

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 4 June, 1982

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 Flin Flon.

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: I beg leave to table the Annual Report of Flyer Industries Limited for the year 1981; and the Annual Report of William Clare (Manitoba) Limited for the year ending December 31st, 1981.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. R. PENNER introduced Bill No. 51, an Act to amend The Child Welfare Act; and Bill No. 52, an Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

HON. B. URUSKI introduced, by leave, Bill No. 54, The Farm Lands Ownership Act. (Recommended by the Lieutenant-Governor); and Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Real Property Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions may I direct the attention of members to the gallery, where we have 23 students of Grade 6 standing of the Montrose School under the direction of a Mrs. Hanna. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

There are 27 students of Grade 7 and 8 standing of the Southwood Elementary School under the direction of Mr. Enns. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member of Rhineland.

There are 45 students of Grade 5 standing of the Daerwood Elementary School under the direction of Mr. Nerbas, and Miss Kulpak. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

There are 20 students, of Grade 6 standing of the Pinkham School, under the direction of Mr. Sloan.

The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Yesterday he indicated that he was prepared to keep the House informed with respect to the City of Winnipeg police negotiations. Could he advise this House whether he has any further information to give to the House and whether he's satisfied that the work-to-rule campaign of the police department, which they have announced, will adequately protect the lives and safety of citizens in this city and, if not, what does he propose to do?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I met with the Mayor as late as 4:00 o'clock yesterday afternoon and I'm satisfied, as is the Mayor, that as things then were and as I'm advised things now are, there's no danger to life or limb in the City of Winnipeg. That is not to say that the work-to-rule campaign is not without its effect, but not in terms of endangering the safety of the citizens of this city or of the functioning of the city in any appreciable way.

It's my impression talking with the Mayor and with officials of the Police Union that there is room and I think I may have been of some assistance. It's my hope that the parties will recognize the very serious responsibility that they have and after thinking about their respective positions over the weekend that they may find occasion to meet as early as Monday and explore what room there is. I'm satisfied that there is still negotiating room.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General has indicated he's spoken to the Mayor and he's spoken to officials of the Union. Does he intend to review this matter with the Chief of Police and senior police officials?

HON. R. PENNER: As required, the Member for St. Norbert knows that in effect the employer is the City of Winnipeg and the Mayor speaks for the City of Winnipeg in matters of this kind between meetings of Executive Policy and Council and I certainly have had no difficulty in communicating with, as the need dictates, the Chief of Police. I'm satisfied as well that the Chief of Police, Ken Johnston, is fully apprised of all movements and developments in this area.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, in view of the increase in actual unemployment in Manitoba from May of 1981 when it was 27,000, to May of 1982 when it is now 38,000, an increase of some 11,000

persons, can the Minister of Labour indicate what sectors of the economy that increase in unemployment is taking place in and what, if any, programs is he contemplating to help alleviate the situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we certainly are experiencing some severe difficulties and, as indicated by the Member for St. Norbert, the unemployment rate has increased significantly over the last year. I suppose on the good side, it isn't hitting us as hard as it is hitting the rest of Canada; that is, the unemployment rate in most other parts of Canada has gone up significantly faster than it has in Manitoba. The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for Canada is 10.2 percent; in Manitoba it is 7.5 percent. This, in fact, is the first time in the last 10 years or more that we are more than 2.5 percentage points below the national average in terms of unemployment. In fact, unemployment is also at a point now, for instance in Alberta where it's at 7.2 percent; and it was at 3.2 percent just a year ago. There has been some significant changes in the last year.

We have experienced in Manitoba in the last month actually a decrease in the number of unemployed, from 40,000 to 38,000, but that does not give us great optimism; that is a significant number; too large a number in terms of the sectors of the economy which have suffered most. They are, manufacturing, construction, other primary and agriculture, all of those areas are down from a year ago. In fact, transportation, communications and other utilities are down slightly; trade is up; finance, insurance and real estate is up; community business and personal service is up significantly; public administration is at the same level where it was a year ago. So those are the areas that are up and down and there's more down than up, but we are not down as far as the average in the rest of Canada.

In terms of what we are contemplating doing, it was our view already last November that the economy was buckling as was indicated - and that was across the country - as was indicated, I believe, it was the Conference Board Report at that time. There is no question, that hasn't changed. We were arguing then, and we are still arguing now for changes in monetary policy, in terms of the tight money policy that we have at the federal level. We think that has been the wrong policy for the last seven years.

We also think that the high interest rate policy of Mr. Bouey and Mr. MacEachen are the wrong policies at this time. We believe that those policies are the ones which have the most severe impact on our economy, and what we are doing - the member asked what it was that we are proposing to do in order to alleviate this situation - and what we are doing as he knows, we have implemented the Interest Rate Relief Program for homeowners, to provide those who have been worst hit with some protection. We have provided as well the small business Interest Rate Relief Program; the Beef Income Assurance Program. We have provided funding for the Hog Income Assurance Program; we have approximately increased amounts — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition doesn't want to hear the answer. I think it

was a serious question. The Member for St. Norbert was asking what it is that we are doing about the unemployment situation, and I am telling him what we are doing.

For one, we have increased by something like 300 or 400 percent the amount of dollars we are putting toward job creation in this province over the next year. Another, is the fact that we have set aside up to \$50 million for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation in order to assist in obtaining additional housing in this province, in order that we can do something for the construction industry. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. When an honourable member asks such a broad and open-ended question, he should not be surprised —(Interjection)— Order please. Order please. That member should not be surprised when the answer he receives is a full one. However, the Honourable Minister should not abuse the rules of question period by turning an answer into a speech.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the increase in unemployment for persons 15 to 24 years from 9,800 last year to 13,900 this year, an increase of 4,100 over last year for this same time period, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Labour change the criteria that he has established for his student employment program, the Career Internship Program, to the same principles of the program we had last year when we were able to employ some 5,000 students for approximately \$2.9 million; whereas the Minister of Labour, under his program, is only able to employ some 1,500 students under the first \$2.4 million he appropriated for his program which he has expanded, but retained the same criteria, and which doesn't appear to be working; will he change the criteria to employ as many as possible of these young students who are unemployed in the number of 4,100 over last year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Member for St. Norbert that the program he refers to of last year, which he alleges created a certain number of jobs, was found by the Auditor of Manitoba - and we continued to hear from that side whenever the Auditor makes a finding that is negative toward a government, they keep referring to it, in this particular case, I don't hear them referring to it - we were told by the Auditor that there was no evidence that these jobs had indeed been created and, therefore, we did what any responsible government ought to do, and that is to look again at the criteria related to these jobs and we changed the criteria to ensure that those jobs, which would have been in effect in any event, would not be funded by the public purse and we would ensure that there would be additional jobs, in addition to those jobs, created as a result of a program set up by us.

I can tell the honourable member that there will be more jobs created by this program than there were - even assuming that there were 5,000 jobs created, which the Auditor says there is no evidence there were - we will be creating more jobs than that with this

program. Well, Mr. Speaker, the applications have been coming in quite well, there have been a significant number of approvals and we are quite happy with the way the program is operating right now.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Auditor confirmed there were 5,000 jobs created under that program. There were 5,000 jobs under that program. The Minister of Labour said, let's assume that. Under his program, there were 1,500 jobs created for \$2.4 million. He expanded the funding to an additional \$4 million, I believe. If the same criteria are used, then obviously there will not be more than 5,000 jobs created under his program. Can he advise how many jobs will be created under his program? How many have already been approved?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my previous answer, I would expect that there are funds available for more jobs, even assuming that every one of those jobs that the members opposite say were created, were created, there is sufficient funding to create more jobs, first of all.

Secondly, I would remind the member of the survey taken by the Department of Labour, when he was in office, that indicated that something like half of the employers who responded to the survey indicated that the hiring was done for regular seasonal purposes. The employers themselves were telling that government that fact, and I didn't see that particular survey until a few weeks ago, but they'd had it for more than a year. So they were well aware of it when they were asking these questions and while they're asking these questions now. —(Interjection)— So if those jobs would have been created anyway for normal seasonal requirements, then it was very clear, it's more clear to me now than ever, that we had to change the criteria. But, as of May 28th, there were more than 1,000 jobs approved by the Department of Labour, and I should say about 60 percent of those jobs were in the private small business sector. There have been some excellent job opportunities made available by employers in the province. There's been excellent response. We are very happy with that response from small business employers in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Will the Minister of Labour confirm that he tabled the Annual Report, in this House, of the Department of Labour and in that report it stated that there were in excess of 5,000 jobs created in the private sector Youth Employment Program in 1981?

MR. H. ENNS: Did he table it, yes or no?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, that was a report which indeed was tabled by me, it was signed by me. It was prepared under the previous administration. It was signed by me at a time when I had not seen

the Provincial Auditor's Report. It was signed by me well before the two weeks ago that I had seen the survey that the honourable members opposite had available to them for a long time following the 1980 season and they did not, in response to that survey, make any changes at all because they seemed to be oblivious to the kinds of surveys - they go and spend money on surveys in the first place and once they've received the results of the survey, they act as though nothing had happened at all. I find that scandalous and a waste of public funds. We were not prepared to waste money in the way that government was prepared to waste it.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Did the Minister of Finance read the Prospectus which he filed in New York last December before he signed it? —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Can this House accept documents that are signed by Ministers in his government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there were over 5,000 jobs created in the Private Sector Youth Employment Program in 1981; and in view of the fact that unemployment in the age group of 15 to 29 has increased by almost 42 percent over last year, will the Minister of Labour change the criteria of his program back to that which was in place in 1981 in order that the young people of this province may have jobs once again?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I suppose I'll have to go over it again for the member. We were told by the Provincial Auditor that there was no evidence that those 5,000 jobs had been created. We were told by a survey done by the previous government, that they had received on the basis of the 1980 program, that at least half of the employers were responding to surveys saying that they were hiring for normal seasonal requirements in any event, in which case — (Interjection)— Yes, there's winter and summer, and most employers in this province hire people on a seasonal basis without any assistance from government. The purpose of this kind of a program surely was to create additional employment in addition to the normal seasonal requirements of an employer. That was the purpose of the program. Their own survey showed that was not happening because the normal seasonal requirements were the ones that were being hired for, and employers were being subsidized under that program. So just based on that, we should have changed, but I didn't know about that survey until a couple of weeks ago.

What I did know about several months ago was the Provincial Auditor's Report that indicated that the

program had not in any way been demonstrated to create any jobs, and that concerned us. The other portion of that program that concerned us, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that it didn't apply at all to the entire public sector, or the nonprofit sector in this province, and we changed the regulations in order to ensure that museums, municipalities, hospitals, other nonprofit organizations would also be entitled to use this program to provide additional employment, and they are taking us up as well, 40 percent of the employers under this program come from that sector.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In view of the fact that these statistics released this morning do indicate a very discomfoting fact for all Manitobans, namely, that employment is up in that particular young age group, 15, I believe, to 24, by 42 percent over what it was a year ago, and notwithstanding the preoccupation of the Minister of Labour who's demonstrating his incompetence day by day in this House; notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, the inability of the Minister of Labour to understand the human suffering that is being occasioned by these figures, will the First Minister give some direction to the Minister of Labour to ensure that the stimulative Job Creation Program that this government has substituted for the effective program that was in place before will be changed and changed immediately in order that more young people can get meaningful jobs this summer? The supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker, would be this very simply, if the First Minister cannot convince the Minister of Labour to do it, will he seek and get his resignation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, first and foremost I want to advise the Leader of the Opposition that the increases in student unemployment in other areas of unemployment, age groups 18 to 24, it's my understanding is a Canada-wide situation and that all provincial jurisdictions are confronted with the problem of increasing unemployment that is not being combated properly federally, and I must say as well, we accept some responsibility provincially as do some other provincial jurisdictions to deal with the question of growing unemployment. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should be emphasizing the problems of unemployment more than indeed has been the case. I sense that there is altogether too much attention being paid to inflation rather than dealing with the problems of unemployment in Canada.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, I sense quite the opposite reaction to that outlined by the Leader of the Opposition amongst Manitobans. The reaction that I have been finding in the last few weeks that Manitobans do appreciate the efforts and very very difficult circumstances that are existing throughout Canada on the part of the Minister of Finance in the Province of Manitoba to do what is humanly possible within the limited resources and with the limited jurisdiction of the Province of Manitoba to contribute toward an easing of the obvious sharpening pressures that are

brought to bear, not just on the young unemployed, but unemployed groups of all levels and witness the Budget, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Since the First Minister has assured the House this morning that documents tabled and signed by his Ministers can be accepted as truthful, can the First Minister advise the House whether or not the statements made in this document entitled, "Policies of the Manitoba New Democratic Party," and signed by the now First Minister of this Province, will he assure the province that the statements in this document are sincere and truthful?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it seems members across the way are still sore in respect to the losing the election of November 17th. Mr. Speaker, we witness one by one across the way, pulling out old election material. Mr. Speaker, we can do that and indeed we may very well do that from time to time to embarrass members across the way. But unlike members across the way, it's not an obsession on our part to drag out old election material.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, the question related to reports being distributed in the House. Mr. Speaker, those reports, indeed, are to be presented on the basis of information that is made available to the Minister at any given time. What I must say, Mr. Speaker, is that this government unlike the previous Conservative Government does not receive reports, then destroy those reports and send them back for republication at costs of thousands of dollars to the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba. That happened with the previous Conservative Administration. I'm not conscious of that happening to any report, Mr. Speaker, on the part of this new New Democratic Party Government in the Province of Manitoba.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister in view of his answer. It now being eight weeks past March 25th, Mr. Speaker, the day when the Minister of Environment indicated he would file his censored version of the private inquiry into the Workers Compensation Board, when he said he would file it two weeks from March 25th - it's now past eight weeks, that date, Mr. Speaker. In view of the First Minister's statement, will he ensure that the Minister of Environment files his censored version of that report in the House on Monday?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the Member for St. Norbert has given me an opportunity to deal with this question of censored reports. The Minister responsible for the Environment outlined very frankly and very fully to this House his intentions in respect to bringing forth that report. He indicated he was working in respect to that report, to put it in a

form in order to protect individuals. Mr. Speaker, he told the members of this House what he was doing, unlike, Mr. Speaker, the situation involving the Hydro report when we had to find out two years after the event that a Hydro report, an annual report, had been destroyed, to be replaced by the former Minister responsible for Hydro with a brand new Hydro report because he didn't like a tribute to a particular individual that had previously worked as a manager of Manitoba Hydro.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, our Minister of the Environment informed the House, unlike another Minister. Mr. Speaker, you will recall another report by another Conservative Minister in the previous government, that did not tell us that a report was edited and censored. We had to find out on our own and bring that matter before members of the House some days after that report had been distributed.

So, Mr. Speaker, let the members across the way not pontificate, because the examples from previous years aren't very flattering to members across the way. The Minister of Environment has been up front. He's advised members fully and comprehensively what he's doing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks by the First Minister with respect to the Minister of Environment and the report on the Workers Compensation Board, which the Minister has been busily working at censoring for the past number of weeks, will the First Minister now not admit that the indictment laid against him and his government by the Ombudsman, which pointed out that this government had wrongfully interfered in the forum of the investigation into the Workers Compensation allegations is not a true statement and that the judicial inquiry, which was put in place, should have stayed in place and we wouldn't now have to be having socialist-doctored, censored reports from the Minister of the Environment?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I intend to obtain the Ombudsman's Report, to read the Ombudsman's comments in respect to - that is the interpretation that the Leader of the Opposition is giving to the Ombudsman's comment - is, from my recollection, grossly inaccurate, grossly inaccurate as to what the Ombudsman said. The Ombudsman expressed disagreement with the fact that the Nitikman Commission had not proceeded, but not in the terminology, not in the tone, that the Leader of the Opposition is attempting to demonstrate.

Mr. Speaker, again, and it's unfortunate that one has to again repeat original answers but you have to do that when questions are repetitious in this House. The report clearly has to be changed in order to protect parties who gave information and testimony, and gave it in good faith and in the understanding, Mr. Speaker, that information would be kept in confidence. Now, what is the Leader of the Opposition proposing? Proposing that the Minister responsible for the Environment breach that undertaking, breach those confidences after encouraging people to participate in

the investigation, to an officer, indeed, that commenced his investigations during the term of the previous Conservative Administration in the Province of Manitoba? Is that what the First Minister is proposing? That my Minister breach confidences, that he betray confidences given to individuals that have co-operated and participated in the preparation of that report?

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this: my Ministers will not breach confidences. It may very well be the ethics across the aisle, it is not going to be the ethics on this side of the Legislature.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a very simple question to the First Minister and he doesn't have to get as obviously upset and discombobulated as he is. Does the First Minister not now agree that the severe criticism made of him and his government by the Ombudsman for cancelling a judicial inquiry into this matter and substituting for it a lesser form of an investigation which now has to be censored by the Minister of the Environment, does he not now agree that had he proceeded —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, we don't need any advice in this House from the Attorney-General about censorship.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm having some difficulty in hearing the question posed by the honourable member.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister not agree that he and his government made a mistake by cancelling the judicial inquiry, the report which would no doubt have been in by now, instead of now having to wait for his Minister of the Environment to censor a report that was made in a way that has been already criticized by the Ombudsman, I imagine to the acute embarrassment of the Premier and his government?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I refer you to page 5 of the Ombudsman's Report, 12th Annual Report of the Ombudsman, and the terminology is, as I had suspected, quite different from that which the Leader of the Opposition is attempting to transfix to the Ombudsman's Report. The Ombudsman's Report refers to, in his opinion, it having been a mistake. "I disagree, Mr. Speaker, with that comment because in my view it has not been a mistake."

Mr. Speaker, number one - and the Leader of the Opposition again chooses to ignore this fact - the report that will be distributed in this House will not be a censored report. Why will it not be a censored report, Mr. Speaker? And I don't know whether this obviously must not have been made clear enough to members across the way earlier. The inspector that undertook the investigation, the inspector that was appointed by the previous Minister of Labour to do the report, the former Member for Thompson, will sign an affidavit indeed, that the report reflects his findings. Mr. Speaker, that is quite a different thing from a censored report. The inspector will sign, again I emphasize, will sign the report indicating to all and sundry that that report indeed reflects his findings, his conclusions, Mr. Speaker. So, I ask, how indeed could the report be a censored one? That, again, was not the

case. That, Mr. Speaker, indeed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that certainly was not the same kind of treatment that was registered to the Hydro Report that I made reference to, that paid tribute to an individual that the previous Conservative Administration didn't particularly like and the entire report had to be destroyed so a brand new one could be put together. That's well documented and if I have to, Mr. Speaker, I'll return with the replaced report to demonstrate and to prove that took place - I hear some members saying, no, across the way.

Number two, it's not the same as the former Rent Control Report that was distributed in this House, Mr. Speaker, as though it was a final report only for Opposition Members of the Day, to be finding out a few days later that it was not the final report at all. We remember those days very well, Mr. Speaker. The Minister responsible for the Environment has been as forthright in respect to this, indeed, as any Minister could be. He doesn't require defence in this Chamber because Manitobans have witnessed how forthright he has been; how he has clearly indicated as well that the inspector who prepared the investigation will sign an affidavit declaring fully, removing any doubt, that the report indeed does reflect the findings of the Inspector himself.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister confirm that this statement was made by the Ombudsman on page 5 of the Ombudsman's Report and I quote, "I think it was a mistake to cancel the public inquiry to be held by Mr. Justice Nitikman. The allegations were serious and were of important public interest. The accusers could have been summoned to give evidence on oath, to give facts, not assumptions and generalizations. They would have had to stand up to cross-examination by counsel for the Board. By this means, I believe, the truth would have prevailed and the public would have been made aware of the truth. I have no doubt that the seconded RCMP officer will do a thorough and impartial investigation, but," and I continue the quote, Mr. Speaker, "it will not be public. I think it should have been. If senior Board members have been publicly maligned, even if only by implication, it follows that if they are to be exonerated that should also be public."

Mr. Speaker, is the First Minister telling us this morning that his version of that kind of an investigation is the kind of socialist freedom of information we're going to have for the next few years in this House.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, Page 6, unfortunately the Ombudsman himself was mistaken when the Ombudsman said that the report would not be made public. I've already indicated, the Minister responsible for the Environment indicated that report would be made public, so how can the Ombudsman say that it will not be made public? Mr. Speaker, even members across the way must understand that elementary fact; there are some that I'm sure do understand that elementary fact. But, Mr. Speaker, I listened

with some curiosity and just a shade of amazement to the Leader of the Opposition when he talks about freedom of information, making information available. Mr. Speaker, we recall the CFI, we recall the Hydrogate matter, and I think we'd better do some checking to get some of the answers to some of the unanswered questions from last year in regard to that whole episode, and we haven't done so yet.

Number three, Mr. Speaker, we have the episode with the rent and I can go on and on. Here a report is being made openly available to members of the public, a report that would be signed by the investigating officer, so how can any member across the way have the audacity to compare that with the dismal record of the previous Conservative Administration, when they destroyed reports; when they doctored reports; when they denied that they had signed documents when, in fact, they had signed documents? How can any member compare the forthright approach of my Minister responsible for the Environment?

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a further comment so it's clearly understood by the Leader of the Opposition what my view is in respect to a Judicial Commission in regard to this matter. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief from years of being in government during a previous administration, indeed, that I was a member of the Treasury Board plus the previous four years that a Judicial Inquiry would have gobbled up months and years before there would have been action undertaken in order to ensure that there was reform in a given institution. Mr. Speaker, the allegations were so serious, the potential need for reform so great, that I must say I don't intend, as First Minister, to sit by for years while a Judicial Commission of Inquiry takes months and potentially years to complete a report. If reform is needed, that reform should be done prudently, and as soon as possible without, indeed, sweeping it under the rug for a lengthy period of time with commissions of inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the time for Oral Questions having expired. Order please. Do the members wish to conduct the province's business or to relapse into a shouting match with each other?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: May I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where there are 53 members of Grade 4 of the Green Valley School, under the direction of Mrs. Moir. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

There are 50 students of Grades 5 and 6 standing of the Selkirk Junior High School, under the direction of Miss Peppel. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 19, and following that on Bill No. 20? We'll see where we go.

**ADJOURNED DEBATE ON
SECOND READING
BILL 19 - THE LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT**

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Bill No. 19, standing in the name of the Honourable Member of Tuxedo.

The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In reviewing Bill 19, an Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act, we find that as the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs indicated, the prime purpose of this Act is to delete and harmonize references with respect to the mediation and arbitration of rent increase protests in the province, to now be replaced with the process that's included in Bill 2, The Rent Regulation and Review Act. Other changes in the bill amount to minor housekeeping changes with respect to certain processes providing for deposits and so on, and we are prepared therefore, Mr. Speaker, to allow this bill to go to committee so that it can be considered at the same time as Bill 2 in the committee stage.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL 20 - THE CONDOMINIUM ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Bill No. 20, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, the provisions in Bill 20, An Act to amend The Condominium Act are merely to delete and correct references with respect to the new Residential Rent Regulation Act, Bill 2, and again we feel it important that this bill proceed to committee so that it can be considered coincident with the considerations and deliberations on Bill 2 at the committee stage.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 28?

**BILL 28 - AN ACT TO AMEND
VARIOUS ACTS RELATING TO
COURTS OF THE PROVINCE**

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Attorney-General, Bill No. 28 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to allow this bill to proceed to committee and examine it in detail there.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 32, standing in the name of the Member for Swan River?

**BILL NO. 32 - AN ACT TO
AMEND THE MUNICIPAL ACT**

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 32, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate and the Member for Emerson would like to speak on it at this time. Is that permissible?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, in going over this Bill, there are four sections basically that are involved in this one, and I see no problem with the first portion of it or the last portion of it.

However, there are two areas where I would like to raise some concerns to the Minister under this Bill. The one portion is where, in his introductory remarks the other day, he indicated one of them which was the major portion of it, the most significant one, which deals with the area of compensation for Council members who provide a service on firefighting, as advisors, or driving of emergency vehicles, or attendance thereof. The concerns that I have, having been Reeve of a municipality for a number of years, I find there is provision in most cases in The Municipal Act that Councils can compensate to some degree Council members that provide certain services, either through mileage or through time, etc., and by putting it in this perspective here as the Minister has done, I am very concerned about the open-endedness of the whole thing. I can perceive in my mind and would just like to draw some of these thoughts to the Minister and raise my concerns about it.

The fact that it would now give Council members the opportunity to get out cruising around; if there is a grass fire somewhere, they can play the role of an advisor; they can get paid for these kind of things, and I am just wondering, a question that can be raised I suppose when we get to Law Amendments, as to what the position of the municipal people generally is, but the Minister indicated in his opening remarks, some municipalities had expressed concern.

Well, you will always have some Council members that will be expressing certain concerns along these lines that would like to see changes, but as I indicated before, I believe there is provisions right now in the Act so that they can compensate to some degree some of these things. By putting it in this perspective as he is doing right now I think what happens is, you have an open-ended chequebook available to Council members that, in some cases, they could possibly abuse. I would like to think, and I am positive, that the majority of the people that are elected to public office and the municipalities are very sincere and dedicated individuals, and that it is not the intent to necessarily

abuse some of these things.

But as I indicated before, there is provision to cover some of these costs and by having this put in the Act now, that it allows a sort of an open-ended expense account for Council members. They can cruise around from place to place under the advisory capacity as it is stated in the Act; actually organizing firefighting, which is what they are doing now anyway. When you have grass fires in Powell, for example, I know of many Council members that are out there organizing some of the people, the voluntary people to fight fire. What you are doing now is, you are going to be creating a problem because a councillor is the one that is going to be paid to do all these things, and he is going to be asking volunteers to come and fight fires. He will be the advisor and getting paid for it when he is already in a position being paid as a Councillor, and as I indicated before, there is provision that he could get some of his expenses paid.

So I just want to draw this to the Minister's attention, that there are problems in my mind by putting it in there and when we get to the Law Amendment stage, I hope the Minister can give some clarification as to how many cases are involved where there has been requests for this kind of legislation.

The other aspect that I want to raise concerns about is on the third portion of the Bill, where the Minister in his opening statement said, "In order to allow some other use of land in question," - we are talking about road allowances here - "the municipality must close the roads and transfer title to the people in question. In many instances municipalities have indicated that they would prefer to close the road by bylaw, but retain title to the closed road for possible future purposes. We propose to amend the Act to provide them with this authority."

Mr. Speaker, they have the authority right now. Municipalities, through bylaw, through the Minister's office, can close a road by bylaw and do it. What the Minister is doing here, or proposing here is that every council can, among themselves, decide to close a certain road allowance.

I would like to cite a personal example of property that I had, that when purchased from the municipality years ago, they indicated to me then in the agreement, no roads, no drainage. So what I did at that time, it was a block of land, I fenced off the road allowances, fully understanding the fact that, well, if I could pasture that area - there's no problems with weeds, etc. - it was exactly a year later that I was informed that I would have to move my fences back and make provision for the road allowance of people, even if there was no road, that they could travel or have access to this road allowance.

What is going to be happening here if municipalities, on their own accord with the power that is going to be given to them, use this provision and close off road allowances; in fall I can tell you something, the Minister is going to be having all kinds of problems because what happens especially in hunting season, people, even if they can't travel - and nowadays they can travel almost any road allowance with the kind of vehicles that are available to them - they will always be going along the road allowances for hunting purposes, for all kinds of purposes.

What's going to happen under this provision if the

municipality can take the bylaw and close the road allowance, transfer the title for that matter or lease it to a private owner? What if he cultivates the road allowance? What if he breaks up this land and fences it off? The first thing that's going to happen is, somebody is going to come along and say this is road allowance, he is going to cut the wires.

I think at the present time Council still has discretion. If they want to allow a man to fence off road allowance, they can do that; but to go around and start closing various roads especially when we talk of areas that I represent - the LGD of Stuartburn and Piney where you have a lot of forestry areas - if they are going to start closing these roads, in many cases they are not really graded roads but they're road allowances, I think the Minister should have a real good look at this.

Again, I would like to check and see whether the municipalities are really requesting this, or why is this issue coming up at this stage again? I don't think it has been a problem. I don't know one instance when I was in a municipality that it was problem. We have more problem with people wanting access around these road allowances.

So these are the two points that I basically wanted to raise at this time, Mr. Speaker, and draw to the Minister's attention. I would definitely want more information on these aspects of it when we get to Law Amendments and get detailed information.

As far as I indicated before, the first portion of the Bill and the last portion, I personally have no great arguments with that. I think these areas are things that are in keeping with what the municipal people want. But the two other areas in there, I hope that the Minister can have some good answers for us when we get to that, or that he would possibly consider bringing in some amendments and some changes.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe when the Honourable Member for Emerson rose to speak, the Member for Swan River was indicating that he didn't mind anyone speaking but he wanted the debate to remain standing in his name.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: No, I am not speaking on it.

MR. SPEAKER: To the same point of order?

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared on this side to let this bill go to Committee. The Minister has indicated that he is prepared to give further explanations on the section-by-section when we do get to Committee, so we're prepared to move it to that stage.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

BILL 21 - THE COMMUNITY CHILD DAY CARE STANDARDS ACT

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, on Bill No. 21, standing in the name of the Member for La Verendrye, I understand he wishes it to continue to stand but I'd like to call the bill so that someone on this side can speak. But it'll stand thereafter in the name of the Member for La Verendrye. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 21, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased this morning to be able to address Bill No. 21, The Community Child Day Care Standards Act. I've been part of the community over the last 10 years that has been working to have day care legislation in its own Act in this province. It's been a long hard struggle over ten years with many discussions with many groups, with lobbying of two governments and, finally, we have introduced into the Legislature in Manitoba an Act which will put day care, I hope, in the Province of Manitoba in the priority position that it should now be in and that it deserves. The legislation that the day care programming in this province has been operating under has not been changed since the mid '50s, however, society has changed very very much over those 30 years.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the background and the need for this particular legislation. In our society today we have an economy where it's not a luxury, it's not a choice, it's a necessity, that 60 percent of married women are in the labour force. Also, in our society, we have many many single parents, both male and female single parents. I think when we look at the care of children in our society we forget, or we don't put the priority that is needed on the care that those children are getting, in fact, we tend to sweep it under the rug. When you consider the United Way Day Care Study, which pointed out that in this province - and that was a few years ago - there are at least 15,000 children in unlicensed care in this province. I think to ignore that and to ignore the needs of those children and to assure and take our responsibility for ensuring that those children have proper and adequate care, both physically, intellectually and emotionally, I think would be misusing the resources of this province to continue that.

When we consider the number of women that are in the labour force and the number of children that are either at neighbors, or with relatives, or in care that is less than adequate, not because the parents want that care to be less than adequate, but because they have no other alternative. The other alternative for many parents in this situation is to go on social allowance themselves. On one hand we say to those parents, "Don't be a burden to society, go out and get a job and pull your own weight, look after your family." We say, "It's your responsibility, you've had those children, now it's your duty to care of them." But, on the other hand, we have neglected the very fundamental duty that we have to provide that care and provide the

funding and the legislation that assures that care is quality care.

I'm very proud that we have finally in this province an Act that will at least address the issue of quality care for those children who are in licenced care. The Act also, of course, insists that all family day care homes, group day care homes and day care centres, are now required to have a provincial licence. I'd like to talk in detail about the components of that licencing, but first I'd like to talk about the name that was chosen by our government for this very important piece of legislation.

The name "The Community Child Day Care Standards Act" did not come about just by accident. We could have called it "The Day Care Act," however, by using the word "Community" in the name of this very important legislation, I think what our government is saying to the day care community and to the people of Manitoba is that day care is no longer an individual responsibility and we recognize that, just as education of children once they reach the magic age of six is no longer an individual responsibility of the parents, and just as health care is no longer an individual responsibility, society as a whole has a responsibility for the provision of proper and adequate child care from the time the child is born. It is our duty in society to take on that responsibility and to ensure that the facilities are available and the support is available to assist parents who are in the labour force with the care of those children so they can participate as equals in this society.

I think by saying to the child care community that we recognize that we have a duty and we have a responsibility, I think we're finally recognizing the excellent service that they have provided over the years under usually most difficult circumstances. When I say difficult circumstances, I mean circumstances where child care has traditionally been organized by interested parents in the community out of a need of desperation, not out of altruism but because a group of parents get together finding that they have a common need. We've given them precious little help over the years. We rely on them to organize the day care centre, to find the location, to apply for assistance under the provincial program if they can, if there's funding left over, if they can be taken in. When they get that assistance, 90 percent of it goes for day care salaries, which everyone knows are so abominable, almost an embarrassment to discuss. When an article appeared in the paper a few weeks ago at a stockholders' meeting of a very large corporation and it was reported that the company had shown quite a healthy profit and the chairman of the board was making \$800,000 a year, some little soul at the back stood up and said, "Now, Sir, how do you justify that kind of salary?" His response, which I found almost beyond words was, "Well, I have a wife at home too, you know."

When you consider that the average wage of women in this province is some 50 percent below the average wage of men; when you consider that many of those women that have their children in day care are paying over the course of time that the child needs supervision under our Child Welfare Act, something in the order of \$25,000 to \$30,000 for the care of that child over that period; when you consider that the average

salaries for day-care workers in this province are around \$10,000, I think what is incumbent upon us in this Legislature is to look not only at the standards that we set and the quality of programming that we're providing for those children, but also the priority that we put on child care as a service in our province.

So we called it The Community Child Day Care Standards Act because there still is a very large educational job to do in our community. Not all people would agree with me that it is a community responsibility. Somehow it's still quite acceptable to insist that working parents still have that burden to bear alone, whether it's a financial burden or just whether it's the burden of never quite knowing whether you're going to have day care to go to work on Monday. If you happen to want another child and can't financially afford to have another child, to know that by doing that, it would mean the consequences for the rest of the family when there is no infant care provided or very very little infant care provided, even though we have maternity legislation that says you have the right to go back to your job 17 weeks after the child is born.

When we don't provide the vehicle and the adequate facilities to assure that a person does, in fact, have the right to choose whether they have another child, have the right to choose whether they continue their job, or whether we leave them with the choice of having to stay at home or go on Social Allowance or have a drastic cut and sometimes, in fact, a decrease in the family's income by a half if the mother happens to stay home with another child, by not taking a responsibility in the community for assuring that women can play both roles in our society, both the production role and the reproduction role, I think that we're not living up to our responsibilities.

So I will continue and our government will continue in this educational process and I think I've come a long way by recognizing the need for standards for child care. We will continue the educational process so that . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If I may interrupt the honourable member for a moment to direct the attention of all members to the gallery where there is a group of 32 students, ages 10 to 17, of the Christian Day School from Stratten, Ontario, under the direction of Mr. Loewen and six other adults.

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

The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

ADJOURNED DEBATE (Cont'd)

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So we will continue our efforts to assure that the day will come when publicly funded and available quality child care is available to all children who require it and to all parents who require it, just as health care is now available to all members of our society and just as education is available to all members of our society, regardless of their financial situation.

There are four components in this legislation that from our consultation with day care workers, day care boards of directors, from parents, from the public in

general, we felt were critical to include and I'd like to talk about each of them.

The first component is a component dealing with programming and to this point in time under the regulations that the Day Care Program has been operating under, the only regulations that we've had are regulations that decide and determine the amount of financial assistance and under what conditions financial assistance is available. One of the major components of quality child care is what happens on a day-to-day basis in that child care centre. I think the number of horror stories that I've heard over the last 10, 15 years are enough to make one shiver in one's shoes in terms of what happens to those children as they grow up. When they have spent hour after hour after hour in someone's rec room, in their basement watching television; when they haven't had adequate space or facilities in which they can develop their small motor skills, their large motor skills; when they haven't had staff that had been trained, not through any fault of their own, but because the Day Care Program over the last few years has grown to an extent where the staff training facilities have not kept up with the demand for staff that have early childhood education, that understand the needs of preschool children.

One of the misconceptions, I think, in terms of programming, in fact, there are two. One is that by insisting in the legislation that a preschool program is a requirement will lead to overprofessionalization and will turn out all these little robots. The other argument is that we don't need to worry about those kinds of things; all preschool children need is tender loving care. Anyone who's had a baby or has been a parent has the qualifications necessary to be able to operate a day care program. There are some arguments on both sides that I think are valid, some parts of those arguments. I think, of course, as most members in this Chamber would that, yes, tender loving care for children at that age is extremely important and I'm not denying that is one of the major components of any child care program. I'm not denying that there are a lot of staff out there in day care centres that have been working under horrendous conditions and have offered excellent care, but I think it's very different looking after your own children that you've chosen to have, that you love with all your heart and, even if you happen to be the type of personality that loves a lot of children, whether they're yours or someone else's.

I think when you're dealing with a group of very small children from early in the morning until supper time there are special skills that are needed, skills that deal with discipline, with co-operation, with teaching children in a group that come from very different backgrounds in their own individual homes that have very different sets of upbringing and ethnic kinds of backgrounds, and when you get a group of children from very diverse backgrounds together for long periods of time, I think, that it's recognized not just by this government, but recognized by the day care community that that is an extremely important component. It's very important to have this program and we will, in regulations, outline just, I presume, the major features that will be required for a good solid quality child care program.

The board of directors of a day care centre will be able to fine tune that to meet their specific outlook,

needs and philosophy. But to say in the legislation to operate a day care centre in this province you must develop a program that takes into account the needs of the individual child and that must be provided in this group, within the context of a group of children that you're taking care of, I think is a very major step.

This brings us to the licensing component. In the province at this point there is a split between responsibility for licensing. In the City of Winnipeg and the City of Brandon the city has a jurisdiction over licensing; in the rest of the province the Provincial Government usually looks after the licensing of day care centres in terms of physical standards, health standards, fire standards, physical space standards and those are all very important. We also have to take into account the diversity within the province. But I think what has been apparent over the years is that there has to be some province-wide standards for the basic acceptable kinds of facilities that are necessary. So we're talking about the programming component for licensing and the physical component for day care centres for licensing, but we're also talking, in terms of licensing, about all those 15,000 children who are now in unlicensed care. I think with this legislation we will have the vehicle to be able to reach out, to bring in all those family day care homes that up to now have not been, because they have not asked for funding, required to meet certain even physical standards. We will be, through the Day Care Program, assisting those day care homes to meet the physical standards, the programming standards and to give them assistance in terms of their training so that they are operating family home day care or day care centres where the children have an opportunity to learn, to grow and to develop into healthy school-age children and healthy adults.

When we consider that a few years ago we had very few day care centres and there are now some 225 centres with over 8,000 children and by the end of this fiscal year it should be up around 9,000 children, we have to have licensing requirements that meet the complexity and the difference of needs throughout the province. For instance, I can remember when I was working in Thompson and we started the Day Care Program in 1974, I had a group of women that called me and wanted me to go into Norway House because they now had a small vacant school - because the new school has been built - and they wanted to know how they could go about setting up a day care centre in this community. They had done a small survey that said there were 40 working mothers in that community who needed day care which certainly was an adequate number to have a day care centre and this school had just been vacated. So I gave them the information that they needed, the names and the people in the City of Winnipeg to contact about setting up a centre and coming under the Day Care Program.

The next time I flew into Norway House, which was a few weeks later, and inquired as to how they were progressing, they informed me that they'd been turned down and the reason they'd been turned down was that this little school didn't have any indoor toilet facilities. When I talk about standards throughout the province I think it's one thing to set up regulations that reflect the needs in the City of Winnipeg, but when you consider that those 40 parents were working at

the hospital, in the schools, in the Band Office, in the restaurants, in the hotel, in a community that had a relatively high unemployment rate, were providing for those children in a way that most members, I believe, in this Chamber would think was exemplary. They would go home after work with their children to houses where they also have no indoor toilet facilities, where they had all grown up going to that school and had graduated or gone through that school with outdoor toilet facilities, to be denied the opportunity of having that centre and on a technicality like that, I think, it's absolutely abominable. So I'm hoping with this Act and with the regulations that we'll be able to take a look at standards on a province-wide basis and take into account those kinds of community norms where they're necessary, so that the licensing requirements on physical standards will take those kinds of situations into account and there is provision for Ministerial exemptions.

I'd like to move on to Staff Qualifications because I think that is one of the major components of this legislation. In the bill there is reference to a Staff Qualifications Review Committee and I'm very pleased that this committee is not a committee of just academics, or just day care workers, or just civil servants, but is a committee that will reflect the day care community as a whole. Whenever I've described this kind of process to delegations or groups in the community that have been enquiring on how we will determine equivalency for day care workers, they've been most relieved to know that they will not have to go in front of an intimidating board to have their qualifications determined.

I think it's a very valid way to give recognition to the experience that day care workers have had in the field over the last many years so that a person can go, who has been working in day care for 10 years, and the Staff Qualifications Review Committee can determine whether the experience in those centres that the person has had is equivalent to the Community College two-year course. I hope that over not a very long time, but quite quickly within reason, we will be able to give the staff that have been working in the field, the credentials that so many of them have already gathered through their work experience and if, for instance, the Review Committee suggests that well, Ms. Smith, I think that perhaps you need just two more courses to round it out, and then you will have your certificate. When all the staff people in day care that have been working in the field finally get some recognition for the skills, effort and responsibility that they have, looking after the 9,000 children that we have in licensed care, I think we will begin to find that there is a wider acceptance in the community for the worth of that job.

I'd like to talk just for a short minute about the worth of that job. When you consider that someone who is a parking lot attendant makes more money than a day care worker, and that we in society think it's fine to pay someone who is watching and is entrusted with the care of our automobiles more money than those who are entrusted with the care and responsibility for our preschool children; when we have a society that views the value of work in that way I think the time has come to rethink our view of the value of different kinds of jobs. I think one of the ways to give the credit, and in

our society credit for the work performed and recognition for the work performed is given to an individual in terms of their pay cheque and yes, they get satisfaction. A lot of people get satisfaction from their jobs; a lot of us have satisfaction from going home and feeling that we have in a day put in a good day's work and have a sense of satisfaction that we've accomplished something. Satisfaction in a job and knowing in your heart that you've done a good day's work has never been the criteria for what kind of salary we give to an individual at the end of the two-week period.

My experience and my research has shown me over the years that the value of women's work in the labour force and jobs that are determined to be women's work, as far as I might disagree with that in that I think there are just jobs, not men's jobs and women's jobs, but in our society certain jobs have been termed as women's work and working in a day care centre is one of those. Whenever a job is labelled, in general, as women's work, the salary then is usually abominably low.

So with this section on Staff Qualifications, I think what we're saying is that when the Act is proclaimed, you will not be thrown out because you don't have the qualifications. We've made provisions to recognize your service and your experience because we feel it's very important, not just in the short term to know, that the people we have taking care of our preschool children must have some qualifications - my goodness, we even insist that our accountants have some qualifications - but also will in the long term hopefully give day care workers in general the sense that their job is, yes, worthwhile and valid and will, over time, assist them in reaching the level of remuneration that I think they deserved many years ago.

One never knows, it might end up like the teaching profession where once the salaries started to become humane and reasonable, many many men moved into that particular profession that years ago - when I was brought up when a lot of us were brought up in this Chamber - primary schooled education was mostly done by females whereas the principal was a man because the salary was higher. So hopefully as the qualifications become established, as day care workers' wages are increased to meet those qualifications, or come in line with the value of those qualifications, that we will end up for our preschool children having a mix of both men and women working in that field and I think that's extremely important.

The last area is the area that allows for regulations governing financial assistance. I think that even though we've had this in the previous regulations and I think over this discussion I've pointed out the major underlying problem with child care in this province, I think it's very important that we look at the whole area of financial assistance.

When you consider we have very, very few centres that offer any kind of infant care; when you consider that there's very, very few centres that have Lunch and After School Programs; when you consider Special Needs children; when you consider the inadequate salaries that day care workers are making; when you consider the fact that even if someone does get a subsidy or a partial subsidy that oftentimes their day care costs for that year are far beyond what is allowable to claim as a legitimate working expense on their

income tax; when you consider the long-term benefit of child care to society, I think it is very incumbent upon us as a Provincial Legislature to assure that budgets for day care that are provided under the section on Financial Assistance are adequate to meet these needs.

I don't know how often my honourable friends in the Opposition speak about this topic. I can only look at their record of the four years that they were in office to give me some indication of the priority that they feel child care in this province deserves, when in the four years their expenditure on child care only went up by not quite \$2 million, when the number of spaces were frozen until the very last year in the 1981 Budget — (Interjection)— well, I would assume it was some rationale like that because the commitment from '77 to '78 - in fact, the number of spaces in '77 were 5,404. In '78 they dropped to 5,370; in '79 they dropped even farther to 5,288; in 1980 it went up to 6,061; and by October, '81 it was up to 7,767. So I thought it was a little strange that they allowed it for three years to sit going nowhere and in the last year decided that perhaps they should allocate a few extra spaces. Of course, the budget figures were \$3,769,000 in '77-78; by '80-81 it was \$5,692,000; then in the '81-82 Budget, which again was election year, it went up to \$9 million. I think we can't afford, when we're talking about the needs of preschool children in this province, to play games with them in this particular way.

I think what we need in this province is a commitment and I think that this Day Care Act, The Community Child Day Care Standards Act, Bill 21, is the beginning of that commitment to assure the money that's being spent is spent to provide quality care, but I think it's only a beginning, as it took us 10 years to get to this stage in the Province of Manitoba.

I started out by saying I was curious as to the discussions that the Opposition might have on this topic. I'll suggest something that I say to my colleagues - the Minister of Government Services and Highways is present in the Chamber - so I feel I can say it: the analogy that I use is that I want one bridge every year. If he can find in this province one bridge that can be stalled for another year, that will hold up and doesn't need replacement, if I could take one bridge every year, we would be assured in the Province of Manitoba the best day care not only in Canada, but the best day care in the western world. \$12 million or \$11.7, as we have in this budget, to do the kinds of things that we're legislating need to be done is far from adequate. In fact, doubling that to \$22 million is far from adequate; in fact, tripling that might begin to meet the needs of those 25,000 to 30,000 children that are out there either in unlicensed care, in poor quality care, or in no care and we've all heard about latch-key children.

So even though I'm excited, happy and very proud that our government has brought in this Act, I think that it will be the basis on which we can build in the Province of Manitoba. I don't want to be satisfied being second best or being at the bottom of the barrel; I want the best day care program in the entire western world. We've been leaders in social programs before and I think this is beginning to be a leader in the whole world, if you may. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, J. Storie: The Honourable

Government House Leader.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe the bill that was just debated stands in the name of the Member for La Verendrye. We should now proceed to the resolution on page 4.

ADJOURNED DEBATES - CROW RATE

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I've been designated to speak at length on this issue by my Leader. Mr. Speaker, the other day the Honourable Member for Virden rose in his place.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. B. RANSOM: Could I ask whether or not the member is speaking on the amendment that was proposed by the Leader of the Opposition?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, that is the motion before the House. No one can speak on any other portion of this resolution, but on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this amendment, the other day the Member for Virden rose in his place on a grievance, of all things, to come forward and then was accompanied by the Member for Lakeside in a fit of indignation that this resolution was not being called, somehow the Opposition was being stymied and that they didn't have a chance to put their position on the record; they didn't have an opportunity to speak on this issue. Mr. Speaker, what a hypocritical position of the Conservative Party in the Legislature.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has used unparliamentary language. I believe he knows that. I suggest that he withdraw it.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word that I've used because of the rules. Mr. Speaker, I say to the Conservative Party that their whole notion was a sham, nothing but a pure political sham in terms of the nonsense that they were trying to perpetrate on the people of Manitoba.

Let's just examine their position as this debate began a number of weeks ago. On April 14th, the first speaker on the resolution was the Member for Lakeside who spoke on this resolution and, Mr. Speaker, in his remarks he indicated that —(Interjection)— yes, I'm waiting for the Gilson Report and I quote. "Well, Mr. Speaker," on page 1471, from the Member for Lakeside, "I am sure that when the deliberations that are currently under way with Dr. Gilson's group, and I believe that we are not talking months or years, I think, if my memory serves me right, he has been asked to have that report in on or about the 1st of May . . ."

"Certainly, I'm not prepared to move in any direction until I start seeing what they are talking about."

Here the Conservative party, the lead-off speaker on this issue gets up and says, look, I want to wait for the Gilson Report. Then he has the gall to get up in this Legislature and say that you're not calling this resolution, that somehow we want this resolution to go ahead and say that we want to speak on this resolution. What a bunch of nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, let's go on to the attitude and the way the Conservative Party has handled this. Did they want to speak on this issue? No. On the 15th of April, the Member for Roblin-Russell, did he speak on it? No, he said, "Mr. Speaker," when the resolution was called, "I beg to indulge the House to have this matter stand." So they stood the resolution; they weren't ready to speak, Mr. Speaker. They weren't prepared to speak. Let's go on.

When it was called again on the 19th, Mr. Speaker, finally the Member for Roblin-Russell spoke. In his remarks and I quote from Hansard on page 1584, the Member for Roblin-Russell said, "So, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the opportunity here, what Dr. Gilson will bring in his report when he brings it on May 31st." I don't know what likely it will be, but he is inasmuch as indicating we want to wait for the Gilson Report.

MR. H. ENNS: And you wanted to wait for the Saskatchewan election.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with that. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin-Russell spoke on that issue. Members on this side spoke on that issue. The Member for River East spoke on the 21st of April, Mr. Speaker. On April 22nd, the Premier spoke on this issue. Then the Conservative Party didn't want to speak, but in fact it was adjourned by the Member for Portage who said he didn't want to speak. He wanted to carry it over.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Portage la Prairie was in the House. On page 1740 and I quote from the Member for Portage, "If no other member wishes to speak, it will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie." The resolution was stood in the name of the Member for Portage la Prairie. Mr. Speaker, on Friday the 23rd of April, the Member for Portage came into this House again and said, "I am not prepared at this time to speak on this issue." He wanted it to stand again. Then, Mr. Speaker, when we said, no, we will call the issue, the Member for Pembina spoke on this issue. What did he say in his remarks, Mr. Speaker? I quote on page 1806 part of his remarks, "I want to know also, why this First Minister is so adamant about getting this resolution passed today, when in about a week-and-a-halfs time we're going to have a preliminary report from Dr. Clay Gilson who has collected the thoughts of all producer groups and affected parties to the Crow rate resolution." So he wanted to wait for the Gilson Report. They weren't anxious to speak on this report, Mr. Speaker.

The day after the election, and this resolution was called after the election, the Member for Portage finally spoke, Mr. Speaker. What was the tenure of his remarks in terms of substance and I quote from page 1883 of Hansard. The Member for Portage la Prairie says, "I do wait with interest on the results of the

Gilson meetings which I am confident can be successful in the establishing of the new and revitalized approach to the transportation problems we are faced with today." So he wanted to wait for the Gilson Report, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's go on. These are all after the elections. We have another Conservative who spoke on the Saskatchewan election that the Conservative Party says, "We are waiting for the Saskatchewan election." After the election on April 28th, the Member for Morris spoke and what did he say? I quote from page 1958 of Hansard: "We're constantly accused, why don't you debate it, well, let's see what Dr. Gilson has to say and then we'll see who leads the debate and who has the farmer's concern," Mr. Speaker. Their spokesman for Morris, "Let's see who has the concern of the farmers," the Conservative spokesman said. Mr. Speaker, the former Minister of Agriculture hasn't even spoken on this resolution, because he has made statements. Mr. Speaker, two of our members spoke after the election as well. The Member for Thompson has spoken on it on April 28th. The Member for The Pas —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, they don't like to hear from the concern of other members in this House. The Member for The Pas spoke on this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives have presented an amendment after the Member for Virden and the Member for Lakeside had the gall in this House and say - all their members who have spoken have said - wait for Gilson. What did the Member for Virden do? He got up in this House and said, they haven't called this debate for five weeks. We demand to know that we have this matter called. Then, what does he do? He gave up his right to speak, Mr. Speaker. He can't even speak, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, since it was brought on by the Minister in his debate, I have not given up my right to speak. I intend to speak and if this gentleman doesn't talk about the Crow, I suggest he sit down and I will speak about the Crow.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, he did lose his right to speak on the main motion. He did lose his right. Is the Member for Virden then indicating to this House and to the community that he is opposed to the original resolution? Because giving up his right to speak, is he indicating to the farmers that he does not support the resolution? Is that what he is indicating to this House when he says he didn't give up his right to speak? He did give up his right to speak on the main motion. Let him not get up in this House and suggest that he didn't give up his right. The only right he has to speak is now on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, that if he wishes. That is a hypocritical sham of the Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, total sham.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister has used the word "hypocritical" in his remarks and that has been ruled unparliamentary. I

would ask him to withdraw. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Springfield on a point of order.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some confusion in terms of words that are considered to be parliamentary and those which are not. I would draw your attention to page 112, which provides a list.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of privilege.

ôêMR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of House privilege, I think it's a very serious thing for a member to stand up and criticize the Speaker. There is only one way for a member to criticize the Speaker and that is to bring in a motion of nonconfidence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I did not take the remarks from the Member for Springfield as a reflection on the Chair, simply bringing something to my attention with regard to the rules and I —(Interjection)— order please. There is always the possibility that something new could be brought to my attention and I certainly am always willing to listen.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, when I talked about confusion about unparliamentary expressions, I was not directing my remarks about confusion specifically to you. In fact, not to you at all, but rather to those on the other side who rose earlier on a point of order with regard to the use of the word "hypocrite." It was they who rose on that point. Sir, page 110 starts a list of words which, since 1958, have been ruled parliamentary and in that list is the word "hypocrite." Certainly the point of order raised earlier by the Member for Turtle Mountain and now, just immediately after the use of the word, by the member was not only an incorrect point which he raised, but certainly he avoided the most appropriate description of his side's activities during the last month. I commend that list to the members opposite and I commend the word to the Minister of Agriculture for its appropriateness.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on the same point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order that the Member for Springfield raises, the Member for Springfield should know the rules and if he refers to page 107, he will find where the use of the word "hypocrites" has been ruled unparliamentary. He is referring to the section which says that, on occasion, it has been ruled parliamentary. Sir, I believe that when it comes to a choice between ruling a word parliamentary or unparliamentary, we would prefer to come down on the side of decency and rule it unparliamentary. The Member for Springfield wants to see debates slide further in this Chamber, Sir, and have words that have been ruled unparliamentary now to be ruled parliamentary.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Springfield on the same point of order.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order, I am sure the Member for Turtle Mountain is fully aware that the words "on occasion" are not in the citation on page 110. It has been both ruled unparliamentary and parliamentary. If the member wishes to determine the basis of the ruling, then he will have to reflect on the citation from the debates of the House of Commons that are referred to beside each word. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the House and more specifically to the Members for Virden and Turtle Mountain who are concerned about this that those debates, which I have consulted, certainly would rule the matter raised and the use of the word raised by the Minister of Agriculture appropriate in this instance.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order, regardless of what is said in Beuchesne and I, like all members of this Chamber, have the greatest respect for what is said and prescribed in Beuchesne. The Honourable Member for Springfield knows, Sir, that to a very considerable degree this House is the master of its own rules, forms and conventions. I haven't been in this House as long as a number in this Chamber, but I think those who have been here a significant length of time would agree with me that our experience has been, and I think the Minister of Agriculture would agree - I think he and I have been in the House about the same length of time - that the use of the term "hypocrite" and "hypocritical" has been regarded by us in the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as unparliamentary language.

We have said that there are a great many terms that we find acceptable. We find them to be not unparliamentary. We did not raise, for example, objections to his use of the word "sham." Certainly, members of this House have to have an opportunity to convey an impression and convey a message fairly directly. So no one is trying to be too precise or too detailed about what pejoratives can and cannot be used, but it has been an accepted convention in this Chamber and you observed that and you ruled correctly, Sir, that the terms "hypocrite" and "hypocritical" are not parliamentary in the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Minister on the same point of order.

HON. B. URUSKI: No, Mr. Speaker, I'll wait for your ruling.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would remind members that, according to Beuchesne, an expression which is deemed unparliamentary today does not necessarily mean that this word will be deemed unparliamentary in other circumstances. In the event that I have already ruled that the remark "hypocritical" should be withdrawn, as they are unparliamentary in this instance, I would ask the member to withdraw those

remarks, so we could proceed with the debate.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, without hesitation, while I think their actions leave much to be desired, I withdraw the connotation.

Mr. Speaker, the whole scenario, the whole game that they have played is nothing but a sham, nothing but a political sham, in terms of that motion. Mr. Speaker, why have they done this? Why have they presented this? They have presented this amendment, Mr. Speaker, I believe because they want to avoid voting on the main motion of the government. That's the reason that they brought this amendment in. They want to avoid voting on the amendment. Really, this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is really not an amendment at all. Mr. Speaker, it's a new resolution. It's not an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, why doesn't the government vote? Why didn't the Opposition vote on the government resolution and they wanted to bring a Private Members' resolution of their own kind. What is stopping them, Mr. Speaker? Nothing is stopping them. So if they want to introduce another resolution, nothing stopped them, but why, Mr. Speaker? This whole amendment again and the whole actions of the Opposition is a sham. Mr. Speaker, if the House were to adopt this amendment that they have proposed to the resolution, one really would not be any wiser where we in this Chamber stand on the issue the Crow rate. No one would be any wiser what our position is on the Crow rate and of course, Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of the amendment.

The Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, they really don't want to vote on the issue of the Crow rate. They really don't want a vote, a clear cut vote. Mr. Speaker, they want to avoid it at all costs, so they will try as best they can to fudge the issue. Every one of their speeches in this House was a total fudging, a complete fudging, of the issue, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— yes, I hope the honourable members in the Opposition, maybe they want to rule that word nonparliamentary. Mr. Speaker, they want this Assembly to really say that we are all in favour of motherhood, but they really don't want to stand up and be counted on the Crow rate issue.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside talks about how serious was this resolution. Mr. Speaker, let's just examine that kind of a comment that the Member for Lakeside made of how serious we were on the Crow rate issue. Mr. Speaker, does the member not recall that in early February there was an announcement made by the Minister of Transportation of the Government of Canada, a policy statement that was made in Winnipeg dealing with the process of the Crow rate? Mr. Speaker, their administration was in possession of studies made for them by the University of Manitoba.

The former Minister of Agriculture was asked by myself in this Assembly, when we were in Committee in Room 254, about that very report because it was raised and it was noted in the University Annual Report whether he would be prepared to release the documentation that was presented to them. He told me he would. Did we see that report? No one saw that report, Mr. Speaker. They sat on that report. They would not release it to the rural people of this province

because of the implications of that report on the various scenarios, a study of the implications of the Crow rate changes on the farmers of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

I'm pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the electorate, that the people of Manitoba, saw through the Conservative Party. We did release that report and now we are being criticized that we had those rounds of meetings and sent out the information from the analysis that was done for the Conservatives and the analysis that we did for ourselves and distributed so that people of Manitoba, the farmers of Manitoba, will know what the implications, what they are being faced with. Now, Mr. Speaker, after five weeks, they now have the gall to come to this Assembly and say, look, you didn't want us to debate so we bring in a resolution. We bring in an amendment to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, that we want to fudge the issue so bad, so that no one will really know where we stand on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, so why didn't we have a vote on the government resolution and then make it very clear to the people of Manitoba —(Interjection)— well, you could have had the vote at any point in time. We want to know, and I'm sure that the farmers and the people of Manitoba want to know where the Conservatives stand on this issue —(Interjection)— no, then let the Leader of the Opposition, or whoever of his colleagues he wishes to designate, introduce a resolution or an amendment and let him start explaining. Let him explain what he means by protecting Manitoba's grain producers, by assuring the historic benefits of the Crow rate, that the Crow rate is maintained. Let's explain. What do you mean, Mr. Speaker? What do they mean by protecting the historical benefits?

We have taken the position, Mr. Speaker, that the Crow rate is there for the protection of the farmers of this province and of Western Canada. Do members of the Opposition agree or disagree with that position? Do they disagree with our position that the Crow rate is there for the protection of the farmers of Western Canada? Are you opposed to that? Obviously, they don't want to answer that, Mr. Speaker. That is the question. That is really the question, whether or not they agree that the Crow rate is there for the protection of western farmers and in particular Manitoba farmers. That's where we want you to be counted. Are you going to be counted? Will you be prepared to say, we agree that it is there for the protection of our farmers of Manitoba? We'll see, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when the Crow rate is going to be abolished, the farmers will be paying more for transporting their grain. Each year, they will pay more and more and more. When the Crow rate is abolished, Mr. Speaker, what will happen? Consolidation of delivery points will occur, elevators will close and branch line abandonment will follow as sure as day follows night, Mr. Speaker, that's what will occur. It will occur, Mr. Speaker. These are the two inevitable results of the abolition of the Crow rate. This will undermine the financial security of Manitoba farmers and the economic prosperity of rural communities. That's what it will do, Mr. Speaker, which the government resolution and the so-called amendment considered to be of utmost importance. We want to see where you stand, Mr. Speaker.

If the Conservatives sincerely believe in the financial security of the farmers and the economic prosper-

ity of rural communities, they really shouldn't be wishy-washy, Mr. Speaker. They really shouldn't be as wishy-washy about the resolution. They should not fudge the issue. They should wholeheartedly support our resolution, Mr. Speaker, but all the motherhood statements that are contained in this resolution in the "Whereases" in their amendments really can't hide the weakness of your resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with what's been said in the preamble, although one might question what some of the statements have to do with the Crow rate issue. The under utilization of Churchill, the Prince Rupert expansion, labour management disputes, the whole issue is wishy-washy, Mr. Speaker. Maintain the historic benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with this amendment, I've said this before, it is completely wishy-washy. It's like dragging a cloth through the water and swishing it back and forth; that's how one can put this resolution in per se, this wishy-washy resolution, Mr. Speaker. Maintain the historic benefits of the Crow rate, but let the Crow rate go; that's really what it means. Let the farmers pay more and more and more; that's what they're saying. That's what the Conservatives are saying: maintain the benefits, but close the elevators, abandon the branchlines and sacrifice the rural communities. Is that what you're saying because that's what your resolution points to? Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are in bed with Pepin; there is no doubt about it. —(Interjections)—

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I know that I have struck a very tender chord. I have struck a very tender chord.

Mr. Speaker, it would not make any difference whether we had Pepin or Mazankowski in Ottawa; they're in the same boat together. It would make no difference. So you can be in bed with Mazankowski, but you are in bed with Pepin, because he is bringing this thing forward. There is just no doubt about it.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are outsmarting themselves with this so-called amendment. —(Interjection)— They may be so. They are only kidding themselves, Mr. Speaker, when they think the farmers of Manitoba aren't wise to the double-talk of the Conservatives and the Liberal politicians. You think the farmers don't understand, Mr. Speaker, of what you're really standing for? The Member for Arthur, on the radio program when that was announced, patted the negotiator on the back and said, I want to see changes in the Crow rate. I mean we, at least, know where one of their members stood with respect to the Crow rate.

The Leader of the Opposition has been a bit more cute about this issue; he wants to fudge it a bit more, Mr. Speaker. The farmers know, Mr. Speaker, that they're getting a snow job from the Conservatives. When someone like they are trying to tell them that they'll keep the Crow benefits while they're losing the Crow, Mr. Speaker, what are they really saying?

Is it that \$612 million that is there in the benefit they have put out? Is that the benefit they are talking about? Is that the \$612 million that they are saying will remain in perpetuity? Is that the benefit? What will

happen, Mr. Speaker, when the projections —(Interjection)— you are absolutely right, what a fudgy issue. Why don't you be clear on where you stand instead of fudging the whole thing, Mr. Speaker? You will see the record when it's called. You're damn right, because you are fudging the issue. You are being so wishy-washy, you want to be on both sides of the issue. You want the railways to get more money; you want to get all their cake. We know why, we know why they want this. The donations by the CPR to the Tories: 1978, \$25,000; 1979, \$35,000; 1980, \$35,000, Mr. Speaker. Obviously one wants to say, "He who pays the piper calls the tune." Mr. Speaker. Obviously, that's the issue; that's the name of the game.

We have a bunch of puppets in the Legislature, Mr. Speaker. They represent rural farmers. What is the Leader of the Opposition going to tell the farmers of Manitoba when in District 1 - let's find out - in the southwest corner in the Member for Arthur's area, when the Crow rate is increased five times, when the average producer in his area will pay an additional \$3,000 to ship his grain; what are they going to tell them then, Mr. Speaker? "Well, we want to ship all the grain we can no matter what it costs us, no matter what the price of grain, we want to ship that grain," that's what they're going to tell them. That's what they're going to tell the farmers in their own areas, Mr. Speaker.

What is the Member for Morris going to tell his constituents in District 8 when his farmers will be paying an additional \$2,000 or more to ship their grain when the Crow rate is increased five times, Mr. Speaker? —(Interjection)— What did he say? —(Interjection)— Oh, now we know the issue. It's "ship the grain at any price," is the Tory policy, regardless of what the income may be, regardless what a price is, Mr. Speaker. Now we know what the issue is: "ship the grain at any price." No matter what the world price on the market is, ship it at any time, just get it out of hand. We'll do well even if we give it away, Mr. Speaker. That is the Tory policy in terms of the grain shipments. They are the ones in Manitoba who turned down as a government, when the farmers of Manitoba and Western Canada were presented with a proposal to give them some stability, some market assurance in terms of the stocks, in terms of the grain stored on their farms, so that if it was not moving and it was not needed at that time, there would be advances made available to farmers to pay for the grain that was stored on their farm so that farmers could be paid for the storage of grain on their farm so that they could cover off the operating costs and the interest rates.

It seems that the members opposite, the members of the Conservative Party are saying, look, we want to ship all the grain that can be produced regardless of what it costs us. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, let's take that argument that they are making and say, okay, in the fall time we're going to move all our grain. All the grain we've got on our farms, we're going to sell; we're going to move it to the Ports, Mr. Speaker, when we don't have the customers and we don't have the storage to handle that grain, and what if the customers prefer or want to ship the grain from the West Coast rather than from the Lakehead where we may have that grain? What are we going to do then, Mr. Speaker? Oh, we made a mistake; we're going to have

to pay more; we're going to have to ship more grain around. Mr. Speaker, the grain may not be in place. What better system is there than to have the grain in place where it is produced and is called upon when it is needed? But we don't disagree and they are the ones who turned it down. We know that farmers need the cash flow. If that is what they are suggesting, let's sell it and move it and meet the cash flow. You don't need to accommodate it by this very resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it's move the grain at any price, regardless of what the export price is. That is the Tory policy and they are selling their farmers down the tube because, Mr. Speaker, I have to say they represent the vast majority of farmers in rural southern and western parts of the province. We understand that. One really has to wonder, Mr. Speaker, if they really wanted to bring in an amendment, why it took them so long to bring in this so-called amendment. You know, you had an opportunity. You had an opportunity for several weeks, Mr. Speaker. For weeks they've refused to speak on this resolution. They debated and they said, let's wait for Gilson, and now they bring in an amendment. Why did they bring in this amendment? Do they have advance information on what might be in Dr. Gilson's recommendations? Is that the reason they brought this amendment in?

Do you have advance notice of what might be in Gilson's recommendations of what the presumed consensus or nonconsensus among the railways and the various - I know the Member for Morris nodded his head in the affirmative, Mr. Speaker - organizations who are negotiating on behalf of farmers. I have heard rumours and I must emphasize —(Interjection)— Yes, I have heard rumours, and I'm sure that they would be a little bit closer to Mr. Gilson than any one of us would be, Mr. Speaker. Obviously they would be very close to Mr. Gilson. I've heard rumours and some of them have been second and third hand, but maybe some of those members will be getting up and give this House some of the firsthand rumours that they may have received. Maybe they have some firsthand information. Maybe they could provide that to this House, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Gilson Inquiry recommend that the railways will get the increases that Snavely said they needed, or maybe more? Is that what the Gilson Inquiry is going to recommend? Are the railways going to get more? Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition indicated not so much that, as I took from his remarks, but that the Crow rate is the obstacle to increased capacity on the main line; that is the main problem to the increased capacity on the main line, the Crow rate. That is implied in what he was saying. He went on again, as well, to say that the Wheat Board is picking the pockets of farmers, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— He did; he said that yesterday. I wrote that down, Mr. Speaker, and it will be in Hansard. They have aligned themselves clearly and very closely with Pepin. They have not even read or wanted to read the information that was presented to his government, to his former Minister who didn't want to release that information in terms of the Tyrchniewicz Report, the implications of it.

If the Crow is the obstacle to the main line capacity, then why are the projections that are put forward by

the railways, that the percentage of grain that will be shipped to the West Coast is going to be decreasing lower and lower as a percentage of the total load hauled, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, will the Gilson Report recommend that Federal Government payments to even the so-called 1981 and '82 Crow gap will at first be made to the railways? Will he be making that kind of recommendation? But gradually the payments will be made directly to farmers so that by the turn of the century the bulk, 80-85 percent of the Crow gap, will be paid directly to farmers and 15 percent to the railways, is that what he's going to recommend? We know that at least a portion of the Conservative Party has supported that because the former Minister of Agriculture has advocated that kind of a payment, so we know some of the thinking that is there, that any benefits should be paid directly to all the farmers.

Does the Leader of the Opposition agree with that kind of a position? Is that what Gilson is going to recommend? Will Gilson recommend that not all of the payments will go to grain producers, but some of that will go to livestock producers as has been advocated by former Conservative Ministers of Agriculture in this province? Is that what he's going to recommend? Is that where they stand? Is that what they're in agreement with? Will Gilson recommend that the new rates will be cost related, which seems to be just another form of variable rates. Will they support that, because they've been waiting for that? Is that what he's going to recommend? That the rates will be cost supported because, Mr. Speaker, it all links and hinges on the "Be It Resolved" in the Tory Resolution in terms of protecting the financial integrity and the historical benefits to the farmers. It all links to that.

Mr. Speaker, will Gilson recommend that the contributions by the Federal Government will be fixed and that the farmers will bear the full brunt of the cost increases? Is that what he's going to recommend? Is that what the Conservatives are standing for? Mr. Speaker, we will vote against this Resolution amendment absolutely.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 12:30 p.m., it's time for Private Members' Hour.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a dispensation that we will call this adjournment hour and that Private Members' Hour is moved aside. I believe that's the agreement.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition are prepared to forego Private Members' Hour, but we're also prepared to continue on with government business and debate this resolution if it's the wish of the government.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, we will call it 12:30 and when the resolution is called again, we'll continue with the debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. With the

understanding of the House, there will be no Private Members' Hour. I would entertain a motion for adjournment.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Health that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. Monday