

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING
AND
SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directs me to report progress, and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND
TABLING OF REPORTS**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I have a brief statement.

I wish to announce the appointment of Mr. Marshall E. Rothstein, Q.C., of the law firm of Aikins, MacAulay, to inquire into the matter of compulsory retirement in Manitoba. The terms of reference require Mr. Rothstein to consider the advisability or inadvisability of revising The Human Rights Act and/or related legislation.

Further, the inquiry has been asked to evaluate, study and report on the following with respect to this issue: 1. Differences between the public and private sector and within the public sector; 2. Trends in legislation of other jurisdictions; 3. Existing research and reports; 4. The relevance of pension plans and social security.

The inquiry has been asked to hold public hearings and make findings and recommendations consistent with the public interest and the general welfare of the people of Manitoba, having a regard to public attitudes, industry concerns and employee concerns, administrative requirements and changing social values and priorities.

I note that the Human Rights Commission had a special meeting with respect to this matter on February 20, 1981 and recommended the following: The Manitoba Human Rights Commission affirms its position that the current provisions of The Human Rights Act do extend protection to those individuals who are mandatorily retired because of age and further that such protection should be unaltered. The Commission also suggests that in view of the many implications and ramifications attending the legislation in recent judicial and tribunal decisions in Manitoba, the Attorney-General may wish to consider the appointment of a body to

study the matter and make appropriate recommendations.

I would add that Mr. Rothstein has served on a Board of Adjudication as provided in The Human Rights Act with respect to several matters relating to the issue of mandatory retirement. These boards of adjudication, including the matter of Aubrey Newport versus the Province of Manitoba, Finlayson versus the Winnipeg Police Department et al, and Bedrich versus the City of Winnipeg have dealt primarily with statutory interpretation of existing legislation. With this background, together with the mandate of this inquiry, Mr. Rothstein is well equipped to review this issue in broad terms and return specific recommendations on this important subject.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable Minister for the information he's given to us. May I say that although I don't know Mr. Marshall Rothstein, he comes well recommended as a lawyer and as a person interested in matters of this nature. However, I would regret that the Minister would not broaden the appointment to include one or two other people not in the legal side, but more involved in social aspects and not in any way do I want to derogate from Mr. Rothstein's objectivity. Nevertheless, I think input could be improved.

As to the terms of reference, I am amused, Mr. Speaker, to note that the question of advisability or inadvisability of revising The Human Rights Act and/or related legislation is the term of reference, whereas I would have thought that it might well have been The Civil Service Act or The Employment Standards Act and related legislation. I suggest that this may be an indication of a bias, it may be.

Also, the public hearings and the findings that are being requested do not indicate the rights of the individual as being something that should be reported on, but rather the employer-employee, and there can be contradictory interests on behalf of employees.

Nevertheless, it is a good move that this will be studied, the report will, I am sure, be made available to the people of Manitoba through the Legislature. I assume that this takes the place of the studies which the Minister of Labour said he was conducting. He said that he and his staff were looking into it, and I'm wondering if, in due course during the Question Period, the Minister of Labour would indicate whether or not he will be conducting an independent study or will assign his staff to assist Mr. Rothstein in this work.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this time I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 15 students of Grade 4, 5 and 6 standing

from La Salle School under the direction of Mrs. Comeau. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Government Services.

We also have 90 students of Grade 11 standing from West Kildonan School under the direction of Mr. Ken Butler. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Hydro. Can the Minister assure us that the Mandan Line that is presently being planned by Manitoba Hydro will continue, and there are no plans under way to either defer its construction or to cancel its construction?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, the negotiations have been continuing with the utilities in the United States, Nebraska Power Public District, with regards to the Mandan Line. There has been some indication from the American partner in this of some revision of the time schedule and probably some necessity to review that schedule from both sides. I think that as much as the line is desirable from both the point of view of Manitoba and Nebraska from a longer term point of view, that it would not be surprising to see a fairly lengthy delay caused by the conditions that currently appear to exist in the United States. From Manitoba's point of view, we would like to see the line progress as soon as possible and particularly in our long-term interests, because it ties in well with the studies that we have been doing with regards to the Western Power Grid. But I think that any further questions, Mr. Speaker, might be more properly addressed to the Manitoba Hydro officials when they appear before the Public Utilities Committee.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, then further to the Minister, can the Minister advise, in view of the fact that there appears that there may be a delay in respect to the negotiations pertaining to the Mandan Line, if he can advise whether or not any firm contracts are presently being negotiated for non-interruptible Hydro pertaining to the sale of same to any of the utility companies in the State of Minnesota?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it's quite possible that there are discussions going on in that regard, but they would be associated with the existing tie-in rather than a new line, if that were the case. Again, I think that perhaps it might be appropriate to direct that question in detail to the Hydro officials when they are before the committee. There are other discussions going on in the United States with regards to diversity exchanges, firm power sales, and so on, of an ongoing nature, but I think that the Leader of the Opposition's questions was probably directed more towards a sale that might occur over

an existing line such as the one connecting to Minneapolis.

MR. PAWLEY: A further supplementary: Can the Minister advise whether or not there have been any firm sales contracted with any of the utilities in the State of Minnesota during the past three years?

MR. CRAIK: There has been one connection with a very very small community that's landlocked inside the Province of Manitoba, which is on the shores of Lake of the Woods, down in the southeast corner of the province, but that's the only one I'm aware of.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. In view of the resolution of the School Division of Transcona-Springfield relative to what they foresee as problems by virtue of the elimination of the system for trying to do equity to all Winnipeg taxpayers relative to the payment of school divisions, does the Minister intend to review and esranscona-Springfield School Division on Monday next and at that time will be closely examining the problems that they see in the program that we have just brought in in the province.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, then can I take from the Honourable Minister that the most recent announcement that he made on the subject, with respect to the elimination of the Greater Winnipeg levy, has been the only step thus far taken by the government or contemplated by the government with respect to seeing to it that all citizens in Greater Winnipeg have some fairness with regard to the amount of taxes that go to education costs; that that is the only step that has thus far been taken?

MR. COSENS: On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, there have been several steps taken, and I would suggest that the new Educational Support Program is a much fairer and more equitable way of taxing for school purposes than the system that did exist.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a final supplementary.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, then may I take it then that the complaints of Springfield-Transcona and the complaints that are coming from other school divisions within Greater Winnipeg, are complaints which are unjustified and that the present system is satisfactory?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, the only complaints that I have heard to this point have emanated from Transcona. I have not heard any others from other divisions. I know of one urban division that announced its school mill rate, and I believe it amounts to a reduction of some \$40 for every homeowner in that particular urban school division; homeowners with an assessment, I understand, of \$7,000.00. So when the honourable member suggests that there are a number of divisions that find themselves in difficulty with this, then I think he is expanding somewhat on the situation.

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

We realize that certainly Transcona would have some difficulty. They were one of the chief beneficiaries under the Greater Winnipeg Equalization Tax, and realize that we made some provision in the plan to take that into consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Economic Development. In examining the latest estimates available from the Conference Board in Canada, it is revealed that during the past full three years of Conservative government, Manitoba's real economic growth rate was virtually zero. Will the Minister of Economic Development now confirm that the government's economic policy . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Questions of confirmation do not really contribute to the question and answer period. Does the Honourable Member have another question?

MR. EVANS: I would like to ask another question then of the Minister of Economic Development, who I know, has an excellent staff who is briefing him, and I know therefore, an excellent staff that was there when I was Minister, incidentally, Mr. Speaker. Since Manitoba was the only province with zero growth since the year 1977, no other province in Canada showed zero growth, is the Minister now prepared to outline a new economic thrust to get this province moving again?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, the figure that the member quotes from the Conference Board, my excellent staff, that the member refers to, on working with Statistics Canada can find no basis for that figure from the Conference Board. Statistics Canada have also examined it and we have been working with them. When we have the third lowest unemployment in Canada, when our shipments and exports are up, our trade is up about 58 percent over the last three years, our investment in manufacturing is up 28 percent over last year; now any economist that has his salt at all, would examine those figures very carefully, which is what my staff are doing with the Minister of Finance's staff, and I might say the statistics from Federal Finance are proving to be much more reliable when we examine them, and there is no basis for that figure from the Conference Board according to my staff.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

MR. EVANS: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should address this to the former Minister of Finance, but he's not here. I could address it to the present Minister of Finance or even the Minister of Economic Development. Is it not correct that these figures of zero growth which I am referring to are the very same kind of figures, from the very same source that was the key portion of the Budget Address of 1980? It was good enough for the Budget Address of 1980,

it's bloody well good enough now, with that zero growth.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East of course likes to select those statistics that are most favourable to his case, and I understand why he would do that, Mr. Speaker, because he is intent on making things look extremely negative. I think it should be pointed out to the Member for Brandon East as to how those Conference Board figures are calculated and what the record of the Conference Board has been on the basis of their own evaluation, and I think for the past year, perhaps even for the past three years, Mr. Speaker, I think they've ranked No. 20 out of 20 firms that made projections. So their track record, by their own admission, has not been that good.

Plus, Mr. Speaker, one has to understand how those calculations are made, that they calculate figures for the entire country and then apportion them to different provinces, rather than calculate on the basis of what is happening in different provinces and assemble them to get a figure at the national level. So there is a considerable amount of room for error, Mr. Speaker, and one has to be very careful in not being selective in the statistics and in using them over a period of time when one deals with trends rather than the short term, month by month figures.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister, in view of his discourse he just provided to us in which he indicated that Conference Board figures were 20th by way of rating, he claimed that they were very very poor insofar as forecasts, can the Minister advise why the First Minister and why his predecessor, the Minister of Finance, at various times used Conference Board figures repeatedly in order to establish forecasts that were attractive to them at particular times, namely during the years 1979-80, and during the Budget Address?

MR. RANSOM: We have used Conference Board statistics of course. We have used a range of statistics. I think the honourable members will find that we have always been cautious to point out that such figures are only estimates, they are not necessarily — their accuracy is open to a wide degree of latitude, we use information from different sources, Mr. Speaker, and always caution on using percentages, especially using percentages in the fashion that the Honourable Member for Brandon East. And I should think we've demonstrated in the last day or two, when we talk about 485 percent increases in housing, month over month, how statistics can lead one to false conclusions, Mr. Speaker. I think they will find that we have always been careful in the use of them.

I think we should have arrived at the point by now, Mr. Speaker, where the Member for Brandon East would stop trying to use statistics in a misleading fashion and get down to talking about the kinds of policies that will do something for the economy of

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

this province. Let us hear what kind of policies the Member for Brandon East espouses.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister of Finance, pursuant to the remarks which he has just provided to us, would the Minister of Finance acknowledge that indeed insofar as the use of the figures have been concerned from The Conference Board, there has been error. The error has always been on the side of the Conference Board of Canada being too generous in their forecasts and secondly to the Minister of Finance, can he acknowledge, acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, acknowledge that when he speaks of selectivity, that if there has been any group of individuals that have exercised the maximum in selectivity, insofar as the utilization of Stat Canada figures, Conference Board figures, that selectivity has overwhelmingly, Mr. Speaker, come from the First Minister and from the Minister of Finance during the past three years of this Conservative administration?

MR. RANSOM: No on both counts, Mr. Speaker. The answer is no to both questions, Mr. Speaker. I have indeed selected statistics in response to the Member for Brandon East. As an example, Mr. Speaker, on one occasion when speaking to the University of Winnipeg, I was able to take the exact statistics that the Member for Brandon East used and presented in his so-called economic analysis of what was happening in this province and demonstrate on the same statistics that he used to show an entirely different picture, to put an entirely different interpretation on it, Mr. Speaker, to the satisfaction of most of the people attending there, until we finally got to the point in saying, well you've just demonstrated that you can interpret statistics in different ways, now what are you going to do, I said precisely. That's the issue, Mr. Speaker, and the Member for Brandon East — I must commend him, Mr. Speaker — he is somewhat of an expert at using statistics to present a distorted picture.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a final supplementary.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister refers to the meeting which he had at the University of Winnipeg with students, in which the Minister indicates he defended his position vis-a-vis the statistics that were presented to us by the Member for Brandon East. Can the Minister acknowledge that indeed the reports from that meeting are to the effect that the Minister spent most of his time quibbling over statistics, being on the defensive and ended up admitting to the student audience, well, we have done a few good things.

MR. RANSOM: We admit to having done a few good things for this province, contrary to what the honourable members opposite admit to. They would never admit to us having done anything for this province that was worthwhile. The Leader of the Opposition talks about quibbling over statistics. As long as they present their statistics in a misleading fashion, and no one questions them, that's fine. When the statistics are challenged and refuted, that's quibbling.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. My question, Mr. Speaker, arises out of a pamphlet, namely a report from the Legislature put out by the NDP Party, signed by the Leader of the Opposition, sent to many of my constituents in Rock Lake.

Mr. Speaker, in this report the headline Rural Outlook is very oblique. And to the Minister, it states, "Rural Manitoba is the province's economic and social backbone. It has been neglected by a Lyon government which does little about interest rates." Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister of Agriculture, if he could indicate and inform the members of this House, and particularly those people and particularly farmers, who received this brochure in the constituency of Rock Lake, as to just what is being done in way of interest rates through MACC and other sources. I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture could give some information on this particular subject.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Question Period has a certain time limit and maybe I could refer to the member that we'd be able to debate this for the rest of the Session, the good things that have taken place in rural Manitoba over the past three years.

First though, Mr. Speaker, if the member is referring to the document of untruths put out by the newly diminished party of Manitoba, I read it as well, and I don't believe that what they have indicated there is true at all. We've removed the state farm program that was competition to the young farmers, replacing it with the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation direct lending program, to assist farmers with lower interest rates. As well, Mr. Speaker, some \$2 million to lease hopper cars to help move the grain out of Western Canada; several programs, Mr. Speaker, that have helped the farm communities.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake with a supplementary.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I know the honourable members opposite are not interested in listening to the answer from the Minister of Agriculture but I have a supplementary. And, Mr. Speaker, in this document it states also that the lack of co-operative drought relief in the cost price squeeze on farmers. I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture could explain very briefly by the way of informing honourable members opposite and to the people of Manitoba, just what was done by this government in regard to relief of the drought situation last summer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it's surely a question as to what the government has done in a particular area of programming is not an appropriate question for the Order Paper. And I would respectfully request, Mr. Speaker, that despite the levity in the Chamber, that we resume our business and that the question be declared out of order.

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The point raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster is well taken. Does the honourable member have a further question?

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order. You know, Mr. Speaker, I think that my questions are legitimate, number one. Secondly, why I say that, Mr. Speaker, when a document of this kind . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The point raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster was well taken. I hope that members will choose their questions wisely to seek information and I would hope that the dialogue, in fact the debate, almost that is being carried on, is one that is completely unnecessary at this time and the Question Period should be used to seek information from the Treasury Branch.

Does the Honourable Member have a final supplementary question?

MR. EINARSON: No, Mr. Speaker, if I may rise on — are you ruling on the point of order?

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the Minister of Agriculture is prepared to answer a lot of questions. Is the Minister of Agriculture today prepared to enunciate some program of assisting the hog producers of Manitoba, who he encouraged over the last two or three years to increase their production, because he was going to be able to solve their problems by marketing strategy of the government of Manitoba? Now that these producers are going broke, is he going to assist them, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Obviously members do not listen very well. The honourable member is debating rather than asking a question. Would the honourable member care to ask his question?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I specifically asked the Minister of Agriculture, is he prepared to make an announcement with respect to the hog industry in the Province of Manitoba, which has been in an desperate situation for a year-and-a-half. They are on the verge of bankruptcy and many producers have gone bankrupt. Is he prepared to help them?

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

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday to the member that I was prepared to meet with the hog producers, and I am not prepared today to make an announcement on the program.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has been prepared and has been meeting with hog producers over the last year. Mr. Speaker, was it not his department who had indicated to the hog producers . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If the honourable member has a question, he may ask a supplementary question now.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, did the Minister of Agriculture of this province, through his staff, indicate to the hog producers that Manitoba would be assisting those hog producers in a time of hard-times as they have faced over the last year, did his department not indicate that they would assist them?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question, in the absence of the Premier, is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he would tell us whether the national conference that was proposed on private pension funds is still scheduled for the end of March.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): I believe it is, Mr. Speaker, unless the member has some information from her Federal-Liberal counterparts, which I am not aware of, but the last I heard, which was a day or two ago, that conference was still on.

MS. WESTBURY: The only information I have is from the Federal Hansard, Mr. Speaker, in which questions were asked and answered a couple of weeks ago, and at that time . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the honourable member has a supplementary question she may proceed.

MS. WESTBURY: I was prefacing my question with a reply to the Minister's question. Mr. Speaker, would the Minister tell the House whether there has yet been appointed, by the Premier of Manitoba, a representative of the Cabinet specifically responsible for pension reform? In view of the fact that in the Federal Hansard a statement was made to the effect . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Orders of the Day . . . The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, was my question out of order as to whether a Minister has yet been appointed?

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member has a supplementary question she may ask it. (Interjection)— If the honourable member has a further supplementary question she may ask it.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, will somebody please tell me who will be representing the government at the National Conference on Private Pension Reform, and whether in fact . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, there is a Committee of Cabinet dealing with that situation and dealing with the preparation for the Conference, that we still believe is scheduled for the end of March.

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. I would like to know what action the government will be taking to deal with Canada's five largest banks' recent announcement that they have made record profits on the difference between their borrowing and lending rates; what action the government contemplates in this regard, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I know that the honourable member is concerned, as are many people concerned, with the impact of interest rates on people in our province, but he should realize that the question of jurisdiction over banks is not one that falls to the province.

MR. CORRIN: In that case, Mr. Speaker, accepting that, I would ask the Minister whether this government will press the Federal Government to enquire into the actions of the banks and other provincial lending institutions in this field, who may be profiting by the now record spread between their prime lending rate and the rate at which they lend money out to consumers, and the moneys of course that they pay on personal savings accounts? Is the Minister willing to make a commitment to ask the Federal Government to take some action?

MR. RANSOM: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I have already initiated action to try and get a better appreciation or understanding of what has taken place, because we do have a concern for the impact of the interest rates, and acknowledging that we have no direct jurisdictional responsibility, we do have a responsibility to understand the factors that are influencing people in Manitoba, and I have indeed asked for some information in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington with a final supplementary.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, given the government's ideological attachment to its sister government in Britain, the Thatcher Government, will the government press the Canadian Federal Government to impose excess profit taxes as have been imposed by the Thatcher Government this week in Britain? Will they ask for that sort of tax to be imposed on lending institutions in Canada?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, that assumes of course that there are excess profits, and I think the honourable member is perhaps jumping to a conclusion, Mr. Speaker, before there is an understanding of what is taking place. It's quite evident from the comments that the Leader of the Opposition is making from his seat that he does not wish to see any sort of investigation. He knows in his mind that the banks are making excess profits, because that is the understanding that those people have about the way this system operates, Mr. Speaker. I am not prepared to jump to that conclusion. I do think that the system should serve

the interests of the people of Manitoba and the people of Canada, and the question that the Honourable Member for Wellington has raised draws attention to a subject of great importance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member with a new question?

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's a new question. I haven't asked it before. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Finance whether he can acknowledge that the current spread between the banks' prime lending rate and interest rates on personal savings accounts, being now reported this week at five full percentage points, is not only double the average, but at a near record high in this particular area of Canadian finance? Can he acknowledge that, and would he, on the basis of that acknowledgement, indicate that there is good reason for Canadians and Manitobans to be concerned about this vital issue?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I listened very carefully to the question put forward by the Honourable Member for Wellington, and in fact it was not a question, it was a statement and I would have to rule it out of order.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Urban Affairs whether the three levels of government have finalized plans for the \$90 million core area initiative?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Speaker, we did meet, I did meet with Mayor Norrie and the Federal Minister last Friday morning. Since then we agreed, because of the requirements of Mr. Axworthy and the Mayor, to meet in Ottawa on Monday for a full day to review the proposals for spending within the core area initiative and a draft agreement, and I hope that that will be the final meeting that will be required of myself and the Mayor and the Federal Minister to put the agreement into final form.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister indicate, in view of the Mayor's remarks that he's looking for the biggest bang for the buck, is the list of major capital works going to include any provincial projects, or will there be an additional complementary list of provincial projects in addition to the \$90 million that is going to be expended?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there will be additional complementary spending by all three levels of government.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member with a final supplementary.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether one of the projects being considered is a replacement for the Amy Street Steam Plant with a newer technology?

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Education, and it follows up on his previous answers regarding the Greater Winnipeg education levy. Does the Minister of Education believe that the people of Transcona should pay for downtown municipal services like those associated with Trizec and the underground concourse at the corner of Portage and Main, while at the same time being deprived of getting access to any tax revenue generated by downtown projects like Trizec or the Richardson Building, or the Bank of Nova Scotia Building?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wants to discuss municipal affairs, he might address the Minister in charge of Municipal Affairs. If he wants to discuss education taxes, that's a different matter.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Minister of Education does not understand the relationship between school taxes and municipal taxes with respect to the Greater Winnipeg education levy. I'd like to ask him if he has done any homework in that respect; if he has looked into the history of the Greater Winnipeg education levy; if he can indicate that he has done his homework by indicating that the Greater Winnipeg equalization levy was set up as a means of providing compensation to suburban taxpayers who are paying extra for downtown municipal services, and as a result they were being given access to downtown assessment for school purposes?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I point out that the Question Period is a time for seeking information, not for making statements. The honourable member is seeking information. He may ask his question.

MR. PARASIUK: I'd like to ask if the Minister of Education has done his homework and determined the original basis of the Greater Winnipeg education levy, why it was established; can he tell us that, it's a very simple question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a considerable amount of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona with a final supplementary.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, then if the Minister has done his homework in this area, can he indicate whether in fact it was not the basis that the Greater Winnipeg education levy was set up to provide compensation for suburban taxpayers who were providing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Again, I must say the honourable member is debating rather than seeking information. If the honourable member has a question to seek information, he may proceed.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I would like to ask the Minister if he can indicate whether in fact the Greater Winnipeg equalization levy, and he can do

this by historical fact, it requires no debate on our part, my part or his part, can he indicate whether in fact government statements at the time would indicate whether the Greater Winnipeg equalization levy was set up as compensation for suburban taxpayers, who were paying extra for municipal services under Unicity, to get access to downtown assessment for purposes of school taxes? Can he indicate whether in fact that is the historical basis of the Greater Winnipeg education levy, which has now been cancelled?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, that may well have been the objective. However, the result was far from that and it caused all sorts of inequities in the metro area.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Minister of Finance, who obviously speaks for those people in stating that he is not satisfied or does not know whether or not there are excess profits indicated in the bank statements recently announced, whether, since he has instructed that a study be made, whether he's prepared to ensure that the study be completed very quickly and present the full information derived from that study to this House during his Estimates at the latest?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to conduct an inquiry on the scale that the Member for St. Johns obviously refers to. There are other means of making inquiries within one's department and without the department that does not necessarily involve the production of a report that would be tabled in the Legislature.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement by the Minister today indicating that he has concerns regarding the profits made by the banks, but refuses to consider them excess profits, is he prepared to inform us as to the result of whatever investigation, no matter how superficial it is, that he is making?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that having notified the members opposite that I did have concern and was prepared to make inquiries to satisfy myself as to what was going on and how the problem was being addressed, follows that I would be quite prepared subsequently to respond to that. I also have some faith, if I can use that term, that the Federal Government will very likely be looking at this situation themselves, given the past record of studies and investigations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a final supplementary.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Minister of Finance, who has indicated faith in the Federal Government's concern and viewing of this problem, whether he is himself carrying on any studies of any kind, superficial,

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

second-hand whatever, which he will be able to report to us at least or at the latest during his Estimates.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I can't assure the Honourable Member that it will be ready during my Estimates. My Estimates may very well be before this House rather shortly. I believe we're to follow with Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The honourable members opposite can better say how long that will be. The Member for St. John's has been a Minister and the Crown, Mr. Speaker, he certainly knows the sort of relationship that can exist, does exist between a Minister and a Deputy Minister and that questions are asked of staff, responses come back and the questions may lead to further questions, and it doesn't necessarily involve a point where yes, the question has now been answered. The responsibility for the area of control of banking lies with the Federal Government and there will be questions raised and perhaps the response will depend heavily on what we find out from the Federal Government and what the Federal Government's response is.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The time for Question Period has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed with Bill 13, then Bill 8, then Bill 27 and then go into Supply to deal with Interim Supply.

But first, Mr. Speaker, I might for the information of the House, advise the House as to the proposed calling of Committees for the next three weeks, which I think will pretty well complete the calling of Committees, Mr. Speaker.

Next Tuesday, Public Utilities Committee at 10:00 a.m. will be March 17th, to deal with Manitoba Telephone System. On Thursday, March 29th at 10:00 a.m. to deal with Autopac. That would be the Public Utilities Committee and the Public Utilities would meet if necessary on Friday afternoon at 2:00 p.m. to complete consideration of the Manitoba Telephone System or Autopac if they haven't been completed.

The following week the Committee on Economic Development Committee will meet on Tuesday, March 24th at 10:00 a.m. and Thursday at 10:00 a.m. if necessary, to consider McKenzie Seeds and ManFor. On Tuesday March 31st, and if necessary Thursday, April 2nd at 10:00 a.m. and Friday, April 3rd, at 2:00 p.m. the Public Utilities Committee will meet to consider Manitoba Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, could we now proceed with the calling of Bill 13.

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 13 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE REAL PROPERTY ACT AND THE REGISTRY ACT

MR. MERCIER presented Bill No. 13, an Act to amend The Real Property Act and The Registry Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to The Real Property Act and The Registry Act in this Bill are in the nature of housekeeping amendments, however, Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member for Inkster will be pleased to note that we have acted on his advice that a more simplified form of mortgage sale advertisement be permitted. Mr. Speaker, he may or may not have received a notice from the Land Titles Office that went out to members of the legal profession late in the month of February which indicates that as a result of a review that we have held a number of changes will be put into place with a review to reducing the cost of advertising while maintaining the effectiveness of same. If any members are interested in receiving a copy of that notice, Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to provide them with it. For example, the notice for properties generally and this will cover most properties, will simply require a street address and comprise all of the land mentioned in a certificate of title number.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have also gone further in that subsection 131 of The Real Property Act which now requires the advertisement to be published for three successive weeks is being amended in this Bill to require that there need be only one advertisement in a newspaper. We have consulted with and acted on advice received from the Real Property subsection of the Manitoba Branch of the Canadian Bar Association that three publications were excessive. The advice we received was that persons who are interested in these matters will note the first advertisement and the additional advertisements merely represent an unnecessary cost factor. That is on the basis too, Mr. Speaker, that the advertisement would be done sufficiently far enough in advance to give sufficient notice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are new definitions in this Bill with respect to Crown Reserves and Public Reserves. The amendments reflect the fact that all instruments presented for registration are now assigned a serial number which determines priority of registration. Heretofore priority of registration had been determined by the day, hour, and minute of filing. The use of the serial number permits the use of more than one cash register. These amendments will apply to both The Real Property Act and The Registry Act. The amendments will dispense with the requirement that the duplicate of original mortgage be filed and registration of the discharge of the mortgage where the Court orders that the mortgage be discharged or the Registrar General orders a discharge of the mortgage.

The amendments require all owners of land included in a plan of subdivision to sign the plan unless the Municipal Board otherwise orders. The amendments permit assignments of caveats, previously ownership of caveat interest may not be transferred in a schedule, is attached to the amendment setting out the form of the assignment. There are amendments to schedule (e) which clears up an error in the form. There is a new schedule (f) provides a new form for a memorandum of mortgage to conform with more modern methods of mortgage lending. To ensure, Mr. Speaker, I think that there is no confusion, we're not attempting to put into this

Legislation the new simplified form of mortgage that the Law Reform Commission recommended in their recommendation, Mr. Speaker, indicated that they had not examined the full legalities of their form and so that proposed form is under review.

Mr. Speaker, I think I've briefly covered the form of the amendments which as I've indicated in the beginning were more in the nature of housekeeping amendments.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased with the quick response and I don't often have occasion to say this, but I must say that I'm pleased with the quick response that the Attorney-General has shown with respect to the problem which obviously became a larger problem with the larger number of foreclosures, and also, Mr. Speaker, became a human interest story associated with the closing of the Winnipeg Tribune, because the combination of those things resulted in a windfall profit. If I may say to the Minister of Finance, maybe the alternative to what the Attorney-General has done would have been to apply a windfall profit tax on the Winnipeg Free Press in particular with respect to mortgage foreclosure advertisements, but seriously speaking I would hope that the Free Press would rather have less revenue and less foreclosures. But since the foreclosures are obviously going to continue, the Minister indicating that the ad will be cut down considerably, and I would like to see a copy of the ad, if he wouldn't mind getting it over to me, and furthermore reducing the number of advertisements will, in my view, result in a saving of considerable expense, which has no productive value. It's all right to expend moneys when you can show that something is coming for it, but I would think that the amount that was being expended for these ads, both in their size and in their number, would certainly justify what has been done.

I tell the Minister I would like to see a copy of the advertisement. I also say that I think that the response has been quick. I believe I asked the question on the first day of the Session that we were permitted to ask questions in December, and if the reaction has been that we now have some progress along that direction, then I certainly think, Mr. Speaker, that shows a good response.

There is one feature that the Minister mentioned to this Bill, which could prove interesting, Mr. Speaker, and although it rarely happens, the fact is priority of registration could sometimes be crucial. The Minister of Finance will know of a case in which I was involved in which land in Red Rock Lake was going to be sold, and I think that I got to the Land Titles Office minutes before the transfer was to be registered and filed a caveat which changed things. Using the serial numbers certainly permits priority to be established by a serial number, but it doesn't guarantee priority will be established by the time that you got to the Land Titles Office, because if you use two cash registers, the chances are, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection)— Unless the Minister tells me that the computer will work it out differently. Is it possible that one person could be at one cash register, the other one be at another cash register, and a person earlier in time could get a later serial number? Because if that's the case, then even in the rare occasions when it happens, Mr. Speaker, it could be very crucial to the people who are registering the documents.

Now if what the Minister is saying that the serial numbers will spit out of those two cash registers in sequence which are co-ordinated with the time that the person is making it, then I could see that the present system of priorities will remain. But if it doesn't, then is it going to be conceivable for a person to be at one cash register and get an earlier serial number than someone who is at the other cash register ahead of him? Because right now the sequence is if you are standing in line, then you will have priority in accordance with the line that you are standing in. Perhaps the Minister could give us more information on that when we get to committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't expected to participate in the debate so soon, but in view of the fact that the Leader of the Progressive Party and the Honourable Attorney-General are waltzing together as a duenna, I wish to put on record, Mr. Speaker, my shock that the Attorney-General of Manitoba has with such great haste moved to fill what he obviously thought was such a horrible inequity perpetrated on Manitoba residents.

I agree, Mr. Speaker, that to some extent it was unfair, but we should remember, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a problem that presented to mortgage borrowers. These high advertising costs that are complained about by the Member for Inkster were not really a problem for mortgage borrowers, rather, Mr. Speaker, it was a problem for mortgage lenders. It was the people, Mr. Speaker, who provided . . . Mr. Speaker, it's the cost of the advertisement. (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says, "What if you want to redeem?" Let him look at the mortgage foreclosure statistics in this province over the past five years, and I'll soon review them, Mr. Speaker. Let him look at those figures with the Attorney-General . . .

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member would address his remarks to the Chair, I would appreciate it. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I hope that your admonition would also extend to the Member for Inkster who shouted and interrupted my remarks.

I presume, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Inkster is not accorded special status by the government any more, is he?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The honourable member has made a pretty serious allegation about the operation of this Chamber and I wish he would consider it very seriously. Maybe he would like to withdraw the remark he made.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I thought I only suggested and I will confer with the Hansard record, but I thought I was only suggesting that I perceived some favour on the part of the government, not on you. It was not a reflection on you, Mr. Speaker. I think I used the words, the government, and a disposition on the part of the government to be supportive and "friendly" towards my friend from Inkster. I don't think that there is anything

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

unparliamentary in that suggestion, Mr. Speaker. I think that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Member for Wellington, when you said that he should address the Chair, you said you should address the same remarks to the Member for Inkster, and then suggested that there should be no favourable treatment to the Member for Inkster. So he put it in that context; perhaps he doesn't remember, but he can read it in Hansard and see it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I leave it to you. I would suggest that we should review the Hansard transcript, and on consulting it we'll deal with the matter. Obviously there seems to be some dispute as to what was actually said or perhaps even what was inferred, and in all fairness to all parties, I think we should have consideration of the transcripts.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It has been customary in parliamentary . . . when things are brought to a member's attention, if there was no intended slight, the member traditionally has apologized. Should the member not wish to apologize at this time, and withdraw his remarks, there are other avenues that then must be taken.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to indicate that there was no conscious effort on my part nor was there any intention to slight you, if that is your concern. I can say, Mr. Speaker, as well and unequivocally that I do believe there is a very close relationship between the Member for Inkster and the government and if that's unparliamentary, I will gladly leave this Chamber on your wish, because I believe it to be true. I believe that to be a fact.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has apologized to the Chair. He may now continue with his remarks. (Interjection)— Order please. We can only have one speaker on the floor at a time.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: I think the Member for Inkster is finished now, Mr. Speaker, may I proceed? I don't know that this is a point of order or just a diatribe — (Interjection)— he seems to be greatly agitated.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the honourable member would address the subject matter at hand, we may proceed with the Business of the House.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you once again, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, I feel that if the government was motivated to show its good faith with mortgage borrowers, with people who are afflicted with this problem, the problem of high interest rates, the problem of a sluggish economy, people who are unable to meet their loan commitments, then the

government could have done that in many ways; but, Mr. Speaker, in immediately seizing the suggestion of the Member for Inkster and simply going about the simplification of the mortgage advertisement form, the form that appears in the newspaper, you have what has to be described only, with respect, as a most tepid palliative. The Member for Inkster suggests that this will help people who wish to redeem their properties; it will decrease their legal costs in redeeming property.

Well, Mr. Speaker, how many people who are actually confronted with an auction sale, actually redeem it? I practiced law, Mr. Speaker, for a decade and I can tell you I think it's almost a matter of record, that people whose loans fall into those sorts of arrears because, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about people whose defaults are usually in the nature of four to five months, when we're talking auction sale, we're talking four to five months in monthly installment default. People in that position, Mr. Speaker, are not likely to be able to redeem their property. So really what the Honourable Member is doing, Mr. Speaker, is providing relief to the poor afflicted credit grantor, the lender, the person who has to pay the Winnipeg Free Press or whatever newspaper in the community, to advertise the fact that there will be a mortgage sale at a specific auction room on a specific date, subject to a reserved bid which will cover that person's advertising costs, legal costs, all the interest, the cost of the sale and all the other accumulated default that has built up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is this really a reform? Is this an initiative? The government wants to take credit and they've seized on the opportunity obviously to do this, as some evidence of their real commitment to the poor, downtrodden, much assailed consumer and borrower. Mr. Speaker, there are so many better ways of approaching the problem, so many better ways. Why don't they grapple with the problem we were dealing with during the Question Period? High interest rates. The question of whether banks are charging too much on their lending rates. Now that's a real problem, Mr. Speaker.

When we know that there's a five percent difference as between the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We are dealing with a bill. I wish the honourable member would stick with the subject matter of the bill before us.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's all within the subject matter because the bill is talking about the ways of simplifying the approach to mortgage foreclosure and reducing costs for people who are affected by mortgaged foreclosure proceedings. So what I'm saying is that it would be better to grapple with the real problems. Let's not look simply at the symptoms, Mr. Speaker, let's look at the real problems. The real problems are the ones that affect the people whose houses are being lost; those are the people who have a problem, not the Royal Bank of Canada or the Toronto Dominion Bank. Mr. Speaker, those chartered banks have the highest profits in the history of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has the subject matter before him. I wish he would address the subject matter of the bill.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. PETER FOX: I believe we are discussing foreclosures in this bill and this delegates very many areas. There are very many facets to why there are foreclosures, and the amendment only addresses itself to one particular area. So I do believe the Member for Wellington is on a point of order in respect to the bill itself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will try and direct myself more specifically to the mortgage foreclosure problem because you know, the government has done some research on this subject. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, although it wasn't tabled in the House, I've come into possession of a very fine report that was prepared by the — and I will table it although the government has failed to do so — prepared by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, dated May 8th, 1980, and it was submitted to the board of that corporation, it was, it's right on the front. It's signed by Mr. Fileccia, Mr. Mr. Shade and Mr. Schubert, all of whom are Senior Administrative Officers of the Housing Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the honourable member can tell me if we're dealing with The Landlord and Tenant Act, I understand that we're dealing with Bill No. 13 and the report he's referring to, I fail to see where it ties in with the bill that we're dealing with.

The Honourable Member for Wellington may proceed.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention — I know that you're not privy to these reports as Speaker when they're not tabled in the House, but I can indicate that the chapter I'm reading from is entitled Mortgage Defaults and deals very specifically with that particular problem in the Province of Manitoba and more specifically with the problem as it presents in Winnipeg. For that matter, Mr. Speaker, it goes into some detail providing us with the numbers of mortgage foreclosures in the city and province and it does so in some depth and perspective.

Mr. Speaker, we didn't know, but we're alarmed to find out that between the years 1973 and 1979, there was a 300 percent increase in the number of mortgage foreclosures in the Province of Manitoba. Now that struck me as somewhat alarming. It struck me alarming that in 1979 in Winnipeg alone, there were some 614 mortgage foreclosures, as compared to some 260 in 1973; 154 in 1974 and 197 in 1975, and I might add in 1976, 171. So we have a situation that under the tenure of this government, we've had a dramatic increase and in fairness we should mention 1978, which was 444 in the City of Winnipeg. So we've had a dramatic escalation in the incidence of this particular problem and I suppose to be fair again, we should indicate that just in the months of — and those are dealing with orders for sale, Mr. Speaker, those are actually full-term

mortgage foreclosures — in 1980 I know that in the months of January and February alone we had 412 notices of sale and some 175 orders for sale. So times six, Mr. Speaker, six times 175, you can see that we're going to have a very dramatic appreciation again in the number of mortgage foreclosures in 1980 over 1979 and 1978, which were, Mr. Speaker, already record years. The government, Mr. Speaker, has indeed set a record with respect to some economic indicators.

Mr. Speaker, I can indicate that the full effect of inflation in the interest rate increases has not been felt, and this was the concern of the reporting staff to the board; they noted that because of the time lag between notices of sale and property auctions, the full impact of 1979 inflation and interest rate increases had not been felt in terms of foreclosure numbers. So what they were projecting, Mr. Speaker, was again a dramatic increase in the number of mortgage defaults in Manitoba and Winnipeg.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that in view of the distressing situation in this regard we have looked, and we will continue to look to the government to do something more substantial about this very pressing problem. Simply by reducing the cost to the lender, Mr. Speaker, we don't regard this as a reform. It may indeed, a small percentage of borrowers may be helped if they are able to redeem, there may be the odd one, but most of the people who will be affected and most of the people whose position will be bettered will be the lenders; that is the class of people whose position is being bettered.

So, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this bill I can say that we don't regard it as a major initiative. We're disappointed that the government, for instance, didn't do something about the time limits upon which a person can redeem his or her property from foreclosure. It is possible, Mr. Speaker, by legislation to extend those limits in such a way that a lender could not put a mortgage into foreclosure as quickly. Now, Mr. Speaker, this may have been, in view of high interest rates, this may have been a reform. It may have worked as an assistance to those people who are marginally underincomed, unable to deal with the inflating economy; it would have assisted those people to keep their heads above water; it would have been a worthwhile legislative reform, certainly worth looking at, certainly worth considering. Now there, Mr. Speaker, some support may have been evinced from members on this side.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, if there was legislation to deal with the problem of usuriously high interest rates in this province introduced in this bill, again members on this side would be, I think, very supportive, particularly as a result of what we now know about bank profits over the first quarter of this year.

Mr. Speaker, there surely are other ways to address this distressing problem. I don't think the government has demonstrated a real commitment to improving the situation of homeowners in this province. I might also add that there was legislation in this province, I believe, that allowed governments to not impose a moratorium, but allowed governments to extend payment periods on defaulted credit agreements or arrangements. I am trying to remember the name of the legislation that was introduced during the depression, it was a piece

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

of legislation that set up a provincial board that had the responsibility of reviewing the cases and situations of various debtors who were unable to sustain their credit relations. So the board could extend the time for payment of a given credit arrangement. They could extend time for payment by one month or two months or three months, or they could also, Mr. Speaker, mitigate by way of reducing the monthly installment due to the lender.

Now that, Mr. Speaker, although it may not be appropriate in all circumstances, was deemed to be appropriate in the depression. I'm not sure that things are as bad in Manitoba as they were then, Mr. Speaker, in the dirty thirties, and I'm sure it would be very difficult for anybody to suggest that they had reached that rock bottom level. But Mr. Speaker, there is considerable evidence that this is an economy that's in a very serious down cycle. Now some will refer to it as a recession, others will refer to it in other ways; they will use euphemisms that amount to admissions that the economy is unhealthy and ailing.

Mr. Speaker, we have to look at ways to deal with this, and if we're not going to do positive things, affirmative things, that will incentive the commercial private sector, if we're not going to do something that will create jobs, something that will increase commercial activity within the province then, Mr. Speaker, we have to look at ways of protecting people who are being . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have given the honourable member a great deal of latitude. I hope he would direct his remarks to the subject matter of the bill before us.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Well going back, Mr. Speaker, I respect what you've said and I will try and address myself more specifically to the subject of mortgage defaults and the consequences of such occurrences. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, and I think I'm reasonably well informed on the real estate market in this city anyway, I can tell you that there has been a serious loss of confidence among investors of residential real estate, and that includes apartment units.

Mr. Speaker, prices of residential property are deflated throughout the city, there has been a lack of commercial activity, the supply-demand situation is simply not working. There is every indication, Mr. Speaker, that mortgage foreclosures and the incidence of mortgage foreclosures caused by inflation and high interest rates is having a very serious impact on that sector of the economy. People are not building, they're not building because they know that the consumer is not willing to take the chance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may, the question related to mortgage foreclosure proceedings in the Act is a reference to reduction in the number of times for advertising. I think, with all due respect to the Member for Wellington, that his remarks do not pertain to the subject matter of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: I think, on second reading, Mr. Speaker, we have always allowed ourselves to address the concept of the bill; that is part of the parliamentary process. I concur with my friend that we should try and restrict our remarks to mortgage default and foreclosure because that is a concept which is inherent in the bill, but Mr. Speaker, I can't suggest that it's not on the table when my honourable friend, and former colleague from Inkster, was discussing the question of mortgage foreclosure, the Honourable Minister didn't chide him or attempt to bring him to order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on the point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order. I have no objection to the member babbling on nonsense for his full 40 minutes. But to suggest that what I said made what he is saying in order goes too far, Mr. Speaker, and on that I do rise on a point of order.

The Minister indicated that a simple step was being taken, he was not talking about the reform or protection of mortgage borrowers, he said that the ad is going to be simplified and it's only going to be required once. He did not put this forward as a suggestion of saving borrowers money. The member is now talking as if this ad, in principle, is designed to prevent foreclosures in the Province of Manitoba. Now I have no objection to hearing it but what I do object to is him saying that my remarks, directly to the point of the bill, make his remarks in order. Because the statistics that he is using are statistics that I brought to the attention of this House two years in succession, and sometimes in contravention to what my learned friend at that time was saying.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has repeatedly been asked to stick to the subject matter before us in debate. I would hope that he would confine his remarks to the area that is included in the bill and carry on in that manner.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have almost concluded my remarks. I didn't intend to go my full 40 minutes, as it was put by the Member for Inkster. Sometimes one wonders, Mr. Speaker, who in fact is the official Government House Leader. We have obviously a slightly distinguished position between . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. If the honourable member does not wish to carry on debate on this bill I will call the question.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Yes. One grows tired of dealing with the red-green access, Mr. Speaker, so I will conclude my . . .

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

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, it's such a simple principle and it has been discussed a number

of times, it isn't intended to solve all the problems. As pointed out by the Member for Wellington, there are serious problems in the mortgage field, interest rates and all the rest of it. But this is but a housekeeping bill and I, for one, would like to see the bill go to committee and be dealt with so that we can get on with the business of the House and deal with these pressing problems that are doubtless causing us all concern.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Then we will proceed with Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Garnishment Act, standing in the name of The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Could we have Bill No. 8 and No. 27 stand, please. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Government Services that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. As I indicated earlier, it's for the purpose of dealing with Interim Supply.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): Committee will come to order, Interim Supply.

Resolve that a sum not exceeding \$673,466,010, being 30 percent of the amount of the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1982, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1982 — pass — the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, first I would ask the Minister of Finance if he could undertake to request that the Minister responsible for Flyer be present in order to deal with some questions during this particular bill when it reaches Committee of the Whole. —(Interjection)— Yes, in Manitoba Development Corporation, its predecessor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I'll make known the Leader of the Opposition's desire to that end. I believe that the company has already been discussed

in committee. I certainly will draw that to the Minister's attention.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, we have a number of matters to raise, and I would think it would be better that the Minister be here in order to deal with the specific questions which are geared towards obtaining information, and it's not that the matter could have been dealt with in Committee, it's pursuant to information received since, on my part, that I would like to question the Minister on, and I think the Minister of Finance could expedite matters if he could provide us with that kind of commitment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Interim Supply — pass — the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, we have noticed the increasing sensitivity of the Minister of Finance and other of his colleagues pertaining to statistics. And it is interesting, Mr. Chairman, that sensitivity is particularly relating to the matter of Conference Board statistics. Suddenly we have reached a stage where it is questionable, one's use of Conference Board statistics.

Mr. Chairman, on April 26th, 1979, it's interesting to note that one that is now employed in a position with this government as a communicator, one Mr. Harry Mardon, in the Winnipeg Tribune, used Conference Board statistics with great relish to demonstrate, and I quote, "The political opponents of Premier Sterling Lyon have endeavoured to portray Manitoba's economic backwater since the Tories took power 18 months ago. But the facts as assembled by the Non-political Conference Board in Canada show quite the opposite." Now later, three, four months, later when the statistics didn't work out, they were too generous in their forecasts, the same Mr. Mardon described those statistics as belonging to the doom cryers of the Conference Board in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak about the issue of the economy. I am going to discuss the lack of economic growth; job creation; the diminishing of population in the Province of Manitoba; the exodus of Manitobans from this province during the term of the present government. Mr. Chairman, discussion of this order I believe is quite in order at this time in view of the circumstances that we are dealing with.

In 1977 the expectation that was aroused by way of commitments; by way of promises, repeated many times by the First Minister and those that now sit in positions of power, was to the effect that there would be a blossoming, a blooming of the economy; that there would be, in the vision of the First Minister who sometimes has some visions, and indeed had a vision just prior to the 11th of October, 1977, a vision of additional job security for young people in this province; has indeed been demonstrated by the past three-and-a-half years of practise. It has been demonstrated that their forecasts now being examined demonstrates that this government has been a complete failure, a total failure insofar as economic development in this province.

Mr. Chairman, that —(Interjection)— Yes, the Minister of Transportation says dream world. Mr. Chairman, the First Minister, the members of the Conservative Government of Manitoba, the colleagues including the Minister of Transportation

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

have lived in a dream world, Mr. Chairman, for the past three-and-a-half years. Mr. Chairman, what we on our side are going to say to the people of the Province of Manitoba, let's cease our dreaming, let's move into the world of reality, let's get Manitoba moving.

Mr. Chairman, during the period 1978, 1979, 1980, we were repeatedly being reassured, in fact, Mr. Chairman, the 1978 Throne Speech reads, and I quote, "The initial steps to recovery have already been taken in Manitoba". 1978, the initial steps to recovery have already been taken in Manitoba — 1978, Mr. Chairman. 1979, Budget Speech, "We can point with a sense of real accomplishment to growing evidence that a turnabout is taking place", — 1979, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, of course they are ideologists. They believe their own words. They have lived, as the Minister of Transportation indicated only a few moments ago, in a world of dreamland. 1980, Mr. Chairman, they even became very poetic in their Budget Speech. They said, and I quote, "Our economy is back on track," after two years, now they are announcing in 1980 the economy is back on track. And do you know what they also went on to say, Mr. Chairman, — please note this, Mr. Chairman — they said, "And there are blue skies ahead." Blue skies ahead, Mr. Chairman, three years of message to the people of Manitoba; three years of attempt to hoodwink the people of the Province of Manitoba; but the problem is, Mr. Chairman, the people of Manitoba will not be hoodwinked by this government or any other group of individuals. The people of Manitoba I have confidence in, Mr. Chairman, will not be hoodwinked by that kind of sing-song that we've heard for three years from members across the way.

Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised because by this time, Mr. Chairman, we know that members across the way live in the world of unreality. But I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that they would have by this time recognized the fact there's been an increase in bankruptcies; I would have thought that rather than coming in and dealing with procedures relating to foreclosure that they might indeed bring into this Legislature, at an early point, and they should have done in back in 1980, 1979 — measures in order to ensure confidence in the small business community of this province to reduce the number of foreclosures in the Province of Manitoba, rather than whining in this Chamber about simplified procedures in order to streamline foreclosure procedure in the Province of Manitoba. Let's see some action from members across the way rather than whining.

And job creation, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this clearly in this Chamber that I, for one, am proud of the work in industry that's been done by the Member for Brandon East. The Member for Brandon East put together a booklet which is entitled, "Decline of Manitoba Economy Under the Conservative Government". That booklet was not hidden; it was widely distributed throughout Manitoba; it was distributed to the small business community, to municipal officials, to Chambers of Commerce and to others in Manitoba. Do you know what I understand, Mr. Chairman, that those that are committed to Conservative ideology within the economics area of the Province of Manitoba have gone through this

booklet, desperately, Mr. Chairman, desperately trying to pick holes in the good work that the Member for Brandon East has done? Do you know, Mr. Chairman, what they have come up with? They have come up with zilch, because of the industry and effort by the Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Chairman, I understand full well why members are so sensitive when the Member for Brandon East rises from his chair and brings to the attention of this Chamber the magnitude of the failure on the part of that government across the way to deal with the real economic problems confronting Manitoba at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, you may not like the information the Member for Brandon East has brought to you but what he has brought to you is fact, and don't think for a moment that you are going to eliminate the fact by trying to destroy the messenger; the fact is there.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Brandon East pointed out what has happened in respect to population under this Conservative government; the Member for Brandon East has pointed out what has happened by way of economic growth under this Conservative administration. Here it is very interesting, because our friends across the way love to say, ah, but we are victims of forces beyond our control. Now we are hearing that excuse. For three years we heard that things were going to turn around or that the economy wasn't really as bad as people in the Province of Manitoba might think but just hold on, just hold on to your seats, everything will improve. Now they are telling us, ah, but the problem is the Federal Government; the problem is international forces.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague and I won't be sidetracked on this matter, but I say thank God, for equalization payments. Our colleagues across the way and this Conservative government don't want to see equalization payments entrenched in the Constitution of the Province of Manitoba. I can see Alberta taking that position; I can even see Saskatchewan not being concerned about that; but, Mr. Chairman, for the government, Her Majesty's Government of the Province of Manitoba to be adopting that position. Mr. Chairman, I'm sure it turns the insides of any thinking Manitoban that our government would adopt such a position. But, Mr. Chairman, during the most interesting and valid analysis that the Member for Brandon East has undertaken, and one that has not for a moment been disproven, is the fact that during the period of this government, three years from 1977 to 1980, Manitoba's rate as a percentage of Canada's rate of economic growth — 9.1 percent, compared to 79.1 percent, 1970 to 1977.

So although the economic picture may have worsened in Canada, although it may have been worsening throughout most of the western world, it is worsened to a greater extent in the Province of Manitoba. That is the key factor that must be analyzed pertaining to this government's record while being in office. Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance will probably get up as his predecessor did and say, when questioned by these statistics, Oh well you should take the final two years of the NDP government or the final three years of the NDP government and compare them with our first two years, or first three years of our government. Mr.

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

Chairman, compare any last two years or last three years or last four years, any three years you wish; I challenge you to do that, the answer will be the same, Mr. Chairman. This Conservative Government has been an abysmal failure insofar as economic management in the Province of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to deal over length about this government, because this government is day by day destroying itself insofar as its credibility is concerned. I could discuss out migration; I could discuss housing starts; I could discuss the retail sales, the picture is the same throughout. This government, the most innovative program that they've come up with is a program to advertise to Manitobans to do what? To stay in Manitoba; to stay in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I would have been ashamed. Ashamed for a moment, many many a moment, if we had ever launched a program, during the time that we served in government, pleading with the people of the Province of Manitoba to stay in Manitoba. If we were so bankrupt of ideas; if we so lacklustre as a government; if we so non-innovative as a government that all we could do to try and turn the economy of this province around was to advertise and plead with Manitobans to stay in Manitoba.

And you know the Minister of Economic Development, if he was here, he would be saying your doom and gloom guise. Mr. Chairman, the Manitobans are not of doom and gloom. If they have any doom and gloom, that doom and gloom is about the type of government that exists presently in the Province of Manitoba and they will be soon doing something about that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, what we have seen is a wholesale retreat from different positions taken by members across the way. We've seen them retreat on property tax credit. Why it was only in 1976 that the former Minister of Finance was going to wipe out the program. We've seen them run with tail between their legs when it comes to Autopac. They spent \$300,000 on a commission to investigate Autopac; then they politely ignored the recommendations of the commission. Mr. Chairman, we don't trust this government because it may only be a temporary retreat from their traditional position with respect to Autopac.

Mineral development; they talked about the heavy hand of government being involved in mineral development; now they've done full-scale retreat. They're introducing government equity into mineral development in the Province of Manitoba, despite those long repeated words about the heavy hand of government.

Tax deficit financing. Mr. Chairman, we expected a balanced budget by this time; a balanced budget or a surplus, a surplus, Mr. Chairman, because these were efficient business managers. These were the people, not only were they going to turn the economy of the Province of Manitoba around, but they were going to balance the books. They were going to balance the books and, Mr. Chairman, what we've observed in the past three years have been large deficits and we see no plan of operation in order to reduce those large deficits. Mr. Chairman, we, unlike the members across the way, have never pretended that in any particular given year it's unwise to run a deficit. But the members across the

way suggested in 1977 that this is part and parcel of a fundamental tenet of their party. They betrayed that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of areas that should be undertaken and I want to deal now with some of the positive features that a positive government would undertake in order to bring about some oxygen into the economy of this Province of Manitoba so we could ensure that there would be job creation and opportunity for our young people, which we haven't seen for the past three-and-a-half years.

Mr. Chairman, the philosophic differential between the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party is straightforward. The New Democratic Party recognizes the role of government in order to bring about the stimulation of the economy during times when the economy ought to be stimulated. The problem confronting honourable members across the way is that during their early period, when they assumed government, so hung up by radical doctrinaire views that government must withdraw, government must withdraw. Oh, Mr. Chairman, if there's anybody that is radical in this province, radical and right wing, it has been the record of this government. Withdrawal, they withdrew economic activity as a government. They said, Mr. Chairman, that they were putting the private sector on trial. We remember those words, Mr. Chairman, government was going to withdraw, the private sector would be placed on trial. Oh those were strong words, Mr. Chairman. So what we witnessed in the Province of Manitoba was a net reduction in investment in Manitoba, total investment in Manitoba. It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that we are now in the situation which we're presently witnessing in Manitoba. We are in that position because this government does not accept any basic role for government in the management of the affairs of the economy of the Province of Manitoba. That is the difference, Mr. Chairman, between their approach and our approach.

Mr. Chairman, when indeed the economy does slip, and certainly it has slipped in Canada, throughout the world in the past two or three years, that is the time that government must become more positive, more assertive insofar as developing programs of an innovative nature in order to turn the economy around. Mr. Chairman, it was not the time, as this government did in the fall of 1977, to freeze all hospital and personal care home construction in Manitoba. They froze hospital and personal care home construction; they exercised restraint when it came to post-secondary education, other programs pertaining to education; other matters pertaining to northern development. There was a wholesale restraint program which was embarked upon by this government, and now of course, Mr. Chairman, you have, with an election coming up, a sudden change in pattern on their part. But what is taking place, Mr. Chairman, that we have a group of individuals across the way that call themselves the government of the Province of Manitoba that are better political managers than they are economic managers in the Province of Manitoba and that's what is wrong, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, there is much housing that should have been examined and developed. Mr. Chairman,

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

there is senior citizen housing; there is housing for low income families; that was discontinued by this government, by way of its pulling back from economic activity; the Critical Home Repair Program, the job creation programs of various kinds and types were withdrawn by this government during a critical time in the life of this government.

Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied, I am not at all satisfied that this government did what it could have done pertaining to Manitoba Hydro. I know that in 1979, when the Member for Churchill brought into this House a resolution calling for the immediate resumption and orderly development of hydro generation work on the Nelson, government members across the way voted to a man against that resolution. But, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we would have been better off in the past three years if we would have had some increased activity on the part of this Minister's predecessor, in order to undertake the development of firm contracts south of the border over the past three years, so that we could have increased the export of hydro from the Province of Manitoba, so we could have brought about further Manitoba generation, rather than what we have witnessed three years, three years of projection, it may still take place, we'll be examining it carefully when it comes forward, of a western connection. They dropped efforts in order to bring about increased sale of hydro south of the border; they dropped efforts in order to try to bring about firm contract sales in Minnesota and elsewhere south of the border. Well for three years, for three years since we first heard of this, Mr. Chairman, they have been working on a western connection involving Saskatchewan and Alberta; three years, Mr. Chairman, that I believe were lost to Manitobans, lost to Manitobans.

Mr. Chairman, also by way of economic development, rather than to have sold out their interest, their option in Tantalum, which has cost the people of Manitoba dearly; rather than to have diluted their interest in Trout Lake, copper mine near Flin Flon, which again has cost Manitobans dearly; rather than have given away interests and, Mr. Chairman, we are at some disadvantage here because it's very difficult of course to obtain any information from this government, but on the potash development in St. Lazare. Mr. Chairman, one of the principle platforms of the next New Democratic Party government will be to maximize public participation in mineral development in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, we need only look to Saskatchewan. One-quarter to one-third of the revenues received by the Saskatchewan budget received from potash development. I can recall, Mr. Chairman, when potash was advanced in the Province of Saskatchewan as the area for public investment. There were those in Saskatchewan that fought it tooth and nail, tooth and nail, the Conservatives in the Province of Saskatchewan. This was socialism; this was alien, alien to our way of life. Mr. Chairman, Saskatchewan has demonstrated that there is a place for government in public participation in the development of mineral resources along with the private sector in order to ensure that there's maximum return for all the people in any given jurisdiction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has 3 minutes.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, do I have your ruling that I'm limited to 40 minutes, I thought that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thirty minutes. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition is limited to, as all members are limited to, 30 minute speeches in committee. You may speak as often as you like, but each speech is limited to 30 minutes.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that I'll be making more speeches before this matter leaves the committee.

Mr. Chairman, what is most disappointing and has concerned my colleagues for quite some time, is that this is a province which depends to a great deal upon the business community, the private small family business in Manitoba. And yet during three years of this government, if there is one government, Mr. Chairman, that has let down the small business community in a major way in Manitoba, it has been the Conservative Government in Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, you read, and I'm sure we all read, the comments by one in last Saturday's Free Press, which I say describes the thinking of more and more in the small business community in the Province of Manitoba, a Mr. Mitchell, in fact in my own constituency. Mr. Chairman, I don't know how Mr. Mitchell, I can tell members honestly I don't know how he votes. I think a couple of years ago he might have been sympathetic to the government, but obviously no more is he sympathetic. When he told the reporter for the Winnipeg Free Press, I received assistance from this government, but boy did I ever find out what kind of assistance they gave me under that Manitoba Enterprise Program. Then he went on to say, this was quite a note from a government that was supposed to be the friend of the small business community, did they ever stick it to me.

Mr. Chairman, I find that more and more small business people are saying to me, and my colleagues report the same, that more and more small business people are saying; we thought this government were our friends, but the last three-and-one-half years, if there's ever been a government that has stuck it to us, it's been the Federal Government in Ottawa and the Provincial Government under Sterling Lyon in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, that's what we're hearing more and more of because the small, and my colleagues say quite correctly, what's the difference?

Mr. Chairman, what we are going to point out more and more and let this be clear, is that that there is no basic difference between the Conservative and Liberal Parties when it comes to economic approaches, not only in Manitoba but in Ottawa. Do you think that for a moment, Mr. Chairman, that it matters that the Prime Minister of this country now is Pierre Elliot Trudeau rather than Joe Clark? It's one that is in and the other is out. But, Mr. Chairman, what this government has lacked insofar as the small business community is a strategy in order to ensure that retail sales are increased and there is some remedial efforts pertaining to interest rates in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, I know that you're looking at the clock. I will be continuing further to point out . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's time has expired.

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add to the words that have been uttered by my leader with respect to the number one problem facing the people of Manitoba and facing the Government of Manitoba today and that is the serious state of our economic health.

I'm convinced, Mr. Chairman, that Manitoba has not faced as serious an economic situation as it has in the last three years since the Dirty Thirties, since the great depression of the Dirty Thirties, and this is not imagination on my part, it's not my statistical work that has discovered this. I think you can talk to the average Manitoban and particularly some of those who have been around a number of years and they will tell you they have never seen things as bad as they have been the last few years under the Lyon administration of this province. I find it rather amusing to see how the government squirms when we refer to what I consider to be reliable data from legitimate organizations whether it be Statistics Canada or whether it be the Conference Board in Canada. The government and the front bench on the government side is indeed — well, maybe the back bench as well — is indeed embarrassed by the fact that using their own sources and their own figures and relating to their previous statements, that we can show them that without a question of a doubt that the Manitoba Economy has gone absolutely nowhere in the past three years, has gone absolutely nowhere.

Mr. Chairman, since the question period, I've taken the trouble to phone Statistics Canada in Ottawa with regard to the sources of real domestic product estimates. I have checked out whether there is indeed any other source that we can utilize; that anyone can utilize to estimate the real economic growth of the provinces of this country of ours and the answer is no, there is only one source at the present time that is publishing on a consistent basis, provincial estimates or real domestic product and that is the Conference Board in Canada; and, Mr. Chairman, the Conference Board in Canada estimates that I'm talking about are historical data, not the forecast. They may be rather poor on forecasting as the Minister of Finance says although I wish the previous Minister of Finance had acknowledged that when he so bravely used it in his 1980 Budget Address. He made a major effort, a major speech, Mr. Chairman, based on the Conference Board forecast. I am not using forecast, in fact, all of the work we have done has not been based and has not referred to forecast, we're referring to historical data.

The historical data used by the Conference Board obviously is based on data provided by Statistics Canada organization, and we realize that all estimates are subject to error; all estimates are subject to change and so on. But the best work of people who have no axe to grind who I would consider to be in a very unbiased and objective position then, namely the economists and the Conference Board in Canada, have indeed come up with figures that make it very very clear and it's unequivocal, Mr. Chairman, that Manitoba since 1977 is the only province in Canada that has had zero growth, zilch, no growth whatsoever.

Well, Mr. Chairman, even the Atlantic region has experienced growth and I'm talking about real

growth when you eliminate the inflation and squeeze the inflation, what has happened? Mr. Chairman, in the three years of Conservative Government, in the three years from 1977 through to 1980, we see the Canadian real growth rate as 7.1 percent. That's the total of economic growth that occurred in the past three years while my friends opposite have been the government of this province, 7.1 percent. If we look at the Atlantic Region we see Newfoundland was 5.1 percent; Prince Edward Island, 7.5 percent; Little Prince Edward Island; Nova Scotia, 5.9 percent; New Brunswick, 4.6 percent; Quebec, 7.3 percent; Ontario which has been plagued by automobile industry declines, 3.0 percent; Manitoba, 0.0 percent; Saskatchewan, 6.0 percent; Alberta, 21.8 percent and British Columbia, 11.4 percent. Mr. Chairman, the best estimates we have, the latest data we have show that this government has had a set of economic policies to the extent that they have been trying to do what they say they've been wishing to do in this Budget Speech and other Budget Speeches, these policies have been totally ineffective, they have been a total unmitigated disaster. The people of Manitoba have been let down; they've been led down the garden path by Sterling Lyon in 1977 and by god they're not going to be led down the garden path in the next election.

Mr. Chairman, Sterling the Premier of this Province, throughout the October '77 election period and thereabout said, "We're going to get Manitoba moving again". Well he certainly got Manitobans moving again because there has never been such an exodus in interprovincial migration that we've experienced in the past years, again, since a period of a previous Conservative Regime under one Mr. Dufferin Roblin.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to report that the figures that we have from Statistics Canada — and we know they're estimates but they're the best thing we can get and we have to use them — show that probably in the years '78, '79 and '80 combined you take these three full years of Conservative Government — and the figures are not final yet — but it looks as though we will have lost 40,000 people, 40,000 men, women, and children on a net basis from this good province of ours. Mr. Chairman, 40,000 people; that's bigger than the City of Brandon. You could put the City of Brandon plus Souris and maybe you could even add Melita or some such place in with it and it's like those communities disappearing from the face of the map in this province of ours.

Mr. Chairman, if the honourable members don't like to refer to real economic growth which I consider to be an overall estimate, it's the bottom line, we can look at many other figures; and I might add that there's soon to be data out on investment expectations in the province and it'll be interesting to see what those figures reveal when they come out in a couple of weeks time.

We, however, can look at all kinds of data. I agree with some members opposite to just take one month of one year and compare it with one month of another year may not be satisfactory — of course this one point of that approach, Mr. Chairman, is that the evidence — I agree that sometimes comparing one month of one year with the same month of another year is not as satisfactory because it is only indeed one year, but nevertheless it the

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

current estimate and you can get an idea what's happening most recently. But if the Honourable Minister of Finance does not like reference to department store sales on a January to January basis, I invite him to look at what happened to department store sales in Manitoba in the year 1980, over the year 1979, and Mr. Chairman, all this does is corroborate the other data that we've got and that is, if you take total department store sales, 1980 over 1979, the increase in Manitoba was 4.4 percent. Incidentally before the Minister of Finance gets all excited, I phoned Stats Canada this morning and I got this information from the horses mouth so to speak, from the section that compiles the data and I didn't use the Free Press of today which also has some wrong figures in it.

The Minister of Finance then will agree with me that apart from tiny Prince Edward Island which had a growth of 3.7 percent in department store sales, the Province of Manitoba was the second lowest in Canada at 4.4 percent less than half of the Canadian average of 9.9 percent. Well I say, Mr. Chairman, those figures don't tell the whole story; they only tell a very fragment of the picture. They only give us a fragment of what is going on, but nevertheless they do corroborate the other data that comes out in a pattern of lack of growth of indeed decline in many areas.

I know the members opposite are always talking about employment growth. Well, Mr. Chairman, we have had an increase in employment — and incidentally for those of you who think that we're so selective in our statistics, I have recorded that in my report — we record that the number of jobs created on average in the past three years was indeed greater than the number of jobs created on average during the eight years of New Democratic Party Government. I've got it in here; we state that. It was 9,700 jobs on average from 1978 to '80, those three years; compared to 7,300 in the years that we were in office. I recognize that and I would be a fool to want to ignore the figures that I have. But, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that this increase in jobs that we've experienced has also been experienced right across this nation of ours from coast to coast. There has been a national job creation wave, if you like, caused essentially by the devaluation of the Canadian dollar.

Our 83 cent dollar is good for our exporters. In fact, it's good for our processors who have to compete within the Canadian domestic market. It has an impact like a raise in the national tariff and indeed that has been the experience from coast to coast. There has been a vast increase in job creation.

But, Mr. Chairman, if you look at what we have been doing compared to the national scene, you'll see that even here we have deteriorated. We had a much smaller percentage of the national job creation pie, if you will, in the past three years of Conservative Government than we had in the eight years of NDP Government. So I say even here in job creation we have to be concerned. If you look at, again figures, and these are put out by Stats Canada, if you look at what's happened — I've got the last few years here, 1979, 1980 — if you take the year 1980 you will find that of the ten Canadian provinces, job creation in Manitoba was the lowest;

we were the bottom province on the totem pole. The national average in job creation was 4.0 percent; Manitoba was 2.8; the lowest of the ten. If you look at how many jobs were created in 1980 over 1979, what was the percentage increase in employment? Again, Manitoba is the lowest province of all ten. Our job creation was 1.4 percent compared to the Canadian average of 2.8 percent.

Well, Mr. Chairman, as I stated you can look at many many figures but I don't want to bore members of the Chamber with recitation of numbers, but I want to make it quite clear that we are not trying to fool ourselves — as I would submit some members opposite are indeed trying to do — grasping at straws, changing their positions; if one set of figures don't work at one time then you move over to another set, and certainly as the Budget Speech of the former Minister of Finance reveals, they depended very very heavily on the forecasts of an institution that they are now disclaiming, that they are now attacking. As a matter of fact I believe, not only in here but I believe in a government official news release put out by the Information Services Branch, I think there's an entire release devoted to statistics of the Conference Board of Canada and the former Minister of Finance, who's crowing about them, because they seem to suit his purpose at the time.

Well, Mr. Chairman, basically the point at issue then is a difference in economic philosophy, I would submit. In many ways as my leader stated, we are debating here, we've concerned ourselves here whether government should withdraw as much as possible from the economic scene, whether government should be as small as possible if you like, whether the least government is the best government, whether that philosophy that the Premier has so often espoused, is the correct philosophy for the well-being, for the betterment of the people of Manitoba.

That philosophy was well enunciated, and I'm not suggesting that it isn't a legitimate point of view. You could have as a legitimate point of view, this ultrafree enterprise approach that the least government is the best government, and by following that philosophy then you bring about the highest rate of economic growth. Indeed the Premier of this province, when he was the former Leader of the Official Opposition, made it very clear that was the single determination of the Conservative Party of Manitoba and would be the guiding post of the beacon, if you like, for a Conservative government, and as my leader has said, indeed this government has put private enterprise on trial.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we never put private enterprise on trial and we don't intend to put private enterprise on trial. We intend to work with the private sector, —(Interjection)— as has been suggested to me, what is on trial, and on trial in the minds of the people of this province is this government, is the Conservative government of Manitoba, it is on trial. It is on trial and the jury will be handing down its judgment, I presume, in a matter of months, we don't know exactly when, maybe sooner rather than later, I don't know. But in a matter of months already I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the jury will hand down its verdict; and it will be deciding on whether a policy of neo-

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

Conservatism, a policy that is very much like that being spoken up today by Ronald Reagan, the President of the United States and his advisers, a neo-Conservative policy whereby you try to reduce the size of government to the point that — (Interjection)— the member mentions Great Britain; and as Margaret Thatcher, the Prime Minister of Great Britain so very well put it, Mrs. Thatcher made it very clear that she recognized that Ronald Reagan was going to pursue the same economic policy as the Conservative Government of Great Britain had been pursuing since the election of Margaret Thatcher and her colleagues.

Well, Mr. Chairman, all one has to do is take a glance at the Economist, the very well-known British economic affairs magazine, or read any magazine or any newspaper that's coming out of Great Britain today to see what a disaster Thatcher economics, neo-Conservative economics has been for the United Kingdom. Britain is suffering today to the extent as it has never suffered before. I say, Mr. Chairman, here again we have a clear example, maybe one of the best examples of neo-Conservative economic philosophy at work; a philosophy that distrusts government; the government cannot do anything in the eyes of neo-Conservatives and cannot do anything of positive value for economic growth.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we reject that philosophy, that policy, and the people of Great Britain I'm sure, are going to reject that policy as soon as they have an opportunity to go to the polls again. As we can see from the news reports, the levels of unemployment are at all-time highs since the 1930s; the inflation is still intolerably high; factories are closing up left, right and centre. It reminds one of what we have been experiencing in the Province of Manitoba and unfortunately which we may be experiencing in the United States and I, for one, would not like to forecast what's going to happen in Manitoba in 1981, or indeed Canada, because of the stated policies of the Reagan administration. If he is successful in carrying out his policies of government cutbacks and elimination of many many programs throughout the organization of government, then I believe that it will have a negative impact on the Canadian economic growth and therefore a negative impact on the provincial economic situation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say the people of Manitoba have had experience with neo-Conservative economic policies the past three years. We may see a change from this; we may be witnessing now a departure from this and if that is the case, Mr. Chairman, then it is an automatic admission of the failure of the philosophy espoused by the First Minister of this province in the last general election; a total absolute failure of the Conservative economic doctrines. Mr. Chairman, if they weren't a failure, why is there a departure from that position now? A very reluctant departure, I must say. I would daresay that if, God forbid, this government is re-elected next time, we would see a return — because that's really what the members opposite want to do — they really would like to cut back further on social programming, they really would like to do the things that they had done in the first two or three years.

Mr. Chairman, what bothers me as well, if I might just talk about inflation for a minute, is the position of the Premier of this province and the Government

of the Province of Manitoba with regard to oil pricing. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the Premier of a net oil consuming province takes a stand alongside Peter Lougheed of Alberta. That, to me, is incredible. It's totally incredible that a province which in many ways resembles Ontario in terms of its position in the supply of demand of oil in Canada, is not taking a position that reflects the real needs and well-being of the people of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that if Mr. Clark had stayed in office and if we had followed the wishes, and in fact, still the stated objectives and desires of the Premier of Alberta, we would have far more inflation today than we are already experiencing. Goodness knows it's high enough now, 11 to 12 percent, it would be even higher, and if that inflation got higher, our standards of living would be diminished thereby, because that money is not flowing into any Manitoba Heritage Fund; that money is not flowing in any way to the benefit of the people of Manitoba. What it is doing is flowing into Lougheed's coffers and what it is doing is flowing into the balance sheets of the multinational corporations.

As I indicated the other day, Mr. Chairman, there is plenty of evidence to show that the multinationals have not been utilizing all of their recently gained profits for oil and gas development in this country. There's a lot of evidence that they're using it in everything almost but oil and gas development in this province. There is evidence to show that they're going into uranium mining, coal mining, and we've got plenty of coal we know that; they've gone into real estate; they've gone into management systems, etc.; there is lots of documented evidence; and there is a lot of evidence as well about the outward flow of profits and dividends from Canada to the United States and other countries by the multinational oil companies and that, Mr. Chairman, is over and above — the numbers are there — but over and above those numbers is fees, management fees, service fees, etc., that are paid by Canadian consumers ultimately to managers in the United States of these multinationals for services rendered.

So I say, if we followed the Lougheed policy, we're following a policy that I don't believe is in the best interests of Canadians, and certainly is not in the best interests of the people of Manitoba. As I said, following what the Premier of this province wants to do, who marches like a zombie behind the Alberta delegation at oil conferences, I say he is in the process causing, or could cause the standard of living of the people of this province to diminish, and at the same time give us even more inflation than we are already experiencing.

There hasn't been too much discussion perhaps by the public of the Manitoba Government's oil pricing policy, but I think that's perhaps what the people don't realize. But what they do realize, and are beginning to realize where it hurts in the pocketbook, is this 20 percent tax, this new tax that the Conservative Government of Manitoba has imposed which is as I understand, Mr. Chairman, a tax upon a tax. That tax takes effect not only when the price of oil goes up at the wellhead, but it takes effect on top of any Federal taxes or levies that might be put into place. So in effect, the people of Manitoba are paying a tax on a tax.

So if my honourable friends opposite complain about oil and gasoline prices going up now because

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

of the new national energy policy, I say a great deal of that increase is also because the Lyon administration is taking its 20 percent on top of all of it, and it's amounting to millions of dollars. This piggybacking approach is amounting to millions of dollars.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I was speaking to a senior citizen just two evenings ago who said that he was managing to get by, but one thing he as a senior citizen was cutting down on, was his automobile trips. He said he didn't go very often, very far around the city, around the province, but he was cutting back on that because that's something he couldn't afford, and I say, Mr. Chairman, if we followed the Lyon-Lougheed approach, I don't think that senior citizen would ever get out of his apartment.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to conclude by referring to the fact that we can talk about all the figures we want and they do show, as I said, that we've had a no-growth situation; but when you bring it down to real terms, when you bring it down to the terms of what's happening to the people of this province in terms of their individual well-being, in terms of their household well-being, then you can appreciate it more, because we bring it down into real terms when your nephew, or your cousin, or your friend, has to leave the Province of Manitoba to seek a job. That's in real terms. Forget about the statistics. Who doesn't know of a friend or a relative that has left the Province of Manitoba in the last three years since the Conservatives have been in office? There is nobody.

Mr. Chairman, who doesn't know of young people that cannot find a job? In fact, we have young people coming into the caucus room saying, where can we get a job? I'm well trained. I'm trained as an interior designer, I can't get a job in Manitoba. (Interjection)— So in the reality . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. ORDER PLEASE.

The hour is 4:30. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage, the report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RESOLUTION NO. 13 PERSONAL CARE HOMES

MR. SPEAKER: We're now under Private Members' Hour dealing with resolutions. Resolution No. 13 — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Wellington, that:

WHEREAS hospitals in Manitoba under the Manitoba Health Services Commission Program are administered on a non-profit basis by community boards composed of dedicated citizens, as individuals, or as representatives of community, service or religious groups; and

WHEREAS the principal of non-profit care in hospitals should be consistently applied to personal care homes, under the Manitoba Health Services Commission Program as well; and

WHEREAS the Conservative Government of Manitoba has refused to approve requests from non-profit community based groups to build critically needed personal care homes while at the same time approving requests from private profit-making corporations to build personal care homes;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba cease approvals in funding of new private profit-making personal care homes and only approve and provide funding for non-profit community based personal care homes under the Manitoba Health Services Commission Program.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the issues in this resolution cannot be given full justice in a mere 20 minutes, they are that major, they are that fundamental to our concept of public care. But I just won't spend 20 minutes on this issue, Mr. Speaker, I've talked on this issue in the past, we will talk about it now and in Estimates and we will talk about it in the future. We will fight this issue in the Legislature, outside of the Legislature. I challenge the Minister to debate me anywhere, any place and any time on this issue and certainly, Mr. Speaker, this will be an issue in the election. We will fight this issue on this side until the government changes this indefensible policy or until the people of Manitoba throw them out of office. Mr. Speaker, mark my words, this will be an election issue and the Conservatives are on the wrong side of it, on principle, on financial terms, on humanitarian grounds, on moral grounds, on efficiency terms, virtually every criteria.

I challenge, not only the Minister but I challenge all members on that side to get up and support your government's slapping non-profit community service and religious groups in the face by turning them down when they want to build desperately needed personal care homes because of their love of humanity; while at the same time your government gives approval to private, profit-making corporations to build homes because these people have a love of a buck and they see an opportunity to make a buck. Your government not only approves them in a discriminatory manner but it also makes the taxpayer of Manitoba pay a pretty substantial additional price for that.

I want the Member for St. Matthews, the Member for Swan River, the Member for Dauphin, the Member for Radisson, the Member for Osborne, the

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

Member for Springfield, the Member for Emerson, the Member for La Verendrye — you can recall a Mr. Dyck complaining in Steinbach about the government's attitude on this. I want the Member for Morris, who shuffled his feet a few months ago when he was asked about this matter, to get up and defend the government's policy.

Mr. Speaker, the question is should there be profit in institutionalized health care which is fully funded by the public? Do we have it in hospitals? No, we don't, not yet anyway. Yesterday we had the Minister of Community Services get up and say, well, we're not going to do any more with day care centres; there's a grandfather clause, just as there was a grandfather provision with respect to the past situation regarding personal care homes where some of them existed before the public took the entire personal care program under its wing. So the Member of Community Services says, no, no, we won't extend and add new private corporations in the day care field.

We have the Minister of Health turning a complete flip-flop, going down to Ottawa and arguing on behalf of the Red Cross for a fractionation plant here and the Red Cross condemned commercially-operated fractionation plants who enter the market to seek profits. They said that voluntary blood donors would stop giving blood if it is to be known that profits are being made on blood; their exact words and the Minister went to Ottawa and fought for that. But when it comes to profits being made on the backs of the elderly this Minister says go to it. That is the predicament we find ourselves with respect to personal care homes.

This government has taken private profit-making corporations and they've rescued them from oblivion with respect to provision of personal care in Manitoba; they've given them a new lease on life and they've given them a great deal of extra taxpayers' money to boot; all because they want to impose a profit-making ideology onto institutionalized health care. Non-profit groups like the Fred Douglas Lodge; the Selkirk Hospital Board; the Transcona Park Manor Personal Care Home; the Mennonite Homes in Steinbach and Grunthal have been turned down when they virtually begged this government for approvals to provide desperately needed personal care homes because they, in fact, have a love of humanity. At the same time private corporations have been given the go-ahead to make additional profits.

I look on the Free Press, November 27, 1980. Remember the Conservative Cabinet had this tour of the southeast and a Mr. Dyck of Rest Haven said in fact that the government always says they are short of funds and the local MLA has said that this is on a high priority list for the next two years. When Consumer Affairs Minister, that's what he was at that time, Warner Jorgenson heard Dyck's case during a tour of Rest Haven yesterday, as part of the Cabinet's three-day tour of the southeast, what's quoted as saying is that shuffling his feet anxiously he left quickly without comment. That, Mr. Speaker, is what people are coming to know as the Warner shuffle. We had the Ali shuffle, now we have the Warner shuffle.

Mr. Speaker, we believe —(Interjection)— he can get his chance to speak on this issue. He shouldn't

shuffle his feet; get up, stand up like a man, defend the indefensible; I challenge him to do that, Mr. Speaker. We believe, Mr. Speaker, on this side that there is no risk in providing personal care homes. We have waiting lists, Mr. Speaker, of over 1,000 people waiting to get into personal care homes. The per diems are fully paid by Medicare or by Old Age Pensions, therefore, you have a long waiting list and the public pays the per diems. All costs are accounted for, Mr. Speaker. There is no risk, and since there is no risk, there should be no profit because the classical definition of profit is that it should be a reward for risk. But what private corporations get for providing personal home care is not profit in the true sense; it is corporate welfare in its worst form; it's corporate welfare in its most perverse form.

Let's look at the corporate beneficiaries of the new Conservative policy — and I quote from not Socialist propaganda because I expect that will be the substance of the response by the Conservative members on that side because that's the only type of response they can make to a substantive argument. No, I'd rather quote financial analysts who are writing about investment opportunities in the Financial Times of Canada, February 2, 1981, edition. It says "Like a troupe of elderly women determined to have a jolly good afternoon shopping spree, despite booming rain clouds, Canada's small band of publicly created nursing home companies has refused to allow a near zero increase in the supply of beds, it's basic product, to dampen growth prospects, profitability or investor appeal." There's an interesting footnote here. There have been no new privately-owned nursing home beds approved in Alberta since 1972, for example; Ontario withheld approval from 1974 to 1978, but Manitoba is on a rampage of approvals with respect to private corporations getting into the personal health care area.

I'd like to quote specifically now, "Canada's 695 nursing homes, private nursing homes, already gross 500 million a year thanks to occupancy rates of between 96 percent and 99 percent. The 71,500 beds generate per diem revenue of \$25 to \$30", a bit higher now, "and a profit margin of up to 20 percent before taxes." Here's a nice quote, "Nursing homes are a super business to own because of the high cash flow and the appreciation of property values," says John Mainyard, Executive Director of the Ontario Nursing Home Association. Another quotation, likened by one analyst to "Running a hotel which is permanently full up nursing homes have been a low risk and profitable business." Another quote: "The excellent nursing cash flow also provides a primed pump for the heavy capital needs of both real estate and energy. The energy venture highly touted by Grousner, one of the analysts, provides sufficient tax benefits for the company.

What we have here is our investment analysts saying there is low risk, high profits. Not only that you can take the profits made off the back of the aged, the elderly who need nursing home care, take those profits to squeeze from them and invest in real estate and invest in energy. No wonder the Minister doesn't want, and will not table, financial statements of private corporations in the personal care field. He would have some difficult time explaining how people squeeze profits from the back of the elderly and

invest these in real estate ventures elsewhere or in energy developments elsewhere. Is that how investment capital is developed? Is that how venture capital is developed under a Conservative philosophy, squeeze it from the elderly? Return isn't just 20 percent, Mr. Speaker. Villacentres, which is operating in Manitoba, earned a 31 percent return on equity in the fiscal year ended December 31, 1979. Results for 1980 are expected to be even better. Nursing homes provide 55 percent of the firm's revenue and 74 percent of its net earnings.

Canada's largest nursing home chain, Extend-a-Care, considered itself a health care company prior to last year's reverse takeover in which it acquired 91 percent of Crown Life Insurance Company, some 75 percent of Extend-a-Care's health care revenues comes from its 55 nursing homes. Those people are the beneficiaries of Conservative policy and what are they doing? They're not re-investing any of those profits to upgrade the plant and facility of personal care homes. They're taking the money; they're socking it right back into real estate and energy. They cry the blues when the plant runs down and they ask for extra per diems from the Conservative Government, because they invested their profits elsewhere. What about the service? What about the service provided in private nursing homes?

We've had records of industrial disputes. Last year the Golden Door Geriatric Centre; this year we have an industrial dispute at St. Adolphe Nursing Home. They are paying wages which are far less than those paid to workers in other health care facilities, other personal care homes. It's interesting to note that the owner of the St. Adolphe Nursing Home also is the owner of St. Norbert Lodge. The Minister says, well, you know, we inspect all these private corporations, we make sure they do a good job.

We've had an inquest say that unlocked exterior doors should be attended full-time by a staff member. If you're squeezing staff down, if you're reducing services, you don't have that protection. The judge said that the deceased had wandered away on at least one other occasion; that fact had been removed from her file because of file overcrowding. That is what this Minister wants to defend; that is not only what he's defending, that is what he is promoting. Furthermore we found that the police weren't notified for a while. I don't even know if the staff knew about it quickly. But that is what this government wants to promote; that is what it wants to defend. So there are beneficiaries to their policy, Extend-a-Care, Villacentre, real estate deals somewhere.

But who are the victims of Conservative policy? The people of Manitoba. The humanitarian non-profit community service and religious groups and especially the aged, the elderly people of Manitoba, who desperately need the best value for money in the provision of personal home care and who desperately need that personal care in nursing homes is of the best quality. What we have seen in the Selkirk Home; what we have seen and read about here in the St. Adolphe Home; what we have seen and read last year with respect to the Golden Door Geriatric Centre, have not been the best in care and quality.

I'd like to ask the Minister if, in fact, the St. Adolphe and St. Norbert Homes are among those

who refuse to file audited financial statements; I'd like to ask the Minister if the Golden Door Geriatric Centre is, in fact, one of those who refuses to file audited financial statements, despite the fact that this government has given those corporations approval to either add new personal care home beds, or to build new homes entirely? Guaranteed annual income, my colleague the Member for Rossmere says, and how true it is.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a Minister who says that he, in fact, says it's questionable whether the province should have the right to know an operator's profit and capital investment. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is hogwash. If the government who provides most of the funding and guarantees the occupancy doesn't want to know what the owners' investments are with respect to that plant and facility, and is willing to pay extra per diem costs to cover their capital expenditures, but they don't want to know exactly what that is. They don't want to know their profit; they don't want to know what's being squeezed out with respect to private corporations; well let me tell you, the government wants to know whether, in fact, non-profit corporations are making a profit, they want to make sure that non-profit organizations don't have any surplus.

A MEMBER: Isn't that interesting?

MR. PARASIUK: Rather interesting. Non-profit, which might take a bit of a surplus, add it back into the facility because, by definition, they're non-profit. The government wants to know whether, in fact, there's any enrichment; take away that surplus, we don't want any enriched quality care in non-profit homes. But personal care homes run by private corporations, this government hears no evil and sees no evil; but we smell evil, Mr. Speaker, we smell evil. —(Interjection)— That's right, Mr. Speaker, that is the flippant attitude with respect to a very serious matter. What can we expect? —(Interjection)—

So Mr. Speaker, the battle goes on and the people will win this battle. Profit is going to lose in this debate and the defenders of profit in this debate will lose, but I look forward to hearing from them. I want to see how they will defend the indefensible; I want to see how they will defend the unjust and I just don't want to hear the Minister, I want to hear the Member for Morris with his shuffle; I want to hear the Member for Springfield; I want to hear some of the backbenchers defend what I believe is the indefensible, namely profit in health care. We will turn that around Mr. Speaker, and we will change it and there will be no further profit in health care; there will be quality care instead of ripoffs.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this hysterical resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Transcona, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the member is badly misled and badly misinformed and badly motivated if he thinks for one moment that either I, or any of my colleagues, feel that we have been put in the position of defending the indefensible.

The position that we have taken, with respect to personal care home construction and operation and expansion and extension of that program in this province, is one that is entirely defensible, is one that

is entirely logical and fair and is one that has helped put Manitoba, helped maintain Manitoba and put Manitoba and keep Manitoba in the very forefront on this continent of personal care for our elderly citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Transcona has reached deep into the bibliography of the party to which he belongs and into the library of that party and into the rhetoric that always features his sort of self-laudatory comments on health care. One would think that the Member for Transcona invented health care and invented the concept of personal care and indeed invented the personal care program that exists in this province. He is, Mr. Speaker, guided in his views on this subject and his comments on this subject by that kind of rhetoric, that kind of approach with respect to health care and participation by the total community, private and public, in various aspects of health care delivery that we have long ago learned to recognize as sheer and pure, mean and cynical and rather unfair and undemocratic doctrine, Mr. Speaker, that's precisely what it amounts to.

The Member for Transcona and his colleagues think that the only people who can do anything in the area of health care are members of the New Democratic Party and the only people who are interested in delivering health care services to the people in Manitoba, or elsewhere, are community groups, non-profit community organizations. I take nothing away from the efforts and the motivation and the impulses of those organizations, but I say at the same time, Sir, that there are many people in the private sector, and they range throughout our health care professions, beginning with the medical profession, extending through many of our health care professions and embracing the whole field of volunteers and the whole service club field, all of whom are made up of private individuals, most of whom employed in the private sector. There are countless thousands of people of that kind who have the best of motivations in terms of delivering services to people, in terms of meeting the needs of our society, the most compassionate of impulses and of motives when it comes to this field and that for members opposite to pose as the sole owners of compassion, the sole purveyors of kindness and charity and tender loving care is a sham, Mr. Speaker, of the highest order and comes close to being the greatest misconception, the greatest deception and the greatest sham that I've heard perpetrated in the few years that I've been in this Chamber.

MR. SHERMAN: I dismiss the message implicit in the honourable member's resolution out of hand; out of hand. It leaps to a conclusion, it tries to create an impression in the public's mind, and in the minds of the members of this House, that this government is moving to pursue and accomplish a shift in health care delivery and health care programs from publicly operated, publicly delivered programs, to privately operated and privately delivered programs and privately operated institutions; and that, Sir, is an outright deception and he knows it to be, but his resolution is phrased in such a way as to convey that general opinion and impression.

What he has said in the 20 minutes in which he has spoken on this subject has contained so many

errors, so many misleading statements, that it's impossible for me, Mr. Speaker, to deal with it in the few minutes remaining to me. I can only touch on some of the points that he has mentioned, but I am fully prepared, fully prepared to debate him on this issue in the manner in which he has invited me to debate him. I have never ducked a debate with him or with anybody on this or on any other subject and I certainly do not intend to let him get away with the kinds of misconceptions and misimpressions he's purveying through this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record. There are approximately 7,500 personal care beds in this province, 7,546 to be exact, at the present time. Of that number, Mr. Speaker, approximately 5,300 are non-proprietary beds and the other 2,200 or 2,300 are proprietary beds. That ratio Mr. Speaker, has not changed during the time that we've been in office. The only thing that's changed during the time that we've been in office is the number of personal care beds that are open and operating in Manitoba, but the ratio of 5 to 2 has not changed.

When the member opposite talks about a shift in the direction of private ownership and proprietary operation, the facts on the record belie that, Mr. Speaker, they simply belie that insinuation and that misimpression, that false impression that he's trying to convey. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, this government has built, or is building, 22 personal care homes in various parts of Manitoba. There will be more added to that total in the 1981-82 capital program of the Manitoba Health Services Commission to be announced when I reach the Health Services Commission Appropriation in my Estimates, but at the present time it stands at 22. Of that 22, Mr. Speaker, 17 are non-prop and five are proprietary homes.

The five proprietary homes that are being built are being built by operators who have proven track records for service in this field in this province in previous years and who, because the whole concept of proprietary operation had been actively and vigorously discouraged by the previous government, had not been either in a position to improve their physical plant, or in a position to seek approval, even if they were in the position to pursue it, in a position to seek approval for upgrading of their physical plant during the years of administration under the New Democratic Party. As a consequence, Mr. Speaker, although their level of care, their tender loving care, to use the catch-phrase of the field, was at all times exemplary and at all times above fault; their physical plants had deteriorated, had reached a point where, in terms of public health and safety and fire safety, this government was deeply concerned. We, therefore, as the honourable member knows, and as other members in this Chamber know, we therefore, as one of the first steps that we took in the health care field when we came into office in the late autumn of 1977, met with those nursing home operators, some 10 or 11 in all and reached an agreement with them that made it necessary for them to either close or down or phase down their operations during the winter of 1977-78. Some five of them were closed down completely; the other five were phased down in total numbers of beds.

We started with 302 beds in that category at that time and during that process that winter, reduced

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

that number to 108 beds. In other words, 194 beds were closed at that time and those residents were transferred into personal care homes that were coming on stream that had been approved by the previous government, most notably the Tache Nursing Centre and Meadowood Manor in St. Vital and the new Lions Manor in Portage la Prairie. We transferred those residents into those homes and effected what was a very traumatic experience for a great many people in the most compassionate way and the most careful and reasonable way that we could and it took a great deal of co-operation from the operators, from the staffs of those homes and from the staffs of the new homes into which they were moved. It was a difficult period moving those elderly residents from the old homes into new homes but it had to be done for their health and safety and the private operators co-operated to the fullest possible extent during that process. They had established good track records in terms of care. They were all told that when this government was in a position to start approving construction in the personal care field they would certainly be relicenced for operation, if they wished to do so.

In that time some changes have taken place. Some have withdrawn from the business, others have combined together in joint ventures and the result of that has been the approval of five personal care homes in the proprietary field to replace what once amounted to 11 personal care homes in the proprietary field. Obviously they are larger in terms of their resident populations but the bed totals virtually equate overall, and it's five homes replacing 11 that were there before. Those are the proprietary homes that have been licenced. Those are the steps that we have taken and pursued with respect to conjoint participation in this field, the personal care field, where prop operators and non-prop operators are concerned and for the Member for Transcona to try to suggest and insinuate as he does, not only in this Chamber and in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, but at every opportunity outside this Chamber and publicly, to suggest and insinuate that we have embarked on some massive shift of the system from the non-prop operation to the prop operation is entirely, totally false and ranks as I said before, Sir, with one of the most cynical exercises in deception that I have seen in some considerable time in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Transcona says that the NDP objects to proprietary operations in the personal care home field on principle, on financial grounds, on moral grounds and on humanitarian grounds. Mr. Speaker, the NDP objects to proprietary operations in the personal care home field on doctrinaire ideological grounds; that's what they object to. They don't believe, they are not willing to concede that any individual private person could possess one scintilla, one ounce of compassion, one ounce of interest in health care, one ounce of love for his fellowman or her fellowman, one ounce of commitment to health care services and care for the elderly, that is beyond the ken of the minds and the minds set of the Member for Transcona and his colleagues. They believe the only people who possess any scintilla of compassion or interest or motivation in this field at all are the 20 shrinking caucus members who wear the NDP colors

in this Chamber. And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, if he thinks that the people of Manitoba are going to be convinced of that and convinced by that, then he is making as big a mistake politically as he is making in terms of legislative debate in this Chamber and I suggest to him, that if he thinks that that's going to be the rallying cry for him and his colleagues in the next election, he is making one of the great tactical political errors of his career and it ranks with his tactical political error in embracing the particular ideology that he embraced in the first place, Mr. Speaker.

Now he says it's a slap in the face to non-profit community groups. What rubbish, Mr. Speaker. No non-profit community groups have been denied their opportunities in the field because of a commitment, Mr. Speaker, to some operators who were in the field, who had the track record, who co-operated with it. —(Interjection)— No, Mr. Speaker, I will not, Mr. Speaker. I only have 20 minutes and that's what the Honourable Member for Transcona had and I haven't got half enough time as it is to deal with the deceptions that he is trying to disseminate.

Mr. Speaker, the prop operators relicenced are those whom I have identified. They were always in the field. They served particular areas in geographic and sociogeographic terms and obviously unbeknownst to the Member for Transcona, Mr. Speaker, we apply intensive evaluation and assessment to applications and proposals to build in the personal care home field, based on guide lines, based on service needs in various areas, based on the bed-to-population ratio of different regions and areas and communities in the province. The fact that there may be some individual non-prop applicant in one part of the province who hasn't received his or her approval to build while a prop operator in Winnipeg has, has nothing to do with rejecting non-prop applications in favour of prop applications. What it has to do with is the distribution of beds in the province; the service needs, the bed needs in various regions.

We are trying to maintain a reasonable equitability and when 10 or 11 prop operators in Winnipeg, Selkirk and Portage la Prairie are asked to phase down or close down because of the program that I earlier alluded to, anybody but the Member for Transcona could understand that that takes a certain number of beds out of those particular communities and those particular regions and they have to be replaced, otherwise we're falling below the ratio and the level that we're hoping to maintain.

Insofar as non-prop applications are concerned, Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated that 17 of the 22 under way right now are such and certainly more will come this year and next year and every year thereafter under this government. We have not turned to other prop operators in this field. But what we have done is recognized the service and the commitment of those who have been in the field.

The Member for Transcona talks about the question of audited financial statements, Mr. Speaker. That's amusing because ever since this program came into effect in 1973 the legislation has called for audited financial statements and the previous government never asked for them; the previous government never observed that legislation and do you know why they never observed the

legislation, Mr. Speaker? —(Interjection)— That's not true. Mr. Speaker, they had many prop operations in the field at the time that the program became universal. They had never insisted on the audited financial statement because there has never been any agreement for any length of time; any consensus for any length of time as to whether that audited financial statement is necessary or not.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, we do take a major audit on their budgets. The major portion of their Budgets is subject to our audit, that is the payroll, the staffing the dietary commitments and the costs related to the general operation of the nursing home. The part that we have not had an audited financial statement on is the part relating to the capital plant and the assets and I can tell you that members opposite and employees of this province, civil servants of this province have argued and debated that point. They have at times felt that, yes, full financial audited statements should be requested. At other times they have said no, there is no reason why the government should have the right to ask for the full financial statements and standing of private operators. As long as we have an audited financial statement on their payroll and the operation of their plant, it's none of our business what their assets and their total financial standing is.

There has in fact, Mr. Speaker, been suggestions considered on the opposite side because I have access to the same kind of information and I think better information than the Member for Transcona does, there have been suggestions from the opposite side in the preceding eight years when they were in government, that the legislation should be changed and that requirement should be taken out of the legislation, then six or eight months later with nothing done on it people have started to rethink the question and so it has gone back and forth, but there has been no deliberate conspiracy to ignore legislation. There has never been any consensus on that side or this side or in the Civil Service as to which is the better way to proceed; and we, with respect to the new prop operators who have been relicenced, have made it a condition of their licences, that they have to file an annual audited statement. But the question is, what about those already operating in the field who were never requested, never required to do that by the previous government? That question has not been resolved as yet but a condition of the new prop operators licence is, that they must supply us with audited financial statements.

Mr. Speaker, in the moment remaining to me I want to deal with one other point. The Member for Transcona had much to say in terms of quotes from articles about the nursing home business, again, Sir, a massive deception. What he does not say is he's quoting from articles having to do with the nursing home business as it exists in various parts of Canada and North America. What we are dealing with here in Manitoba is a unique system, a unique spectrum. We are dealing with a universally insured personal care home program that is intensively regulated. The prop operators have to meet the same standards; they receive the median per diem; they have to go through the same processes as the non-prop operators do. We have a rigidly regulated system here which ensures the best possible care for our

personal care residents. It can in no way be compared to the kinds of things that the honourable member may be reading from jurisdictions in the United States, where you have a wide open free enterprise field. We do not operate that way. We do not intend to operate that way and I dismiss his resolution . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. The honourable member's time is up.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we have certainly heard the outburst of the session, the outburst of the session. The Honourable Minister made a statement about a hysterical resolution, hysterical resolution were the words, Mr. Speaker, used by the Honourable the Minister of Health, or should I call it private nursing homes.

In the space of his remarks he referred to the Honourable Member for Transcona as having misled, badly motivated, being self laudatory, thinks he invented the personal care home, mean, cynical, unfair, undemocratic, a sham of the highest order, the greatest deception perpetuated in a few years in this Chamber, the greatest deception perpetuated in the last few years in this Chamber. Then he went on to refer to 20 shrinking caucus members and beat his breasts as he announced 20 shrieking caucus members, outright deception. Then he announced he had never ducked a debate with him, referring to the Honourable Member for Transcona, or anybody else. Then he said, engaged in an exercise in deception. Mr. Speaker, if we've ever heard an hysterical outburst, it was an hysterical outburst which we have just heard from the Minister of Health which has done his position, as Chief Administrator of Health Services in this province, no service this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, indeed I am saddened to hear from one that appears to be suggesting that he is proud of his service to the entire field of personal care home, that he would be the Minister that would have permitted a 25 percent rate increase in the space of one year in per diems in personal care homes by way of an increase from \$9.00 to \$11.25; 25 percent increase, double the consumer price index and this Minister has the nerve to talk about tender loving care, Mr. Speaker. The nerve.

Mr. Speaker, again we hear from the Member for Minnedosa, it doesn't trouble any of us on this side. The only problem we have we would like to hear if the Honourable Member for Minnedosa has a single gem to ever offer to this Chamber because we haven't heard any so far, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the member talks about the importance of voluntary service, voluntarism is his word. Mr. Speaker, voluntary service is what one anticipates from those that are engaged in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. We can only have one speaker at one time and I, at this time, recognize the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, what we expect from voluntary service is those that are prepared to provide their services for non-profit, that's what I've always understood voluntary service to be, Mr. Speaker. So when the Minister talks about voluntary service and relates that to private nursing homes, Mr. Speaker, we have to ask who is he trying to kid?

Wednesday, 11 March, 1981

Mr. Speaker, what we are dealing with is a situation, and the Minister ought to be straightforward and acknowledge this, that the nursing home proprietors are indeed in service for a profit. It is the only way that they can operate is for a profit. They must meet their mortgage payments, they must ensure that they make an additional margin in order to enjoy a profit for those that own the nursing home. There is no question about that, Mr. Speaker, so why does the Minister try to fudge the issue by trying to suggest that they are engaged in voluntary service, Mr. Speaker. He is suggesting they are engaged in voluntary service; he attempts to ignore the fact that they're indeed in a business and I don't blame them, Mr. Speaker, if this Minister is prepared to grant to the private personal care home operators in the Province of Manitoba \$1.3 million, as he did last year for subsidies in construction, then surely, Mr. Speaker, I don't blame the private nursing home operators but I blame this Minister for his incompetent actions, Mr. Speaker, in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, what we indeed must examine is whether or not the service is equivalent to that which could be provided by way of non-profit. The Minister suggested that well, indeed, no group was denied. Those were the Minister's words, Mr. Speaker, I wrote them down — no group was ever denied. Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Minister in my own constituency that the Selkirk District Hospital Board had already received approval in 1976 to proceed, as a result of its request, the construction of a hospital which was to be attached to a personal care home. The personal care home was to be operated under the Selkirk District Health Board; it was to be operated on a non-profit basis. One of the first steps that this Minister undertook, Mr. Speaker, as a Minister of Health was to cancel out those plans, freeze them for one year, and then finally the Selkirk District Hospital Board had to accept a complete redesigning of its plans in which the non-profit nursing home aspect was deleted, deleted, Mr. Speaker; so there's one example. No. 2, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Fred Douglas Lodge in the north end of the City of Winnipeg made, I know, numerous requests during the time that we were in government, I don't know how many requests, and they were always advised that the number of beds was being examined, they would be first on the list. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that they made requests to this Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes and they're operating a new personal care home in Deer Lodge.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister says in Deer Lodge. Mr. Speaker, we're talking about the north end of the City of Winnipeg, not out in the constituency of the Minister of Economic Development.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has happened according to the information that has been conveyed to me, there has been approval given to the construction of a profit nursing home within the north end corner, that very northwestern corner of the City of Winnipeg. The best of my information is that there has been no approval given to an expansion of the Fred Douglas Lodge, despite the fact that there is record after record of requests on their part in order to expand what indeed has been a very fine

operation. I don't believe anybody could question the nature of the operation that has been provided by those that are running the Fred Douglas Lodge in the northwest corner of the City of Winnipeg. So when the Minister challenges us to show examples; there are examples for the Minister and I'm sure that during the course of this debate there'll be much more that will be offered to the Minister in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, it is not an issue of doctrinaire ideology; it is not a question of free enterprise; not one of socialism; not one of Marxism as the First Minister would like to shout and sometimes scream from his seat; it is simply a question of what is best for the elderly and ill that require the services of a personal care home. Let's not confuse the issue by talking about ideology.

Mr. Speaker, I think even the most hard-bitten, hard-core Conservative is prepared to acknowledge that there is no place for profit in hospital care. Maybe I'm wrong, maybe I'm being too nice a guy again by giving them too much credit; I wouldn't want to do that. But, Mr. Speaker, most reasonable people, let's put it this way to you, Mr. Speaker, most reasonable people within the Manitoba social fabric now recognize the fact that there is no place for profit in hospitals. Thank goodness, Mr. Speaker, the majority of Manitobans today disagree with the present Minister of Health's position that there is a place for a profit in personal care homes in the Province of Manitoba. I have no doubt that a majority of Manitobans would concur with the resolution introduced by the Member for Transcona, there is no place for profit in health care and certainly not in the personal care home field, no place.

Mr. Speaker, I was uneasy as I listened to the Minister because I couldn't tell whether the Minister was really anxious to obtain those financial audit reports or not. I don't want to be unfair again to the Minister but I thought the Minister would stand up and say, yes, the private nursing homes are receiving public funds; it would be my intention to insist upon the production of financial statements. And for the Minister to say well the NDP didn't require those statements. Mr. Speaker, we weren't subsidizing private nursing homes in the Province of Manitoba, we were paying them the same rate as the average non-profit nursing home in the Province of Manitoba; there was no requirement, no need for financial statements during those years; but there is now under the new policy unveiled by the Minister. The Minister would have strengthened his position this afternoon if he would say: I would insist on financial statement; I will ensure that every penny is disclosed insofar as expenditure is concerned; I'm not fearful of having those financial statements tabled and filed. The Winnipeg Gas must file financial statements before there's any rate increase — Winnipeg Gas. Yet the Minister takes such a milkshake approach, Mr. Speaker, to the production of financial statements from private nursing homes that are serving the elderly and the ill in the Province of Manitoba. Let me tell the Minister that when we form the government of this province there will be no hesitation in insisting upon financial statements from the private nursing homes in this province, no hesitation. If the Minister wishes to be hesitant . . .

Mr. Speaker, again the Minister is not listening, he was talking to the Minister that shuffles his feet. If he had been listening, Mr. Speaker, he would have been aware that I pointed out to the Minister that during those eight years we were not subsidizing private profit nursing homes. They were receiving the same rate as non-profit nursing homes in the Province of Manitoba, thus they could be treated alike. We were not subsidizing them to the extent of \$1.3 million which the Minister has done in the year 1980.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, and I pointed out to you that those we are subsidizing do have to supply us with a financial statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We can only have one speaker at one time. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister talks about 11 proprietary nursing homes being closed up, now he says only five. He tries to leave the impression that — quite a change. The Minister didn't mention the number of beds in those five, as compared to the number of beds in the 11. Mr. Speaker, I would hazard, from what the Minister himself acknowledged, that the number of beds is as great if not greater than there was before. So let the Minister not try to fudge the issue by trying to suggest well we reduced the number of proprietary homes in the Province of Manitoba; the bed allotment is similar.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are faced with is a simple issue before us. Ought a government that is interested in providing civilized care to the elderly, to the ill in our midst, provide that health care under the motivation of profit or should that care be provided with the principle motive being the provision of health care for purposes of, as the Member for Transcona so well put, although the Honourable Minister of Health didn't seem to appreciate it, for love and tender care. That is the issue that is before this House today; that is the resolution which we are debating. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Member for Emerson isn't here because he should be joining in this debate and he should be taking issue with the Minister of Health on behalf of his constituents in Emerson. Where is the Minister responsible for Physical Fitness? Why is he not speaking out on behalf of his constituents in La Verendrye?

The issue that is before us is whether or not personal care can be best provided through non-profit voluntary service through churches, service homes, others that are interested in providing health care for purposes only of service and not being involved simply as part of a larger operation for land development or profit purposes or speculation or whatever it be. So, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Minister that we do look forward to debating this issue in the months that lie ahead; we do look forward. The Minister said he's not going to duck debates. That's great because, Mr. Speaker, this Minister is going to be challenged from one platform to another about . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned till 2 o'clock tomorrow. (Thursday)