



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXII No. 42 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 13 JUNE, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 13 June, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports By Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have 23 students of Grade 1-9 standing from the Maple Creek School under the direction of Mr. Mowbray. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Milk prices

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

My question is for the Premier. In view of the fact that the recent policy announced by the NDP Government's Manitoba Food Milk Price Commission has resulted in an almost immediate 23 cent per two-litre carton increase of milk at supermarkets and large retail stores, what is his government going to do to protect low-income earners who need to have milk as part of their diet against such a massive increase in the price of milk?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I regret that apparently the Leader of the Opposition is party to some inaccurate information. I think the Minister of Agriculture probably could assist the Leader of the Opposition in correcting some obvious misinformation that the Leader of the Opposition is working under.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition alleges that milk prices in the Province of Manitoba have increased by 23 percent, 23 cents per litre. — (Interjection) — Oh, per two litres, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: The Leader of the Opposition should recall, Sir, that when the Milk Prices Review Commission announced an increase to farmers of approximately seven cents per litre in the cost of milk, it was followed by an increase of an additional 10-12 cents per litre by the industry. It was felt, upon analysis, that the increases were exorbitant. Part of that was due to the fact that certain retail outlets were given very large discounts, somewhere in between 10 to 30 percent. Those retailers were able to offer discounting of milk to consumers, Sir, however, in the rest of the province those discounts were not available. In rural areas and Northern areas that discounting practice was not available and those consumers were not able to gain the benefits of the discounting. Discounting, Sir, primarily for the reason of gaining greater market share or forcing some of the processors out of the industry. That was really the practice . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the government on the advice of the Milk Prices Review Commission rolled back those increases at the retail level which resulted, Sir, in great savings across the province to consumers, Sir, while in some large retail outlets there was no change in the retail price. But across the board in the major part of the province, there was a reduction in prices at the consumer level.

Sir, there is no doubt that in this second stage where the Commission has now regulated the price in terms of minimum and maximum pricing, there are some retailers who will not make as large a margin - and that is what is being alleged - on their returns from milk as they did in the past. However, Sir, the vast majority of consumers have had no increase in the price of milk from what was established by the rollback, Mr. Speaker, and there is greater stability and greater equity as consumers in the Province of Manitoba will have a more stable price in terms of milk supply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the Minister of Agriculture doesn't think that a 23 cent per two-litre carton increase, which is about 16.5 percent, is something to be concerned about.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. G. FILMON: I am surprised as well, Mr. Speaker, that he believes that in order to solve . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister believe that in order to solve some minor problems that occur

in localized areas in the province that he should instead adopt a socialist approach of spreading the misery across, so that two-thirds of the people who are consumers of milk now have to pay considerably more? Is that his answer? Is that the only answer that he has?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the Leader of the Opposition thinks a 14 cent a litre increase in the price of milk was minor, Sir, because that's what was imposed by the industry. That's what the Leader of the Opposition said was a minor increase.

Mr. Speaker, there may be some retailers, and I have said this, that have received greater discounts than other retailers. Now, Mr. Speaker, they have received greater discounts, and many of them who have received discounts did not pass on those benefits to consumers. By regulation, the benefits of a regulated price is being passed on to the vast majority of consumers, not on the basis of one retailer, Mr. Speaker, being able to get milk at a greater discount than another retailer.

But, Sir, to suggest that a rollback of anywhere from seven to 14 cents at the retail price was a minor or very miniscule problem, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition should drink more milk and know the prices of milk in vast parts of the province.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister and his Commission could have come up with a formula that would have protected the people outside of Winnipeg and the major markets without impacting on all of the other markets; in view of the fact that what he has done impacts on about two-thirds of the markets that have access to major retailers and major independent chains, why does he believe that it's not reasonable for people to pass along discounts and to use milk as a loss leader when people will benefit throughout the province? Those people are people who need milk as part of their staple diet. Why does he not want that passed along?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, both of the last two questions have been clearly argumentative with lengthy preambles and not designed to solicit information from the Minister.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, there has been a very deliberate policy change affected by this government under that Minister of Agriculture. My Leader is simply asking for explanation and clarification of those policy changes that have the precise effect that my Leader is talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. A question should seek information and not the opinion of the Honourable Minister involved. Oral Questions should be short, concise and to the point and answers to them should also be short, concise and to the point.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the President of the Consumers Association of Canada,

Manitoba Branch, one Joan Friesen, indicated that the policy that was brought forward by this NDP-appointed Milk Commission will undoubtedly result in higher prices to consumers and will leave major retail chains laughing all the way to the bank, will he not go to this commission and ask them to take consumers into account and ask them to consider the low income earners who need milk as part of their staple diet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, it is true that there has been a change in policy, from a policy of allowing an uncontrolled intrusion into the marketplace by the processors to try and . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the roll back that was announced by this government and this commission was supported by members of the Conservative Party. They agreed that the roll back was adequate and it should have been brought into play, showing and agreeing that their legislation did not work, that their legislation did not work.

Mr. Speaker, because of the massive increases introduced by the processors, the Conservative Party agreed with the actions of this government. Now to have the Leader of the Opposition come into the Legislature when the second stage of the controls to regulate the prices so that there is a greater benefit for all consumers in the Province of Manitoba is pure grandstanding. He would rather, Sir, have the consumers in rural Manitoba and in Northern Manitoba and consumers buying from local, small stores be prepared to pay more money for the price of milk so that the prices in the supermarkets could be discounted at the expense of the small retailers and chains, exactly what was happening, Sir, before the controls were brought in by the Commission. That's the policy he's advocating.

Let him come out and say so, that we're prepared to let Safeway discount force out all the little chains and all the little processors out of business, the small businesses out of business by discounting the price and fighting for the retail market, because that's what he's suggesting. If he's suggesting that, let him stand up and say so, because it's his own party that has supported the policy change in terms of rolling back the retail prices of milk, Sir.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister accuses me of arguing on behalf of low income families and grandstanding for the working poor in this province, I'll accept that.

In view of the fact that previous submissions to governments have always indicated that it's the low income families with children who are hardest hit, because they must have milk as part of their staple diet, will he not intercede with his commission and ask them to reconsider this policy because it's not good for two-thirds of the people in this province; and will he not say that it's the working poor and the people

with families, with children, who need this policy change? Will he not tell them about that?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, it is clear now that the Conservative Opposition now admits that their legislation did not work, clearly that their legislation did not work.

Sir, they agreed that the marketplace wasn't working when the marketplace was charging and gouging consumers over and above what should have been charged by the original increase by the dairies and the processors. They want to forget that and that won't go away, Sir, because the price was increased upwards to 14 cents a litre for the price of milk in parts of Manitoba. They agreed with the policy change that we had to move, we had to side-step their legislation to be able to roll back the price of milk which was exorbitant.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission has set the price of milk as an interim measure pending a fuller review of the cost of production of all aspects of the industry. Sir, if ever I heard a clear admission on behalf of an opposition that their legislation didn't work, we have heard it today. They have now said that their legislation doesn't work. We want some action on behalf of the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was sensitive as he says to the working poor, Mr. Speaker, he would have asked his critic of Agriculture who agreed with the steps we took to roll back the price of milk in this province and stabilize the price to consumers. He should have asked his own critic.

Mr. Speaker, at the consumer level there has been no change in the price of milk. In fact, there's been a reduction for many consumers across the Province of Manitoba with the exception of the odd one who was getting a greater discount at the expense of others, Mr. Speaker.

Hydro power - sale of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Premier. Knowing of his keen interest in the impending power sales to the south, can the Premier tell us that companies such as Northern States Power or the Western Area Power administration groups are, in fact, wholesalers of electrical energy, who in turn sell at a profit to the local distributors and utilities or municipalities, the energy that they intend to purchase from us?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House Leader but there were really so much noise across the way I couldn't hear the last part of his question. I wonder if he would repeat it.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm simply asking whether the Premier can tell the House that companies such

as Northern States Power are, in fact, wholesalers of electrical energy, who in turn sell at a profit the power that they expect to get from us to any number of local utilities, municipalities or other distributors of that electrical energy in their area?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Northern States Power is a utility that serves the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, some 3 million people within that area. As the Minister responsible for Energy has indicated there will be significant benefits to the Province of Manitoba by way of profit, as well as substantial savings insofar as those that are purchasing the energy. It's a satisfactory mutual arrangement insofar as both parties are concerned, Mr. Speaker.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question.

As his Minister of Energy and Mines indicated when announcing the Letter of Understanding with the Western Area Power Administration which describes their role as a wholesaler who then provide electricity to more than 500 customers in 15 states, which include municipalities, co-operatives and private utilities.

My understanding of that statement would mean that after having purchased Manitoba power from this wholesaler, who I assume is making a profit, then it goes through the distributor, who I assume is making a further profit in selling it to the final American end user. Would that be an appropriate understanding of what's happening?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the honourable member is aware, but the Western Area Power Authority is an agency of the Department of Energy of the United States Government, so I think that indeed we are dealing with an appropriate and a satisfactory party.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I simply want the Minister to confirm that Manitoba power is going to be sold to a wholesaler in the United States, who in turn will sell it at a profit to a distributor, and the distributor in turn will sell it at a profit to the American end user. My question to the First Minister is . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . can the First Minister assure this House, because these arrangements are being concluded without taking any of us into confidence, these arrangements are being concluded with the House or the Public Utilities Committee not having an opportunity to discuss them, can the First Minister assure Manitobans that after two middlemen make their profits out of Manitoba Hydro, that American users will

not be getting Manitoba power for less money than Manitoba users?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I can assure the Opposition House Leader that unlike the proposed transaction that was proposed during the term of the previous administration in this province, of which administration the Member for Lakeside was a member of the Treasury Bench, this particular transaction will not involve a subsidy by Manitoba Hydro, Mr. Speaker. It will not involve a pickup of costs by the people of the Province of Manitoba, unlike the proposal that was advanced by the former administration of this province.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there will be a substantial profit, as the Minister of Energy has pointed out, and indeed that full and complete information will be provided at the National Energy Board, Mr. Speaker.

I don't blame honourable members across the way, Mr. Speaker, because they are worried. They have good reason to be worried about this transaction, about Alcoa that they raised yesterday, Mr. Speaker, because they are whining because they are frightened. They are frightened out of their political wits by the fact that there is substantial economic advancement taking place in the Province of Manitoba, and that this province is on the verge, Mr. Speaker, of leading Canada by way of economic recovery.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, another question on another subject also directed to the Premier, I understand that the Federation of Labour has requested that this government consider the nationalizing or the purchasing of Greater Winnipeg Gas. I am aware, of course, that is a long-standing ideological goal of this government and of the New Democratic Party. But my direct question to the Honourable Premier is: has anybody in the government taken a recent examination as to what it would cost to nationalize the Greater Winnipeg Gas system?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know just whether there has been any analysis in respect to same. I think it was made very clear by the Minister of Energy some 16, 18 months ago, in that neighbourhood, when in fact that opportunity did arise because of the expiry of the franchise that we would not, in fact, be assuming public control in respect to Greater Winnipeg Gas. It was an issue that was dealt with at that time.

Thompson - contaminated transformers

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of the Environment.

There has been concern expressed in Thompson about the possibility that PCB contaminated transformers have been put in the Thompson Waste Disposal Ground. I was wondering if the Minister could indicate if this is in fact the case and whether his department has in fact checked into this particular matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question is most appropriate. I just received an update on the situation just at this moment.

On May 30th of this year, the Public Health Inspector in Thompson was, in fact, notified by the landfill operator in Thompson that three transformers were present in the waste disposal ground. The transformers were found to originate from the CIL Chemical Division Plant in Thompson which was - I'm not sure - either being demolished or being renovated at this particular time and these transformers were disposed of.

The Waste Management Division of my department inspected the site. Approximately 20 gallons of oil had leaked from one of the three transformers and on the other hand the labels on the transformers indicated oil fill, non PCB. However, a screening test was conducted as a precautionary measure and the initial tests made in Thompson indicated that there was a positive reading in one of the transformers and, as a result, three or four cubic yards of oil-contaminated soil were removed and stored in two metal containers. The transformers themselves were isolated and stored safely in the meantime, while the oil was being analyzed.

MR. S. ASHTON: In view of the fact that at least of those transformers was PCB contaminated, I was wondering if the Minister could indicate what steps, if any, will be taken to dispose of that transformer and the transformer oil and, particularly, I'm wondering if the Minister can give any assurance to my constituents that there will be no threat to the environment or the health of people in the area due to that contamination.

HON. G. LECUYER: The transformers contained, according to the lab analysis that was made here in Winnipeg, 30 parts per million, 28 parts per million and 62 parts per million of PCBs; therefore one of those was marginally above the acceptable guidelines which is 50 parts per million.

The soil analysis itself was at three parts per million and on that basis, Mr. Speaker, the soil is going to be buried and left there. The two transformers that are below the acceptable limit will be flushed of the oil and the metal used for scrap or returned to scrap yards. The one transformer which is above the acceptable limit will be taken to Gimli for storage where other transformers are currently being stored; so therefore there is no cause for concern at this time and the limits which had been imposed on the public, or access to the public in the waste disposal site, have been lifted at this time.

Manitoba Forest Resources Ltd.- Annual Report

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I wonder if the Minister can tell us today when he expects to table the Annual Report of Manitoba Forest Resources Limited and if there is a change in the fiscal year end for that firm?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I expect that I will be tabling the annual report tomorrow.

Manitoba Native Council - funding

MR. D. GOURLAY: I thank the Minister for that answer. I direct another question to him.

During the review of the departmental Estimates of Northern Affairs some two or three weeks ago, the Minister indicated that he had received a request from the Manitoba Native Council for funding. I wonder if the Minister can tell us now whether a decision has been made to fund this organization.

HON. J. STORIE: No, no decision has been made final on that item.

Camperville - self-government

MR. D. GOURLAY: A further question to the Minister of Northern Affairs, has the Minister endeavoured to seek a legal opinion on the status of the Camperville Metis Government?

HON. J. STORIE: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not sought, other than internal, informal advice with respect to that issue. I have indicated a number of times, Mr. Speaker, the department's and the government's position, and I believe that the individuals who discussed that particular conceptual framework are aware of the government's views.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to that question, I wonder, is the Minister satisfied that there is no conflict of interest between the Camperville Community Council funded primarily by the Province of Manitoba and the Camperville Metis Government, which the Minister indicates he's not sure of their legal status. but by and large these two organizations are manned by the same people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The question seeks an opinion from the Minister. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister of Northern Affairs then can confirm that the Mayor of the Camperville Community Council also serves as the Premier of Camperville.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I have explained to the Member for Swan River a number of times that the Department of Northern Affairs and the government deals with the duly-elected representatives of the community of Camperville. We deal with the Mayor of Camperville, and the elected councillors of Camperville.

What individuals do on their own time in a voluntary way is their own affair.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Can the Minister tell the House then who is funding the Camperville Metis Government?

MR. SPEAKER: If that is within the administrative competence of the Minister, the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether that question was ruled out of order, or whether I am permitted to answer that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister should be aware that the question should be on topics within the administrative competence of the government. If it is so, the Honourable Minister may answer it; if not, he should not.

Home Economics Program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, a week or so ago, I was asked a question by the Member for Fort Garry. I have been waiting for him to come to the House. I know he is preoccupied, but I would like to place the answer on the record of this House.

He was asking about the Home Economic Services, and I had suggested at the time that the Home Ec's had lost their separate identity. I want to say to him that to develop and expand a cohesive and effective approach to help promotion, the various components of the department have been realigned under one branch, Health Promotion Directorate. That consists of Home Ec's, Health Education, Service to Seniors, Fitness and other specialty health resources and public health nursing.

He wanted to know if the number of Home Ec people in the staff years had been reduced. The Department of Agriculture had two in the central office and 18 in the rural Manitoba. This is the same. The Department of Health has seven at the central office: a director, two nutritionists, one housing specialist, one volunteer co-ordinator, one money management specialist, one training and program co-ordinator; and nine in the field: six in Winnipeg, one in Wesman, one in The Pas and one in Thompson for the total of 16.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no reduction in staff resources, and also the nutrition component has been identified as the top department priority. Other public health resource nurses and educators have been directed over to this nutritional program, and some additional positions to be determined will be moved into nutrition home ec services in the field. The Nutrition Program will be directed over into the high-risk group, that is the deprived, prenatal and Native, so there has been no reduction of the service.

He's just come in. I will send this copy over to him.

A MEMBER: No, no, read it again.

Manfor - spraying

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would pose my question to the Honourable Minister of Environment, Workplace Safety and Health. A couple of weeks ago, the Minister advised that before spraying was to be carried out by Manfor certain precautions had to take place. Has the government been advised as to the necessary precautions taking place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In regard to that particular issue, Mr. Speaker, nothing further has occurred. Neither the company who was to do the spraying nor Manfor have supplied any of the additional information in question in regard to the first test spray that was to take place. That is not to say, they will not do so in regard to the one that was to be carried on this fall or late summer.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Can the Honourable Minister assure this House that no spraying has taken place to date?

HON. G. LECUYER: The test in question, which the member refers to that we discussed here a couple of weeks ago, had to do with a special test carried jointly by DuPont and Manfor. That particular test is the one that we had requested a design before they could carry on with the actual spraying. That, in effect, is what brought an end to the test on the 20th, rather than - the test was to take place on the 24th of May, but rather than to proceed with the test after having been requested for this information and not being able to supply, rather than to turn around and supply the information requested, they decided not to carry on with the test. In fact, the chap who was to do the actual spraying left the province on May 20th.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I thank the Honourable Minister for that information, and the people in the North will thank him also now that they know that there has been no spraying taking place, even though I have been advised as to the contrary.

I would like to pose another question to the Honourable Minister of Environment concerning the situation at Thompson that was brought up by the Honourable Member for Thompson, where the Honourable Minister described the situation at Thompson as no cause for concern. Can the Honourable Minister honestly make that statement considering that the oil that is being buried or has been buried in Thompson does contain PCB's? Can the Honourable Minister make the statement that there is no cause for concern?

HON. G. LECUYER: I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the soil in question contained three parts per million of PCB's, which is considered a trace. When the contamination level is at 50 parts per million - the member will find that there are many parts, many areas, and I am not in any way acting here or standing here as a proponent of the disposal of . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, if the member on the other side wishes to hear the answer maybe he can control some of the members that are shouting from his side.

Mr. Speaker, it is in no way something that I condone, the disposal of transformers on a waste site, and it's not something that generally occurs. I explained the circumstances under which it did occur.

As well, I explained that when staff first checked these transformers, they were labelled as non-PCB transformers, so obviously somewhere along the line they have been tampered with. Some oil was added to them that was not of the type that was non-PCB content. The tests having revealed that there's only three parts per million PCB's in the soil, that will be disposed and buried.

I have to inform the member that unfortunately there are many parts of this province where soil contains away higher contents of PCB's and that is unfortunate.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My supplementary and last question concerning the same transformers. Has any action been taken against the people who placed those transformers into the disposal area, has there been any fines levied, has there been any advice to those people that they mustn't do it because of the danger that is caused? Are there any fines? What is being done to see that it doesn't happen again?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, the matter is still being investigated. We, at this point in time, don't even know exactly who placed these transformers in the disposal site, but I also want to repeat something I said earlier. The transformers were — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, if it is repetitive, then the questions are repetitive, but I will provide the answers seeing as it was asked, independently of what the Member for Arthur wants to shout from across the House.

I will repeat what I said earlier, Mr. Speaker. The transformers had labels on them which indicated that they did not contain PCB's. It was because the department did not take any undue chances that we were able to determine that was not the case, otherwise these transformers could have been left there, even though they did have - in one particular instance anyways - levels that were higher than acceptable.

Order for Return No. 15

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

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

Some time ago, I submitted a written question that was subsequently transferred to an Order for Return on the understanding that the information would be forthcoming quickly. I wonder if the Minister could tell me when I might receive the answers to those questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I hope to have that information tabled hopefully before the end of the week.

Lotteries

MR. D. BLAKE: I thank the Minister for that answer and I'll be anxiously looking forward to that information, Mr. Speaker.

I have another question to the Minister in charge of Lotteries. For some time they advised the winning numbers of the various lotteries in the weekly newspapers of Manitoba and that's been discontinued. I wonder if he could tell me when that was discontinued and why the policy change to discontinue that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the lotteries that my honourable friend refers to is run by the Western Canada Lottery Foundation and they are the ones that are in charge of that. I've been asked that question before and I'm checking with the Foundation to see what their intent is. Apparently it is not as acceptable as it was, it's difficult for people to get their winning numbers, so I'm checking with the Foundation. It is the responsibility of the Western Canada Lottery Foundation, not the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation.

MR. D. BLAKE: I apologize to the Minister for having the name incorrectly, but I wonder when he gets that information if he'd be kind enough to pass it on to me.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh, absolutely.

City of Winnipeg Act - amendments

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs.

I wonder if the Minister is planning to introduce amendments during this Session to The City of Winnipeg Act so that the city can start paying claims to homeowners for sewer replacement on city property?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, that has been under consideration by this government as I have answered before, and I suspect that an answer will be before this House shortly.

Surface Rights Board - firings

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A question to the First Minister. I wonder if he can confirm that his Minister of Energy yesterday fired three members of the Surface Rights Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would take that question on behalf of the Minister responsible for Energy. I think there have been changes in respect to the board. The details of that I would take as notice.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, when he's taking the question as notice would he find out the reasons for the firing of those individuals?

HON. H. PAWLEY: The honourable member ought to know that the proper phraseology certainly is not firing and, I think, it's unfortunate that the honourable member uses that term because it has a certain connotation in respect to it.

Members of boards are changed from time to time. They were under the previous administration, the administration previous to the previous administration, there will be changes from time to time in respect to this administration, that is to the part and partial responsibility of administering a government in respect to boards carrying on independent functions.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder when the Minister is checking into it if he would find out as to why those three particular people were fired and not any of the other ones, why those particular three people were fired.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, again, I point out that the member, of course, for his own particular purposes which I think will be evident to all, insists on using a term that is inflammatory and misleading. I will take the question insofar as the change in respect to the membership of the board as notice for the Honourable Minister of Energy to respond to.

MHRC - Jobs Fund Assistance

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister responsible for MHRC.

Last Friday, he indicated in a statement to the House that last year with the assistance of the Jobs Fund and Manitoba Housing, there were 1,905 apartment units started. Would the Minister responsible for MHRC, Mr. Speaker, specifically identify the number of those units that received financial assistance either from the Jobs Fund and Manitoba Housing and exclude those apartment units that received funding through CMHC or were MURBS?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was busy trying to find Hansard for last Friday for the Ministerial Statement that I made. I will recheck that statement. I would suggest that the Member for St. Norbert do too. I do not believe that I made the connection that the Member for St. Norbert is making.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MS. D. DODICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a committee change on Economic Development. The Member for Seven Oaks will substitute for the Member for The Pas; the Member for Transcona for Rossmere; and the Member for Wolseley for Flin Flon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have some committee changes on Economic Development, the Member for Lakeside for the Member for Roblin-Russell; and on the Public Utilities and Natural Resources, the Member for Pembina for the Member for Charleswood.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, would you call Second Reading, please, on Bill 22, followed by Second Readings on the other bills standing on Page 2 of the Order Paper; and following that, the Adjourned Debates on Second Readings on the same page.

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 22 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT AND VARIOUS OTHER ACTS OF THE LEGISLATURE

HON. M.B. DOLIN presented Bill No. 22, An Act to Amend The Labour Relations Act and Various Other Acts of The Legislature, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill 22 is firmly based on this government's commitment to industrial harmony. We believe that such harmony is a key contributor to the province's steady economic growth and our drive for increased job opportunity.

Thirteen months ago the government undertook what we believed to be the most extensive review and detailed discussion of labour legislation that has ever been conducted in the Province of Manitoba. We did so in the belief that fair and balanced labour laws are not only critical to a productive economy, but to the pride and dignity of all of those who live and work in Manitoba.

It has been 12 years since The Labour Relations Act was first introduced in Manitoba - some of my colleagues remember that day - and it's been eight years since it has been amended. Over the course of our review, we have spent much time talking to the province's business and labour communities about the changes that have occurred over the years, about their needs and about their concerns.

Throughout that detailed and lengthy consultation, we have looked for and we have found a great deal of common ground. We have, wherever possible, sought consensus on the needs of the industrial relations

community today and their needs in the future. While many of Bill 22's provisions are based on consensus, we recognize that there are other provisions that will take time before they receive general acceptance. Mr. Speaker, that is the nature of legislation and particularly of labour legislation.

I remind members opposite that their cries of economic disaster, lost investment, failing business are not new cries. Indeed, it's difficult to remember the introduction of any labour legislation, though based on equality, fairness, balance, that has not met with similar cries by Conservative critics, but they're firmly rooted in the past.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Progressive Conservatives to put away the rhetoric and quit crying wolf. I invite them - in fact, I challenge them - to join in a responsible discussion of the industrial relations needs of this province. We recognize that Bill 22 doesn't have all of the answers and we will carefully monitor the effect of its provisions. What's more, we will continue to consult, consult with business, consult with labour in a responsible manner. In our efforts to continually improve the industrial relations environment in this province.

The introduction of Bill 22 comes following a period of unprecedented industrial peace in Manitoba. The number of work stoppages, the number of workers involved in these stoppages, the working days lost to industrial conflict are the lowest since 1969. While these statistics are impressive, they should never be seen as an excuse to ignore the need for real change and for improvement. There are critics who would suggest that it is better to wait until Manitobans have suffered through a strike or a lockout or have had their business crippled as a result of a work stoppage. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that such critics are not only naive but they are actually insensitive to the real needs of workers and to their employers.

This government believes that progress can best occur in a climate of relative harmony. We on this side do not believe that a humane and responsible government sits back and waits for an arbitrary quota of suffering or of inconvenience or of economic hardship. We have introduced Bill 22 to deal with specific concerns in the industrial relations community, to provide much needed clarification of the act and a firm foundation for labour relations in the future.

We believe that the future lies with a responsible industrial relations community and it's for that reason that we have retained the Manitoba Labour Board's tripartite structure. It is for that reason that we have increased the Board's independence by providing for five to seven year terms for the chair and the vice-chair and by moving legislative provisions dealing with the Labour Board from The Department of Labour Act into The Labour Relations Act. It's for that reason that we have given the Board increased responsibilities and put a heavy emphasis on settlement.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is our belief in this province's industrial relations community that has given us increased confidence in the Manitoba Labour Board as an institution that is capable of dealing with industrial relations issues, quickly, competently and with clear authority. Privative clauses of the type that are found in Bill 22 are not new and the protection that they provide from judicial review have been found both necessary and desirable.

In March of 1979, the now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, Brian Dickson, wrote: "The rationale for protection of a labour board's decisions within jurisdiction is straightforward and compelling. The labour board is a specialized tribunal which administers a comprehensive statute regulating labour relations. In the administration of that regime, a board is called upon not only to find facts and decide questions of law, but also to exercise its understanding of the body of jurisprudence that has developed around the collective bargaining system, as understood in Canada, and its labour relation sense acquired from accumulative experience in the area."

Mr. Speaker, while Bill 22 provides the Board with greater freedom from judicial review, it also respects the role of the courts in interpreting constitutional matters and in ensuring that the Board has acted within its jurisdiction. While we believe that, for the most part, unions and employers in Manitoba do act in a responsible manner, sensitive to the needs and respectful of the rights of employees, we also believe that it would be irresponsible to ignore the exceptions to that rule.

When an individual signs a union membership card, he or she has made a decision that must be respected. They must not be subjected to intimidation, threats or pressure. The right to join a union is one enjoyed by every Canadian and I believe it is supported also by the constitutional, freedom of association.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that what is known as a date of application certification process, is the best way of ensuring that the true wishes of the employees are respected. It is a process already in effect in other Canadian jurisdictions. It is clearly the intent of this legislation to have the Manitoba Labour Board determine the true wishes of the employees by the use of signed membership cards as at the date of application.

While employees will still have the right to change their minds prior to the date of application and the Board will still have the right to disregard the cards if a union has acted inappropriately, the new emphasis on the date of application will limit the opportunity for unfair and illegal interference.

When the number of cards does not constitute a clear decision by the employees involved, then the Manitoba Labour Board will require that a vote be held. It would have the authority to exercise this option where the number of cards signed represent less than 55 percent of the employees affected, but at least 45 percent. Where support for the union is below 45 percent, the application would be dismissed.

Bill 22 contains other important certification provisions. It gives the Board the power to grant an interim certificate where the only outstanding issue is the composition of the bargaining unit and where it is clear to the Board that whatever way the dispute is resolved, the union has enough support to be certified. Bill 22 serves notice that blatant attempts to interfere with an individual's freedom of association and right to join a union will not be tolerated.

Under the provisions of the bill a proven serious, unfair labour practice could result in certification, regardless of the number of cards signed at the time. Indeed, if this provision had been in place earlier there are some Manitoba employees, who exercised their

legitimate right to join a union, who would not have been subjected to intimidation and humiliation inflicted upon them by someone acting in total disregard of the law.

We realize, Sir, that just as employees have the right to belong to a union, they must have the right to leave or to change that union. We have introduced a number of amendments that will make that process more fair and more representative of the true wishes of the workers, while ensuring that unions act in a fair and responsible manner. For example, the board may decertify if it has found fraud in the original application, or if the union abandons its bargaining responsibilities.

Sir, Bill 22 contains other provisions allowing employees to continually review their union membership and to periodically apply for decertification where they feel it is in their best interest to do so.

Mr. Speaker, while we are proud to have introduced provisions, such as, the date of application procedure, interim certificates and discretionary certification, we must acknowledge that these are not new concepts. Although labeled by the opposition as being anti-business, they have been in effect in a number of Canadian jurisdictions for some time. The label that the opposition would like to give us they would, therefore, also have to apply to the Conservatives in Ontario, in Saskatchewan, in Newfoundland and in Alberta, or to the Socreds in British Columbia, and also to the Federal Liberals.

While, under this government, it would seem that the Manitoba economy has been doing better than the ones that I have just mentioned, I don't believe that the comparatively poor performance of those economies could ever be attributed to the certification procedures that are in place in their laws.

Mr. Speaker, this government is committed to encouraging all individuals to take an active role in building a society that is based on co-operation and that is characterized by justice and equality. To that end, Sir, Bill 22 has provisions that will ensure consultation in the workplace and ensure that it is not merely a platitude, but a contractual commitment.

Bill 22 provides for the inclusion of just-cause provisions, providing for contractual protection from arbitrary dismissal or discipline. In fact, a great number of contracts already contain such clauses.

Bill 22 calls for a commitment on behalf of unions to act fairly in exercising their rights as bargaining agents and for management to act fairly in its administration of the agreement. It establishes, in law, provisions protecting the rights of workers to democratically participate in their unions and protects the worker's right to vote on critical matters, such as, contract ratification and strikes.

Where workers have found it necessary to exercise the right to strike, or where an employer locks workers out, Bill 22 includes measures to ensure that the conflict does not escalate to unacceptable levels. The bill bans the hiring of professional strikebreakers and ensures that workers will have the right to return to their jobs upon conclusion of the work stoppage.

Mr. Speaker, the true strength of Bill 22 is in the provisions it contains to reduce confrontation, particularly during the life of a contract. Grievance mediation and improved grievance arbitration are mid-contract resolutions that are best able to deal with mid-

contract disputes. Bill 22 introduces provisions for grievance mediation in the hopes that the persuasive powers of mediation, previously used almost exclusively to settle contracts, can now be used to settle ongoing disputes. When those disputes can't be settled, then arbitration must be used.

Through the consultation process leading to Bill 22, both labour and business have made it clear that improved grievance arbitration procedures were an absolute must. While many collective agreements contain strong arbitration provisions it was felt and, indeed, it was demanded that the act provide a faster, less expensive, high quality system of arbitration. We have responded to this request, this demand, by introducing provisions for expedited arbitration. Under this form of arbitration, firm deadlines for decisions are established, a mediator is appointed to deal with the parties during the time of arbitration, and a sole arbitrator is involved in hearing the case.

Mr. Speaker, having legislative remove the right to strike during the term of an agreement, I believe it is incumbent on any government to see to it that the alternatives available are as effective as they can possibly be. That is a belief that is similarly expressed by the former Labour Minister of Ontario, Robert Elgie, when speaking on expedited arbitration, and I quote. He said, "If we feel there is any suggestion of disrepute falling upon the grievance arbitration procedure it is my view that we have an obligation to endeavour to correct it so that the procedure sets out to do what it was originally intended to do, and that it sets out to do so without undue delay or undue cost."

Mr. Speaker, if such measures are interpreted to be detrimental to improved labour relations, then I would suggest that such critics have either a lack of understanding of the arbitration process, or they have to be dedicated to the obstruction of the just settlement of grievances.

Expedited arbitration is one example of this government's commitment to responsive legislation. Mr. Speaker, Bill 22 itself is an example of our commitment to harmonious, industrial relations.

We believe the time to act is now. Our study of Manitoba's legislation and the legislation in other jurisdictions has been detailed and extensive. The labour and business communities have worked very hard to ensure that their concerns have been met and their needs have been addressed.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 22 will go a long way in providing the kind of long-term labour stability that is needed for a steady economic growth, while helping to ensure that the rights of Manitoba workers, their needs and aspirations, are also better met.

This government is committed to the provisions of Bill 22 and I invite all those involved, the labour community, the business community, the members of this House, to assist in seeing that the goals of industrial harmony, economic growth and the dignity of the worker are achieved.

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

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 6 - THE DANGEROUS GOODS HANDLING AND TRANSPORTATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER presented Bill No. 6, The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act; Loi sur la manutention et le transport des marchandises dangereuses, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to bring this most important legislation before the House. As members of this Chamber may be aware, this legislation has gone through an extensive consultation and planning process. We have worked closely with both the private and the public sector in an effort to make the new legislation as pragmatic and effective as possible.

Before I get to the details of The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act, I would like to give you some background that has brought us up to this point in time. As members of this House, you will recall that our government passed Bill 43, The Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, in May of last year. This act was to provide provincial legislation to parallel and supplement the federal Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act of 1980. The Manitoba Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act was not proclaimed, because its implementation required the adoption of federal regulations.

To date, no operational regulations have been passed. Concurrently, the Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health had been developing a Dangerous Goods Handling Act which was introduced as a discussion bill in August of last year to be subjected to intensive public consultation during the interval between August of last year and this time.

In the fall of 1983, approximately 3,500 copies of the proposed Dangerous Goods Handling Act were distributed for comment to numerous industries, employer groups, labour unions, environmental interest groups and private individuals. Special public meetings were also held in Thompson, The Pas, Dauphin, Brandon, Morden, Portage la Prairie and Winnipeg. Approximately 250 people attended the meetings, and some 34 written briefs were received.

A detailed report was prepared, and it is being circulated to all those involved in the process. Copies are also available for anyone else who wishes to consult, and they are available on request.

The consultation process was completed, and the legislation redrafted to address the concerns and comments raised during the meetings. One such issue raised on a number of occasions was the relationship between The Dangerous Goods Handling Act and The Transportation of Dangerous Goods Handling Act. Due to the obvious overlap areas and the concerns raised, it was deemed highly desirable to amalgamate these two acts into one combined piece of legislation. This is what you will find in the bill that is being introduced

for second reading today. It was determined that this move would facilitate private industry and government.

I would now like to highlight the major provisions of Bill 6. Bill 6 will give the province the much-needed capability and authority to regulate and react to site-specific problems regarding the manufacture, use, storage, transportation, handling and disposal of dangerous goods. The new legislation will also accommodate the establishment of hazardous waste disposal facilities in Manitoba.

A cradle to grave manifest will be required for hazardous wastes, so they can be tracked from generator to final disposal. This system will be compatible with planned national and international systems.

Under Bill 6 as well, transporters of hazardous waste will be licensed, and required to carry adequate third party liability insurance. They will also have to adhere to stringent site-specific requirements.

Under the new legislation, environmental accident response capability will be improved so that a greater number of responders will be available. The bill makes provision so that capable persons can be deputized to perform required functions until departmental staff have arrived on an emergency scene.

Failure to comply with the provisions of this new act or future regulations will result in penalties of up to \$50,000.00. This is consistent with the federal Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, and the public health and environmental consequences of improper dangerous goods handling.

Prior to closing my remarks, I wanted to make the following points known to the House. As I indicated during our department's Estimates review, to facilitate the combining of two acts, the Transportation of Dangerous Goods unit from the Department of Highways is being transferred over to our department. Therefore, our department will now have the operational and legislative responsibility for the majority of dangerous goods management in Manitoba.

I would also like to emphasize this new legislation is one of the major components of our government's Hazardous and Special Wastes Management Program. This legislation will, in essence, form the legislative foundation of this very important program.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the outset of my remarks, it is both a pleasure and an honour for me to present this legislation before the House. I consider it crucial to Manitoba's long-term public health and environmental interests.

Thank you.

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just a question to the Minister if he would. He indicated that the summation of the briefs from the public hearings was mailed out to some 34 presenters of briefs. Could the Minister indicate whether copies of the bill have been sent out to those presenters of briefs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The copies of the bill were sent out starting - what was it? - Tuesday or Monday that the bill was distributed in the House. Starting on that date, the bill was being sent out to all of those who attended the meetings, not only just the 34, but to all the 250.

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

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 11 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CLEAN ENVIRONMENT ACT

HON. G. LECUYER presented Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Clean Environment Act, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present these amendments to the House for consideration and passage.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments are necessary for four major reasons: firstly, Mr. Speaker, to accommodate the new Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act that is now before us, and which I just presented for second reading; secondly, to accommodate the implementation of the planned province-wide Pesticide Control Program; thirdly, to accommodate any future decision regarding bringing the City of Winnipeg water discharges under the control of The Clean Environment Act; and fourthly, to allow for some housekeeping changes regarding enforcement procedures and special cases.

I would now like to delve into detail in regard to the proposed amendments. One of the principal reasons that The Clean Environment Act is being amended at this time is to accommodate Bill 6 which, as I stated, was the bill titled Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act. It is important to note that, without these proposed amendments, there would be duplication of legislation. These changes will also ensure technical consistency among certain provisions of The Clean Environment Act and Bill 6. These amendments to The Clean Environment Act are also necessary to allow for the implementation of the Pesticide Control Program.

As many of you may recall, in 1982 the Clean Environment Commission recommended that a province-wide permit system be implemented in an effort to effectively control the application of non-agricultural pesticides in Manitoba. Of particular concern was the mosquito control. In accordance with this, my department recently completed the first draft of a proposed regulation aimed at implementing this new permit system. The draft regulation is now out for extensive public consultation and discussion.

Since it is our government's intention to proceed with this program in the spring of 1985, it is now necessary to make the relevant amendments to The Clean Environment Act. Another amendment to the act will accommodate any future decision in respect to bringing the City of Winnipeg water discharges under The Clean Environment Act. It should be noted to the members of this House that water discharges within the City of Winnipeg are now exempt from The Clean Environment Act by Order-in-Council.

As my colleagues are aware, ongoing water quality problems have occurred in the Red River and, in large measure, it has resulted from discharges from the City of Winnipeg. As it stands now, the province has no effective control over these discharges. Over the course of the last two years, our government has attempted to resolve the ongoing water quality problem via consultation with the various parties involved. These parties are the City of Winnipeg, the Town of Selkirk, the Federal Government and the Provincial Government. Although there has been extensive review and discussion of the problem, somewhat limited progress has been made in terms of providing a long-term plan towards improving the quality of the Red River water.

The former Minister says we tried, and that is true, and we will continue trying. Therefore, in view of this government's strong desire to bring a resolution to this problem, it may be necessary to seriously consider bringing the City of Winnipeg discharges under the control of The Clean Environment Act. At least the act will make provision to do so.

Finally, the amendments allow for some housekeeping changes to the act. These changes relate to enforcement procedures and special cases. In the area of enforcement, the amendments will make the existing requirements of the act more enforceable in the courts. As well, the maximum fines under the act are being increased to be consistent with The Dangerous Goods and Transportation Act. As I mentioned, the housekeeping changes also relate to procedures under the act. They will streamline the process of varying Clean Environment Commission orders so that hearings are only required in the event of objections. When we get into the details, members will notice that this will streamline and expedite the process.

Finally, the housekeeping changes also deal with special cases. This will permit the declaration of environmentally sensitive areas and accommodate government action in future emergencies involving Western Equine Encephalitis situations. Mr. Speaker, none of these housekeeping changes reflect any fundamental differences in the principles which are now embodied in The Clean Environment Act.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honour and my pleasure to present these amendments for consideration to the members of the House. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Minister.

The Minister indicates that this bill is companion legislation in many respects to Bill No. 6. If for any reason Bill 6 is held over and not passed this Session for further study, etc., will this bill likewise be held over?

HON. G. LECUYER: The question, Mr. Speaker, begs for speculation on what is going to happen to one bill in order to determine what will happen to the other. Without having given it further reflection and without considering all the causes or all of the amendments to The Clean Environment Act, I find it difficult to answer that question. I presume one could still occur without the other, not as is, though. Not as is.

MR. D. ORCHARD: One further question. The Minister indicated regulations which are currently being circulated which have no effect upon the agricultural community. Will these regulations apply to the application of pesticides by weed control districts established throughout the various rural municipalities that provide weed control services to the farm community?

HON. G. LECUYER: If I understood the Member for Pembina correctly, this is a service provided by the weed control districts which come under the municipalities, and I do believe that they would be subject to this regulation. But I want to also clarify something that — (Interjection) — I would like to finish my response to that, and I would also like the Member for Emerson to listen to it before he takes off with some misconceptions. So it is preferable that he listens to it.

I would like to correct something that the Member for Pembina said - that is, seems to be implied - that this is not a regulation that is being circulated. This is a draft of a proposed regulation which is being circulated, therefore, for consultation. We are not talking, therefore, of a regulation that has been implemented, nor are we talking about a final format of a regulation. We are doing exactly that, Mr. Speaker, circulating a draft regulation to get the feedback from the various levels of governments which will be affected so that we can arrive at the regulation which will serve the intended purposes and still remain practicable and enforceable.

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

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 12 - THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

HON. M. HEMPHILL presented Bill No. 12, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les écoles publiques, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to the House for second reading a bill to amend The Public Schools Act. This proposed legislation is intended to do two things. It's intended to provide

for the release of school board budgets to the public and to amend the Education Support Program which provides the major portion of revenues to school divisions.

I am going to just touch on that last amendment that I mentioned first, Mr. Speaker. This section is in relation to the Education Support Program, and what we are doing is bringing in an amendment to the existing legislation so that the consumers price index factor, which was built in as the determining factor for the inflation increase in the Support Program, is going to be changed for the 1984 calendar year to coincide with the previously announced funding levels of 3 percent.

I think that when my Estimates were up, I announced in the House that the increase for school boards this year would be 3 percent and therefore it's necessary that we make this change to conform to that decision.

I would like to concentrate most of my few remarks, I think, on the item that is of major interest to the people of Manitoba and that is the release of school board budgets. This amendment and this change in legislation, Mr. Speaker, is being brought in for three major reasons.

The first one would be freedom of information, which this government believes in. Secondly, it is because we believe that it's important that taxpayers know how their tax dollars are being spent. When you're looking at the Education Budget, you're looking at the second largest budget in the province. It's about 19 to 20 percent of the provincial budget and this year school boards will be spending about \$734 million. That's a great deal of money and that is taxpayers' money and I think that we believe very strongly that they have a right to know what that money is being spent on.

Individual schools have a lot of autonomy. We agree with that. Out of the funds that they get, about 76 percent of the funds they get are block funds. That means they have a lot of discretion in terms of programs and where they spend that money and it's very important for parents to know what programs are going on in their schools, what the priorities of the school divisions are, what the programs are costing and what the distribution of money is. For the taxpayer, it's very important that they have access to information that tells them what that money is being spent on.

When we did the survey, and we've discussed this a fair amount in the House, both myself and the Member for Morris, but we've talked about the survey of public attitudes in education; and I think there was some important information there, because generally the people of Manitoba were saying that they thought there was a reasonable amount of money being spent on education at this time. They didn't want it cut; they didn't want a decrease and they didn't want a major increase and - this is very important - they didn't necessarily equate improved quality of education with increased spending. That's important for elected representatives to know that, that you can't just throw money into the pot and assume that the people of Manitoba are going to believe that you have improved the program and the quality of education.

However, they did say very clearly that they would be prepared to have more money go into education even if it meant increased property taxes, provided we could demonstrate and show them what the improvements were going to be and that there was

going to be improved quality of education for their children. This really shows how important it is that they have access to the budgets, because that's one of the only ways they're going to know where the money is going and what it is being spent on and be able to make a judgment from their point of view on the value of the money that is being spent on their child's education.

I really believe that the question of confidence and support can only increase with increased access to information, particularly financial information like school board budgets.

Are you convinced? Did I convince everybody? I have just a few more things to say.

One of the thrusts of my department, as all the members in the Chamber know, has been public involvement, increased public involvement and participation in decisions made about their child's education and one of the major factors will be resulting from this change in legislation that will give them access to all the information about the money that is being spent on their programs.

I think we've got some very difficult choices. The education system is being pressed to do more and more all the time with less money, or with not a major increase in money, and I think the parents have to help us make some of those decisions. The public has to help us make some of those choices; they have to know what those choices are.

I did set up an inter-organizational committee. I think it's important - just one last thing - to say that the education community supports this.

A MEMBER: Don't feel rushed.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, I'm not. They did set up an inter-organizational committee and asked them to deal with this, because I believe we should be releasing school board budgets to the public. There were a few concerns put forward. One was that they believed there should not be any information made available dealing with negotiations. In other words, there shouldn't be any access to information telling you what they are doing in their negotiations and I agree with that; and they should not receive any information that gives information about an individual, and I agree with that. So we have provided those two exemptions, but other than that, any member of the public of Manitoba has a right to ask for and a right to have access and to receive the school board budget.

The Federal Government does it, Mr. Speaker; the Provincial Government does it, the Municipal Government does it; and I believe school boards should do it too.

I believe that this may be a small bill in size, but a large bill in terms of the important principle to parents and the people of Manitoba.

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

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Roblin-Russell that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

**ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND
READING**

**BILL NO. 8 - AN ACT TO AMEND
THE SECURITIES ACT**

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 8. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourn this debate on behalf of my Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

I'm pleased to be able to speak to the information contained in Bill No. 8, An Act to Amend The Securities Act, which was introduced by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs approximately a week ago.

In speaking to the bill, Mr. Speaker, I will be taking issue with the intent and the decision of the government to proceed in this manner. I want to say, as the former Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that I begin by concurring wholeheartedly in the words of commendation that the Minister put forward to Mr. Peden, the Chairman of the Securities Commission, Mr. Tapley and the other members of staff who I know are eminently well qualified, very capable individuals, who are attempting to do an excellent job on behalf of the people of Manitoba in their roles, respectively, in the Securities Commission.

My criticisms of the government's decision to proceed in this manner, Sir, are of the government and not of the commission and the members of the commission. Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicated that this bill was urgently requested by Mr. Peden and members of the Securities Commission and I say, Sir, that I take him at his word, but I suspect that was not his first choice, in terms of an urgent requirement, and I will go on to discuss, in my view, various aspects of this legislation and the alternatives that there are before the government today to proceeding in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister, in introducing the bill last week, put a few statements on the record in justification of the government's decision, the first of which was that the amendments are primarily intended to achieve or provide a mechanism for achieving uniformity of securities legislation in this province with the legislation of other provinces. Indeed, Sir, my recollection is that was always an objective that was important to the workings of the commission and important to the Minister in his position that we do have uniformity with the securities legislation of other provinces.

The problem is, Sir, that these amendments are not the best way of achieving that. The Minister indicates that Bill 72 of 1980 provided an entirely new approach to The Manitoba Securities Act, but was not yet proclaimed. It is his contention, Mr. Speaker, that: "Until such time as that bill can be amended to reflect amendments which are expected to be made, indeed expected to be made fairly soon, in The Securities Acts of the Provinces of Alberta and Ontario, it is very important to keep us pretty well in a lock step with these provinces primarily." That's what he said.

The problem, Sir, is that this bill will not do that. This bill is a piecemeal, patchwork kind of approach to keeping in place the old legislation, whereas the best method of putting us in lock step, using his words, with The Securities Acts of the other major provinces in the country would be to proclaim Bill 72 and, Sir, make the additional amendments that are now required as a result of the passage of the last four years.

But the Minister has given us a variety of excuses, one might say, or reasons why they are not proceeding in that manner, preferring to stay with the patchwork system of trying to keep the old bill in place and to keep up to date with it. But the longer we proceed in this manner, the more difficulty we have, Mr. Speaker, in keeping in parallel and in lock step with these other jurisdictions.

I believe, Sir, that the ultimate answer would be for the Minister and his government to seriously consider something that I know he is seriously considering, because it was referred to during the debate on his Estimates, the addition of staff to the department which would be the major component necessary for them to be able to proclaim Bill 72 and bring up to date the amendments that would put us in lock step. This does not.

Not only does it not put us in lock step, but it does something which I consider to be unusual and perhaps even unwarranted in that it anticipates potential amendments in Ontario at a time when, I am given to understand by people in the industry and professionals who are dealing with the Securities Commissions in our province and that province, there is great reason to believe that they will not even be proceeded with by Ontario. They are proposals, I agree. They have been proposed by the Province of Ontario, but they may not be proceeded with in the form that they were proposed. In fact, the Ontario Government is having serious second thoughts about it.

Therefore we are going to be in the unusual position of passing amendments, anticipating what happens in Ontario when in fact it doesn't come about. So now we're going to have a whole hodgepodge of things that we're waiting for proclamation on, that we are trying to bring us into lock step with an act that isn't parallel in any case. I think that it's just simply a very very bad approach to this whole effort.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that there will be people from the industry and professionals who deal with securities and the registration of instruments of security and offerings of securities here in our province who will come before a committee and say precisely that to the Minister, who will not be in agreement with what the Minister is doing. I am wondering why the Minister is proceeding in this manner. Perhaps in committee and perhaps later, he will tell us that.

But it seems to me that rather than face the real root problem of putting additional staff in the Securities Commission to deal with it and to be able to allow them to proclaim the act of 1980, Bill 72, he is instead asking them to continue on a patchwork basis, do the best they can, and the only manner that he can persuade them to do it on that basis is to bring in these amendments that bring in some of the necessary changes to bring them closer to these other acts. But it isn't the real answer, and I would like the Minister to tell us why he isn't proceeding with the real answer.

I'll give him the benefit of even quoting his answer to the Member for St. Norbert who asked that very question last Wednesday, Mr. Speaker. The question that was asked was, why doesn't he proclaim Bill 72, The Securities Act, that was passed in 1980?

The Attorney-General, as is his wont, replied to the question with a question, and he said: "I only ask, of course, rhetorically why the previous administration, having passed the bill in 1980, didn't proclaim it in 1981 or 1982?" Well, I can tell him why we didn't proclaim it in 1982. We weren't in government in 1982, that's the first reason.

In 1981, Mr. Speaker, we were, of course, being given the advice of the Securities Commission that they needed a little bit of time. The Ontario act incidentally, although it had been passed in 1980, was not proclaimed until late 1980, and they wanted to have a little bit of experience in understanding what the Ontario Securities Commission adjustments would have to be in their staff and their procedures in order to deal with The Securities Act in that province. Then it was our anticipation that, if not certainly by late 1981, by 1982, it would certainly have been proclaimed so that it could have been put into the works, but it wasn't.

Of course, since then, and we're dealing now with a matter of two-and-a-half years, it is this government who has not proclaimed it for two-and-a-half years, all the while stalling off what I believe would be the first preference of the people of the Securities Commission, the staff of the Securities Commission.

The Attorney-General further spoke about "significant changes in the marketplace, in the legislation of other provinces." Sir, those changes have been added to their equivalent of that 1980 act, Bill 72. They are already off on that new course. We could be making those parallel changes, but we're not. We are instead dealing with the old act and trying to, on a patchwork basis, bring it in step or close as possible to what exists with the new act and its amendments in other provinces. That, Sir, is, I think, not the right route to go.

He spoke further in his answer to the Member for St. Norbert, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General, and he said: "The amendments here proposed to The Securities Act as it presently exists, just to make sure that we are keeping up, and to see in fact what the amendments which are being considered, which of those will be made in the other provinces - Alberta and Ontario particularly." So we are dealing with proposed amendments that are being considered in other provinces, not yet in place in other provinces. It seems to me that this whole process of doing things in anticipation is not a very good one, because those provinces may think twice and may reconsider and may not put in those amendments. Here we are dealing with them in Manitoba on an anticipatory basis.

It doesn't seem to me to be the best approach, particularly in a year when this government is saying we're only dealing with essential legislation, we are only dealing with things that absolutely must be done, urgently required and all those things. Here we are dealing with a proposal that anticipates something that may or may not happen in these other jurisdictions. I don't believe it is the way to go.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, as well, the bill is being suggested to us as being in the best interests of those people who deal with the Securities Commission in all

respects. The Commission has various responsibilities in my view. In addition to maintaining and preserving the integrity of the Manitoba Securities Commission in dealing with the issue of new securities, we have to be very cognizant of the need to ensure that we can deal and they can deal - that is the Commission - with the examination and administration of the legal, financial and other assessments that are necessary in order to approve and carry out the proper registration of securities issues in Manitoba. That's a prime function and we've got to be concerned, as the Minister pointed out, that we preserve that watchdog role and that we ensure that nothing we're doing is going to lessen their opportunity and ability to be a watchdog on the registration of new securities issues here.

As well, we also have to recognize that the registration of new securities in Manitoba can have a significant and major financial impact on our province because of companies registering here to sell their securities. They create a capital flow through Manitoba that is important to many sectors of our economy. It brings employment in a variety of areas, financial reward for people in various areas of our province, investment companies, financial institutions, accountants, lawyers, people who are in the business of marketing, securities, printers, all sorts of areas, benefit as a result of these organizations being able to register securities here.

We've got to have a rational and a reasonable system of dealing with this business of registering securities here that doesn't provide a roadblock or a disincentive for people to register here that is not provided in other provincial jurisdictions in the country. I don't believe that this legislation is necessarily going to do that.

I emphasize that I'm not arguing for any lesser scrutiny, any weakening of the watchdog role of the Commission. I'm concerned that by this approach, we'll remain out of step, we'll continue to have perhaps a more cumbersome or least time-consuming operation in the Securities Commission in their role in registering securities and, we may, in fact, provide more of a disincentive or a roadblock to private organizations that want to register securities here without any additional assurance of more protection to the investor.

I agree that we must be as closely parallel to the other jurisdictions as much as possible in lock step, as the Minister indicated, with their processes and their legislation. This won't do the trick is the argument that I've put forward. I believe proclaiming Bill 72 and making the necessary adjustments to bring it up to date with the Ontario legislation and others would be the right tack, Mr. Speaker.

I believe, from what I'm told by people within the Commission area and others who deal with the Commission, that in order to do that it would require more staff. As I said earlier, that is a problem that the Attorney-General, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has to wrestle with.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a growth in the registration of securities over the past couple of years. The Minister rightfully pointed that out. By doing it this way and by keeping in place a system and a procedure that I'm told is taking much longer for the processing of these registrations, for the processing of these securities issues is going to choke off some major financial industries that have been growing in Manitoba during the past short while and will probably result in

the assurance that private offerings of these securities are now going to avoid Manitoba in future and go elsewhere to do their work. That, I think, would be a serious financial loss.

We have in Manitoba, or at least an organization that grew out of Manitoba that is nationwide now, an organization called the Association of Canadian Real Estate Syndicators, which I know that the Minister is familiar with. These people are a major significant economic impact in our province. The leaders of this industry in Canada are located here in Winnipeg by and large, even although their products, that is the basic developments for which they are issuing securities, are elsewhere. In fact, 90 percent of those products that are being syndicated and issued here in Manitoba are being built somewhere else. Whether it be somewhere else in Canada or even the United States, their investors to a large extent or outside out of our province but, nevertheless, that industry and that expertise in organization and management and marketing is located here.

I'm told that it is the closest thing to a comparison to what Great-West Life and Investors Syndicate meant to Manitoba when they located here. That kind of financial expertise and that kind of ability to market securities all over North America and do their financial work all over North America, but be headquartered here, has a major impact on us and, yet, we're going to make it more difficult for them to do business out of their home base right here.

Mr. Speaker, the figure I was given, and I'm sure that this organization will be at Committee to give similar information is that industry was responsible for developments over the past 10 years between \$15-20 billion, that whole industry in Canada. The Winnipeg people located here were responsible for half. So, we're talking about somewhere between \$7.5 billion and \$10 billion of those securities were headquartered here in Winnipeg. That's significant. That's \$1 billion a year over the last 10 years just about. With that kind of expertise and marketing and management capability and everything located here, it obviously has some significant impact.

I spoke earlier about the lawyers, the accountants, the printers, the various people who are of importance, I believe, financial importance to our community. They are syndicating things such as hotels, shopping centres, commercial buildings, and all sorts of others things. They started off, of course, with the MURBS and with the other primarily residential developments and, of course, they've very much expanded their offerings.

It costs them \$100,000 to \$150,000 for one public prospectus. That's a very significant cost. As I say, most of that kind of soft cost accrues in our province, whereas the development accrues somewhere else.

I'm told, Sir, that last year and, it was indicated that they would have no objection to my using the example, a very large Winnipeg family, at least a Winnipeg family of substantial financial means who were developing a hotel on this basis in Palm Springs, California, tried to have that issue registered in Manitoba and had it lodged with the Securities Commission for over six months without being able to have that securities issue approved. At the same time, by comparison, they had that issue registered in Ontario within one month - that's how long it took to clear it there; in Alberta, it was a

matter of days to clear the issue there; here it remained for over six months and was finally withdrawn, because, in frustration, they could not get it processed.

They were of such substantial means that, you know, in this case they have to wait until they get the approvals in order to proceed ultimately with the project, and they were so much delayed by this process that they finally pulled it out and themselves subscribed to more than half the shares in it in order to be able to commit it and to proceed before the inflationary costs and the costs of preserving the land and the commitments on construction and so on could expire on them - they did it that way - but very few people would have that kind of financial backing to be able to do that. Most people would have the whole thing collapse on them and not proceed and lose a great deal of money as a result of the Commission not being able to deal with that kind of issue as it should.

Mr. Speaker, the fear is of the people who are in the industry that by making these amendments and preserving the old system, the old act, we will not clear up this bottleneck in the Securities Commission, we will not be able to make it as easy as it is in other provinces to go through the paperwork. Again, I emphasize I'm not talking about lessening the watchdog role or the amount of investigation and protection for the public that's involved, but rather the process and the timeliness that it takes to go through this whole process.

The people in the industry are telling me that will not be clarified, that will not be corrected by this approach to the act.

They give further commentary on such things as the change in the threshold from \$97,000 to \$250,000, a level above which the security does not require the approval and the registration. That, Sir, as I understand, is what is being proposed in Ontario, but that was a proposal that was made by the Securities Commission but is now being challenged by various people who have to deal with that matter. It appears as though the government will not go forward with that change of threshold to 250,000.00. Now it may be 150,000; it may be something in-between, but it appears as though that may not go through at 250,000.00.

So by us passing this at the present time, we are not necessarily going to be in step with Ontario, but will be further out of step with Ontario or, for that matter, any other jurisdiction, because I understand no other jurisdiction currently has the 250,000 threshold in place.

Two of the arguments that have been put forward to oppose the proclamation of the act of 1980 and instead proceed on this piecemeal basis, two of the arguments are: No. 1. Shortage of staff. I think I have probably dealt with that already, but the bottom line is, why should we choke off a major financial industry in Manitoba when the answer is a shortage of staff that can be dealt with by this Minister and this government.

No. 2. The argument that has been put forward by the Commission and, I believe, the Minister is that they are waiting for Ontario to make its amendments or other provinces to make their amendments. The point is, and I speak from experience as I had to deal with these proposals from staff as the Minister currently is, that these other jurisdictions are constantly amending. In particular, Ontario, I believe, brings in amendments to The Securities Act almost annually.

So if we are waiting for Ontario to be finished its amendments, we'll wait forever because every year they'll bring in amendments to bring them into step with changing times. Even that figure that we talked about, the threshold of 97,000 and 250,000 will be amended, no question. The question is: to what amount? Why should we jump to an amount that hasn't already been approved by Ontario? So they're constantly amending their legislation. This isn't going to solve the problem by waiting and by utilizing the old act with patchwork amendments.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that should be pointed out to the Minister is that the Ontario Securities Commission, the reason he knows and we know and everybody in the public knows what amendments they are considering, is that they have a very public form of communication and dialogue with the people who are affected by their Securities Act changes. They attempt as much as possible to have this open communication and draw the wisdom and the expertise of all those who have to use the act and be affected by it in bringing forward their amendments.

I think the impression has been left that the industry in Manitoba was consulted before this act came forward. I am told, Sir, that they got two days' notification that this act was being presented and of the details of it before it arrived at the Legislature. That, I don't believe, is consultation. That, I don't believe, is drawing on their expertise and listening to their concerns. They are the people who are going to be affected by the changes that are brought forward in this act. As I say, Ontario does have a mechanism in place, and I think it would be wise for this Minister and the Securities Commission to have done that before coming forward with this.

Mr. Speaker, my concern is that we should not be put at a substantial disadvantage to other provinces in being able to deal with and register securities on a proper basis here in Manitoba. I believe that we are going to be put in that position by the proposal that's before us. Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a case here for the Minister to sit down immediately and find out whether or not what we should be doing instead of this is proclaiming Bill 72 of 1980 and bringing in the appropriate amendments to put us again in lock step with Ontario and the other jurisdictions, because I am told and I'm led to believe that this will not do it.

So having put that on the record, Mr. Speaker, I just simply say that we'll be interested to listen to the various people who come to committee who are interested in the act because they have to deal with it on a regular basis. We'll be interested to hear the presentations of the professionals, the industry and the businesspeople in Manitoba who are going to be affected by this. We'll ask the Minister and the government to listen and to consider carefully their alternatives before proceeding on this basis with this proposed act.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Opposition House Leader, that debate be adjourned.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is moved by the Member for Pembina, seconded by the Opposition House Leader that - the Opposition House Leader has already spoken on this — (Interjection) — seconded by the Member for La Verendrye that debate be adjourned. Is that agreed?

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of - the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, just so that it doesn't become a precedent, I thought it was established that, even though a member had spoken, his or her name could be used to second the motion. I just want clarification on that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recognize the point of order of the Member for La Verendrye.

BILL NO. 5 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways, Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act, standing in the name of the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister in his introductory remarks indicated that this act dealt primarily with two areas, and one of them was the institution of legislative framework under which mobility aids, motorized, and mobility vehicles can be used by handicapped citizens of the Province of Manitoba. He indicated that his predecessor, the MLA for Lac du Bonnet and former Highways Minister, had established a committee to attempt to come up with appropriate amendments which would allow the changes he is proposing in Bill No. 5.

This is a problem that has been, I guess, with us for a number of years, because I know at one stage of the game I wrestled with this problem and had, at one stage, got to amendments which were found to be faulty and weren't proceeded with beyond committee stage, I believe if my memory serves me correct. It is a difficult problem to come up with a legislative framework to allow some of these new inventions, which are very very helpful to the physically handicapped in the province, to allow them some equal participation in getting around and transporting themselves independently in the province.

I note that in the proposed amendments, one of the problems that came up when we wrestled with the problem has been addressed, that being a splitting off of the two types of motorized mobility aids. The one will primarily deal with devices such as a motorized wheelchair in that the maximum speed that class of vehicle can achieve is some less than 10 miles an hour, and that particular vehicle doesn't require a licence and essentially becomes a pedestrian and shares the sidewalks, the crossings, the crosswalks, with pedestrians in the Province of Manitoba. That does appear to eliminate one of the problems we ran into when we had a proposal which didn't specify those

separate and apart from something like - and I use for just purely recall - the happy wanderer type mobility vehicle which would fall under this definition now. That should suffice to separate the two types of vehicle that are currently available.

If I understand the act, and, of course, we will get to understand it further as the Minister closes debate and in committee, the licensed vehicles under the mobility vehicle classification will, by and large, operate under the same rules and regulations as bicycles or mopeds. They will apply the rules of the road currently in The Highway Traffic Act, which will require single file operation down streets and highways and not beside each other in tandem, and also will require travel to the extreme right of the road much as a bicycle now is required to do.

These changes are something that will be welcomed by the physically handicapped in the Province of Manitoba and are indeed welcomed on our side of the House, because it was, I believe, the Session of 1981 that we attempted to come to grips with the problem and tried to come up with a workable solution to a problem that has some difficulty for the enforcement agencies, the police agencies and the traffic authorities in the Province of Manitoba.

I've got several questions as a result of these amendments that I pose to the Minister to ensure that the use of these mobility vehicles is done very safely for those using them, that they won't be endangered whilst on the streets and the highways, and that they will not put the rest of the motoring public in cars and much larger vehicles to some disadvantage because that has always been a problem, how do you accommodate a happy wanderer and a semi-trailer on the same street or highway for the safety of the physically handicapped person using the happy wanderer type vehicle. I think that is a consideration we all want to give very serious thought to, because it is not a fair contest, I submit, Sir, between a car or a truck and some of the mobility vehicles that will be now licensed.

The question that I have to the Minister is this: now that we have a mobility vehicle classification, I understand the government's intent that this is designed to give physically handicapped Manitobans access to the streets and highways of the Province of Manitoba, but will that use of a mobility vehicle be restricted solely to handicapped Manitobans or can, for instance, I buy one myself because they are electric powered, very economical to run, and can all Manitobans license these mobility vehicles without having a handicap and hence use them on the streets and highways?

I ask that question, Sir, from the standpoint that the desire, if I understand it, of this legislation is to allow the physically handicapped access to our streets and highways. That access has and will present certain logistical problems in traffic flow and traffic handling and safety. We are willing, and I believe I can speak on behalf of government members because I can speak on behalf of our side of the House, we are willing to accept the risks to the physically handicapped of taking those vehicles out on the highway for the offsetting advantage that they participate more fully in society and day-to-day activities.

But if these mobility vehicles, which are now licensed, can be used by all members of the society, I could

foresee a potential problem where you have greater numbers than were anticipated with this amendment, and we end up having to put restrictions on which were not envisioned now and those restrictions would impact on the people we are trying to help with the passage of this legislation, the physically handicapped in Manitoba. So that is a question I have and I don't believe the definition addresses that. If it does, I will certainly accept that, but that is a potential problem that I would like the Minister to address.

As I recall, when we discussed amendments suitable to bring this advantage to the physically handicapped of the province, I recall a question that had come up from the Motor Vehicles Branch from the Registrar of what sort of driver licensing capabilities are necessary. I note that the legislation provides that one must have a Class 1 to 6 or a learner's permit. Okay, that is fairly straightforward, Sir. Now that creates the potential problem I just mentioned in that anyone, simply by having that licence, could purchase a mobility vehicle licence and use it on the streets without being handicapped.

Now the other problem is that is the requirement of holding a valid driver's licence going to restrict the number of people who are currently physically handicapped in the Province of Manitoba that could successfully operate these vehicles and, because of their physical handicaps would not qualify for a driver's licence as required by this amendment. I know the discussions that we had, and there were problems with these discussions, but the discussions I had with the then Registrar was that of setting up a separate driver's licence category which would be, quite frankly, more lenient. It would be a special category of driver's licence for handicapped people. That presents a problem right away because in our society, the way we are developing, we are - I guess the word is mainstreaming - so that we are not identifying people by physical handicap, and having a special licence provision separated them when the intent of the legislation was to bring them in to the mainstream of society as much as possible.

So that proposal for a separate licensing had that problem, but I suggest to the Minister that his licensing requirement now might have as big a problem or possibly more of a problem in that it will be automatically excluding a number of physically handicapped people from using mobility vehicles from the very fact that the Registrar, under the terms and conditions and regulations set down for the issuing of a Class 1 to 6 driver's licence or a learner's permit, may not license those individuals, those physically handicapped Manitobans, because that licence could be used to operate a car or a truck as well as a mobility vehicle.

So I ask the Minister whether that particular problem has been considered and addressed, because we are, as I said earlier, on both sides of the House attempting to bring in legislation which will allow physically handicapped Manitobans self-contained transportation, transportation they don't have to rely on a third party to provide for them under most conditions. If we are restricting that in some way by their inability to get a valid driver's licence, then that is something I am sure the Minister and his caucus would want to address prior to Law Amendment Committee.

I would ask the Minister at some point in time during the debate on this issue, since it is not evident to me

in the amendments that he is passing, whether there are any nighttime restrictions on the operation of this vehicle or any rush hour traffic restrictions on the operation of these vehicles, because those were points that we had given consideration to some two-and-a-half or three years ago.

Now the nighttime operation, when I realize is partially remedied in the amendments because the mobility vehicle will be classified as a bicycle, and if the Minister of Highways wanted to have discussions with his former colleague, the MLA for Elmwood, that's always been one of his favorite beefs to the Highways Department in that to ride a bicycle in the evening or at night you had to have it lighted with one of those self-contained generators so that you had a light and many bicycles don't have that.

I notice that the act provides that this mobility vehicle must have a lamp in front for forward illumination, but there is a further section in the bill which - if I understand it correctly - exempts the mobility vehicle from the necessity to have either a reflectorized warning device, such as a slow-moving vehicle sign, on the back of it and exempts it from having flashing amber warning lights pointing to the rear of the vehicle. So on the one hand we've got no restrictions that are apparent in the amendment on nighttime operation, but we have removed by this amendment some of the rear protection on these mobility vehicles in that they don't have to have an SMV signal or flashing amber lights to warn people at nighttime that they're there.

This may be addressed and I've missed it, but if it isn't I think the Minister's got to give some very serious consideration to providing that kind of protection for people using these mobility vehicles, because there is no restriction, as I can see it, on nighttime operation or rush hour operation, for that matter. So if there are no restrictions, then certainly we want to make sure that those vehicles are as highly identifiable to traffic meeting and passing them as is possible, because once again I do say with no hesitation that these vehicles are no match for a car or a truck on our highways if a collision occurs.

The other question I'd have for the Minister on the mobility vehicles is: is there a restriction on any highways for their use? In other words, can these vehicles set out on a trek to Selkirk on the undivided highway between Winnipeg and Selkirk or, for that matter, down to Falcon Lake on the divided highway, Trans-Canada? The Minister smiles slightly, but that will happen, because these people have been waiting a number of years for the amendments to allow them to take these mobility vehicles out and enjoy life like the rest of us. That will happen, and in those instances we have 100-kilometre traffic, and cars and trucks moving at 100 kilometres, and these vehicles are licensed only as mobility vehicles if they can go less than 25 miles per hour or 40 kilometres.

So I ask the Minister: are these vehicles able to mix with traffic on our major highways throughout the province, and what concerns does he have in terms of the safe operation of those vehicles and the protection of the physically handicapped operators of those vehicles on our highways? Because, as I've said, there is a specific exemption in my interpretation in this Bill No. 5 for the rear identification of these vehicles by slow-moving vehicle symbols or flashing amber

lights. So on a highway with 100-kilometre traffic, and some of it heavy on the weekends, these vehicles could be out there, unless I have missed the restrictions preventing them from being there, and they are there in my estimation with less than adequate identification for traffic approaching them from behind. I'm sure the Minister would want to attempt to address that in his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, by and large and closing on the mobility aid aspect of it, I know it's a problem that's been wrestled with. I wrestled with it, his former colleague, the MLA for Lac du Bonnet, wrestled with it, and it appears as if they've got an amendment which has met with a lot of approval, and with some of the questions I've posed we may well have a better amendment and better safety for handicapped Manitobans to be able to use our streets and highways. If that's the case, certainly members on this side of the House are supportive of it.

Mr. Speaker, to move on to another section of the bill, and this was a section of the bill that the Minister did not address at all and I regret that he didn't because I have been known to interpret amendments incorrectly. I did it once before with the former Minister of Highways and apologized to him quite openly because I had made a mistake, but unless I have misread the legislation the Minister is bringing in a requirement that turn signals be placed on all cars and trucks.

Formerly, the exemption was there for cars manufactured prior to 1958. What this does, Sir, is require the individual with an antique Model T to put turn signals on it and ruin the antique and original value of his vehicle. I don't think that the Minister intends to do that. I'm not sure whether the department would not want to intend to do that but this situation developed once when I was Minister where they came in with an amendment requiring turn signals on motorcycles, and once again the antique motorcycle and motorcycles I think beyond 1972 didn't have to have turn signals and we grandfathered them.

I ask the Minister why this is happening here and now with this amendment? And if it isn't happening, well, that's fine.

MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I'd just like the member to refer to the section he's dealing with. We had intended, Mr. Speaker, that this deal with two issues, and if we have missed something in here I'd just like the honourable member to refer to that section he's referring to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I am indeed in a terrible quandary, Sir, because I never like to break the rules and I would be doing so if I referred to a clause at second reading debate. I will rely on your advice - when I never break the rules - should I refer to a clause specifically in this bill?

MR. SPEAKER: I think the member knows that second reading is intended to deal with the principle of the bill and not the clauses.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I will privately tell the Minister what's in his bill, since he doesn't know what's in his bill, but there is a section in this bill which, by principle, if I am reading it correctly — (Interjection) —

A MEMBER: In which clause is the principle?

MR. D. ORCHARD: In which clause is the principle? Would that be unparliamentary? I don't believe I can refer to any clause but, Mr. Speaker, the principle of the clause, that is in about the middle of the bill at almost the bottom of the page, deletes an exemption of 1958 and prior on motor vehicles and just says "every motor vehicle." Now, that means antique cars, farm trucks - lots of them on the road prior to 1958 manufacture. I've got one myself. They are now going to have to be equipped with turn signals which is not there, so the Minister obviously doesn't know what's in his bill, and the problem is that it makes a further exception to it and deals with "every trailer shall carry at the back thereof flashing lights." That means farm trailers that are carrying water tanks and I believe, if I'm misreading this amendment, I will do like I've done in the past when I've made a mistake. I will apologize for drawing it to the Minister's attention incorrectly, but if it is there and the Minister doesn't know it's there I suggest he has to read his own bills a little more carefully before he brings them to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close on one aspect of the bill and that is the suspension of driver's licences for those impaired drivers in the Province of Manitoba. My colleague, the former Attorney-General, my colleague, the MLA for St. Norbert, when the Attorney-General introduced some statement on drunken driving, impaired driving in the Province of Manitoba, pointed out the problem that appeals from the Licence Suspension Appeal Board, decisions could go to the Court of Appeal and they're always reversed or practically always. My colleague challenged the Attorney-General to indicate the number of times when those reversals by the Court of Appeal, by County Court, the drivers so reversed or so given remission from the Licence Suspension Appeal Board decision caused a further problem with alcohol-impaired driving. Now we see the amendment, but we don't see the justification for it.

This is troublesome from two ways, and no one on this side of the House wants to see people driving on the highways impaired or under the influence of alcohol. We have brought in amendments; all governments have brought in amendments to prevent that. But what we don't want to see is an amendment to The Highway Traffic Act which will allow further bureaucratic interference into the lives of Manitobans without recourse to an impartial body. That's exactly, Sir, what this amendment does, because now the decision of the Licence Suspension Appeal Board is final. The only appeal the driver has is on a point of law.

Now that does two things. First of all, the boards must now be very careful that they do not make any legal mistakes in their decisions, but the biggest danger in this, Sir, is that we now have a politically-appointed board. This time, political-appointed faithfuls of the New

Democratic Party, members of the Licence Suspension Appeal Board hold final sway, no appeal, on their decision on the driving public charged with impaired offences. I do not believe that is a good amendment to make, to give final decision to a group of political appointees regardless of who appoints them. There has to be a court of appeal that drivers in front of the Licence Suspension Appeal Board can go to. I don't trust this government's politically-appointed Licence Suspension Appeal Board.

Furthermore, Sir, the Attorney-General nor the Minister of Highways justified on questioning several weeks ago by my colleague, the MLA for St. Norbert, the statistical reasons for doing this. I wonder, Sir, what the unions who, when I was Highways Minister and before, during our government, who wanted to set up a separate licensing category - one being a work licence, the other being a pleasure licence - to avoid having their working licence removed because of an impaired driving charge, think of this. Now they go before this Licence Suspension Appeal Board, and there is no court of appeal, no place to have the decision reversed except from a politically-appointed board by this government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30, when this bill is next before the House, the Honourable Member will have 15 minutes remaining.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Resolutions, the Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, before you call the resolution, I believe there may be leave to call for second reading of the two bills in Private Members' Hour, Bill 7 and 17, and then proceed to the resolution.

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

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 7 - THE CENTRAL TRUST COMPANY ACT, 1984

MS. M. PHILLIPS presented Bill No. 7, The Central Trust Company Act, 1984; Loi de 1984 sur la compagnie du Trust Central, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Briefly in 1982, serious problems arose regarding the Crown Trust Company, particularly in Ontario. In January, 1983, the registrar under The Loans Trust Corporations Act of Ontario took possession and control of the assets of Crown Trust Company. Subsequently, in February, 1983, an agreement was approved by an Order-in-Council of the Province of Ontario appointing Central Trust Company to manage the business of Crown Trust Company under the provisions of the Ontario legislation, and appointing Central Trust Company as the

substituted trustee in respect of all types of trusts for which Crown Trust Company had been previously the trustee.

This agreement has subsequently been substituted by legislation of the Province of Ontario, confirming the substitution of Central Trust Company in the place of Crown Trust Company in that province. Obviously, Ontario does not have the constitutional authority to effect the substitution of Central Trust Company in respect to certain estates, trust, agencies governed by the laws of other provinces, nor can it effect the vesting of Central Trust Company of property held under such estates in trusts and agencies.

The sheer volume of work to effect such a substitution by an application to the court in each case would indicate the necessity of having legislation in our province to assist in the orderly transfer of business by the new trust company, and to make certain that all of those citizens of our province who are affected by various trusts have their interests protected.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this bill so that citizens of Manitoba who have relations with Crown Trust are not penalized.

Thank you.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Turtle Mountain, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 17 - THE DENTAL MECHANICS ACT

MR. P. FOX presented Bill No. 17, An Act to amend The Dental Mechanics Act, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member.

MR. P. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Briefly before I get into the amendments, it should be noted that The Dental Mechanics Act was proclaimed in 1970, August 13th, and has been in existence since then without any significant changes. The purpose of the amendment is simply to recognize the development since that time of the association which represents the majority of denturists in the Province of Manitoba. The amendments do not in any fundamental way change the work that the denturists are permitted by law to do, or modify the power of the Minister of Health to regulate the practice, admissions and licensing of denturists in Manitoba.

The Dental Mechanics Act defines the scope of the work that denturists are permitted to do by law, and remains unchanged. The Dental Mechanics Act permits dentists and medical practitioners to perform the work of denturists.

Further, it provides that denturists will be required, before making, producing, furnishing or supplying any of the prosthetic dentures or dental plates for another

person or for any other person, to take an impression of the inside of the mouth, that other person's mouth unless that other person produces to the denturist a Certificate of Oral Health respecting that other person signed by a dentist or a medical practitioner.

Further, the act provides that no denturist except as provided in the act shall make, produce, reproduce, furnish or supply any prosthetic denture or dental plate for another person who has live teeth in his mouth or for other purposes.

The act also provides, where permitted under the regulations and in accordance with the regulations, a denturist may make, produce, reproduce, furnish or supply:

(a) an upper prosthetic denture or upper dental plate for another person who has no live teeth in his or her upper jaw and the same for a lower jaw or, for any of those purposes, take impressions of the inside of the mouth of another person without a prescription signed by a dentist.

Accordingly, the present amendments do not change the section of the act which defines the work a denturist is permitted by law to do. The amendments do not modify the requirement that a denturist must obtain a Certificate of Oral Health signed by a dentist or medical practitioner before they are able to do any work, nor do the amendments modify the requirement that in certain circumstances a denturist must obtain the prescription signed by a dentist.

The power of the Minister of Health to regulate the practice of denturists remains unchanged. The act permits the Minister of Health to refuse to grant a licence under the act to any person who, in the opinion of the Minister and in the interests of the public, is not a fit person proper to be licensed as a denturist. The Minister of Health may suspend or cancel the licence of any person if, in the opinion of the Minister, it would be in the public interest to do so. The act retains the right of any person affected by the decision of the Minister to appeal that decision to a judge of the Court of the Queen's Bench.

The section, which is the section relating to the offences and penalties, remains unchanged. The amendments do not in any way affect the power of the Minister to establish an approved school for the training of denturists or to utilize any existing facility for that purpose. Also, the act remains intact and grants the Minister of Health the power to authorize inspectors to inspect the records and accounts of denturists and to carry on the investigation as authorized by the Minister in writing.

Now what are the amendments? The act is changed from The Dental Mechanics Act to The Denturists Act. Wherever the term "dental mechanics" appears in the act, it is changed to "denturists." This name change is warranted by having regard to the functions of the denturists and brings the description of denturists in Manitoba in line with the description of denturist across Canada.

The Denturists Association has for many years represented the vast majority of denturists in the Province of Manitoba. The act recognizes the role of the association by (1) incorporating the association, and (2) by establishing a board composed of four denturists and two other persons to administer the affairs of the association. The denturist members of

the board shall be elected by the association and the two other persons shall be selected by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. This board has the power to establish and maintain standards of the professional ethics and social welfare of the members of the association.

The bill also provides that no person shall be denied membership in the association because of race, nationality, religion, colour, sex, marital status, physical handicap, age, source of income, family status, political belief, ethnic or national origin of that person.

It should be noted that this board does not have the power to suspend or cancel the licence of a dentist. This power is retained by the Minister of Health. At best, this board can only recommend to the Minister the suspension or cancellation of a licensed dentist.

The amendment permits the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to appoint an Admissions Committee of two denturists and a member of the Faculty of Dentistry of the University of Manitoba. The function of this Admissions Committee will be to consider the applications and qualifications of any persons who desire to become a denturist.

Where it is satisfied that the applicant meets all of the qualifications and requirements prescribed by the regulations, it shall recommend to the Minister that a denturist's licence be issued to the applicant. Before making the recommendation to the Minister, the committee shall require the applicant, in accordance with regulations, to sit and pass such written, oral or practical examinations as it considers advisable in the circumstances. Again, it should be noted that the Admissions Committee does not have the power of itself to license anyone to become a denturist, but may only make a recommendation to the Minister of Health.

This amendment relating to the Admissions Committee constitutes merely a change in the composition of the committee. Under the previous regulations, the Admissions Committee was composed of a member of the Department of Health, the Faculty of Dentistry and a licensed denturist. Accordingly, this section is a change in the composition of the committee rather than a granting of any new powers to the Admissions Committee.

That, Mr. Speaker, briefly sums up the amendments of this bill, and I hope members agree to pass it in principle on to the committee stage where it can be discussed in detail and also where counsel for the denturists will be present to explain to any further questions that may arise.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

RES. NO. 7 - OPPOSITION TO HIGH INTEREST RATE POLICY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Riel, that

WHEREAS interest rates in Canada have increased again in recent months after a lengthy period of a significant decline, and

WHEREAS interest rates have reached their highest level in 18 months, and

WHEREAS the previous use of high interest rates as an economic policy created serious economic problems for many homeowners, farmers and small business people, and

WHEREAS the previous high interest rate policy of the Bank of Canada and the Federal Government created serious problems in terms of low economic growth and unprecedented levels of unemployment, and

WHEREAS Manitobans and Canadians are concerned that there will be other increases in interest rates thereby preventing further economic recovery,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Assembly oppose the continued use of a high interest rate policy, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Assembly urge the Bank of Canada and the Government of Canada to reduce interest rates as one element in a plan to encourage further economic recovery in Canada.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member.

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

The resolution that I have put forward in this House today has several dimensions to it. At first glance, it is obvious that it is a major issue in terms of economic policy, and I am going to address some of those policy questions today in my remarks, but also there is the obvious human aspect as well, the impact that high interest rates have had on the people in Manitoba and Canada, and will have if we face them again in the upcoming months. I intend to stress that dimension as well.

Let's review the background of high interest rates here in Canada. When we are talking about the high interest rate policy, what we are really talking about is monetarism. Contrary to what some have thought, and that is that monetarism has developed strictly in the United States under President Reagan, or in Britain under Prime Minister Thatcher, it actually has had development in Canada even prior to the election of either of these two governments.

If one is to look at it, monetarism has essentially been practised in Canada since 1975, for it was in September of 1975 that the Bank of Canada announced it would implement a policy of gradually reducing the growth in money supply and, in particular, the N-1 measure of money supply and would attempt to control its growth around smaller target bands. This actually predated the October, 1979 adoption of a similar goal in the United States by the Federal Reserve Board.

So when we are talking about monetarism, when we are talking about control of the money supply, we are talking about a decade of experience with that policy in Canada under various governments and prior to the implementation of this policy by the Carter

administration first and later by the Reagan administration in the United States.

I don't want to go into the complete details of the economic theory of monetarism. I am sure those theories are readily available to members of this House if they do wish to do further research on it, but one corollary of the policy does involve high interest rates, because that is one mechanism of controlling growth and money supply and also controlling some of the associated parallel goals which are attached to monetarist economic theory.

When we are talking about this experience both in Canada and United States, I would suggest that experience has been nothing less than disastrous, Mr. Speaker, because what has happened is, as a result of the concentration on such economic policy tools as high interest rates, we basically accepted the principle that inflation could be controlled at the cost of high unemployment, because that's essentially what has happened, Mr. Speaker. We have had a decrease in inflation both in the United States and Canada over the last number of years, but that decrease in inflation came at the cost of very high levels of unemployment which are continuing, particularly here in Canada where we haven't yet had even the drop that they have in the United States in recent months.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, it has had a significant negative effect. You can look at academic studies, there are studies by Fortin, Watson, Peters, Donner, Barber, and even one Mr. McCallum, an economist, which members opposite might wish to look at. Generally, I think it's accepted that decade-long experience of monetarism, that experiment of monetarism has not worked. While it has achieved some of its policy goals, the cost that has been attached to that has been far too high.

Let's look at what happened in that period, let's look at the human cost, let's look what happened - as the member on this side points out with supply side economics - well let's look at it. We saw unprecedented levels of unemployment throughout the Western World. We're still faced with very high levels. We saw a tremendous negative impact on homeowners, many of whom were in danger of losing their houses because of high interest rates. We're seeing the continuing negative effective of high interest rates on small businessmen and farmers. That's right, Mr. Speaker, even at a time when interest rates were about half of the peak level, the effects are still being felt. We do have a very high level of bankruptcies across Canada particularly as we all know in terms of farms, especially in recent months.

This was shared too, interestingly enough, this economic pain by companies as well, by corporations. Well, there was one exception as we all know, and that was the banks. I think that's interesting too when we look at it, Mr. Speaker. You just have to look at the time at which the interest rates were climbing to a new high in 1981. For example, this is approximately the time when the prime lending rate was 22.75 percent, corporate profits were down 7 percent in the first quarter of 1980, bank profits were up 62 percent; the second quarter of 1981, corporate profits were down 1.7 percent, bank profits were up 32 percent.

You can go later to the fourth quarter of 1981, overall profits were down by 31.3 percent while bank profits were up 12.3 percent. That's important because if one

looks at the structure that has been set up, if you look at the way the Bank of Canada has been operated, two things become apparent. First of all, the Federal Government has passed the buck on interest rates at the Bank of Canada. It's passed that buck to a group, which is not representative of the Canadian people, it doesn't preserve their interests. I would submit it doesn't even preserve the interests of Canadian business. It essentially preserves the interests of the Canadian banking system, that's its constituent group, the five major chartered banks. There should be no better evidence of that than the experience with bank profits at a time when the economy was in the worst shape it had been in 50 years. While we were in a near depression, Mr. Speaker, in this country bank profits were soaring.

While there's been recovery in recent months, while corporate profits have increased, while we are on a rebound economically, across Canada and certainly here in Manitoba, where in the upcoming year our growth is predicted to be 4.5 percent, the second highest in Canada, the fact is that the banks are still getting the major advantage from this system.

What they've done throughout this period is they've levered their traditional spread between the prime lending rate and their own lending rate, which used to be about 2 percent, to unheard-of levels of 3 and 4, and in some rural and northern spots to even higher percentages - 7 percent above the prime lending rate. They've managed to lever and lever and lever additional profits at the expense of the Canadian people. So, that's one other side effect of these particular policies.

The obvious question is then, how do we do that? How do we solve the problem of high interest rates. How do we adopt in practice the policy of lower interest rates in Canada?

The first thing that has to be recognized is the fact that if you do have lower interest rates in Canada, lower than in the United States, there is a danger of a capital outflow. That's one thing that is always brought up in terms of an argument against lowering interest rates.

There are a number of ways though in which that can be dealt with. The first is via the exchange rate. You don't have to ask me, you don't have to ask any economist about it, you just have to read some of the statements, for example, made by the Premier's in 1982 at the Economic Policy Conference. Certainly Premier Pawley from Manitoba was up front in wanting lower interest rates. I remember statements by a number of other Tory Premiers saying the same thing.

They said at that time that we should be willing to accept lower exchange rates so that we could have lower interest rates in Canada as an incentive to get the economy going. That's what they said in 1982. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I hear some echo from the other side, from one of the Tory members about the exchange rate.

Let's talk about the exchange rate for a minute. I've heard so much mythology from members opposite about exchange rates. It's just incredible. They're so myopic, Mr. Speaker. They talk, for example, when we borrow funds from overseas about the concern that we are borrowing in non-U.S. currency. Well, let's look at that for a second.

In the last couple of years our exchange rate has dropped compared to the U.S. dollar, but where has

it been compared to every other currency in the world? Mr. Speaker, what we've dropped against the U.S. dollar we've often increased. In fact, in 1983 the Canadian dollar was the second strongest currency along with the Swiss franc. It fell only behind the U.S. Check what happened to our exchange rate in comparison to the British pound, to the French franc, to the German mark, or any number of other currencies. We appreciated in value over that period of time. So, it is very myopic to look at the latest exchange rate vis-a-vis the American dollar and say that we are necessarily dropping over all because that is not the case, Mr. Speaker, and that is important to look at, because it shows the myopic approach that people often have. What people are concerned about is more the psychological impact. They're not interested in the economic impact that we could get by exchange rate depreciation.

There's another way too in which we can control the problem. That is by imposing exchange controls. I make no bones about that. If we were to follow this policy we would need exchange controls. Now the question is obviously is what impact that would have. Would it impact on average Canadians, for example?

Let's look at the experience in other countries. Many Western European countries have had exchange controls of one form or another in recent years. Some of them had them permanently since the Second World War. Now, what impact does it have? What it's done basically, Mr. Speaker, is that it's prevented speculators from taking their money out of the country in response to an interest rate differential between Canada and the United States. So, if we dropped our interest rate 2 or 3 or 4 points below the American exchange rate, they would attempt to move their money into the United States to get a higher return on their investment.

If we posed exchange controls, it would be possible to allow Canadians to take the same sort of money they take out any year in terms of going on holidays overseas, but to impose controls that would prevent this movement of capital. It's feasible, it's been done in other countries. We can do it here. The impact of that would mean that a fraction of 1 percent, a small handful of capital speculators would suffer perhaps, but the vast majority of Canadians would benefit from the results of having a lower interest rate policy and that's something I make no apologies for.

So, when we're looking at lower interest rates, let's recognize we're looking at a combination of allowing the exchange rate to depreciate or stay depreciated, because it has done that to a certain extent in the past few months anyway, and a combination of exchange controls. Well, that is the basic policy mix that is available.

Let's look at the human side, let's look at the impact, let's look at what will happen if we don't do that. We've seen in general macroeconomic indicators how negatively the impact of high interest rates can be, but let's look at the average individual.

If you look at the mortgage structure that the average individual is faced with, you'll find that a .5 percent increase in the interest rates on a very modest home, a \$50,000 home, for example, can lead to a \$10,000 extra cost over the life of the average mortgage. That's 0.5 percent. In recent months, our interest rates have increased even more than that, so that means that our home-owners and other mortgage holders, small

businessmen, farmers faced increases in cost of tens of thousands of dollars by that simple increase alone.

Look at it in the overall sense. A 1 percent increase in interest rates leads to an additional \$1.5 billion cost to mortgage holders across this country, a \$1.5 billion cost. If we were, for example, to go to the previous height of interest rates in Canada of 22.5 percent, I believe it was at one time, which is in excess of 10 points above this present level, you would see that it would cost upwards of \$15 billion to mortgage holders in this country.

I know that uncertainty myself. I just recently purchased a home in Thompson and I've seen, just in the last few months since I purchased my home, how much interest has gone up and how much that's going to cost me further down the line in upcoming years; and it's the kind of feedback I'm getting from a lot of people. I know a number of people, for example, who are still locked into fairly high mortgage rates - 15 or 16 percent. At the beginning of this year, after the experience of last year, they were hopeful that they weren't going to have that mortgage cost decrease but now they're beginning to find that by the time their mortgages come up this fall or early next year, they may again be up to the 15 percent level and they're concerned it may go even higher than that.

Those are people that cannot often afford it. Some way or another, they'll manage. That's what people have told me. They did it before, they'll do it again, but some haven't done that and some aren't doing it right now. They're faced with other pressures. Farmers, for example, are faced with a whole series of pressures.

When I look at the situation in bankruptcies I really fear what will happen if interest rates increase any more. There's enough pressure out in the system as it is. There's enough pressure there that it doesn't matter how much the general economy recovers, it doesn't matter if there's going to be a 4.5 percent increase in growth in Manitoba next year, they're going to suffer.

When I look at what happened previously, when people were in danger of losing their homes, I'm afraid that we're going to run into that situation again, or small businesses. I saw in Thompson many small businesses that were basically killed not just by high interest rates, but by a combination of an economic downturn with the high interest rates. The business often dropped in half because of the decrease in population and yet they were faced with the monthly fees of double what they were paying previously because of high interest rates, so that's the human terms.

What is being offered right now in Canada in terms of response to that? Very little. Federally, the leading Liberal candidate, John Turner, is quoted and I quote from the Winnipeg Free Press of Wednesday, June 6, as saying that he supports the Bank of Canada Governor Gerald Bouey's interest rate policy to date and would want to consult him before saying what future policies should be. Obviously Mr. Turner does not recognize the problems with the policies that have happened the last decade up to this point in time. He's not going to recognize it by consulting with Mr. Bouey. It's clear where he stands; he stands for continuation of the existing policy.

Let's talk about the federal Tories. Where do they stand? Where does Mr. Mulroney stand? We've had a hard enough time figuring that out on a lot of issues

and I've heard very little on this one and I think I know why, because he's going to do the same thing that the federal Tories did when they were in for that grand period of nine months. In that period of nine months they did nothing to turn the course of interest rate policy around. They did nothing to turn the Bank of Canada's policies around. They did absolutely nothing then and if they were re-elected, as John Crosbie said, we'd have to wait until they were elected to find out their policies, and for good reason, because if we knew their policies now, they'd never get elected and they know it.

Only the federal New Democratic Party has stated clearly what it would do. Only they have stated clearly what they would do and I will tell you what I personally think should be done and what is the policy of the federal NDP. The first step is we have to get control over the Bank of Canada. If that means firing Mr. Bouey, let's fire Mr. Bouey. I remember one Liberal leadership candidate made the great faux pas of saying that he would fire Mr. Bouey. He made it during a commercial break and then he quickly retracted. I think he was right; I think we should fire him because his policies just don't work and we should make sure that whoever is put in there to replace him is brought under political control, because right now the Bank of Canada operates totally on its own.

The Federal Government has passed the buck. We need to get that back; we need to get that control back. We need to have the Government of Canada and the people of Canada having some say over such an important issue as interest rates in Canada.

As I said, there are some tough decisions that have to be made. Those decisions include what our exchange rate should be; those decisions include exchange controls. There are some tough decisions that have to be made but we have to make them because we cannot take interest rates of 22 or 23 percent again. We're just on the road to recovery; let's not kill that recovery now by getting back to the madness of high interest rates and the madness of monetary policies.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes financial wizards get to speak, sometimes cattle rustlers get to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to what the member had to say and I was really hoping that I would hear something from him that would be meaningful and that you could say, by gosh, there's an idea that maybe has something to it or maybe all of this path that's been followed by Canada and United States and Britain and Germany and many countries of the world, maybe they're wrong. Maybe the Member for Thompson has the answer that all of the other people who lead these countries and help to manage their finances are wrong and the Member for Thompson is right. I guess that's a possibility, but he's going to have to have longer than 20 minutes to demonstrate it to me, Mr. Speaker.

Very interesting though, in everything he said, he never once that I can recall, mentioned two words. He didn't mention inflation and he didn't mention deficits. Inflation and deficits happen to have been two of the

very major factors involved in the economies in recent years, along with high interest rates. Along with high interest rates there has been inflation and there has been huge deficits on the part of almost all governments, all national governments and of course, in our own case, provincial governments. The member never said a word about that, Mr. Speaker. He never said what effect his solution would have on inflation.

Is he saying that the country should be printing money to cover the money that's going to be required when he drops the interest rate? — (Interjection) — What money? The Member for Thompson says, what money? Is he not aware of how much money the Government of Canada has to borrow, the Government of Manitoba has to borrow, every other provincial government has to borrow. Where do they get it, Mr. Speaker? They don't get it all in Canada. There isn't enough capital in Canada to supply the money that is required to finance the governments of this country, let alone the private sector.

Who's going to invest in Canada when we try and impose an artificial interest rate in Canada? Suppose the government says tomorrow the interest rate shall be 8 percent and that's all we're going to pay, and then off goes the Minister of Finance, rattling his tin cup, to Switzerland or Japan, wherever, and says this is all we're paying. What's going to happen? They're going to tell him to get lost, Mr. Speaker. That's what they're going to tell him. You and I know that if we go out and want to borrow money we don't tell the person we're borrowing from how much we're going to pay. That person has money, that institution has money that people have earned and have saved, and they are not about to give it to other people unless they feel they're going to get a return and be protected against inflation.

So the member will have to tell us where the money is going to come from to finance the borrowing requirements that this government has and every other Provincial Government in Canada has, the Federal Government and the private sector when he puts an artificial limit on and when he puts exchange controls on. Who from the outside wants to invest their money in a country where there are exchange controls, because the next step is very apt to be, don't let them take their money out? Don't let the foreign investor take their money out of that country, because they won't let their citizens take their money out. The next step is, don't let the foreign investors take their money out.

Mr. Speaker, if they're going to — (Interjection) — What happens, he says, if the currency appreciates? Mr. Speaker, what has happened? I mean, what really has been the history of Canada? What has been the history of Canada in the past few years, and what has happened when our dollar has dropped from \$1.05 or \$1.06 against the U.S. dollar down to 77 cents or whatever it is now? Where are the benefits of that?

That has happened within a very short period of time. The vast majority of the trade that we engage in takes place with the United States, not with other countries but with the United States. I think it's probably around 80 percent or something. Now where are the benefits of that, Mr. Speaker, because our currency has dropped a great deal during the past eight years? Certainly to some extent, it makes it easier for people to buy our exports, but we don't happen to export very much grain to the United States. They are not buying it.

If the member wants to make the point that our currency has appreciated against other currencies of the world, then our grain is going to be more difficult to buy by those people who want to buy our grain, and the things that we are buying from the United States, Mr. Speaker, are going to be much more expensive.

It hasn't worked to make our industries more competitive. That is what we need in this country is something that makes us more competitive, is that we can produce something more efficiently and more effectively than somebody else can. Well, if you keep on trying to simply devalue the dollar, to beggar thy neighbour with that kind of policy, you're not going to get anywhere because other people can engage in that, as was learned in the 1930's, Mr. Speaker, what can happen when countries start into a war of devaluing their currencies to see who can get the upper hand.

Who cares about the value of the Canadian dollar if Canadians don't care about it? I mean, who is going to have any confidence in the Canadian dollar if the Canadian Government isn't even concerned about their dollar or the provincial governments aren't concerned about it? We have got billions of dollars borrowed, and here we have this member standing up advocating that the value of the dollar should be reduced.

Does he know what that means in terms of the debt that Canadians have, of the increased interest costs that it is going to put upon the taxpayers of this province? It's simply unrealistic, Mr. Speaker, totally unrealistic.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. ENNS: The telephone rates will triple in a month.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Other members of the House have their opinion. They will have the same opportunity to speak to the other members as the present member has.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the member just demonstrates such a lack of understanding of how things actually work. They're great on trying to tell us about how things should work in their view, about how they should work, never with demonstrating any understanding of how they actually work. I guess that's probably why they are at 11 percent in the polls nationally, because there just isn't much of a market for snake oil anymore. That is what the social democrats are trying to sell in this country.

They are trying to tell people that there really is an easy way out of all this, something like Mitterrand thought there was in France, that there was going to be an easy way out of it. Do you know what's happened to him, Mr. Speaker? He has turned around now to where he is exhibiting what some people would term conservative policies.

Actually, of course, there are people who believe that this government opposite is demonstrating what one would believe to be conservative policies. That's hard to understand, Mr. Speaker, because if these members opposite really believe that it's good for government to spend money and run up bigger deficits, etc., why

are they trying to control it? Why are they making so much of having a 3.9 percent spending increase this year, following on the heels of 15-and-some last year and 18 or so the year before?

They have turned around in their view of how the provincial economy should be managed. I have every confidence that if they ever did somehow achieve government in Canada they would turn and they would change their policies at the national level as well. But fortunately, I guess, Mr. Speaker, that's a theory that I don't ever expect to see tested in the lifetime of anybody in this Legislature, because they are simply not going to have the opportunity to be in government at the national level.

I really would like to hear from - maybe the Member for Inkster or the Member for River East is going to speak, will be speaking in the debate, and maybe they will address the question of inflation or of printing money. Is the government going to simply print money to cover the \$30 billion of debt that the Federal Government is running up every year? Where are they going to get the money? How are they going to finance that? How is the Manitoba Government going to finance its deficit of close to \$500 million when the member's policies are put in place, and the Canadian dollar is devalued and exchange controls are put on? How are they going to finance it?

How are they going to finance the billions of dollars that they are going to require if they go ahead with their Alcoa deal? They're going to have to put up hundreds of millions of dollars for the plant. They are going to have to put up billions of dollars to build the Hydro facilities. They are not in Manitoba. They are not available in Manitoba. They're not available in Canada. Where are they going to go for them?

And what is it going to do to Alcoa? How is Alcoa going to look upon Manitoba if the government was suddenly to devalue the dollar, put on artificial interest rates and put on exchange controls? How is that going to impact on a potential investor into Manitoba? How is it going to affect their power deals that they're negotiating with the United States? How is that going to affect them?

You know, they're talking in one of those press releases at least about being paid in Canadian dollars, and it will remain to be seen whether all of them are in Canadian dollars or whether they're in American dollars. Here is a member advocating the devaluation of the currency in which he is going to be paid for the product that they're selling, for the energy that they're selling. Hasn't he thought it out? If he has, tell us how he sees it working out.

Even a little comment that he made, Mr. Speaker, about criticizing John Turner for not saying that he would fire the Governor of the Bank of Canada. Has he any idea what impact that is going to have on how the money markets work if the person who is most likely to win the Liberal leadership and be the Prime Minister of Canada is to say publicly that he will repudiate the policies that have been followed by the Bank of Canada and fire the governor? Does he know what happened when Lalonde — (Interjection) — yeah, what happened? Does he know what happened?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: Does he know what happened when Mr. Lalonde said that he wasn't going to lose any sleep over the value of the Canadian dollar? That was enough to set off a round of speculation over the Canadian dollar. You don't do that kind of thing. Mr. Speaker, if it has to be done, you don't announce your intentions beforehand in order to set it up for the speculators to be able to take advantage of that.

I don't know what Mr. Turner's intentions would be, but I know that if his intention was to get rid of him he shouldn't be announcing it in advance. He shouldn't be announcing that kind of change in advance because it sets up the opportunity for all kinds of speculation and, further, he might have the devaluation of his dollar long before he'd wanted to see it happen, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to hear from the members opposite about the human suffering that is associated with inflation. We've heard about the human suffering that's associated with high interest rates, we know that, everybody knows that, I know that. I dare say I've got more money borrowed than the member opposite has, and I dare say that when the interest rates go up I suffer more as a consequence of that than he does. Does he not realize the suffering that goes with inflation? Does he not realize the suffering that took place in Germany with the hyper-inflation? Does he not realize what's happening in Israel today, in Brazil? — (Interjection) — Those things have their human suffering associated with them as well, Mr. Speaker, and you can't separate them out. You can't just say let's just deal with this one little issue here of interest rates, let's wave our wand, we'll have interest rates down and inflation won't be any problem then and unemployment won't be any problem and there'll be no human suffering. Nonsense, nonsense! It doesn't work that way.

If he's prepared to address all of the other issues at the same time, if he's prepared to address the hyper-inflation and the deficit spending that has taken place and how he's going to get control of that, then I'd be prepared to pay a little more attention to him, Mr. Speaker. I'd pay more attention to him if he'd at least deal with those. He didn't even think that they were important enough to mention, not even important enough to mention that we have a deficit in this country in the range of \$30 billion a year. — (Interjection) — The American deficit is huge and it's contributing to the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . problem, Mr. Speaker. It's contributing to the problem, but by comparison it is small compared to the one that Canada is running.

Now, the honourable members — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Inkster has probably injected more words into this debate while I've been speaking than I have. I must say that I don't really appreciate that. I don't mind a little heckling the same as any other member of the House, Mr. Speaker, but I do get a little sick of that continual nattering that I hear from the Member for Inkster. It doesn't matter whether he's in his own seat or whether he's over sitting in somebody else's seat or whether he even wanders over onto our side of the House, he doesn't have a great deal to contribute when he finally gets a chance to put it on the record, but he has lots to say when he's sitting in his seat or in somebody else's seat, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to move an amendment, and maybe it will give the honourable members opposite a chance to look at some of the other issues as well, and that we'll give them an opportunity to take off their blinkers that they have on and realize that we're dealing with a problem of much greater dimension than one would judge to be the case from listening to the Member for Thompson.

Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for Arthur, that Resolution No. 7 be amended by substituting for the words "after the word Assembly" in the first resolved clause the following, "deplores government policies leading to high interest rates and"; and that the resolution be further amended by substituting for the words after the word "to" in the 2nd line of the last resolved clause; and before the word "encourage" in the last line the following, "adopt mutually-supportive policies that will result in lower interest rates and."

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed)

That being the case, the House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).