



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

---

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

---

31-32 Elizabeth II

---

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



MG-8048

**VOL. XXXI No. 35B - 8:00 p.m., MONDAY, 28 MARCH, 1983.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 28 March, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Order please. Will the Honourable Government House Leader indicate the next item of business?

**HON. R. PENNER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you please call adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance, Bill No. 29, Page 3 of the Order Paper.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES - SECOND READING BILL NO. 29 - THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1983

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak in this debate at this point, for the record, on a matter of extreme current urgency and pain to me, to my colleagues and to the majority of citizens of the Province of Manitoba.

I am not prepared, Sir, to vote \$8 million for Economic Development and Tourism, being approximately 30 percent of the 1983-84 Budget for Economic Development and Tourism; or \$25 million for Natural Resources, being approximately 30 percent of the '83-84 Budget for Natural Resources, as long as the two current Ministers continue in those two portfolios, or indeed as long as they continue in the Cabinet of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it may well be that the Progressive Conservative caucus votes for Interim Supply out of the spirit of requirement and necessity to meet the economic and fiscal needs of the province and the payroll of the dedicated public servants of this province. I can agree with that, I can accept that, but I want to advise you, Sir, and advise members opposite that I personally do not intend to support the Interim Supply Motion, either on a vote on division or on a recorded vote.

The two Ministers in question have recently given Manitobans one of the most embarrassing and uncomfortable, if not the most embarrassing and uncomfortable, weekend in the history of this province.

I appeal to the First Minister again, Sir, and I know that the appeal falls on relatively deaf ears, but I appeal to the First Minister again, Sir, to try to repair some of the damage that was created by those two Ministers and to apologize publicly, officially and formally to the President of the United States of America for the affront that was delivered last Wednesday to our greatest friends and allies.

Mr. Speaker, I want the First Minister to apologize in a way that will be as widely publicized in the United States as the incident of last Wednesday was itself. I think that members opposite are deliberately deluding

themselves if they are unprepared or unwilling to admit of the incalculable damage that has been done to Manitobans, vis-a-vis their relationship with North Dakotans and Minnesotans in particular, and all Americans in general as a result of what happened last week. This thing cannot be sloughed off or easily brushed aside, Sir, and I for one do not intend - and I serve notice to my honourable friends opposite - that I for one do not intend to let it die.

Many of us in this Chamber, many on both sides of this Chamber, have participated shoulder to shoulder with American citizens of the United States of America in respect to the difficult challenges that free men and women have had to face in the 20th Century and I would think, Sir, that many of those opposite who have served in that capacity - and I know that there are several opposite who have done so - I would think that they would feel enormously hurt, and pained, and embarrassed by what they're two unthinking colleagues did.

I spoke the other night about the event itself and I said that the six backbenchers who participated were perhaps not so much to blame, because in the words of a great teacher, philosopher and leader, whose death in fact and resurrection is celebrated a few days from now by the adherents of one of the world's great religions, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do," and some of them probably did not know what they did. But you cannot be a Minister, you cannot be sworn in to the Cabinet of the province of any jurisdiction in this country and not know what you are doing, or in fact if you are, then you shouldn't continue in that office, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I've spent the weekend listening to and hearing from a great many Manitobans and my colleagues have spent the weekend listening to and hearing from a great many citizens of this province who have been deeply hurt, in fact outraged by the actions of this government last Wednesday evening vis-a-vis the greatest friend, the greatest ally, that Canadians and free men and women have in this world, the United States of America.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Now, I know that members opposite don't like to hear this, Mr. Speaker, and I know that they're going to try to drown out my remarks and I know that they're going to try to discount and rationalize the kinds of things that we are saying and I know that they're going to drag more contrived excuses and arguments across the path as they have been doing and as the First Minister has been doing since Thursday of last week.

But there is not a justification, there is not an argument that has been raised by anybody on that side of the House, Sir, that stands up under scrutiny. Every reasonable, decent Manitoban and every reasonable, decent Canadian knows that those two Ministers were acting whether they like it or not in their capacity as

representatives of the people of Manitoba and as such they betrayed the people of Manitoba by participating in that demonstration.

I am not concerned at the moment with the burning of the flag which was a heinous and scandalous incident, but I'm not so concerned about that, Sir, the Ministers, obviously, who participated didn't know that was going to take place, at least I assume that they didn't know it was going to take place, but, Sir, the actual participation in the anti-American demonstration is what I'm referring to and that is what bothers me.

As I said the other night, if they want to do that, let them quit the Cabinet, let them retire and let them return to private life. If they want to carry on in their sophomoric, juvenile, irresponsible ways; if they want to continue as many of us did on university campuses many years ago; if they want to act without any sense of responsibility or commitment to the people of Manitoba; they are free to do so. It's a free province and it's a free country, but you don't do that as an elected, sworn Minister of a government representing people who believe that you symbolize for them their jurisdiction, their province, and their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I'm not prepared to vote the 30 percent being requested tonight, either for Economic Development and Tourism or for Natural Resources. I have no particular quarrel with the amount being requested in the Interim Supply bill for other departments but, Sir, those two Ministers, Economic Development and Natural Resources, although they may be very nice individuals - and they have claimed throughout that they were acting as individuals which is an insupportable argument that doesn't wash and will not stand up under scrutiny but they claim it nonetheless. They claim they've been acting as individuals - they may be very nice individuals but they are not, Mr. Speaker, and they have proven themselves not competent Cabinet Ministers.

By their approach to that episode last Wednesday evening, they have proven themselves incompetent, unworthy and unfit for the job of serving in the Cabinet of this province, serving the people of Manitoba as representatives of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether members opposite are capable of bringing themselves to as sensitive an awareness of the ramifications of this episode, as many Manitobans who have been in contact with us over the weekend are. The impression now for Americans, rightly or wrongly, whether members opposite like to admit it or not, whether it's true or not, the impression now for Americans, rightly or wrongly, is that Manitobans through their government participated in an irresponsible anti-American demonstration and burned the American flag.

Sir, members opposite surely have been in the business long enough to know that in politics, unfortunately and regrettably, many many things are perception, not reality and it doesn't matter to what extent those of us in this Chamber argue for the next innumerable number of days, that in fact the Ministers in question did not participate in the burning of a flag, or did not know that a flag was going to be burned, it doesn't matter how strongly that is argued, the perception is that members of the Manitoba Government representing the people of Manitoba, did that; and that is the kind of recognition and cognizance

of what goes with government and office, that persons elevated to the Cabinet must be aware of. That's the kind of sensitivity and consciousness that a First Minister must demand of his or her Ministers in any Executive Council.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I have many contacts with the news media, having been in it for some many years, that the major wire services in the United States carried that story on Friday and on the weekend, A.P. and UPI, to every single newspaper in the United States of America and NBC television news carried that episode and that incident into the homes of Americans.

Now members opposite may not think that's important, but I want you to know that for those of us who believe in friendship, alliance and unity in this continent, and many of us who have blood relationships with our ally to the south, feel that to be an extremely, a critically important episode of damage with respect to our relationships with Americans. We feel that to be critically important. Members opposite may try to laugh that off and slough it off, but if they do, it simply betrays their insensitivity to some of the values for which their forebearers in this House, for many decades, and our forebearers in this House for many decades, worked and served and fought. It just betrays an insensitivity to the things in life that are important.

I want to say that many Manitobans will find it extremely uncomfortable, if not embarrassing, in the weeks and months ahead, Mr. Speaker, and I will be one of them, frankly, who will find it extremely embarrassing to visit Grand Forks, to visit Fargo, to visit Minneapolis, with Manitoba licence plates on my car, which is something that all of us have done all our lives, because of the unthinking, dishonourable and irresponsible action of that government and the two Ministers of that government who participated in that episode.

It is not going to be comfortable for Manitobans to try to maintain the kind of rapport and relationship with their friends and neighbours in North Dakota and Minnesota that has been traditional and historic on this continent, since the beginning of our province and since the beginning of those States.

Members opposite may not care about that, but these are things that matter in life. These are things that matter to people, and I want them to know that tens of thousands, nay, hundreds of thousands of Manitobans are very concerned about that this weekend and today, and they will continue to be concerned about it tomorrow and they will continue to be concerned about it through the year ahead.

Mr. Speaker, they may, on the opposite side, try to dismiss it and try to discount it in their best cloak of confusion and rationalization and contrived justification, but it just won't work. Manitobans are deeply upset about this; we are deeply upset about this; I am deeply upset about this; and we are not going to let that government off the hook over this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the fallout of this government's folly in permitting those Ministers to attend is going to be seen in tourist exchanges and in tourist relationships. It's going to be seen in all the interaction between Manitobans and Americans, particularly upper Midwestern Americans, that have become traditional part and parcel practices of our lives.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said and made of individual difficulties that may now confront us with respect to negotiations having to do with the Garrison, with negotiations having to do with energy sales, hydro-electric sales, with negotiations having to do with freight and tourist exchanges, student exchanges, those are all critically important, Mr. Speaker, and I don't downgrade them or subordinate them for a moment. But I am, frankly, more concerned about the simple relationship man-to-man and woman-to-woman of Canadians and Americans in this central part of the continent, of Midwestern Canadians and Midwestern Americans, as friends and allies.

I can see the potential danger to the Minister of Energy's efforts to make hydro-electric sales in the United States, I can certainly see the potential danger to negotiations on Garrison and those are extremely important to Manitoba. But more important to me is the price of this folly of the Manitoba Government that we will be paying, in terms of friendship and relationships between Midwestern Canadians and Midwestern Americans. More important to me is the damage to the whole interaction between Manitobans, North Dakotans and Minnesotans that flows as a consequence of that irresponsible action on the part of those two Ministers last Wednesday, on the part of the First Minister for permitting it, on the part of the Chairman of the Government Caucus for permitting it, on the part of the Government Caucus itself for discussing it and permitting it.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** What about the Americans who live in Canada?

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well, my colleague, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell says, what about the Americans who live in Canada? Another example of a body of friends and allies, who are deeply hurt and humiliated by that kind of irresponsible action.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that the two Ministers, who are most deeply involved in this episode, should be as embarrassed by what has happened as their current activity in the House today suggests, and I will make no further comment on that point. I think that comment speaks for itself, to all who are present here. Obviously, the two Ministers concerned are deeply humiliated and embarrassed by what they have done. They recognize that they have damaged - not so much this government as this province and its people - and that they, as a consequence, feel extremely uncomfortable about facing the fallout from that and are having difficulty facing it. Let that remark stand by itself for what it means, and I know it means a good deal to all those who are in the Chamber at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

It's scandalous, Sir, of the First Minister or any of the Ministers or any of the members opposite to try to suggest that the two Ministers, Economic Development and Natural Resources, and the other six government backbenchers were there as individuals, acting and operating in a private and individual capacity. They know that when you become a member of the government you become a representative of your province or your jurisdiction, whatever it may be, and a symbol of that jurisdiction and the citizens of it. They

know that you cannot divorce yourself from the burden of office and the onus of responsibility that cloaks you, once you assume that office. It is a sad commentary on the attitude that this government has towards the intelligence of the people of Manitoba, that its foremost spokesman would even attempt that kind of a spurious argument, or justification, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, what further concerns us here is that those who participated in that demonstration last Wednesday night didn't even know what they were demonstrating against, except that it was anti-American. They did not know. And the organizer of that demonstration admitted as much to the media that he did not know, that that demonstration could have been held in front of Eaton's, but it was a chance to get out and demonstrate, so they got out and demonstrated. Here we had two members of Cabinet rushing off to participate, simply because it was an opportunity to express further anti-Americanism.

Mr. Speaker, what that reflects is an attitude and a posture on the part of this government to exercise any excuse that presents itself to embarrass Washington. How sophomoric, Mr. Speaker, how juvenile. Perhaps members opposite don't know, so I will tell them, that the vast majority of Manitobans considers the United States of America and its citizens to be close friends and allies and they don't want you out embarrassing Americans.

How about the contrived argument, another specious and spurious attempt to try to smooth this thing over and justify it, the contrived argument that this was somehow equivalent to the fact that my leader, when he was the First Minister of this province, attended a National Republican Convention in the United States. Well, Mr. Speaker, that argument hardly deserves comment. It is so blatantly contrived and so blatantly incredible that it hardly deserves comment, Mr. Speaker. If members opposite want to go down and participate in a national convention of the Democratic Party in the United States, let them do so. There would be no argument from anybody on either side, certainly on this side, there would be no argument from any Manitoban. Politics is politics when it comes to participating in different party conventions and different party representations of that type.

But, Sir, what we were looking at here the other night was an opportunity for two sophomoric - and I use the term again - Cabinet Ministers who have not yet grown beyond the campus, and not yet grown beyond their student activist days, to indulge in an opportunity to be anti-American again because that's part and parcel of their makeup. It is not part and parcel of the makeup of Manitobans, but it is part and parcel of their makeup and the First Minister, the Chairman of that government caucus and other officers of that government caucus did not have the courage, Sir, the fortitude, or the guts to say to them, stay home; don't do that; don't be foolish; don't be childish. If you want to do that, you're out of the Cabinet. But that First Minister and his colleagues and that Chairman of caucus over there from Radisson didn't have the guts to do that because they all drift along in a willy-nilly impressionable attitude which denies or fails to admit, fails to recognize the essential values and importance of alliances and friendships of a historic nature in this world such as that, that exists between this country and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister and the other members of the Manitoba Government have any grievances or difficulties with the policies of the United States - not that they demonstrated any proof or justification of that the other night because they didn't know what they were demonstrating for or against - but if they do have any grievances or difficulties, Mr. Speaker, surely the First Minister and his colleagues know that there are proper, normal and formal channels through which those differences can be expressed. Surely they don't have to go off in a willy-nilly ragtag kind of demonstration that reflects and bespeaks their irresponsible, individual, student days which they have apparently never outgrown.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to ask this First Minister with respect to every decision he now brings forward, with respect to every action that this government now takes, are they acting as a government representing me and representing the people of Manitoba, or is the particular Minister doing it, acting as an individual?

**HON. S. LYON:** Or a Sandinista?

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** How do I know, now that the Interim Supply Bill is in front of me and the Minister of Finance and the Government House Leader would like to get that bill through, how do I know that the First Minister really wants to get that bill through? How do I know that the government wants to pass Interim Supply? How do I know that the Minister of Finance isn't simply acting as an individual? I am told the other night, that the Minister of Economic Development and the Minister of Natural Resources were acting as individuals, so how do Manitobans know, Mr. Speaker, when we are being called upon by our government to do certain things, and when we are being represented by our government, and when we are being confronted by the irrational, irresponsible activities of a bunch of juvenile individuals?

**HON. S. LYON:** Perpetual Mr. Hydes.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take any more time on this subject tonight, but I want to repeat that I, as a friend and ally of the United States whose brother, for one, lies dead on the slopes of Italy, having fought shoulder to shoulder with Americans - and there are members opposite who did the same - do not intend to accept that insult lying down, I do not intend to forget this issue and I do not intend to vote Interim Supply or any other kind of Supply for those two Ministers. I, personally, in the place of the First Minister of this province, who apparently won't do it, issue and will write to the President of the United States to apologize for that incident and to tell him that Manitobans disassociate themselves, not only from the incident, but from the government that participated in it.

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rather than dwell further on this unfortunate incident that took place in front of the Embassy the other night, I'll move

off into the field of housing and see if I can't draw to the attention of this government to some of the problems that we face out there. Instead of burning flags and marching around at night, if they'd stay at home and look after the business of the province, we'd get along a lot better, and we'd maybe help some of the people in this province to get back on the job again and get the economy rolling.

Mr. Speaker, from Day One, the local housing authorities had the responsibility of calling for tenders for insurance coverage as prescribed on the specifications on these various houses, MHRC housing around the province. These tenders, Mr. Speaker, are usually given to local agents. It has always been the practice of government, as many years I think as I've been here, to give local rural businesses an opportunity to compete in the insurance field and in various fields in this province. It's generally worked out quite well, and it's been acceptable, and it's balanced the economy of this province between rural and urban pretty well, Mr. Speaker.

Last year, and of course we can look at the insurance rates that housing in this province enjoyed over the years, and I can quote as an example, Mr. Speaker, that rural agents were able to provide insurance on MHRC housing and residences from between 9 to 11 cents per \$100 insurance with a 250 deductible clause in the policy. But last year, Mr. Speaker, there was a slight change, a new twist in this longstanding development and arrangement that had gone on over the years with the rural insurance agents in this province. The last year, the local authority was allowed to call for and receive the tenders, but unfortunately he couldn't handle them from thereon. The government didn't figure, or MHRC didn't figure that these agents, who some of them have been in business longer than I have - and I've been in the insurance business 35 years - said, oh, no, you guys can't handle this any longer, you're not capable, you've got to send these tenders into MHRC to award them.

Then this year, Mr. Speaker, the strangest thing happened. November 23rd, a letter goes out from MHRC to all these local authorities, MHRC housing authorities - and there's many of them around this province - and tells them that the local insurance agents that are going to apply for a tender for the insurance on these MHRC billings, you boys got to get your specs in first by the 3rd of December. Then another memo ran out real fast, I think it was within one week, and said that quotations had to be in, I think on the 10th of December, I'm told. So they had one week, and I don't know how many people across the way have been in the insurance business and understand how difficult it is to take a risk such as that and walk around the insurance market, ask for quotations on that kind of insurance package and come back in a week with a figure. It just isn't realistic; it isn't done. If it's done, it's poor insurance business. It's not the way insurance is carried on in my years in insurance.

Anyway, the next letter comes out within another few days and said the policies all expire December 31st. Just like that. Now, what chance, Mr. Speaker, did the rural insurance agents in this province have, first of all, to send in their specs, then to get their quotations back from these various insurance companies and then to send them in to MHRC? Strange, Mr. Speaker.

You know what happened, Mr. Speaker? They finally got a letter. It was all for naught, they weren't going to insure with these rural agents at all. They were going to place the insurance for the whole package in the province with a firm by the name of Marsh & McLennan Ltd., Winnipeg. You know, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting, this firm took on this package of insurance at 2,500 deductible. Have you ever heard anybody in this room insure your home with a 2,500 deductible, have you ever heard of it before?

**A MEMBER:** Never heard of it.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** That's the new policy of MHRC and this government. 2,500 deductible and the premium would be, as was calculated by one of my agents, it came out to \$37.60 on a certain risk. A 2,500 deductible, the premium would be \$40.00.

Mr. Speaker, no common courtesies have been extended to the rural agents of this province by the policies that have been implemented by MHRC and this government as to whether they were to renew or not, their contracts. They had problems because a lot of civil servants were away on their Christmas holidays. It was an absolute nightmare and, Mr. Speaker, it's my belief and it's the belief of a lot of insurance agents that little or no consideration was in fact given to any of the rural agents at all. They had their mind made up. They had made a deal with Marsh & McLennan Ltd. and the rural agents could take it for what it was worth.

I regret that very much, Mr. Speaker, because surely this province with the insurance on this housing is spread all across this province. I know the Minister, he is going to rise in his place and he's going to tell us of all the great savings that he's made. I can tell him if he takes a look at some of the decentralization programs that have taken place in this province historically year after year, such as moving the Water Resources Branch to Brandon, great savings can be made by decentralizing big big government and giving the little people, the small rural agents out in the country or the boondocks, a chance to compete in the insurance business on these small private homes that MHRC has constructed across this province.

I dare say, in my opinion, it's not fair, and I'm sure the Minister is going to say he saved \$200,000.00. I doubt it very much. On behalf of the insurance agents in my constituency, a lot of insurance agents across this province, I'm very unhappy with the way the insurance business is being handled on MHRC housing and the residents in this province.

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

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Are you speaking as a Minister, or is it your night off?

**HON. J. STORIE:** . . . as everyone knows, I don't take any nights off.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, to clarify what the remarks of the Member for Roblin-Russell, the local insurance

agents of course were given consideration; that we are very aware of the fact that any time that you change a policy, whenever you take money out of the local community, that it's going to have an impact. The Member for Roblin-Russell was quite right when he said I'm going to stand up and I'm going to say, look, there are significant savings to be had from this rationalization. I don't know whether he expects me to stand up and apologize for that fact. We continue to hear on the one hand, well, the government's got to learn to be better managers, the government has to make sure that the dollars spent are in the appropriate places, and that the dollars spent aren't wasted dollars.

With all due respect to the insurance agents, I recognize that this is going to mean additional hardship for some of those agents. I recognize that that's a fact. As the Member for Roblin-Russell will also recognize, that in each of these communities or in many of these communities there are two or three or four agents who share this business. They survive from time to time without the particular business that MHRC gives them to insure their particular properties. So to suggest that it's a death blow in most instances I think is misleading. It's a tendency to create hype where none needs to be created. The fact is that suggesting that it's a death blow simply isn't accurate.

Mr. Speaker, it may be a blow that hurts in the pocketbooks of some particular agents. I would like to indicate, however, the steps that were gone through before this decision was taken.

As the member indicated back in November of 1982, MHRC did send out a letter to the housing authorities requesting that they get quotes from individual agents, the agents in their community with respect to insuring the properties in the local communities. It was explicitly written in that letter that they were to get quotes; they were not to place the insurance; that MHRC was looking at re-evaluating its policy with respect to the location and the type of insurance that MHRC has on its properties; it was made clear to them at that time. They were requested to get quotes, submit those to MHRC and at that point MHRC would compare the rates as they came in from the local agents as to what they could get on a provincial scale by way of the three brokers that they approached to get quotes on a provincial scale.

It wasn't just Marsh & McLennan, it was - I forget the other two names of them, but there were at least two other brokers.

**A MEMBER:** Reed Stenhouse.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Reed Stenhouse was one of them, and they were asked to make quotes. Each of those brokers went and obviously obtained quotes from a variety of sources, one of them being MPIC and a decision was made prior to December 31st that there was some significant saving to be had by going the route of the central broker.

These housing authorities were notified prior to December 31st that that was the case. A follow-up letter was sent on January 5th indicating that for a three-month period in 1983, that this procedure would be followed with an indication as well that there was further review that in fact the province was looking at

the possibility of self-insuring because of the hefty premiums that we were paying to insure our properties.

Mr. Speaker, the minimum that we had paid in 1981-82 was approximately \$215,000.00. Just with respect to the rural properties, the comparable insurance to what we had at that point would have cost us somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$176,000.00. Subsequent to that three-month period, MHRC has done an extensive review of their insurance needs and an extensive review of the various options - cost options - with respect to insuring through the local agents, insuring through a broker and trying a variety of options within their insurance package, including changing the deductible where it seemed advisable and the bottom line was, particularly with respect to the real properties, there were significant financial benefits to be had on their local properties. — (Interjection) — The Member for Minnedosa has suggested that we should wait until we have a loss and the implication being that when that happens you will have difficulty getting the adjuster out to settle the claim and we hear those arguments from time to time, where you're insuring with a local agent you get a better service, but the fact of the matter is that in most of the major claims the individual comes out from Winnipeg to do the inspection and the adjuster is sent out from Winnipeg in any case. The fact that the adjuster is not in the community himself and you have the same problems of communication that I expect that might be the case in this instance.

However, I'm not arguing that isn't going to be something that will detract, that there is possibly that price to be paid in terms of the immediacy of the response or whatever.

I think the major consideration was certainly one of finances and the recommendation that will be made to MHRC Board tomorrow morning at the regular board meeting will be that we proceed with providing insurance through the central broker. Although I don't have the figures at hand, if I can just go from memory what maybe members would be interested in knowing what kind of figure we're talking about in terms of saving.

The insurance that the staff are recommending that MHRC approve is one that not only MHRC staff, the finance administration staff have recommended, but one that has been recommended by the Risk and Insurance Manager of the Department of Finance and I think one that, upon reflection, is a reasonable one. The coverage that we are being offered through the central broker for the remainder of the year costs in the neighbourhood of \$40,000 and that figure is comparable to what we would have going through the individual insurance agents; the rural insurance agents, of something in the neighbourhood of \$150,000 - amounts to in the neighbourhood of \$112,000 saving simply on the rural property. That sounds like not a bad figure and we're talking about that much money.

Clearly there are some concerns with respect to the damage that it . . .

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** It's a joke.

**HON. J. STORIE:** . . . possibly could have on some agents. We looked at that. We found as well that a number of the housing authorities with significant amounts of property in fact were not . . .

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** . . . deductible for for 37.60, you get 250 deductible for 40 bucks what would you take?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about deductibles of \$250, we're talking about deductibles of \$25,000 with an aggregate of \$100,000 and a number of other provisions.

**A MEMBER:** Wally, when did you ever let the facts get in your way?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, it's not simply a question of whether we're talking about \$100,000 or \$200,000 saving in one year. The fact is that those savings mount up, that we're talking about a half a million dollars on a five-year basis and those savings are there regardless of what the deductible is.

I was, I suppose, amused by the remarks of the Member for Roblin-Russell when he belittles the fact that we're making that inroad. He's says, well big deal, you're saving us a \$100,000 or \$200,000.00. The fact is that you have to start somewhere. The fact is that we did look at where the insurance was being placed on local properties, whether it was being placed in the communities where the properties existed. We have examples of other communities where there are significant numbers of properties existed. We have examples of other communities with their significant numbers of properties placing their insurance with Winnipeg brokers anyway. So the supposed advantage of having the local agent keep the business in a local community, hasn't always been the case. The housing authorities have gone outside of the communities in a number of cases where there are significant amounts of housing insurance. So it's not a simple matter.

The fact is that we certainly look at all avenues as did the risk manager, as did I'm sure the staff when they were making these suggestions and we will certainly be evaluating the effect of that decision over the coming year.

I should indicate that I have had conversations with the insurance agents of Manitoba on this policy. They have indicated they had some concerns but after a frank discussion of the options, the fact that the Provincial Auditor has mentioned, on more than one occasion, that this is the route that we should be going - it was a simple procedure to put in place to make that saving - and we shouldn't be ignoring it year after year. We will have to wait and see what the impact is. I expect that there is going to be some reaction from the insurance agents, that they are not going to find this entirely to their liking. That is understandable. I think that by and large they will be able to function without the business in this case, of the MHRC property insurance.

They have various other avenues and certainly in tough times, I suppose it's understandable, that while they would be upset they will be prepared to accept this as part of the measures that the government has to undertake if it's going to get its spending under control where it can, and also if it's going to turn those funds around and use them in areas that are going to be creative in potential job creation. So it's not as if the monies can't be used in other areas where our



priorities are higher and I am sure the agents themselves will understand the rationale for the government doing that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell have a question?

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Well, I just wanted to further my argument with the Honourable Minister if I could, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member has spoken once during this . . .

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** You're only allowed to speak . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** No, but you may ask a question for clarification.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** I was going to ask him, how much of this business has been taken away from the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation? Has Marsh & McLennan Ltd., got it all now, and the MPIC is wiped out completely?

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

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I had indicated previously to the member, that like other insurance companies MPIC had been asked to quote to the brokers. They did so in the first instance with respect to the first three months of insurance that we acquired. The deductible was subsequently changed. MPIC was again invited to make a bid - and I should indicate that in the first three months there were a number of losses, as members are aware, in terms of fires - that had to be picked up by the company that was then insuring our properties. Those amounts totalled, if I recollect correctly, \$75,000.00. The premiums that we paid that company for those three months totalled in the area of \$45,000, so it's certainly no bargain to MPIC and I presume that it was one of the reasons why, when they had the opportunity, they did not come in with the lowest quote.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Honourable Minister now, are all these units now \$2,500 deductible?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, they will be \$2,500 deductible until and if the MHRC adopts the new recommendation which would put the deductible at \$25,000 with a \$100,000 aggregate feature with a number of other clauses in it. So to this point, for the first three months \$2,500, not \$250, was the deductible and if MHRC adopts the recommendation of the Risk and Insurance Manager and the staff of MHRC, then the deductible would be moving to \$25,000.00.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to comment on two or three things tonight but the subject that the Minister was just speaking of is

something that I have some knowledge of and there is no question that there is a saving by placing the rural business of MHRC with one large broker in Winnipeg. It's just another example of this government's death wish to rural Manitoba.

As I said earlier in this House, the gasoline tax, the many things that this government seems to do, which is the disregarding of the prosperity of rural Manitobans, is something that I'm sure is being recognized by rural Manitobans throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, in 1977 when I took over as Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, the NDP Government that was there previously insisted that the insurance for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation go with MPIC, there was no quoting, Mr. Speaker. As there was in most of the government, if not all of the government corporations, etc., schools, etc., everything, it came down from above, from the government before 1977, that everything must be insured by MPIC, no quoting.

The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, who contracted with an individual who was an expert, or a previous underwriter in insurance, to write out the specifications that the corporation needed as far as insurance was concerned. It took about six to eight months for him to complete that job. He looked at all the urban and the rural insurance portfolios.

He told us what we needed and, Mr. Speaker, we put it out for tender for the first time in something like six years, and do you know what we saved as a total in the City of Winnipeg by putting it out to tender? - \$286,000.00. It wasn't even allowed to be tendered before - \$286,000 was saved.

Mr. Speaker, at that time we also said that the rural insurance agents would have the opportunity to quote to the housing authorities that were in the area. Did you know, Mr. Speaker, that they didn't even have a chance before that to even quote on it? Mr. Speaker, we said, we know that it will cost more to do business through the rural agents on the rural housing construction that was out there, on the housing that is out there. We knew then, by quoting to the boards that it would cost us more.

We asked the boards to get prices. We told them what we wanted by way of guidelines; they got those prices; and, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in six years the rural fellows even had a chance to quote. Mr. Speaker, it did save us money by having the quotations come in, in the rural area, and it would have saved us more if we hadn't allowed those rural agents to quote.

The previous government believed in the rural small enterprise. We had a program called "Enterprise Manitoba" that the Premier continually badgered, but they kept it on and it has proven to be the best program we've ever had in Manitoba as far as increasing employment in manufacturing in the rural area of Manitoba. Yet I have the Premier's statement that it was no good, but we believed in the entrepreneur in the rural part of Manitoba. Now, the Minister gives the excuse that they might have spread it around between three agents and none of them would make too much money and the odd one took a quotation from Winnipeg, the odd one took a quotation from Winnipeg, but, Mr. Speaker, ' can assure you that we were well aware of the increased costs by dealing with the local entrepreneur in the rural area, but we were well aware

that we had saved money by even letting them quote, which never happened before, and we had already saved \$286,000 as far as Manitoba is concerned. The Minister seems to be glaring at me. If he wants to look up Hansard, I said this in Estimates in 1978 or '79, and I'm sure if he takes a check he'll find the figures at the Housing Corporation.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Let's discuss 1983.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Oh, Mr. Speaker, the Premier just said let's discuss 1983. We should discuss 1983. Mr. Speaker, I have just now got something that I can really feel good about, that when we get questions answered in this House, we'll discuss 1983.

**HON. S. LYON:** And the Sandinistas.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** When we ask questions in Estimates, we will discuss 1983, and when we discuss the gross national product in the province, when we bring forward statistics, etc., we will discuss 1983. — (Interjection) — Now.

Mr. Speaker, let's discuss 1983 for a minute on another subject. But just to go back for a minute, let the Minister of Housing know and let's have it on record that the Progressive Conservative Party believed in supporting the rural business, and we proved it.

Let's discuss 1983, maybe we'll have somebody to discuss it now that the First Minister has said that he wants to, that when there are statistics or whatever presented in this House, that we will all talk about what happens in 1983, instead of going through all his statistics and picking things up.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier was very pleased and so was the Minister of Finance to stand up and say Manitoba is going to have a .4 increase in investment in 1983, total investment, private investment - private and public investment. I wonder when he was looking at those figures, Mr. Speaker, if he found that new capital investment, private, would be down 4.9 percent, nearly 5 percent. I wonder when he looked at those figures that were right here, Mr. Speaker, that investment in manufacturing in the Province of Manitoba is estimated to be down 39.5 percent. Mr. Speaker, if I'm allowed to speak about 1982, we were down according to the records put out by the Department of Economic Development - and I just received the last one - we were down \$70 million.

**HON. S. LYON:** That's the Government of Nicaragua over there.

**A MEMBER:** That was on a free night.

**HON. S. LYON:** They could waste time to spend on Manitoba.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** That's right.

**HON. S. LYON:** The rest of the time is on Nicaragua. Sandinistas, the one-party Marxist government.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Turn the record again, why don't you? Turn the record again.

**HON. S. LYON:** Come on out to my constituency and tell them about Sandinistas. Come out and tell them that you are worried about unemployment and the 1.5 percent payroll tax.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Can't get you fellows to talk about unemployment.

**HON. S. LYON:** I'll go to Selkirk and talk about it any time.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. Order please. If other members wish to speak to the debate, they will have the same right to do so as the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the moving across the floor, the comments across the floor are very factual. As a matter of fact, if the government would stop worrying about all of these other things and demonstrating, as my colleague has said, in front of the American Embassy, maybe they would be more concerned that we were down \$70 million in manufacturing investment in 1982 and the predictions, which are right there with the .4 figures that the Premier was so proud of, about total investment in Manitoba, the predication for manufacturing in 1983 is to be down 39.5 percent.

**A MEMBER:** Unbelievable.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Total private investment is be down a total 5 percent. And do you know, Mr. Speaker, we were living in an age when the private investment was 70 percent, and the public investment was 30 percent, manufacturing was moving up, everything was moving up in the province and that goes by the same statistics that are supplied by the Department of Economic Development; I refer them to you, get them any time you like. All of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, we have a group of government Ministers who were out demonstrating while we have predictions such as this in the private investment in this province. Mr. Speaker, I could tell you sincerely that kind of priority is something that we all should be very concerned about within the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the figures, if the First Minister wants to talk about 1983, let him get up and tell me what the farm incomes are going to be in 1983 in this province, and then let him tell me about the bankruptcies. Oh, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister was very proud to say that the last consecutive months, five consecutive months, the ones behind us, we had lesser bankruptcies since September of 1982, and we had less in October in 1982, and we had less in November, 1982, than we did in 1981. Mr. Speaker, that's correct, but we had more than double the bankruptcies during '82 than we had in '81 but — (Interjection) — You see, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister wants to talk about 1983, does he examine the statistics? Did he realize that interest rates started to go down in June of 1982, and we saw bankruptcies get a little less starting December because those people

in business could handle that lesser interest rate. There weren't as many going bankrupt. But no, the First Minister stands up and he uses this phony figure that he must have had put in front of him.

Mr. Speaker, I have those figures. The minute he said it, I phoned over to the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, I have them all. I also know that what he said was right. Mind you, we had something like 360 - and I'm not sure that we had bankruptcies versus 150 or so the year before, nearly double - and it is quite true when interest rates started to go down in June of '82 that businesses were able to handle those interest rates better and we were having less bankruptcies. We kept telling this government on the other side that interest rates were the problem. High interest rates were a problem, but they didn't see it that way. Well, the statement of the First Minister is proof, because there were less bankruptcies in '82 and so far in '83 than there were in '81 because interest rates have gone down, Mr. Speaker.

Maybe the First Minister would take the time, instead of having me go downstairs to get the information for another debate, to prove that from the second page of his speech that he made, when he was made Leader of the NDP Party, he started to mislead this province and I have a file that big, it's just that big.

As a matter of fact, tonight in the paper, I think he said 17 television sets. Seventeen televisions sets? We had 17 Ministers; I can name you five Ministers that didn't have coloured television sets. — (Interjection) — Well, I didn't see anything about deputies in the article tonight, Mr. Speaker, I didn't see anything about deputies. But no, I happen to know that there are five Ministers sitting here that didn't have it, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, misleading. Now that the First Minister has been told that, he's been told that, and do you know I wouldn't doubt that he'll go out and say the same thing next week and say it with all conscience. I don't know how he does it, but he does it.

**HON. S. LYON:** He's not an honest man.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** After he's been corrected on most anything, he walks out the next day and just says it again.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we have that sort of a situation on the front bench, and when we have a Premier that has acted absolutely spineless over the situation that has happened in this city during the last week, we have a serious situation.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite have made a big thing about it. They keep saying you can't have it both ways. Do you know that is on the first page of the Socialist Manual, "Whenever you're in trouble, stand up and say to the person you're talking to, you can't have it both ways." Right there, Page 1 of the Manual, no problem. It's quite true that there are times when I admit the statement, "It all depends whose ox is being gored is better," much better. But when they say in spending that you can't have it both ways, that is just a complete admission of poor management. They absolutely have no idea of sitting down and trying to work out the proper priorities for the province and basically it wouldn't matter if they were in the province, it wouldn't matter if they were in

a business as an administrator; my Leader, says, it wouldn't matter if they were operating a peanut stand, they would not know how to operate a business or know how to handle priorities. The only thing they'd say when they're doing something wrong is, you can't have it both ways.

Well, you can't be in business and be broke at the same time. You can't have it both ways. That's the silliness and the shallowness of what we have put before us.

Then the Attorney-General - you know, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't in the House on Friday; I took the opportunity to look at Friday's question period, Sir, shortly after 12 o'clock on Friday night, and I saw one of the most arrogant, sarcastic people I've ever seen in my life. You know arrogance and sarcasm doesn't come out unless you're doing it in a quiet knifing way, that's when it really shows up. The Attorney-General was absolutely an expert at the way he was last Friday. I want to watch those from now on, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the members on the other side have had a lot to say about the fact that they would not give the business to Superior Bus. We're all very sorry about that and, Mr. Speaker, I have said I do believe in the tendering system. To give the members just a little bit of history about Superior Bus, when the Minister of Economic Development got up and said when they were 11 percent high, the previous government did not give them the business. One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, at that time they were a wholly-owned subsidiary of an American company and there was no chance of them going broke. I wonder, did the members know that? The wholly-owned subsidiary of Sheller-Globe and there was no chance of them going broke. Yes, Mr. Speaker - now let's just carry on a bit.

**A MEMBER:** You know about American plant closures.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Yes, Sheller-Globe closed their bus division in United States. We had a factory up here that was doing business and making a profit. This was a profitable side of their business but they decided to go out of the bus business in United States.

We had an urgent phone call, it said, in order to continue manufacturing buses up here; in order to keep these people working; in order to keep this plant operating, we have the opportunity to buy this business. We have the opportunity to buy this business and he said, we have the opportunity to bring equipment up to Canada, and that equipment, when we have it in Canada, will give us the opportunity to expand, hire more people and buy more products in Manitoba. In the United States, I mean, business was closing. Corporate closure the Attorney-General said earlier, yes, he knows about them.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government DREE and the Manitoba Government worked very hard to do that. It cost us about \$250,000; it cost the Federal Government about \$500,000, but we brought that business to Manitoba, the only Canadian bus manufacturer in Canada, and we kept those jobs in Morris, Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, after they got into business, we used the facilities that we have over at the Research Department to have them develop their new mini-bus. Mr. Speaker, they came along when they were about

3.5 percent high in the next quotation and we had just formulated a business in Manitoba that is a prosperous business, it has orders, so we gave them the order. Mr. Speaker, we now have a situation where we have the worst economic situation in the Province of Manitoba, quote the Premier, "worst in history."

Mr. Speaker, when I read the "Wish List," the \$200 million "Wish List," and after I read in the Budget Address that they're going to save jobs, I read in this "Wish List," a new facility to produce emergency efficient freight cars for Canadians and export markets could be located in Selkirk, Gimli, the Pas, or Thompson. Doesn't that sound like NDP territory to you, Sir? Mr. Speaker, capital cost of the new facility would be about 25 million and would provide 250 jobs. Mr. Speaker, if they had just said, you know, we'll have to spend \$125,000 to save maybe 75 jobs. We don't know whether the plant is closing or not, but the \$125,000 to save maybe 75 jobs - there are 32 gone already, I believe. The Member for Morris has all the figures. But you know here we have a \$200 million pile of junk that there's no money for anyway, only if it's an NDP constituency, by the look of it, where they're willing to spend \$25 million.

You know, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, do you know that there hasn't probably even been a feasibility study about making these cars in Manitoba? The Federal Government used to demand feasibility studies; I'm sure they still do. I don't think there's been a feasibility study on any of these, but do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Manitoba in our Research Department has worked with Superior Bus to help them design the new mini-bus? They can get orders, they're capable of making them, they just have got to get over this hump. They need a little bit of maybe push in the butt, or let's say they really need some encouragement from their government.

The Member for Morris has said that one of the biggest damages that has been done to this company is that other people who want to buy are going to say your own province ignored you when you were in trouble. Mr. Speaker, for \$125,000, to keep the only Canadian bus manufacturer in Canada operating in Morris, Manitoba . . .

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** For 18 days.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Oh, now, Mr. Speaker, wait a minute now, the Minister of Finance says for 18 days. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that they're still in business. Is the Minister of Finance going around telling people that business is only going to be in business for 18 days? Is that his opinion?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** Order please.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** I'd like him to say so right now. I'd like him to say that . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please.  
The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I'm surprised that the member would want me to say that about any business in Manitoba. What I was saying was that there were about

60 buses, 70 buses; they manufacture about three buses a day. That works out to about approximately a month's work. Certainly the other work that they have will continue on but to suggest, as the member is trying to do, that that particular job is somehow going to make the difference between making and breaking that business is totally inaccurate, and it is incorrect for the member to try to suggest that I was saying that job would only last for 18 days.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please.  
The Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. May I suggest that the honourable member was entirely out of order. He interrupted debate, and he should be chastised by this House for his improper attitude.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I can hear the Member for Springfield talking, but I can't hear because I can't associate with things that crawl. But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance was not saying they'd only be in business for 18 days, he was talking about 18 days' production and I thank him for explaining it.

Mr. Speaker, we are saying that for a few dollars, I think, \$125,000 versus \$25 million that would be spent in NDP constituencies, I certainly think that this government should have been doing more to work with the largest bus manufacturer in Canada, the only bus manufacturer in Canada and on that basis they should have given more consideration during these times. Mr. Speaker, the worst economic times in Manitoba according to the Premier, but of course Mr. Premier, if we were going to have this other business located in Selkirk and Gimli - the Premier wouldn't care anyway. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, that's the way that it has gone.

The forecast, Mr. Speaker, for this province - and I mentioned many reasons before but we now have some more reasons. I don't know when we're going to stop getting reasons why people won't invest in this province and I gave you a long list during the Budget Debate and they're all there. But I have to say one thing about the demonstration that took place the other night that I didn't mention last Thursday when I spoke on it. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Tourism, which I had the privilege of being the Minister of, is a hard working group of people and they spend a lot of Canadian dollars on advertising to have people from North Dakota, Minnesota, South Dakota come up and visit. As a matter of fact, we have their tourism people come up and visit with us and at one time we were making plans to have, you know, a tour through both areas, what have you. I guess those plans are gone.

But, Mr. Speaker, now we have a Minister of Tourism that speaks in front of the American Consulate when there is a flag burned. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think when we spend our money on advertising in the United States, to ask Americans to come up and spend their money in Manitoba because our tourism was the fourth largest

industry - I know what the figures were, it was \$475 million for 1981 and it dropped drastically for 1982 - can you imagine what will happen when the people of the United States find that the Minister of Tourism for the Province of Manitoba is involved in a demonstration in front of the American Consulate here where the American flag was burned?

Mr. Speaker, I assure you the people in the tourism industry in Manitoba - and I have had calls already basically saying, what the hell did she think she was doing? Was she trying to drive people away from our hotels? - Mr. Speaker, that's the type of thing that the Ministers on the other side have done and we have a Premier who doesn't do a thing about it. It's called spineless, Mr. Speaker, if that type of thing is allowed to carry on, that's just another reason why we won't be able to get the money to come near these estimates and we know the estimates are under now. We know the income is overexaggerated and we know that the expenditures are underexaggerated.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have a list that is growing every day of reasons why people will not invest in Manitoba. We have a statistic that says private investment will be down 5 percent. We have one that says manufacturing investment will be down 39.4 percent. We have another situation that is going to hurt tourism, our fourth largest business, and every day that goes by this government does something else and apparently they're conscious when they do it. They don't care, they just do it. They take the business from the small entrepreneur in rural Manitoba - think nothing of it, take it from him.

We increased the gasoline taxes to the rural people and, Mr. Speaker, they do it and they know what they're doing which only proves what I said earlier, they can't run a government, they couldn't run a business and the only thing they revert to is, well, you can't have it both ways. That is the famous saying on Page 1 of the Socialist Manual. I told you that and I keep repeating it.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to refer - where's our great promises, you know.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Policies for Manitoba.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Yes, the great policies for Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I can hear the Minister of Finance, that's his favourite argument, you just raise this, you just raise that, you want this, you want that, and he'd probably end up by saying, you can't have it both ways. Yes, now we know. We know the story.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Government Services on a point of order.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member should know by now that he can't have it both ways.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, and to my honourable colleagues here, wasn't that an example of the calibre we have on that side? Wasn't that a beautiful example of what we have on that side?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** That's quicker than you usually are, John.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I have said to my colleagues, we have this, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans." People may see me wandering down the hall at times with quite a bundle of these under my arm. I keep them in my car, my home, keep them in my overcoat pocket and I have a little sign. When I take out . . . — (Interjection) — the comment about chiliburgers comes across the House quite often and I would say to the member again, that I wouldn't have any discussion about my personal affairs with something that crawls, than fly to the moon.

Mr. Speaker, I have a little reminder on my door. It says, you see the advertising on television about the American Express card, "Don't leave home without it," and, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues never leave home without one of these. In fact, we take several of them around and we assure you that your promises, your faint promises that you have made to the people of Manitoba, signed by the Premier who started misleading them on the second page of his Acceptance Speech when he became leader of the party and I have it in my file, signed by the Premier of this province, of what he was going to do and they have done the opposite under his leadership. The exact opposite under his leadership of his promises.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** We won't write the President of the United States.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** We have a group of Ministers who have a First Minister who broke their promises to them, actually. He told all of you when you were running, look I signed this, everything will be different in Manitoba. These promises will be made.

You all carry it on your shoulders now and that's what has happened to this province. There will be no investment here to speak of and this government consciously goes along doing something every day to discourage it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The question before the House is the Second Reading of Bill No. 29, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. Do you need it read?

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day debate was adjourned on Bill No. 28 and ordinarily, without leave, it could not be reintroduced. I spoke briefly to the Opposition House Leader and it seemed to me that it might be a good idea, if leave can be obtained, to have second reading on Bill No. 28 and then refer both bills to the Committee of the Whole. Is that agreed?

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

**BILL NO. 28 - THE LOAN ACT, 1983**

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, then with leave, would you call Bill No. 28 for any further debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 28, the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, I believe.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to see the bill pass to Committee.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Transportation that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report of the following bills for Third Reading, Bill No. 28, An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and to Authorize the Borrowing of the Same, The Loan Act, 1983; and Bill No. 29, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1984, and to Authorize Commitments to Expend Additional Money in Subsequent Years and to Authorize the Borrowing of Funds to Provide for Cash Requirements of the Government.

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

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

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE**

**BILL NO. 28 - THE LOAN ACT, 1983 and  
BILL NO. 29 - THE INTERIM  
APPROPRIATION ACT, 1983**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Committee come to order. We are considering Bills No. 28 and 29. Is it the will of the committee to go clause-by-clause or page-by-page? Page-by-page. Bill-by-bill? Page-by-page. The Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, Bill No. 28 only contains one specific section dealing with Schedule A. Therefore, it is impossible to compare it section-by-section to last year's Loan Act.

Section 3 provides authority for funding the Manitoba Beef Stabilization Fund, the complexities of which, I'm sure, the Minister of Agriculture can explain probably

better than I. Any part of the cost to providing financing to the Fund, which is not recovered from the Fund, is included in Appropriation III-9. Income Insurance Fund in the Department of Agriculture, as set out in the Main Estimates of Expenditures. There is also \$20 million in Schedule A for The Insulation Loan Program as part of the Jobs Fund.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Finance with respect to the Jobs Fund. If he has his Estimates with him, Mr. Chairman, on Page 134 of the Estimates, there is set out an allocation of funds at the bottom of Page 134. At the bottom of that page, Mr. Chairman, he will see allocation of funds for Cultural Affairs, Education, Government Services, Labour and Employment Services, and Natural Resources for a total of approximately \$19.8 million.

Could the Minister of Finance confirm that those funds will be used in the Jobs Fund to fund ongoing programs, programs which were in the Budget last year and which will be continued in those various areas this year?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, what we have done there is indicate that for the year ending March 31, 1983, there was spending authority for \$19.8 million. With that same type of spending under the Jobs Fund, rather than the \$19.8, we are now proposing in that area 72 million, but that is new money. The 19.8 million will be spent or if there is any portion of it not spent, that will lapse, as is usual with departmental spending, as of the 31st of March. For next year, the comparable figure is the 72.2 million.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I cite, for example, in the Estimates of the Department of Labour in 1982-83 there were shown two Youth and Student Employment Programs on Pages 85 and 86. In the Estimates this year, one of those programs has been deleted and we heard the Minister of Labour, the other day, announce a new Jobs Fund program called Careerstart, which is essentially the program which was deleted from the Estimates this year which was carried on in the Estimates of last year. It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that the government has simply deleted a number of programs from the Estimates for 1983 and 1984 and are now funding them through the Jobs Program, calling them new programs, making the people believe that this is a new emphasis and a new initiative on that part of the government, when in actual fact there was a program like Careerstart last year. They have simply changed the name, said it's from a new fund, and tried to impress people that it is a new initiative.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, the program announced the other day is very similar to the program that I announced when I was Minister of Labour last year. There is no question about that. I believe, and I stand to be corrected, but I believe that the amount authorized last year was 2.7 million. It could have been somewhat different.

Let us remember though that when I presented the Budget I said very clearly that of the \$200 million Jobs

Fund, approximately 100 million was new in the sense that it had not been around before. You can see from the 19.8 million as compared to the 72 million that we are talking about an additional more than \$50 million just in this component of the Jobs Fund, which is only one of the components. There is other money, of course, in the Jobs Fund.

If you look under 1.(a) Current Operating Expenditures, we're talking about over \$25 million from which this new program, announced by the Minister of Labour, will be drawn. Now I don't deny that there is some similarity in programs and there will be other programs that are somewhat similar to programs that were in the Estimates last year. But what we've done is, we've drawn them all together into one component and looked at them from the prospective of creating employment in Manitoba. — (Interjection) — Yes, there will be some areas that are very, very similar to what was done last year, and I don't think that the Minister of Labour was trying to say that somehow this was something that had not been done before. What she did say, however, and if she didn't say it, then I will say it, we are now in a position where we have more flexibility with that fund, because if we run out of funding - there's been a certain amount of money allocated to it now - if we run out of funding, we have an additional amount in the \$25 million that we can then throw in, without having to come back for further arrangements.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the Minister now confirms that the Careerstart Program is simply a continuation of an existing program carried on in last year's Budget, can he explain why the Minister of Labour, in speaking to the House, called this an important new initiative from the Manitoba Jobs Fund? A new program. Mr. Chairman, that program was simply a continuation of a program which we had started, when we were in government, which the Minister of Finance, while he was Minister of Labour, changed in terms of reference a little bit. The new Minister of Labour now calls it a new program, because it has a new name, but it's simply a continuation of that program.

Mr. Chairman, would the Minister of Finance, looking again at Page 134, could he confirm that those figures, which have been plucked out of those five departments, are they all related to job creation projects?

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, they would all be related to job creation. You will recall, for instance, the \$10 million that we had in an unallocated portion in the Budget last year, etc. But you know, I suppose history seems to start at the time a government takes office. It is true that when I announced the program for students last year, I announced it as a new program, because there were a number of differences between that program and the one that the previous government had been carrying on.

When the previous government took office, the same thing happened. They took an existing student program, changed it, and said they had now a new program. So, let's not pretend that somehow this program started - if you want to say, where did it come from - it had

been going on at least throughout the 1970s. There were changes in '78; there were changes in '81; now in — (Interjection) — I'm answering his question. Now in '83 there's another change and so, it is a different program from the one that we had going last year. Just for instance, the opposition was saying that they wanted a program that would relate to people who had more than 10 employees. This one does relate to people who have more than 10 employees and there are, as I understand it, some other changes, which I'm sure the Minister of Labour would be glad to explain to the Member for St. Norbert.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, earlier on, I believe the Minister of Finance indicated that \$100 million of the \$200 million Jobs Fund related to ongoing programs. Can he confirm that's correct?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** No, I did not say that, Mr. Chairman. What I said was that we had created a \$200 million fund, of which approximately \$100 million was new, in the sense it had not been - there's a large number of unallocated dollars, both in Crown corporations, government departments, and as the member can see, for current operating and that means the type of program we're discussing right now, we've moved from \$13 million to more than \$25 million. So there's current operating, there's departmental capital, and there's Crown corporation capital.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister of Finance indicate how many projects have been approved out of the Jobs Fund to date?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Well, there's two that I can think of, but really, Mr. Chairman, I point out that the bill we are dealing with refers to the Manitoba Beef Stabilization Fund and the Insulation Loan Program. These questions could be better answered at another time. The two programs are the one announced by the Minister of Labour, with respect to student employment, and the other one being the Red River Community College diesel shop.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, Schedule A on Page 2 of the Bill - can the Minister explain the significance of the words "Jobs Fund."

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, I had indicated in my opening remarks that the \$20 million slated for the Jobs Fund in Schedule A are for the Insulation Loan Program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder can the Minister, under this Insulation Loan Program advise me, how many houses in Manitoba today are not insulated under the various federal and provincial programs that have gone on for the last several years? How many? A rough estimate - how many houses are not insulated to date?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, I think it could only be the Member for Roblin-Russell who could figure

out a question like that at this time of night. I will take that question as notice for the Minister of Energy and Mines and I'm sure that he will — (Interjection) — I don't know whether he can answer it.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Minister of Finance will be kind enough, I'd be most pleased to get those figures as to how many homes in this province are already properly insulated? How many homes are not insulated, and the third question, how many homes are you going to insulate under this \$20 million Insulation Loan Program? I'd sure like to know.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Act enables eligible homeowners to borrow up to \$1,000 to assist in paying the cost of insulating or improving the insulation of their residences. The \$20 million is proposed in order to have the required authority in place as soon as possible. It could, at \$1,000 per home, \$20 million divided into 1,000, I'm sure that we can do a bit of arithmetic and come up with the number, although I don't think that's what the Member for Roblin-Russell has in mind, so he'll tell me.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** I would like those statistics and the others that the Honourable Minister promised me regarding this program.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to get those from the Minister of Energy and Mines. I just want to say that some of the statistics the member asked for, I do not know whether they are available. If they are available they will be provided to him.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Page 1—pass; Page 2—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass; Bill be reported—pass. Bill 29, page-by-page? (Pages 1 to 6 were each read and passed.) Preamble—pass; Title—pass. Bill be reported.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

### COMMITTEE REPORTS

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Committee of the Whole has considered certain bills, passed same, and asks leave to sit again.

### IN SESSION

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

**MR. P. EYLER:** I move, seconded by the Member for Wolseley, that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### THIRD READINGS BILL NO. 28 - THE LOAN ACT, 1983

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, by leave I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, that Bill No.

28, An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes, and Authorize the Borrowing of the same, The Loan Act, 1983, be now read a third time and passed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It is moved by the Honourable Attorney-General, and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that Bill No. 28, An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes, and Authorize the Borrowing of the same, The Loan Act, 1983, and that the same be now read a third time and passed.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the Motion? Agreed and so ordered.

### BILL NO. 29 - THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1983

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, that Bill No. 29, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1984 and to Authorize Commitments to Expend Additional Money in Subsequent Years and to Authorize the Borrowing of Funds to Provide for Cash Requirements of the Government (The Interim Appropriation Act, 1983); be now read a third time and passed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It is moved by the Honourable Attorney-General, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that Bill No. 29, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sum of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1984 and to Authorize Commitments to Expend Additional Money in Subsequent Year and to Authorize the Borrowing of Funds to Provide for Cash Requirements of the Government (The Interim Appropriation Act, 1983), be now read a third time and passed.

Is the pleasure of the House to adopt the Motion? Agreed and so ordered.

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

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few comments on this Bill at third reading.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have declared the motion passed at third reading.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** That's the same thing you did last year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is the Leader of the House willing to revert back to Third Reading?  
The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. R. PENNER:** I believe I saw the Member for Turtle Mountain rising in his seat before the motion was called.



**MR. SPEAKER:** If it's the leave of the House we will revert back to third reading.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** It is not a matter of leave, it's a matter of privilege that a member have the right to speak on third reading of a bill.

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

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I simply wanted to make a few very brief comments

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

I had declared the motion carried.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** No, you hadn't, it the same . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. S. LYON:** You got in trouble with that once before.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Would the Clerk approach the Table?

**HON. S. LYON:** You don't pay attention to this House.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Utter nonsense! I can't believe this.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The motion having been passed, it would need the leave of the House for the honourable member to speak on third reading.

**HON. S. LYON:** No. No. The motion wasn't passed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** I don't see why an issue is being made here. It was your view, as you saw the House, that the motion was passed before the Member for Turtle Mountain rose, and you declared the motion passed. Having done that, it stands as a matter of record and you're now ruling that leave be granted that the member may speak -(Inaudible)- I have no hesitancy saying on behalf of this side of the House we would more than willing to grant leave.

I don't see why anybody has to get all upset and high and mighty about what is a matter of record and we would grant leave. Let the member speak for the seven minutes that he had left on the clock at the time, eight minutes.

**HON. S. LYON:** It is not a question of leave.

### POINT OF ORDER

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

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Yes, if the Government House Leader was speaking on a point of order, then I'm speaking

on the same point of order. It is not a question of leave, it is a right of a member in the House to speak on a bill at third reading, and one should not have to get up on their desk and jump up and down to get recognition by the Chair.

**HON. S. LYON:** The Chair should know that.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** This was a situation where there was no reason to believe that the bill would be passed quickly at third reading. I rose in my place as soon as the bill was called to speak on this bill, and it is not a question of leave, it is a question of my right to speak on this bill, and if you, Sir, are ruling that the bill has been passed, then I respectfully challenge your Ruling.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Springfield to the same point.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, with respect, I am inclined to agree with the Member for Turtle Mountain. However, I think, rather than your ruling and forcing the Member for Turtle Mountain to carry through with his suggestion of a challenge, and rather than moving by leave, which I respectfully suggest does incur the problem the Member for Turtle Mountain suggests that it does, that he is then being denied his right to speak except with the granting of leave, that instead the House could revert back to putting the question for third reading at which time the Member for Turtle Mountain and any other members could rise and be recognized as they would have been had the opportunity for the Member for Turtle Mountain to speak been granted when the question was first put to the House.

So the House has two options: to allow the member to speak by leave, which I respectfully suggest is not the best way to proceed, or instead by leave to revert back to the putting of the question for third reading. I would suggest, Sir, that would be the most appropriate way in which to proceed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Virden to the same point of order.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to recognize that it is only the House that can pass any bill. It is not the role of the Speaker to pass a bill. The Speaker can ask the Clerk to record the vote of the House as he has interpreted that vote, but any bill requires a vote of the House to pass. In this case, we have not had that vote yet, and I would suggest that we carry on with third reading of the bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is it the will of the House, by leave, to revert back to third reading of that?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the question may simply be put this way: Is it the will of the House to revert to third reading? Not to revert

back - I refuse to be ungrammatical even in a moment of crisis - to revert to the third reading of the bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain to the same point.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** The same point of order, Mr. Speaker. The position of the opposition is we never left third reading; therefore, we do not need to revert back to third reading. We do not need leave to have me speak. We are still on third reading, and if your ruling is that it has been passed and I do not have the right to speak, Sir, then I challenge your ruling.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I regret I did not observe the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain when he rose to speak on this matter.

### THIRD READING BILL NO. 29 - THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1983

**MR. SPEAKER:** It is moved by the Honourable Attorney-General, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that Bill No. 29, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31st, 1984, and to Authorize Commitments to Expend Additional Money in Subsequent Years and to Authorize the Borrowing of Funds to Provide for Cash Requirements of the Government (The Interim Appropriation Act, 1983) be now read for a third time and passed.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hour being very close to 10 o'clock, I am prepared to grant leave that should we go a few moments past that we can complete the business for the House.

The few comments which I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, are directed towards the Minister of Agriculture and have to do with the farm financing and farm credit situation which exists in the country today. The Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues last year brought in a program of Farm Interest Rate Relief as a partial fulfillment of the promise that no farm would be allowed to go bankrupt as a consequence of high interest rates. Because that program was limited to farmers grossing less than \$70,000, it is our belief that there are a great many farmers who have not been able to take advantage of that program but who yet are in grave financial difficulty and do not have adequate financing to allow them to carry on.

The Minister has since announced one or two other programs and expansions of programs that to some sense recognize the problem that exists out there in the farming industry but are inadequate to deal with what appears to be an impending crisis in farm financing. I simply wanted to bring to the attention of

the Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues because I recognize that there are not very many of them who have the privilege of representing rural areas that have a lot of farmers. The members on this side do, and I can assure the Minister of Agriculture that the agricultural industry in this province is facing a very critical problem in the area of farm financing.

The Minister of Agriculture is going to have to show a great deal more leadership than has been shown to date because there are, I believe, more farmers that are in difficulty, more farmers that are not going to be able to carry on this year than is generally recognized by the government or by individual lending institutions. I simply want to stress that to the Minister of Agriculture that before very much more time passes, this issue must be addressed not just by this government, but in concert with the Federal Government and perhaps other Provincial Governments as well.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### ROYAL ASSENT

**DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS (Mr. Myron Mason):** His Honour, the Administrator.

His Honour, Justice S. Freedman, Administrator of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne:

Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour in the following words:

**MR. SPEAKER:** We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, approach the Honourable the Administrator with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for the Honourable the Administrator the acceptance of these Bills:

No. 29 - An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1984, and to Authorize Commitments to Expend Additional Money in Subsequent Years and to Authorize the Borrowing of Funds to Provide for Cash Requirements of the Government (The Interim Appropriation Act, 1983);

No. 28 - An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and to Authorize the Borrowing of the same (The Loan Act, 1983).

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** The Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these Bills in Her Majesty's name.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time of adjournment having arrived, the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).