use the power of the Legislature because they are in government to ram things through. — (Interjection) — I just heard from the Minister of Environment that that is what they are supposed to do. My goodness, Mr. Speaker, that really disgusts me.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister and the government, in my opinion, have no regard for business and management whatsoever. They have decided to take aim on them. They have said, in my opinion, that they don't have any regard for their ability and they don't trust them whatsoever.

All through this act it says that the employer must act fairly, but basically no references to the union acting fairly. The Minister referred me to Section 16 last night. I read it and that really refers to the labour representative making sure that he treats the employer fairly.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a complete disregard as there was in The Pensions Act with this Minister, and anything that she has brought before the House to the disregard of all of the experts in the field. You know there is one side of the field that does have some people with knowledge, but there is absolutely no attempt whatsoever to listen to the other side. She has definitely put a path of her record in this House as one of only listening to one side at all times and not listening to the other, but at all times putting up the great big scam of White Papers and everything, so that they could say, "Well, we were listening and we had discussions with them."

Mr. Speaker, the last three meetings of the Industrial Relations Commission proved that the Minister does not listen to people. Also, the businessmen that were sitting there through those three meetings when I went up and talked to them they said, "Well, Frank are they not going to listen? Are they just going to ram it through? Did we come here with these logical arguments for nothing?" That was their attitude out there. As a matter of fact, their attitude got worse and they became more depressed when the Minister would actually appear to laugh at them, and one of the speakers brought that up.

Mr. Speaker, we had come before us some people that have been involved in labour relations in this province for many years. Mr. Newman was mentioned, and he obviously has done a study of it, as much as anybody else who came before the committee, of the history of the labour relations within this province - the how they were structured and why they were structured - and then started to make an examination of the bill that is before us.

It is unfortunate that we put a time limit on people in that committee, but we do have the ability to give leave. If anybody should have had leave, Mr. Newman should have because he was not — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I am hearing from the Member for Wolseley, who was the chairman, who was probably saying he did and saying how, to show her generosity as Chairman, and yet she was very quick to cut people off when they were asking questions. He did have some extra time for questions, but he was not allowed to

finish his brief. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Newman accepted it and he said that he felt personally that he had been abused all through this procedure.

Mr. Speaker, the other people that came forward, we had people like Ray Winston of the Manitoba Fashion Institute, and I might say their organizations had gone to the trouble of putting together excellent briefs, and if you think that they don't receive advice from experts, they have the money to buy advice, they have the money to have the bill analyzed and they come forward with very good briefs, and brought forward some very good reasons why the bill should be examined further.

Mr. Speaker, we had a gentleman come before us that had absolutely no relationship whatsoever with large business. His name was Mr. Quesnel. I hope I have that properly.

A MEMBER: Quesnel.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Quesnel, is that it? Thank you.

This gentleman introduced himself as a personnel and industrial relations advisor for eight and-a-half years. He didn't have any axe to grind with anybody and probably represents and works with small business more than all of the rest of them here, and yet he came forward. He indicated that he was a little nervous and this was the first time he had come before a committee, but he took the time to read that bill on his own as a person - a small person - and analyzed it and came forward and said, "This is not a good bill." He basically said, when you read his handwritten statement, Sir - he didn't have the money for a lot of people to analyze it for him and have it typed for him - he did it on his own. He basically said, "If the system isn't broken, why fix it? It's working well and this bill will be harmful to labour relations within this province. Also, Sir, he said, "It will harm investment within this province." A small man in business, a personnel and industrial advisor who probably deals with small labour people or small businesses all the time and he finds that this will be a detrimental bill. Probably read about it in the paper and looked it up and came forward, Sir, won't even listen to him. They can call the big fellas whatever they like, but they won't even listen to him.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Green came forward and - very interesting - gave a presentation, was accused by the other side - another person giving a presentation - of getting personal and I guess Mr. Green did get fairly strong with his opinions on what he thought of some union organizers, but Mr. Green is a forceful speaker and he was wound up, but I really never saw him better when you listened to the points he brought out about this bill. Nobody is any better, has any more knowledge of labour legislation than Mr. Green. — (Interjection) — I just heard, "That's what he likes to tell you." Well, I would say to the Member from Wolseley, get anybody you like and have an open debate with him and I am sure he would take the challenge. So if the Member from Wolseley isn't prepared to put her money where her mouth is, we don't need any more comments.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Green did point out, though, several of the areas and he named the cases of why this bill was here. He laid out where the unions had lost and said, "Well now they lost, so now we have to have this section," and he named the cases where they lost.

What more proof than the government is taking one side, which is the unions', within this province? Let's be fair to the unions, but let's be fair to the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I refer again, as I did during this debate before, I read "Building a Better Manitoba. Victory - how sweet it is. Manitoba election on-the-job canvass by the unions." There's Mr. Michael Lewis and George Nagasaka - is it - national representative with the Political Education Department, Canadian Labour of Congress. Michael Lewis, CLC Education Organizer, came and worked in Manitoba. The Phone Canvas - another success history story by the unions in this province. Then, of course, I read the compliments of Mr. Pawley and Mr. Walsh, who is the provincial organizer. Mr. Walsh, of course, comes from just outside of Bolton, Ontario, where my sister lives.

Mr. Speaker, those are the absolute - you get two out of three - you're getting close to proof of why this government passed this bill, which was to appease the unions, which is a political payoff. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we didn't have any reason to question some of the people that came before us because they came with excellent briefs that were detailed, that the Minister should take into account and listen to, and you would expect, when they are that detailed and that good, they would be listened to. Mr. Green didn't have a brief, he just spoke because of his knowledge. But not even the Attorney-General, when he came through that hearing, didn't stop to debate with Mr. Green as he debated here today. I didn't hear one person or one member of the committee from the government side take him on. — (Interjection) — oh, did I hear the Member for The Pas say, "You can't take on a mad man." Is that what he said?

A MEMBER: The Member for Flin Flon.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Flin Flon. Is that what the Member for Flin Flon said?

A MEMBER: That's what he said.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: He should be so lucky to have the brains of that man. I'll tell you, what we got in replacement for Mr. Green from Inkster is an absolute disgrace to this House. — (Interjection) — The Member for Flin Flon says, "That's my opinion." I'd like to assure him that is in spades, without any doubt.

So, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't one person, and you know, if they were so concerned about Mr. Green's remarks not being on the record or that they should be challenged, why didn't they? It's very simple, why didn't they? It wasn't worth responding to? Well, Mr. Speaker, they're laughing and giggling like a bunch of little smart-aleck children back there in that row and not one of them would have the guts, as Mr. Green puts it, to get up and debate with him on this issue. They just as much as said so.

Mr. Speaker, the people that came forward said, "Why didn't the Labour Management Committee of the government have more input into this legislation?" And the history of it was, which was given to us by Mr. Newman, that the Chamber of Commerce and Mr. Martin - our great Mr. Martin who they had a roast for the other night with the proceeds going to the NDP

federal election, our great Mr. Martin also signed and agreed that the changes in labour legislation to this province should go through the Labour Management Committee and yet it was hardly used with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, is that the kind of co-operation that the Minister is giving labour and management in this province, ignoring the Labour Management Committee, not doing any one of them any favour by doing that, yet that's what was done and the Minister and this government takes the side of the unions.

Mr. Speaker, they didn't consult, they just used their majority to push it through and I repeat that because I said it before, but they had 144 amendments that didn't change the principle of the bill - pardon me, I just got corrected, 44. Thank you. It's a very small point, but it's 44. Mr. Speaker, there's no question, it's 44 or 46, I'm not quite sure which and then we had one this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, Sir, that the legislation, which had no consultation to that large a degree with the Labour Management Committee, the legislation which was drafted because of the report of Ms. Smith, which we've never seen, and the complete change of the Minister when she, from the time that it all started till the time the bill was put in, and Mr. Newman said that she had received a letter, I think the day before, or the morning before, making specific requests and they were basically ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you that the legislation, whether you like it or not, is dictatorial. What it does is, it takes and it really puts the government into the position of legislating labour legislation for the unions.

You know, the Member for Fort Rouge, he just made some statements that were a little amazing. He basically was saying that the small businessman was going to feed on the labourers. The bigger unions were able to get along and they were able to cope with that, but these employers, these bad guys, when he refers to the employers in this province like that and 90 percent of them have businesses with less than 20 people, what is he saying about them?

He's talking about the Chamber of Commerce. Did you know that the large companies that are members of the Chamber of Commerce really wouldn't even have to be members? The Chamber of Commerce can't really do anything for them. The Chamber implores them to be good corporate citizens and good employers within this province. The Chamber of Commerce and the larger employers work to help the smaller people and the smaller businesses within this province and they work to have businesses so we have a creation of jobs in this province, so jobs could have happy people, enjoying the benefits of this province.

But now, what's happening? The unions are having trouble. They're having problems dealing with the larger companies because the larger companies now have lawyers and everybody, and I mentioned this before, and they're not winning. So now they're going to turn their guns onto the smaller business where they have the advantage over them. Mr. Speaker, when the unions have to be defended by Big Brother, I assure you that something is very wrong. When somebody gets their house in such bad shape that the government has to come along and bail them out, they're on a slippery road.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if Mr. Martin, maybe it's good he's leaving, maybe that's why he's leaving, because he's failing, if he has failed so badly that this government has to come in and legislate so they can stay in business and attack the small businesses of this province or organize the small businesses of this province, I assure you maybe it's better he did change because that, Sir, is going to be the most detrimental thing that can happen to unions when they aren't capable of working on their own, negotiating agreements and having to have the government come in and legislate so they can survive. Mr. Speaker, that is the sign of something that is sinking.

You know, the Minister of Industry and Technology has got a lot more experience in the union movement than I have and he would agree with me when he has to depend on the shoulders of somebody else to get along. I think he knows there's a problem. Let's say that problem is the same in life and you have to start depending too much on Big Brother, you're in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, they keep saying, it's a good bill, is good legislation, legislation that says that there is a board that has all kinds of jurisdiction and there is no recourse to the courts. Is there no recourse to the courts?

The Attorney-General had another bill here, I think it's the driver's review or the assessment review of drivers - I'm not sure what the board is - but he took away the appeal to the courts. — (Interjection) — License Suspension Appeal Board - thank you. I thank the Member for Thompson for reminding me of it. He took away the appeal from the courts and the same thing applies to this. There's people's lives, their jobs, their feelings, their businesses, everything involved and a board, appointed by the government, regardless of whether they have representations from both sides, will make a final decision; and, Mr. Speaker, I say that they took away the appeal to the courts. Is that good legislation?

What have you got against courts? Maybe somebody on the other side could tell me what they have against courts. Mr. Speaker, the confidence in the board, the Minister was telling us all night the grievances; we were talking about the grievances. There's no time limit to bring in a grievance. If the Member for St. Boniface, when he was back running his business, had an employee come back two years later with a grievance and it was accepted, I think he'd have reason to be annoyed. Shouldn't there be a time limit? There is no time limit for grievances. It says in here that the board can make the decision as to whether the grievance is valid or not and the board - if they say, accept a grievance for two years - after two years, how do they explain to somebody else when they won't do it for them? What position is this board in? Why haven't you got a time limit in the act?

Mr. Speaker, the other night when we were in a legislative committee - it was on The Liquor Control Act - and the Attorney-General thought it would be wise to put the 60-40 liquor versus food ratio into dining rooms. He was intending to leave it to the discretion of the board, but the board would have a terrible time. Who do they do it for and who don't they? But you put it in, you're the legislators, put it in; but in this legislation, no.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister explained that by saying she had complete confidence in the board and then

when we got to the section on first contract legislation, the legislation says, the board shall put in a first contract. The board shall. And we asked the Minister why would this board that she has so much confidence in, doesn't she say, "may, if the board so decides, put in first contract legislation." Manitoba's the only one where the legislation doesn't say "may," and yet, you see the contradictory part of the legislation, Mr. Speaker. Is that good legislation? Was there a sitting down with discussion on that, to any great extent, with the labour management group? I don't think so, Mr. Speaker.

The government has proven that they don't want to talk to those people all that much. It overlooks the rights of people. I questioned two people that were from the unions and I said, "Do you really believe that 45 percent of the people that weren't contacted?" — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I'm hearing from the person back there that, who said they weren't contacted? I'm saying that weren't contacted because they don't have to be contacted and there is nothing that says they have to be contacted before that certification goes in.

I ask the Member for Wolseley, is that right? There's nothing says they have to be contacted before the certification goes in. Mr. Speaker, that is right; they don't have to be contacted. Sign 55 people up, 55 percent up, put in the certification and the other people don't have to be contacted.

I heard the Attorney-General talk about majority, when he's the man who spoke in this House and talked about minority rights to a very great extent; and I think the minority groups should at least know what's happening or be told what's happening. That is democracy and you're telling me this is a good bill, when you have things like that?

Mr. Speaker, they've mentioned the grievances, first contract and the cost of benefits, the clause that the company has to supply. To give you an example, and I'll take the breweries as an example who deal with the same union right across this country. They have different contracts in Manitoba; they have different contracts in Ontario, etc. That union in Manitoba, that company is going to have to tell what the cost of the benefits are that that company has. Those benefits are probably purchased in head office, negotiated with somebody and it's those companies' private negotiations and you really believe those companies want those private documents and negotiations, which they may have, that's better than somebody else's, made public to the same union and the same union will come along and they'll go to the other company after negotiating and say, well we want something better because this company was being able to buy it cheaper than you, etc.

Mr. Speaker, that is not good legislation. Mr. Speaker, we have the sale of business, of businesses going broke or has gone broke and somebody buys the assets. We questioned the Minister thoroughly on this last night and I think the only thing you bought of the assets was the building and the desks and you put a completely type of business in it, you'd still have to take over the old contract. It's almost that tough, because the Member for St. Norbert said, you mean, after five months, the business has been closed etc., that it could come back, and somebody else had purchased it and started it and it was broke? Yes, that's good legislation;

and all of the things I have mentioned will discourage investment. Do you really believe that companies are going to invest in Manitoba? I heard, yes, from the Minister, but the Minister only has her opinion and her opinion is there only because she won't listen to anybody else. She listens to one side.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the labour legislation that was passed in 1972 or '73, did the members opposite know that manufacturing investment in this province dropped steadily from 1974 on? You know, there's a report from the Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce to the Minister which I have in my desk which is extensive and says that investment dropped in Manitoba from 1974 on in the manufacturing sector. Mr. Speaker, this is the type of thing you have to be concerned about, investment in this province and jobs for people in this province.

Do you really believe that somebody, when they take a look at the labour legislation in this province, and they find out that it has clauses that there's probably nowhere else in North America, that they're going to come here; and this government says, why shouldn't we be the leaders? Why should you be the leaders of people who lead people out of this province and discourage them from coming here?

Mr. Speaker, this Minister has actually taken aim and blasted the business people and the management of this province. She has absolutely told them what side she is on. She wouldn't listen to them last night after there were good points put through, the brief that they sent in that they were misled. Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing that voice back there who is the same as the Minister, who doesn't listen to anybody, and she says, "I ain't heard nothing yet."

I haven't heard her speak yet, Mr. Speaker, and I didn't hear her challenge Mr. Green. She could have got out of the chair and done it. Yet she harps about him from her chair. I reminded her earlier, if you want me to set up the challenge, you get who you like, and I'll set it up between Mr. Green and whoever you like.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to finish by making this very clear. I believe the Minister of Industry and Technology, and certainly the Attorney-General, they are living a little in the past. They came through an age or grew up in an age where they believed that industry and management were trying to take everybody they could, and the Attorney-General's remarks came close to saying that.

Do they not realize that some of the young people they grew up with and I grew up with today that came from all parts of this city are managers today, are owners today; people who came up the hard way, who have every consideration for labour and people that work for them? Do they not believe that? Do they believe that when some young guy becomes management, you shouldn't be opposed to him because you are of the NDP Government and you're on the side of the unions? Do they really believe that?

Mr. Speaker, this Minister, as I said, has taken aim on the business and management people of this province. She's decided not to listen to them. She's put herself on one side and the Premier should not allow it. She should resign or her resignation should be accepted, be put in, because the Minister of Labour of this province, who has lost the confidence of business and management throughout this province, has no right to sit in that chair.

She has said I am on one side only and she has proved it throughout this whole legislation. She proved it last year in The Pensions Act - she wouldn't listen to anybody - she's proved it this year, and the hopeless part of it she takes it with a smart-aleck attitude.

Mr. Speaker, that Minister should resign. You cannot be the Minister of Labour in this province and be on one side and lose the confidence of business and management in this province and do things that will stop investment and be a disincentive for jobs in this province and under that basis resign.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

Order please. The question before the House is the amendment to Bill 22 proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

QUESTION put, MOTION defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

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

YEAS

Banman, Blake, Brown, Downey, Enns, Filmon, Graham, Hammond, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Steen.

NAYS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Dolin, Eyer, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Penner, Phillips, Santos, Storie, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 17; Nays 24.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly lost.

The question before the House is the proposed third reading of Bill No. 22. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, why is Bill 22 before us? That's a question a lot of us have been asking ourselves. Mr. Speaker, we know that the people who are most responsible for providing the thousands of jobs in Manitoba don't want Bill 22. We've heard that in committee, we've heard that in newspaper advertisements, and we know that.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps even more importantly, but I'm willing to bet - I am speaking to the Attorney-General - he spoke of the working man, the everyday working man. I'm willing to bet that if we could ask the everyday working man, the majority of the working people of Manitoba are not asking for Bill 22. Mr. Speaker, certainly, we in the opposition are not asking for Bill 22.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a source of utter amazement to those of us who have been around in politics for a while to try to decipher this government's politics. Mr.

Speaker, we all take polls from time to time. I know they do it and we do it. Can any member of the government tell me that high on the list of demands or of what is of concern to the people of Manitoba was a bill such as Bill 22, labour legislation? Of course not, Mr. Speaker, and they have at least the honesty to tell me that.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, those same very polls that they do from time to time, that we do from time to time, tell us that there is an overriding concern about the inordinate strength of the large union and the kind of tactics that unions from time to time employ in terms of disrupting the work force in this province. That is also a fact, Mr. Speaker.

I say, Mr. Speaker, why is this bill before us? This government spent eight, nine months on another matter that by the Premier's own admission ranked 58th or 59th in their priority list. What have they learned in the last eight, nine months?

By the way, Mr. Speaker, many of us consider this Session that is now ending simply a Session that was begun in December of '82 and went through most of all of last year and we are now just coming slowly to a conclusion to it. But what has the government learned from that, Mr. Speaker? They have committed political suicide on a matter, on an issue that, by the Premier's own words, ranked 58th in their list of priorities and I ask them, what demonstration can they show to us at this late hour that Bill 22, the principle of Bill 22, the content of Bill 22 in any way ranks anywhere near.

If the language issue ranked 58th, what would the labour issue rank - 78th, 178th? Of course not, Mr. Speaker, so we to have ask ourselves why is Bill 22 before us?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a document that members opposite are well familiar with, Manitoba Victory, by Michael Lewis, How Sweet It Is. That is the title. It goes on to say what happened in the last election, the Manitoba election of 1981, and the massive effort put on by organized labour. Approximately 31,000 workers canvassed, 179 trained in active canvass organization, 506 trained in active canvassers, 149 locals from 27 unions participated, in the words of the Minister of Energy and Mines who acknowledges with deep gratitude, as he should.

In 1981, the Manitoba election on-the-job canvass was the most comprehensive and successful one ever run in Manitoba and indeed, Canada, said the Honourable Wilson Parasiuk, new Minister of Resources. What was the kind of canvassing that was being orchestrated, paid for and done in such a highly organized manner? I just list a random question that they were carefully trained and coaxed to spread through all the workforce in Manitoba, one question. Look at the screwing you have been taking over the last four years from the Conservative Government. That's what 149 locals, that's what 179 trained professionals, canvass organizers, were spreading through the Province of Manitoba in 1981, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have the full details of the organization, the people like Kerry Woollard of the Canadian Labour of Congress, Susan Reznick, the regional co-ordinator and, of course, the MFL at that time, MFL President, Dick Martin. They describe in detail, and remember, Mr. Speaker, this is all under the heading of How Sweet It Is, how a phone bank of 20

phones, over 100 phone canvassers took part. They were on the phones afternoon and evening during the last three weeks of the campaign in Winnipeg. The last week in Brandon 19,049 calls were made, 7,654 union households contacted and on and on it goes, said Eugene Kostyra, the Minister of Trade and Technology, as a candidate. This is the new Minister being quoted: "As a candidate, I was fully aware of the impact of the Manitoba Federation of Labour and the Canadian Labour of Congress campaign. The phone and the on-job canvassing was tremendous. I have been in other campaigns before but never have I seen the support that organized labour gave us in the 1981 election."

Previous to this, while they were getting organized, a second team of full-time and volunteer - Mr. Speaker, when I say, when they refer to full-time, that means paid organizers, that ordinary working people were paying those people \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year to do what? To elect a political party, not to look after the interests of their workers, Mr. Speaker, but to see that their political pawns, the NDP, were put in position.

A second team of full-time volunteer workers had to be found to help co-ordinate the canvass around the province and run the phone bank. George Nagasaka and Kerry Woollard of the Canadian Labour of Congress, along with Susan Reznick of the Federation, were to be in charge of a southern Manitoba team and Michael Lewis was in charge of the North. During this time, the Federation and the Canadian Labour of Congress were carrying out their regular, pre-election activities, raising money from the unions, from the Manitoba NDP election effort and - listen to this - arranging the release of people to work in riding campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, this is over and above the regular union check-off that the NDP already is the beneficiary of, but they arranged their release from their normal duties, looking after the affairs of unions, looking after the affairs of the working conditions for the working people in Manitoba, released them from their jobs to elect their pawns into office, Mr. Speaker.

We know the result. The election was called in October and the labour campaign machine was ready to roll, and roll it did. I have to acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, yes, it rolled; and indeed it rolled over the then Conservative administration - pity for the people of Manitoba - but I have to acknowledge success when I see it. I just say to honourable members opposite, can you imagine the howls of anguish, the screams of indignation if a Chamber of Commerce publication would have published a similar fact sheet about their contribution to a political party. I don't deny for one moment that members of the Chamber support this political party. I also know they support that political party. The truth of the matter is we now have an Elections Finance Act and, of the contributions of the order of \$250 and more, the NDP get more of their funding from that source than does the Conservative Party, which is surely indicative of something, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that is, of course, what has been referred to before by other speakers on this bill, but it certainly makes it understandable why Bill 22 is before us because there is honour among the other side. When they make a promise to certain people and

organizations, they do keep those promises and they're keeping their promise right now, as well they should, with this kind of support; but, Mr. Speaker, the question, surely, that is before us, is that truly serving the interests of Manitoba? is that truly serving the interests of the working people of Manitoba? I think not, Mr. Speaker.

There has been no polling, no indication that demands Bill 22 now be before us. Quoting from the Minister's very own words, quoting from the Premier's own words, who on any given occasion will laud the state of industry, labour and management relations in this province, laud the fact that we lead the country in terms of relatively industrial peace, that we are fortunate that we have the lowest unemployment rate in the Country of Canada. Mr. Speaker, these are all statements coming from government sources. This same government, although devoting only one sentence in the Throne Speech to give any inkling of any major labour legislation on its way, spent several paragraphs in that lengthy document about how this government was now going to co-operate with the private sector, how they were going to work hand-in-hand with the private sector.

They even managed to lure a vice-president from a multi-national corporation, Esso-Imperial Oil, at something like \$80,000 a year to help them with their corporate image, to help them with their business relations, Mr. Speaker. All of this they were doing to indicate that they genuinely want to work with the entrepreneurs of this province. They generally want to work with small business, middle business and large business for the betterment of our economic situation in this province.

Mr. Speaker, where is their political savvy in all of this? Why, when they have, to some extent, succeeded? I still smart to some extent from having the remarks by the Chamber of Commerce or investment dealers, during the time of the Budget Speech, praising this government as a government that was prepared to work co-operatively with business, Mr. Speaker. That was only a short month ago, perhaps a little longer, six or eight weeks or two months ago.

What have they done and where have they lost sense of their political moxie, that the very same people, Chamber of Commerce people, the employers group, would now take out a full-page ad in our newspapers and write letters to us telling us how they've been hookwinked, zapped and betrayed? What lemming instinct do they have that they continue to run over the precipice to commit political suicide? What drives them? What gene is wrong in their makeup, Mr. Speaker? You know, when they see a precipice, when they see a cliff, they want to jump over it, knowing full well that the bottom is strewn with rocks.

I simply can't understand it, Mr. Speaker, and I have watched politics in this arena for some 18 years now, Mr. Speaker. I am well aware that sometimes governments have to do, and I say, Mr. Speaker, they act responsibly when they do certain things because they know they have to be done. They are right and they're in the interest of the public of whom they serve, even though these are unpopular measures.

Mr. Speaker, I will never regret for one moment having served a government, headed by the Honourable Member for Charleswood, that saw the difficulties that we were heading into with respect to the economy, that knew that some effort to control expenditures had to be made, even though we knew at the time we were

doing it that we would not necessarily be thanked by the public for it, Mr. Speaker.

If labour relations in this province were at an all-time dismal low, if we were leading the country in work stoppages, if we were leading the country in disputes, if we were leading the country in disputes and if labour and management in this province were at each other hammer and teeth - that's not quite the right expression - but if they were going at each other constantly and the Minister of Labour and this government finally said we have to do something, we have to revise our labour code, we have to bring in legislation to bring back some sense of stability, some sense of harmony in this province, Mr. Speaker, I might still not agree with the kind of legislation that she would bring forward. In fact, I doubt very much whether I could agree with the kind of legislation that emanates from members opposite but, Mr. Speaker, at least politically I could understand it. Politically, I could understand the necessity of doing something to try to improve a bad situation.

Mr. Speaker, we have no bad situation in Manitoba, and that's not just the Member for Lakeside saying it, or the Chamber of Commerce saying it; that's the Minister of Labour saying it a couple of weeks ago in this very Chamber, and that's the Premier saying it in this Chamber and publicly.

There are no serious grievances to redress that justify Bill 22 at this time, Mr. Speaker. The request was for reconsideration. The bill does not become operative until January of 1985. The honourable members opposite should really think about what they are doing, should really think about what it's going to cost in terms of votes at the next election. They're paying off their obligation because the elite organizers of organized unions felt, as they expressed it, how sweet it was, the victory in 1981, and they are now calling in their debts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the third reading of this unfortunate bill in the full knowledge of the fact that this is the only public arena in Manitoba, and it's an important public arena, but it is the only public arena in Manitoba in which the New Democratic Party socialists can exert a temporary majority to do either good or harm to the public interest.

I say to you tonight, Sir, that they are exerting that transitory majority tonight to do harm to the public interest of Manitoba. I say further, Sir, that it is with regret that I have to note that they really don't care that they are doing harm to the public interest because, as friends of mine have said in earlier parts of this debate, they are paying off crass political debts, and the public interest is really cast into the sewer when it comes to that kind of consideration by these transitory socialists in government.

I was looking at the Economist today and noting some of the problems that the Labour Party in Britain have with respect to the almost total support that party enjoys from the Labour Congress in Britain; then, in the United States, we see articles about the labour support that Mr. Mondale enjoys from the labour movement in the United States, and the headline caught my attention. It's a headline that I thought had some

application, Mr. Speaker, to the debate that we have tonight. The headline read this way: "When Labour's Crown of Laurels Turns to Poison Ivy."

The very thing that Walter Mondale is suffering from in the United States where the working public of that country, unionized and non-unionized are saying, "Big labour has too much to say about what goes on in the Democratic Party"; that is what we are seeing a manifestation of tonight here in Manitoba, with a million people, where big labour is dictating a policy that is not in the public interest, that is not wanted by the people of Manitoba, and yet is able to be passed in this small arena, which is the only arena, I mention again, where the NDP enjoy any public support.

I am not attacking Bill No. 22 because of its ideological bent. I am not attacking it tonight, even though it is subject to this kind of attack, because of the many mischievous sections that are put into it. I am not attacking it because it was probably written, word for word, in the headquarters of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, even though the president made a pretense of saying it didn't go far enough. We all know the game that is played between organized labour leadership, not the ordinary workers in Manitoba or in Canada, but organized labour leadership, the ideologues who work with their friends in the NDP. I am not saying that I'm opposing it even because of that, even if that were not sufficient reason to do so.

I oppose this bill, Mr. Speaker, because it is basically and intrinsically unfair. I think that in labour relations the one element that has to be present at all times when the state is attempting sometimes ill-advisedly to arbitrate as between management and labour, the one element that has to be present at all times in the legislation is fairness. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, breaches that rule and breaches it fundamentally.

This is unfair legislation because it confers on one of the two parties to the generations-long disputes that have taken place, centuries-long disputes that have taken place between he who employs and he who works an unfair bias on one side, and the public will not tolerate unfairness. Even the public who, in their own philosophical considerations, would ordinarily wish to support the NDP, the public will not support unfairness when they see it manifested in legislation.

This bill is unfair because it loads onto one side of the continuing debate that will take place in labour management relations long after this government is gone from the scene in Manitoba, it loads onto one side items and attempts to put into place statutory provisions which are, of their very nature, unfair.

The public of Manitoba may be from time to time fooled into voting for one party or the other but I tell you, from a lifetime of living in this province, that the public of Manitoba will not long be fooled into supporting unfairness.

This bill tonight should not pass, not because it's ideologically left wing or anything of that sort at all, not because it's been dictated chapter, line and verse by Dick Martin or some of these other transitory people who pass through the office of the Federation of Labour presidency and then go onto other greater labour laurels in fields far beyond here; it should be defeated because it's basically unfair and because the people of Manitoba will not tolerate unfairness. If there are not enough people in the government benches who have been in

this province long enough to understand that, let me tell them that I've been here long enough to know. I've been in this House, I've been in this province long enough to know what the people of Manitoba will tolerate and they won't tolerate unfairness.

Mr. Speaker, other speakers before me tonight have talked about the genesis of this bill, about why it's here at all. It wasn't just the current President of the United States who gave popularity to the term, but the term is well-known and others have said it in debate tonight. "If something works, don't try to fix it."

Here we are, the only arena in Manitoba in which the New Democratic Party commands a majority. An important arena, and yet a small arena, because we represent totally just over 1 million people, and 1 million people will not support this kind of legislation because it's unfair. Why are we then, as my colleagues have said, being asked to support this, because it is a crude and a venal kind of payoff that is being made to the labour movement, to the bosses of the labour movement, by this government?

I'll go one step further, Mr. Speaker, because I'm certain in my own conscience as to why this is being demanded by those who call the tune on the other side. It is being demanded because they know, because they have done the polls, as we have done the polls and the New Democratic Party has done the polls, that this government is finished. It's been dead in its tracks for a long time and what it's doing now is going through a few death racks and fibrillations before it screws up its courage to call a general election. All we're seeing here now is sort of a deathbed payoff of the NDP to those who use distortion, who use misinformation, who use all sorts of gimmicks that are known to the people of the world, to try to convince them that black was white, or up is down, or round was square, or whatever, and they ended up with this government. Now this government is paying off its debt. The people of Manitoba know it's paying off its debt and the people of Manitoba don't want this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't present to hear the Attorney-General who apparently reverted to type tonight and betrayed to the House and to the people of Manitoba the taproots of what really enlivens and gives vitality to the kind of perverse political philosophy which animates and has animated his life and the life of those who went before him. He is, in a word, a subversive and tonight we saw, by his use of the — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, does the Member for Ste. Rose deny that a communist is a subversive? Because if he does, then he's one of them.

Mr. Speaker, we heard talk apparently tonight . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I am a little concerned that a member of this House should be termed by another member a subversive. I don't think it is parliamentary and I would ask the Honourable Member for Charleswood not to us it.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if anyone can ever demonstrate to me that an adherent of the Communist Party is not subversive to the whole parliamentary institution, which we exemplify in this House then, Sir, I stand to be corrected by someone higher than you.

Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I suggest that members should not reflect on the Chair in the course of their debates. The Honourable Member for Charleswood should withdraw that remark.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I never thought that even you would deny that God is higher than the Speaker or anyone else in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I asked the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

HON. S. LYON: I will not withdraw the remark that God is higher than any of us in this House, Mr. Speaker, and that's what I said.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The honourable member knows that he was being told not to reflect on the Chair and he should not twist his words to mean something else.

The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

HON. S. LYON: I'm happy to withdraw anything that you, Sir, saw in your vision as a reflection on the Chair. Mr. Speaker, when one refers in this country to God, one was not referring to a reflection on the Chair. That may come as a new experience to the Attorney-General because of his Marxist background, but it's not a new experience to you or me.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. S. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't finished speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

HON. S. LYON: So, Mr. Speaker, faced with comments by the Attorney-General, dredged from his peculiar and perverse background about unscrupulous employers and the setting of class against class, which has been all of his lifeblood since he started to spout in our free democratic system, I would be the first, Mr. Speaker, to admit that in our province and in our country there are some unscrupulous employers. Indeed there are, but the remedy that they need is not the kind of unfair legislation that we see in Bill No. 22; the remedy that is . . .

HON. R. PENNER: Haven't got the courage to repeat the remarks when I'm in the House, have you?

HON. S. LYON: . . . Oh, oh - the communist candidate from 1952 or '54, whenever it was, now says from his seat that I haven't got the courage to repeat what I said about him. I'll say it any time and to any audience, anywhere and he can sue me if he wishes because he was the communist candidate, and we all know, Mr. Speaker. We all wonder, Mr. Speaker, on whose side

his flag would fall if the inevitable ever came about, we all wonder.

Mr. Speaker, there are some unscrupulous employers in Manitoba, indeed there are, and legislation is needed from time to time to provide that means whereby the state can arbitrate as between the proper compassionate requirements of a working person and those of the person who employs that working person.

Mr. Speaker, to found this kind of legislation on the kind of tirade that I am told we heard from the Attorney-General, where he was bringing forward all of the old, tired clichés of the Marxists of the 19th Century talking about the class structure and putting class against class and so on. Mr. Speaker, we have in this province an act that this particular Attorney-General claims to be proud of; that is, The Human Rights Act. That prohibits people in Manitoba from saying anything in a derogatory way about another group in Manitoba whether it may be ethnic or racial or religious or whatever but, according to that particular kind of flawed and wrong-headed philosophy which has animated him throughout all of his life, he finds that there is nothing wrong, that there is nothing perverse with setting class against class in Manitoba, even though it's phony. He has spent a whole lifetime - he and many of his colleagues on that side - have spent a whole lifetime doing it.

I'm wondering sometime, Mr. Speaker, whether The Human Rights Act perhaps should contain an amendment that would prohibit people of that yoke from making that kind of class confrontation possible in their speeches when - in this kind of democracy that we enjoy in Manitoba which is largely a class of society that doesn't exist - and when they do it for the most putrid of motives which is their own self interest and the interest of whatever party it may be, whatever political party it may be at the time, that the Attorney-General or some of his supporters support.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that we should not support this bill. We're going to vote against this bill. We're going to vote against it because it is basically unfair. We're going to vote against it . . .

A MEMBER: Fairness is not one of your high degree points.

HON. S. LYON: Well now, Mr. Speaker, we hear that person who is called a Minister sitting in the back row . . .

A MEMBER: Where are you standing?

HON. S. LYON: I see that the Minister of whatever, of Cultural Affairs talks about the place in which I sit. Mr. Speaker, I can tell him for the sake of the record that I chose the seat that I would sit in and Messrs. Lecuyer and whatever his name is, didn't choose their seats.

Mr. Speaker, I say tonight that this bill should be voted against because it is basically unfair, because it represents the most crude kind of payoff that a government has ever been seen making to its political benefactors, the big labour movement and because, Sir, for the third reason, it is against the public interest. If that isn't sufficient for a bill to be defeated then, Sir, I don't know what is.

If this bill passes tonight, it will be but a continuing testament to the arrogance, to the insensitivity and to

the very transitory nature of this kind of incompetence that we have seen in Manitoba since 1981 in which we will soon be rid of and would be rid of sooner, Mr. Speaker, if they had the intestinal fortitude to call an election today on this bill or on any other matter.

Thank you.

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

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I will not prolong the debate but I just want to add one or two points to the record and that is that it has to be said over and over again, when we have a society that has been working relatively well between the two different groups, between labour and management, that it is extremely unfortunate particularly in a time when we have the dark clouds of high interest rate, where we have lost the confidence of the investors in this particular province, where there is danger of losing a lot of employment opportunities because of action that this kind of bill is introduced to this Legislative Assembly. It is not a time to drive wedges between groups and society. It's a time to build confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I have not heard one group in society other than the group that have a vested interest in two things, in their own organization that's the Federation of Labour, and in their association with the New Democratic Party to keep this group of people elected, that is the only people that I have heard speak out in favour of this act. The vast majority of Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, do not want to see an upheaval or anything that would affect the economic activity that is carrying on and the job opportunities that are carried on with that relationship in Manitoba.

The question again has been put by my colleagues, why are they doing it? Are they doing it to further make themselves more unpopular with the people of Manitoba? Why are they doing it, Mr. Speaker? Is it a last-ditch effort to pay off those people that helped put them where they're at? Yes, I think that we've heard what government's responsibility is, put very well. It is a government's responsibility to be fair, to keep a balance in society. We aren't seeing this government keep a balance in society; we're seeing them slide one way. One way to help one special interest group and the people of Manitoba, as has been said, will not tolerate it.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely upset. I am extremely upset on such a major issue that we have heard very little from the Premier of the Province of Manitoba. What has he said on the Labour Bill? Has the First Minister of this province spoke on Bill 22 at any stage? Well, I don't think he has, Mr. Speaker. I don't think he has stood up as the central focus, as the leader of the party and as the Premier of the Province of Manitoba taken a position at any point, first, second, third reading or committee.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I know where he was when it was in committee and their former Minister, Sidney Green, was tearing them apart in committee stage. He was handing out or trying to look after the interest and defend himself. In fact, maybe he was having a petition passed around to continue to support him as a New Democratic Premier at the Red River Ex, Mr. Speaker.

When the labour bill was being debated in committee, he was the person who was at the Red River Exhibition. I don't criticize him for being at the Red River Ex, Mr. Speaker, but I think he could have picked his time a little different.

This is the problem with the New Democratic Party. Their priorities are screwed up. They lack a leader. They're paying off political patronage, Mr. Speaker, to a small group in society. It is not healthy for the people, it's not healthy for industry, it's not healthy for this Assembly, to yield to one small group in society that have a vested interest in two things, their own power and the power of this government, Mr. Speaker, and it will not wash. It will not wash and before they pass such controversial tough legislation, and I challenge the Minister of Labour, she didn't sell me on it. I would expect as a legislator that one of them, the Premier, the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Economic Development, who is responsible for creating a good business atmosphere in the province, would have stood and put a hard sale case to us, but they didn't, Mr. Speaker. They didn't stand and speak, the majority of them. They haven't stood and spoke on any issue.

Did they stand and speak on the language issue? Did they stand and speak on the — (Interjection) — No, they didn't. I didn't hear the Minister of Education stand on the language issue, the person who is responsible for educating all the children, she didn't stand and speak. She was muzzled as was the Minister of Housing, as was the Member for Concordia, as was the Member for The Pas. Has he stood and spoke on labour legislation? No he hasn't, Mr. Speaker. They're muzzled because they don't represent their constituents. They use the bulldozer of power to pay off their political patronage.

Mr. Speaker, I don't support this kind of legislation. I support a strong, fair system in society and we're not getting it under the New Democratic Party, and the constituents of Manitoba, come the next election, will give them their reward and turf them out of office.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I plan to keep my comments brief and in a somewhat different tone than most of the comments that have been spoken this afternoon and this evening on this bill because unfortunately a lot of the comments were not directed on the issues contained in the bill, but rather on other issues. I regret listening to some of the debate, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, because it's centred on hate. It's centred on hate towards working people. It's centred on hate towards unions and it's also centred on hate towards business people, towards management. That is where the debate is centred.

The suggestion that members on this side, and one member directly stated that I hated management, that people on this side hated management. Now you see, that kind of comment, Mr. Speaker, shows how one-sided, how in some ways ill-informed someone is when they make the suggestion, because I worked as a union organizer prior to being elected by the people in my constituency to represent them and being chosen to sit on the front benches, that I spent a career in that

working and hating management. That is how ill-informed that member is, and I would challenge him to speak to some of the management people that I dealt with, that worked with me, that I negotiated contracts for, and you ask them what they thought of me, what they think of me now and the kind of relationships that existed between the people that I had the privilege of representing them as a union representative, and the interest that they had as being management, as being the employing authority. You go and ask them and then maybe if you did, and did that with an open mind, you wouldn't make the kind of ill-informed and one-sided comments that you make.

I do want to speak for a few minutes about this whole notion that's been brought up about the hate that was being suggested to members on this side towards management towards management. We have worked and we have, in the context of this legislation, consulted with management. We have dealt with a number of issues related to The Labour Relations Act and I can say from the consultations that I had, and the Minister of Labour had many more than I did, that there were significant changes in our thinking; there were significant changes in the legislation; there were significant changes in the many clauses that go into the legislation because of that consultation.

I don't fault the representatives of the businesses in this province, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce for taking a position in opposition to any improvements in the labour legislation because it doesn't necessarily work to their best interest to have improvements and they have taken that position constantly, and I respect them for it, that they are representing the interests that they represent as Chambers. They took the same position in 1972 and they said the same kind of things in 1972 about the changes that were made in the labour legislation as they did with respect to the most recent amendments - to the work, one member says - and that is true. So I don't fault them for that and we, as government, have to take in their views and consult with them, get an understanding of what they are saying and then make decisions and make judgments and make legislation based on what we believe to be the responsible position with respect to legislation after taking in the concerns of all.

We will continue to consult. I will continue to work with the Chamber of Commerce, with the business representatives, because that's my role in Executive Council to work with the private sector to ensure that there is, as much as possible, economic development. I won't attack the individuals that took positions with respect to the Chamber of Commerce like some members opposite had with respect to positions that have been advanced by other people or get into those kind of personality conflicts because I believe that they are honest people and they are trying to do what's best for the people that they represent. I believe that they have the right, and they have the right without the kind of challenge that exists with respect to others to take that right.

I do want to spend a moment, though, talking about the kind of hate that was brought forward tonight with respect to unions and with respect to some individuals who happen to represent working people and unions in this province. There was a lot of anger directed to

one Mr. Martin who was - I guess still is - technically, the President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour.

I want to put it on the record that Mr. Martin is a personal friend of mine. I have worked with him for many years; I think he's a fine individual and I think he has done a good job representing the interests that he has to represent and I think he has done that in an admirable way. He is a friend of mine; I regret to say that we're probably not quite as good friends as we were at one time because we happen to have disagreements much more frequently now than when he and I were in a different position, when I was working with him in the labour movement. Now I have a different role. I am on the government benches and I have to reflect the views of all people in society as reflected through our party and our philosophy; so unfortunately he and I are not quite on the same wave length to the extent that we were at one time.

I really regret when I hear that kind of hatred and that kind of hate directed to individuals who are doing their job in the best way that they can; and I don't think that kind of hatred is the kind of thing we want in Manitoba society because I really believe that in order to succeed as a province and a country we have to break down some of those myths and some of those attitudes that exist.

I would like to spend just a couple of moments to talk about the very basic principle which I see in this act. I guess it's one that will clearly outline the difference in philosophy, the difference in approach between members on this side and members on that side.

This bill has been brought up as this bogeyman, that this is going to set up a situation where the big bogeyman - the big union members - are going to somehow. The big union bosses, as some members opposite cry, are going to suddenly just going to take over these mindless creatures, these little employees. I heard one member say they're going to jump over back fences and corral them and force them into joining unions. What utter nonsense!

We believe that this bill gives people the right of choice. It gives workers that if they want to exercise their right of choice to belong to a union, they can do it. It's been facilitated somewhat by the changes in this bill, but the bottom line to this legislation is to give working people, give employees the right of choice; if they want to exercise that choice, to join a union. That is all that's in this bill, Mr. Speaker.

I guess that really outlines the difference in philosophy between us on this side and that, Sir, because we don't believe that employees are mindless creatures that can be manipulated by union representatives. We believe that they are individuals with minds, with feelings, with thoughts, and they can make decisions for themselves and that is really the underlying principles that are in this bill. I think that very clearly, Mr. Speaker, outlines and shows the difference of our approach.

In conclusion, I just want to say that, as I indicated with respect to this legislation, I believe it is good legislation. It is not way out of line compared to what exists in other jurisdictions throughout Canada. I do not believe, and I say this quite genuinely, that it is going to harm investment in this province the same way as the 1972 legislation did not harm investment in the Province of Manitoba.

I had the opportunity just recently to meet with some investors from Japan who were here looking at some

opportunities in Manitoba. We talked about the labour relations climate, and you know what they told me about what existed in Japan - I think all members know that there is a very high level of unionization and there is very good co-operation between management, government and labour in that country - and they believe that is one of the reasons they have been successful. They say that when they look at Canada, they look at a situation like exists in British Columbia where these very polarized positions exist and they do not believe that is a good environment for investment. But they are of the view that the kind of situation that exists in Manitoba, where there is some level of co-operation between the workers and unions and management, as a good place to invest.

I think we've got a lot to learn from them in terms of co-operation, a co-operative society, and I would hope that all of us can work toward that, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that it's in the interest of all people in this province. So we don't need the kind of hate that has been generated; we don't need the kind of hardened positions. I don't believe that this legislation is doing what some members opposite are saying it is doing. I believe it will continue to lead Manitoba into a co-operative society where there is a quality of opportunity and a quality between those who provide the labour and those who provide the capital.

As I said before, and I just want to emphasize, this bill merely gives people the right of choice which I believe they should have. So I believe it is good legislation, one that should be supported and one, I will suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, will stand the test of time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

Having spoken on the hoist motion just a few minutes ago, I don't intend to replot the same ground. I intend instead, Mr. Speaker, to spend a few moments in wrapping up my thoughts as they occur, having seen that the government is not prepared to listen, is not prepared to delay for consultation and consensus, is determined to steam-roll through and take no notice of any alternate views that have been legitimately and reasonably presented.

Mr. Speaker, the people on the other side, the members opposite, appear to be cornered now and lashing out, saying that the process of this debate is one of spreading hatred. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if they're going to seek that view, then they should start by looking at themselves because we on this side hear it constantly not only on this particular issue, but on all issues as members opposite start their speeches.

The Member for River East, in his maiden speech in the House, talked about the people on our side of the House who represent the golden ghettos of our province. The Member for Thompson who made me rise to debate just a few hours ago by making his typical statement, "Will that sell in Tuxedo?" as though the people of Tuxedo are different from the people of other areas of the city; although they have different views, aspirations and goals, as though they don't put their pants on one leg at a time like most of us do, or that

somehow they have two heads or four arms or something of that nature. They are constantly trying to paint a picture of class discrimination, class distinction. That's the real hatred, Mr. Speaker, that's over there. That is the insidious, underlying, prejudicial hatred that lies over there.

Mr. Speaker, even a very intelligent, intellectual individual like the Attorney-General can't withstand the temptation to say something like this labour legislation is needed because of the unscrupulous employers in our province. — (Interjection) — Yes, okay. He hastens to correct that there are some; except the problem is that he doesn't tell us which are the unscrupulous and which are the ones who are good employers. As a result, everyone is painted with the same brush. We are rushing forward to institute this legislation because we want to exercise the unscrupulous employers of this province, because he believes there are some who have not acted in reason and in fairness and in justice, then everybody's going to be made to pay.

Sir, I acknowledge that the same thing has to be said about union people and union leaders. I know many, I have been related to some, and I don't say that everyone is a bad union leader. Everyone who is a union leader is an unscrupulous individual. But, by the same token, this legislation has been demanded and forced upon the government by some perhaps whose objectives and goals are not as laudable as they ought to be.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's what we are faced with, is an attempt to change the balance of power, an attempt to change the belt line of fairness in legislation here and an attempt to do it on behalf of one group as opposed to another group and at the expense of the other group. That, Sir, is the issue. It's an issue of fairness, it's an issue of justice, it's an issue of equity, and that, Sir, is being damaged, that whole issue.

It's a sad day for Manitobans because I believe that this government is demonstrating its contempt for the opinions of Manitobans today because, like members opposite, we are doing public opinion sampling from time to time and we hear what the public is interested in.

At a time when the public is saying that their No. 1 concern is jobs and job creation, this government is willing to thumb its nose at the chief job creating sector of our society in Manitoba today, stomp on them, kick them in the teeth and tell them that their agenda doesn't put job creation first; their agenda puts change in labour legislation to favour one group over the other first.

At a time when they are taking some considerable risk that that changing of the balance will change the opportunities for job creation, lessen the opportunities for job creation, they're prepared to take that major risk today at the expense of jobs and that's exactly where it is, Mr. Speaker. When the public is telling us that economic development is high up on the agenda, a desire for economic development, they are scorning the investors, the economic developers and the job creators right today. They are willing to set aside that.

At a time when people are telling us that they want to see a government that's willing to plan for our future economic growth, they are talking about a short-term vision of putting more power in the hands of the labour organizers of this province.

At a time when the people are telling us that they want a government that listens, they are tuned out to

the vast majority of Manitobans, unwilling to listen. Whether it's on bingos, whether it's on the language issue, whether it's on this issue, on labour legislation, they are unwilling to listen. That's the contempt with which this government holds the public opinion today.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General feels that it's funny for me to be making this speech when the president of the Chamber of Commerce isn't in the gallery. Mr. Speaker, he wasn't in the gallery when I spoke the last time. I am not speaking to the President of the Chamber of Commerce. I am speaking to the members of this Assembly in the hope that they might come to some rationale, they might come to some reason, they might come to some understanding.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the public is saying that they want to have a government that's capable of managing the affairs of this province, they get a government that is only willing to subject itself to the pressure of a special interest group and to listen to the people who paid the piper, are now calling the tune, and that is those people who put them in government.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology just made a great play about saying that this legislation is no worse than the legislation in other provinces, but we found out by questioning during the long three sessions of committees that, in essence, this bill cherry picks some of the most onerous provisions of every bill and puts them together. If it's in Ontario and it's a tough piece of legislation, we take it here. If it's in B.C. and it's a tough piece of legislation, we bring it here. If it's in The Canada Labour Relations Act and it's a tough provision on employers, we bring it here.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, we found out from committee that they even added some things that are unheard of on any other jurisdiction in this country. So what we have done, Mr. Speaker, is we have taken the worst of all possible worlds and put it together and our justification is it exists elsewhere, not all of it but almost all of it. I don't believe that's the rationale that ought to be used in bringing in fair and reasonable legislation in this province today.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General took issue with my suggestion, Sir, that I was concerned about the ordinary Manitoban when I was speaking today, earlier. He said that there are 480,000 workers in this province, ordinary Manitobans, as he characterized them. I agree with him; except that I think the figure is closer to 460,000, but that's okay; that's not his department. Statistics comes under the Member for Brandon East. In any case, he says, Mr. Speaker, that we're not talking on behalf of ordinary people; we are only talking on behalf of the Chambers of Commerce and they aren't ordinary people. They aren't the ordinary people of this province.

But I want to tell him that at the same time, of those 460,000 workers in this province, something in the order of 15 percent are unionized workers. So if he's doing this on behalf of organized labour, he's not doing it on behalf of the vast majority of the workers of this province. He's doing . . .

HON. R. PENNER: That bill is for the unorganized and those who want to be certified.

A MEMBER: That's right, that's right.

MR. G. FILMON: Now you've got it, Mr. Speaker. It's on the record. The objective of the Attorney-General is that he wants all that other 85 percent of the working force who are not unionized to become unionized. That's the objective of the bill and he's just said it from his seat.

Mr. Speaker, although the 15 percent of the populous who are organized labour aren't the only ordinary people in this province, they obviously are the ones who count when it comes to decisions of this government. They are the ones who pull the strings and they are the ones who have all of the power and authority when it comes to legislative priorities.

Mr. Speaker, he quoted Abraham Lincoln as justification for his point of view with respect to this legislation. When he quoted Abraham Lincoln, members opposite swooned that the Attorney-General has all of these references at hand and he's wont to use them and, in fact, he's good with words; indeed he is in so many different ways, but I'll quote him some more of Abraham Lincoln because I believe that it should be put on the record beside the comments that he gave from Abraham Lincoln earlier on this afternoon.

Abraham Lincoln said, "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong." That's of course what so many members opposite are always attempting to do. Take it away from the strong so that we can make others strong. Not the case, Sir. Not the case. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. What are you doing? Pulling down the wage payer. Yes, Mr. Speaker. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. That's their objective, Sir. You heard it. Make the rich pay; that's the slogan that members opposite are constantly putting forth.

Here is a good one I had forgotten about, Mr. Speaker. It's one for the Minister of Finance. It says - and this is again a quote from Abraham Lincoln - "You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money." Well, we wish the Minister of Finance were to learn that one, Mr. Speaker.

"You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence." Indeed, so often we see members opposite so prepared to take away initiative and independence, and that's what they want to do in the work force is create dependence upon the fiat of government, the control of government and their allies, the union organizers, Mr. Speaker.

"You cannot help permanently by doing for them what they can do for themselves." That's what Abraham Lincoln said in addition perhaps to what the Attorney-General quoted earlier today.

Mr. Speaker, the key to what we're talking about in labour relations is balance. When both sides believe that they don't have enough, that the legislation doesn't satisfy them, then, Sir, everybody works together because they believe that it's a little bit unfair to each of them, but they have to put up with it because they don't want it all of a sudden to be thrown out of balance and to be put all on one side.

I believe honestly that the good employers don't want the system to be thrown out of balance. They don't want more power for themselves. They didn't come, when we were in government, crashing our doors down

and demanding, saying we supported you, we put you in government, change all that labour legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we did not change that legislation in our term of government because although there were complaints by employers, Sir, we recognized that both sides were to a degree not totally satisfied, but both sides were working together. There were indeed harmonious relations and there was indeed fairness, equity and justice. That's what all of us ought to be after in this whole process, Mr. Speaker.

What they are doing by this legislation is destroying that climate of fairness, that climate of equity, that climate of justice. They are creating confrontation, and we saw it begin with the full page ads in the paper earlier this week. They have caused it by this legislation. They have created the confrontative attitude and they, Sir, are destroying the confidence of investors both now and in future in this province. They have intervened and interfered at a time when it isn't justified, at a time when it's not warranted. They have done it without consensus and we heard last night, it's been repeated and repeated and repeated, that there is not consensus, that the Labour Management Review Committee has not been allowed to participate in arriving at this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many examples in this legislation of how it is anti-jobs, anti-workers. The fact that when a business closes down today, the obligations of the collective agreement remain so that it will make it almost impossible for someone to come in and reorganize and get a business back together and working again because that will mean that nobody will ever move in and buy a failed business and try and reorganize it.

What they have done is condemned to unemployment the workers at Superior, condemned to unemployment the workers at Burns in Brandon, Mr. Speaker, because they have made it so that nobody will be able to come in again and reorganize the business and get it working again, Mr. Speaker. Are they the friends of the worker? Ha, ha!

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sad at the insensitivity of this group who would steam-roll through this legislation because of their own desire to get back at the employers who don't support them. In their desire to get back at those people in society who don't support them, at the same time they've dealt a severe blow to the workers of this province, Mr. Speaker. In destroying the balance, they've begun the process of destroying the good relationship that has existed in the past between workers and employers in this province.

It's been built up over decades. As I say, we didn't change it when we were in government for four years, and I predict, Mr. Speaker, that these unwanted changes will not work. They'll destroy jobs in this province and like so many of the ideologically motivated pieces of legislation that they've brought forward in the past two and-a-half years, measures will have to be addressed to turn around the destructive effects of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we will have to change some of the aspects of this legislation as we will other things that they've done in the past like the farm lands ownership, like The Election Finances Act and so many other things. Mr. Speaker, they have begun the pendulum swinging and they have sowed the wind and they will reap the whirlwind.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is the proposed third reading of Bill 22.

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

YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Dolin, Eyler, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Mallnowski, Parasluk, Penner, Phillips, Santos, Storie, Uskiw.

NAYS

Banman, Blake, Brown, Downey, Enns, Filmon, Graham, Hammond, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Steen.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 24; Nays 16.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

BILL NO. 30 - THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1984

HON. A. ANSTETT presented Bill No. 30, The Appropriation Act, 1984, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. E. HARPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say a few words and just briefly state some of the concerns of the aboriginal people, especially in regard to self-government. I am naturally disappointed that we didn't deal with my private member's resolution dealing with self-government, and I felt there were some things I had to say in respect to self-government.

Self-government is a fundamental principle and also a fundamental reality that has to be recognized and accepted by the people of Canada and also by the Canadian governments. We have used the term "nations" when we described ourselves as people, but I don't think that nations should have connotations with separatism. I recognize that the English-speaking Canadians are sensitive to the word "nations" because it reflects on the Quebec situation in regard to separation, but nations meant, as we mean it, as aboriginal people, to mean common language, culture and history of our people.

Self-government has nothing to do with separatism and let that fact be clear. The threat to separatism is not to aboriginal people. I might say the greater threat to unity in Canada is the Western Confederation

Regions. Aboriginal people have always held our relationship with Canada with the greatest respect. Also, the Indian people have always held their treaties were sacred; also, the Indian people believe in an united Canada.

There is nothing threatening about self-government. I believe self-government can be achieved through the constitutional process. It requires an understanding of the general public. It requires a political will and also the courage by governments to advance self-government.

The Canadian Parliament, the House of Commons, just recently adopted and also received a special committee report on Indian self-government. I might say that the report was received and supported by all members of the House, including the Conservatives, the Liberals and the NDP. The committee made recommendations and also statements that I haven't heard those kind of remarks and especially in support of self-government. I hope the Federal Government begins to implement some of these recommendations.

As you know, one of the greatest stumbling blocks and also one of the greatest setbacks for Indian people in advancing and moving forward is The Indian Act. It certainly has caused great pains and great problems for Indian people, not necessarily all Indian people but also the public as a whole. It has caused social, economic and political problems. A new approach is needed and, certainly, the committee has advanced a new relationship.

I might quote from the Parliamentary Committee Report which was tabled in the House. On Page 41, the recommendations, and I quote: "The committee recommends that the Federal Government establish a new relationship with Indian First Nations, and that an essential element of this relationship be recognition of Indian self-government."

The Indian Act presently renders the chief and council powerless. The Indian Act denies the Indian people opportunity to make their own decisions, to develop their own lands, to develop their economic potential, to educate their children and also to plan for their future. The Indian people want to control their own affairs with their own territory.

Some of these rights and some of these authorities that they would like to see might include with family law dealing with adoption, child welfare-caring agencies; even within a territory, their reserves, construction, zoning, public order, etc. I just named a few. Those are still within the control of the Minister of Indian Affairs and also by the Governor-in-Council. I believe the initiatives can be worked on and also advanced by the Federal Government through legislation. As you know, the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction with respect to Indians and also land reserves for Indians under The BNA Act of 1867.

I might say that I recognize that in order to entrench self-government, we would need the support of seven provinces plus 50 percent of the population. It is something that I still believe in, that we can still achieve self-government, that I have trust in the public forum and also the public will support the ambitions of the aboriginal people.

It is also for me to deny and say that we have self-government. I recognize we don't have that authority, even as legislation, we can't grant the powers that we

have to the reserves. We would have to negotiate some of those powers and jurisdictions with the governments. We talk tonight about fairness. We talk about taking away from the rich. I always felt that the Indian people today should be the richest people in Canada and also they should be well-off, but today we see what has happened over these years.

I am not complaining for the fact that we had negotiated away all those lands that we had that rightfully had belonged to ourselves, the Indian people. I think part of the problem might have been because Indian people have never described or asserted to the kind of ownership that the European application of law might have in terms of land tenure. We always felt that land was something that we didn't own, but because of the new realities that exist today, we have to wrestle with those problems and we have been left out in the process, even in a democratic process, for some time.

It is why I make a statement in this House, because we see an institution like democracy in here, a forum where decisions are made, where laws are made, where rights are protected, and where I believe confidence should be able to be maintained here by Indian people. For that, a new approach is required and certainly the Constitution process provides that opportunity and that challenge.

As we are drawing a close to this Session, I may have the opportunity to further these remarks at the next Session. I don't want to go into great detail in terms of the actual details of what I see, and also the Indian people of self-government, and what it entails; but at this time I thought I would put these remarks on the record.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we speak on the Main Supply Motion, the last bill that's before us in this Session, in wrapping up some of the thoughts that come to me, and involve one of the terms that was used by one of the speakers opposite earlier today when he spoke about this government's actions on labour being made in the name of principle, that to me is probably one of the terms that I could not, in any way, imagine being attributed to this NDP Government, given what we have seen this government go through over the past couple of years, but particularly this last Session.

Probably, in the first two Sessions, they were acting out of ideological motivation, trying to implement philosophical beliefs and trying to stick to their principles. However out of date, out of touch with reality they were, they were trying to stick with principle, I believe, but since then, in this Session, Sir, we have seen the most amazing transformation that I believe any political party in government has gone through in the history of this country.

This desperate group of people, Sir, have turned on all of the things that they used to hold as tenets of their political faith. The things that they held dear most of all they have now swept under the carpet in a desperate attempt to try and recoup public opinion, public support, and try and put themselves back

together again for the next election. So what have we seen in the course of the economic moves that this government has made over the past number of months? We've seen some incredible flip flops and some incredible convoluted moves designed to do something economically for this province.

The scheme that was revealed to us just a matter of a couple of weeks ago by the Minister of Finance has to be the icing on the cake, the piece de résistance of all of the economic flip flops that we could have seen a government of an NDP stripe take. This preferred-share scheme, which is probably more of a scam than a scheme, Sir, is demonstration of a government without principle.

Here we have a provision in The Tax Act that was intended to allow private businesses the opportunity to take profits out in the form of dividends which could then be reinvested because the incentive was for private businesses to get some money out at a lesser tax rate in order to reinvest in real long-term job creation in this country. That was the purpose that particular proviso was created in our tax structure.

These people, Sir, perverted that whole concept of long-term investment and job creation in order to take money out of the pocket of the Federal Treasury and get even with Ottawa for what they perceived to be unfair treatment. Maybe indeed Ottawa could be criticized for some of their changes in terms of transfer payments and equalization payments and so on, but here the group of people who talk about co-operative federalism, co-operative discussions and projects with the Federal Government, who talk about how wonderful it is to be able to get together, as my colleague from Pembina likes to refer to, the kissy face-huggy bear approach, these people now have turned to going at any type of tax scheme or scam to gouge money out of the federal tax pocket.

That, Sir, after all was said and done, was the bottom line behind the payroll tax, that they could get some \$30 million out of the Federal Treasury that they couldn't otherwise get. That, Sir, was the bottom line behind the preferred scam, that they could reach in to the Federal Treasury to the tune of \$25 million or \$30 million, totally against their normal principles of operation, because normally they are the people who will stand up on any platform and rail against loopholes in the tax system, who will rail against corporate welfare, who will talk about not having these kinds of things within your legislation, within your tax system so that people shouldn't benefit from them.

They then turn and take this, in a perverse way that wasn't intended, perhaps in a way that may yet be struck down by Ottawa, in a taxation sense, because, Sir, I'll read to you a letter that was sent to them by a tax lawyer in this city who talked about the speech that was made by the Minister of Finance when he introduced this.

He says, "Dear Mr. Schroeder: May I remind you that dividend tax credits are not loopholes. Dividends are accorded tax credits because the corporate revenue on which they are based pay a tax at the corporate level and, therefore, tax on the dividends would, in effect, be double taxation.

"May I therefore suggest that the scheme you announced on Wednesday, June 20th, to issue preferred shares of a Crown corporation to the public, on the

basis that the dividends received on those shares would be accorded tax credits, may run the risk that if the scheme is very successful and the Federal Government feels that its tax base is being eroded, the Federal Government may very simply amend The Income Tax Act to eliminate tax credits in respect of dividends from corporations controlled by governments which statutorily do not pay tax on their revenues.

"Again, if you tie your guarantee of the dividends too tight, and this is important, the tax department may reassess the shareholders on the basis that the dividends they are receiving are in fact interest and not entitled to dividend tax credit treatment. So they may in fact be hoodwinking the unsuspecting purchaser of those shares.

"The department and courts have been very active in piercing the corporate veil and striking down schemes that have no business purpose."

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we can say that this scheme or scam does not have any business purpose. In fact, the Minister indicated that this corporation would be intended not to make a profit. It's merely a sophisticated tax dodge.

Mr. Speaker, the writer of this letter concludes - and again he makes another very valid and telling point - "In either of these events, the shares would be substantially discounted, and I would strongly recommend that if the shares are not retractable at the option of the holder after a very short holding period, the investors in these securities may find themselves a substantially discounted stock and the Province of Manitoba with a tarnished reputation in the market."

Indeed, the Province of Manitoba has a tarnished reputation in the market as a result of the efforts and the stewardship of this government, Mr. Speaker. This government is willing to go to any length to save their political skins. They tell us that we ought to be happy about the manner in which things are today in Manitoba, that we ought to be satisfied and grateful for the good job that they have done in running our province.

What do we have to show for it? Even though they brought in a pseudo-conservative budget that purported to have a 3.9 percent increase in expenditures, what did it turn out? It was probably closer to a 6 percent increase. But, nevertheless, how could it have been a pseudo-conservative budget, Mr. Speaker, when it had a \$488 million deficit?

Added to two previous years, we now have \$1.4 billion of deficit in the three cumulative years of this government's stewardship. Is it any wonder that we have had our credit rating downgraded? On top of that, we have the payroll tax, an unheard-of imposition on the employers, on the jobs of this province. Besides that, they removed the Hydro rate freeze, Mr. Speaker. Property taxes have increased at an unprecedented rate. They are three times as high, Mr. Speaker, the property taxes; the increase for their three years is already three times as great as it was for our entire four years of government. That's what has happened as a result of the stewardship of this government. More so than that, they have increased virtually every fee, every charge and every tax that this government imposes on all the ordinary individuals of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line question is can any ordinary Manitoban say that he is better off today than he was before the New Democrats took office? The

answer, unequivocally, is no. No, no, a thousand times no. Sir, those ordinary Manitobans can't even say that in future, in looking at the bright future that they are saying exists. There are the storm clouds on the horizon of the rising interest rates, the falling Canadian dollar and the predictions that our economic recovery, such as it has been, is already being cut off.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that this supply motion brings us good cause to reflect upon how ordinary Manitobans are today versus how they were when this New Democratic Government took office in 1981. Sir, the answer very simply is they are worse off and the prospects are that they won't be getting any better as long as this group is in government.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Business Development and Tourism, that when the House adjourns today, it shall stand adjourned until a time fixed by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the government.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to debate the adjournment motion. I want to do just one or two things, though.

I think it would be in order, Mr. Speaker, to acknowledge that we are losing the services of our Assistant Clerk, Mr. Gordon Mackintosh, who is going on to an advanced career in other fields, and we wish him well. It would be my hope that perhaps some arrangements can be made that he can be of some future service to all of us and to this Chamber if even on a part-time basis.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the adjournment motion put to the Chamber by the Government House Leader, while I don't quarrel with it, it is somewhat out of the ordinary for the tradition of this House. We would normally have prorogation take place at this time. I acknowledge that the practice that the Government House Leader is now introducing to the Manitoba Chamber is, in fact, carried out in the Federal House and perhaps in some other jurisdictions.

I caution this government, Mr. Speaker, that it should not be used or that it should not cross their minds to bring this Legislative Assembly back in an emergency Session for any ill-thought out schemes that they may dream up during the course of the summer or as a result of Supreme Court decisions, Mr. Speaker. They should have learnt by now that this opposition, supported by the people of Manitoba, will do battle on any issue that they may conjure up.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, we on this side would join with the Opposition House Leader in wishing our Clerk-Assistant well in his future career endeavours.

Mr. Speaker, I would accept the suggestion by the Opposition House Leader and his concurrence in the fact that the adjournment change is one for technical procedural reasons that leaves available, in terms of options, the same kinds of options that are available to the House of Commons federally and to other Provincial Legislatures, but we have no intention of satisfying the Member for Charleswood or of proposing this motion in this way for any motives other than the procedural ones which I did discuss with the member and which I have reiterated now.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: We can just wait for the administrator. There is Royal Assent to come shortly.

ROYAL ASSENT

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS (Mr. Myron Mason): His Honour the Administrator.

The Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, Mr. Speaker addressed The Honourable the Administrator in the following words:

MR. SPEAKER: May it please your Honour.

The Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed several bills, which in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. DEPUTY CLERK, G. Mackintosh:

- No. 4 - The Blood Test Act; Loi sur les analyses du sang.
- No. 5 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.
- No. 6 - The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act; Loi sur la manutention et le transport des marchandises dangereuses.
- No. 7 - The Central Trust Company Act, 1984; Loi de 1984 sur la compagnie du Trust Central.
- No. 8 - An Act to amend The Securities Act.
- No. 9 - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.
- No. 10 - An Act to amend The Family Maintenance Act.
- No. 11 - An Act to amend The Clean Environment Act.
- No. 12 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les écoles publiques.
- No. 14 - The Jobs Fund Act; Loi sur le fonds de soutien à l'emploi.
- No. 15 - The Canada-United Kingdom Judgments Enforcement Act; Loi sur la Convention Canada-Royaume-Uni en matière d'exécution des jugements.
- No. 16 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.

- No. 17 - An Act to amend The Dental Mechanics Act.
- No. 18 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1984).
- No. 19 - An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.
- No. 20 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1984)(2); Loi de 1984 modifiant le droit statutaire (2).
- No. 21 - An Act to amend The Law Society Act.
- No. 22 - An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act and Various other Acts of the Legislature.
- No. 24 - An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.
- No. 26 - The Chiropractic Act; Loi sur la chiropractie.
- No. 28 - An Act to validate an Expropriation under The Expropriation Act; Loi validant une expropriation effectuée en vertu de la Loi sur l'expropriation.
- No. 29 - An Act to amend An Act respecting The Agricultural and Community District of Newdale.
- No. 31 - The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act (1984).
- No. 32 - An Act to amend The Health and Post Secondary Education Tax Levy Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur l'impôt destiné aux services de santé et à L'enseignement post-secondaire.
- No. 35 - An Act to amend The Construction Industry Wages Act.

MR. CLERK: In her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Administrator doth assent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful servants, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, approach the Honourable the Administrator with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg the Honourable the Administrator the acceptance of these bills:

- No. 3 - An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and authorize the Borrowing of the Same (2) (The Loan Act, 1984, No. 2).
- No. 30 - An Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1985 and to authorize Commitments to Expend Additional Money in Subsequent Years and to authorize the Borrowing of Funds to provide for Cash Requirements of the Government (The Appropriation Act, 1984).

MR. CLERK: The Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these bill in Her Majesty's name.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

(GOD SAVE THE QUEEN WAS SUNG)



PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

The Manitoba Gazette

Vol. 114

Winnipeg, Saturday, March 2, 1985

No. 9

PROCLAMATION

“Pearl McGonigal”
Lieutenant-Governor.

CANADA—
PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

ELIZABETH THE SECOND, by the Grace of God of The United Kingdom, Canada and Her other Realms and Territories QUEEN, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith.

A PROCLAMATION

To our Beloved and Faithful the Members elected to serve in the Legislative Assembly of Our Province of Manitoba, and to each and every of you — GREETING:

WHEREAS The Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba now stands adjourned;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed appropriate to request Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor by a Royal Proclamation effective on the sixth day of March, 1985, to prorogue the Third Session of the Thirty-Second Legislature of the Province of Manitoba and to summon the said Legislature for the dispatch of business on the seventh day of March, 1985.

NOW KNOW YE THAT for divers causes and consideration, and taking into consideration the ease and convenience of Our loving subjects, We have thought fit, by and with the advice and consent of Our Executive Council of Our Province of Manitoba, to hereby prorogue the Third Session of the Thirty-Second Legislature of the Province of Manitoba effective, Wednesday, the sixth day of March, 1985, and to convene the Fourth Session of the Thirty-Second Legislature of the Province of Manitoba on Thursday, the seventh day of March, 1985, at the hour of 2:00 o'clock in the afternoon, For the Dispatch of Business, in Our Legislative Assembly of Our Province of Manitoba, in Our City of Winnipeg, there to take into consideration the state and welfare of Our said Province of Manitoba and therein to do as may seem necessary.

HEREIN FAIL NOT.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent, and the Great Seal of Our Province of Manitoba to be hereunto affixed;

WITNESS, Her Honour Pearl McGonigal, Lieutenant-Governor of Our said Province of Manitoba;

AT OUR GOVERNMENT HOUSE, at Our City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, this twentieth day of February, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eighty-five, and in the thirty-fourth year of Our Reign.

BY COMMAND,

“ROLAND PENNER”,
Attorney-General.