

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 26 April, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. EUGENE KOSTYRA (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House today that copies of Bill No. 2, The Residential Rent Regulation Act, will be distributed to all members this afternoon.

In view of the high level of public interest in this legislation, along with copies of this statement, I am including copies of news releases that will be issued this afternoon. It has been previously indicated that the Bill will provide for the setting of threshold rent increases by regulation.

I now wish to inform the members of the House that the threshold for rent increases, retroactive to January 1st, 1982, and for the balance of 1982 is proposed to be 9 percent. This figure takes into account two factors, increase in actual operating costs and an economic adjustment. The government has agreed that this will be the threshold set out in regulations after the Act is passed and proclaimed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. GARY FILMON (Tuxedo): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We, on this side, thank the Minister for his announcement and for providing the information that has been enquired about and alluded to in many discussions thus far since the proposal of this Act was put forth as part of the government's promises during its campaign. We, as always of course, support a fair and equitable system of rents for those who live in the residential rental market in this province. I know that we, along with many thousands of Manitobans who will be affected, both tenants and landlords by the implementation of this Act, are anxious to read it, review it and bring forward our comments for the benefit of the government in reviewing and dealing with this legislation as it goes through the House.

So, we thank the Minister for the announcement and we're looking forward to reviewing it and bringing forth more definitive comments in the near future.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, can I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 70 students, Grades 8 and 9

standing of the John Henderson Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Ramsay and Mr. Lynch. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the First Minister and I would ask him, Sir, notwithstanding the important announcement just made by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs whether, in view of the announcement made on Friday by the Minister of Energy and Mines with respect to layoffs and cut-backs at the ManFor project in Northern Manitoba, it's the intention of the First Minister and his government to continue to make major announcements of that kind outside the House rather than inside the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I understand the concerns expressed by the Member for Fort Garry but I want to advise the Member for Fort Garry that I do believe that the Minister did what was right under the circumstances. The Minister travelled to The Pas, he spoke to the workers that would be affected directly by the layoffs so that they would indeed find out the news first. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is very important, in our society, that when indeed the livelihood of men and women are being affected that they should hear it first from government, not through the news, not through statements in the House but, when we're dealing with a matter as serious as that, that it should indeed be provided by the Minister to those that are affected directly.

I'm pleased to advise you, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Energy did indeed advise the people that were involved directly, so they would get the news first and not receive it secondhand by way of a report from the Legislature. So, insofar as the workers themselves, I think it was the best course of action, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there is no quarrel with the principle of telling the workers first. The question is whether it is the intention of this government to arrange the timetabling of such announcements in the future in such a way as to preclude that announcements being made in the Legislature particularly on the last day of the working week when the Legislature is recessing for the weekend. Is it the government's intention to ignore the mechanics of timetabling for such announcements that could be put in place to ensure that the workers were informed first and the Legislature was also informed simultaneously?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think this government

proportionate to other governments has, indeed, taken advantage of providing more statements in this House than has, indeed, been the case before. Insofar as the Friday announcement, I believe the Minister, indeed, issued that information here at 12:00 o'clock, not ahead but at the same time that the workers as a whole would receive that information from the local media and the Minister, I think, properly honoured the understanding that he had given to those he had spoken to on Thursday in The Pas that they would, indeed, hear that news not after but at least simultaneous with the release of the information here. I think the Minister did the right thing insofar as the families that, indeed, must be very worried and very upset by what is the inevitable result of the slowdown in the lumber and pulp industry that he made that kind of arrangement. In fact, I would commend him for having done so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. In continuing to do the right thing as the First Minister puts it, and with which the opposition has no quarrel, will the First Minister undertake in this House to assure that the righter thing will be done in future and that the elected representatives of the people who have a question period at 10:00 o'clock on Friday morning and who are not in a position to ask question of the government after 11:00 o'clock on Friday morning for the remainder of that week, are properly advised of major and significant announcements of this kind affecting the well-being of many hundreds of Manitobans and the economy of this province?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the honourable member this is not a program or a policy announcement. It was an announcement pertaining to the layoff of employees at ManFor. So far as it being a policy or program, it certainly was not and therefore I think it does fall into a different realm altogether than that of an announcement pertaining to a policy or program.

Insofar as the timing, it's my understanding that the local news outlet in The Pas would not have been able to release that information before 12:00 o'clock; certainly they would not have been able to release it in time to head off the news that had been released during the question period on Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister will advise the House what day the Budget will be brought down?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the date is not determined precisely but it will be approximately the middle part of May.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister confirm that there will be a sales tax increase in the Budget?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I turn to you whether or not such a question is in order. I believe it not to be in

order. A question of Budget is certainly out of order. The Minister knows full well the difficult circumstances under which we are working in regard to the preparation of Budget, but I'm not going to get into specific questions pertaining to whether or not something will occur arising from the Budget. That is why the Budget will be tabled in the proper manner.

The Minister, however, does know of the difficult choices that are confronting us in every respect.

MR. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While in Opposition the New Democratic Party strongly opposed the ad valorem tax. Since coming to government they have raised that tax twice. I wonder if the people of Manitoba can expect any relief from that or will this be another broken promise?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do ask you whether or not questions pertaining to information in the Budget are in order in this Chamber?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the honourable member is entitled to ask the sort of questions that he has. The members of the Treasury Branch are free to answer them or not to answer them as they fit.

The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, Budget questions will be answered with the delivery of the Budget in this Chamber and I'm certainly not going to be answering yes or no to the specific questions pertaining to whether this or whether that will be in the Budget. That information will be provided by the Minister of Finance when he, indeed, does table his Budget in the normal way at the normal time, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health. I wonder can the Honourable Minister of Health advise the House, and especially the students and teachers, parents and trustees in Inter-Mountain School Division if it's fit, safe and proper to re-open the Grandview School tomorrow after the three-day examination of the possible health hazards?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, the latest information was handed to me just as I entered this House. So with leave of the House to give the information, I'm ready to read the short memo that I have, but I have to ask leave at this time.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS (Cont'd)

MR. DESJARDINS: The Department of Health, Medical Public Health, Dr. W.G. French and Dr. Eric Sigurdson of Dauphin continue to maintain the lead

role in the investigation and action at the Grandview School. Environmental Management Division staff are continuing to provide a support service.

On Friday, April 23 and Saturday, April 24, 1982 Environmental Management Division staff, local Public Health Inspectors in Dauphin and Air Pollution Control staff of Winnipeg established continuous monitoring for carbon monoxide. Drager tubes were also used for carbon monoxide, nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide. Detectable levels were not recorded.

On Sunday April 25, 1982 Don McLean, Assistant Deputy Minister of Health advised Dr. Sigurdson who had been requested to attend a school board meeting at Grandview at 2:30 p.m. to decide on school opening. It was agreed that teachers should return Monday, April 26, 1982 and students on Tuesday, April 27, 1982.

On Monday April 26, 1982, Dr. French advised the results on students indicating a need to investigate carbon monoxide levels and carbon dioxide levels in the school in more detail, particularly the stage and music room areas due to abnormal Carbic C Hemoglobin levels. This diagnostic evidence became available only on April 26, 1982.

On receipt of this information the Environmental Management Division, the Dauphin inspection staff are proceeding to the school to continue monitoring, and Air Pollution Control staff from Winnipeg are proceeding to Grandview today to continue the continuous monitoring equipment and investigate the carbon monoxide source in more detail. This includes the ventilation system which may require immediate improvements and the use of the school incinerator.

The Mechanical and Engineering Division of Labour and Manpower is being requested to inspect the heating and circulation systems. Environmental Management Division staff is maintaining close liaison with Medical Public Health and further action will be taken in response to the medical direction. The medical review is continuing.

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. Information over the weekend leads me to believe a meeting took place between members of the government and officials of the Peguis Indian Band having to do with the longstanding flooding problems on the Fisher River and the Peguis Indian Band. I wonder if the Minister can confirm whether the government has agreed to depart from the practice that has been the case over many years to fund up to 40 percent of the flood damage costs incurred by the Band and indeed in future construction projects involved in the relieving of the problem. Can the Minister of Natural Resources confirm that obligation has been assumed by this government on behalf of the people of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. AL MACKLING (St. James): Mr. Speaker, in respect to the matters that the honourable member raises. It is true that recurring problems again result from flooding of the Fisher River and a meeting was held in respect to that issue with the Band. My colleague, Mr. Uruski was present during those discussions; my Deputy Minister was there. I believe that the understanding the honourable member has indicated in respect to a 40 percent sharing was the position that was articulated, but that matter has not been finally discussed. There has to be discussion, I assume, with the Band and Department of Indian Affairs and so on. It will come back for further review but, certainly that area of sharing was under consideration or will be under consideration.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to him or indeed to the Minister of Agriculture who was present at the meeting. I think both the Ministers can confirm that the practised date has been that the Federal Government has assumed its 100-percent responsibility in these instances, just as it assumes 100-percent responsibility in the flood costs occurred on the Rousseau Indian Reserve; that's located in the constituency of my colleague, the Honourable Member for Emerson. What I'm asking for, is this a major policy departure or, indeed, is it going to start taking the Federal Government off the hook in a different way, if it so happens to be in the constituency of an NDP elected member such as the Minister of Agriculture, or will the Rousseau Indian Band be the recipient of 40-percent provincial costs of future flooding in that location as well?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member can be assured that no way do we as a government want to reduce the amount of cost-sharing that the Federal Government has been obliged or felt morally obligated to provide in the past. We certainly do not want to reduce the amount of assistance that the Federal Government should be providing in respect to projects within the province which would include that area.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Can the Minister confirm that it has been the practice — and we've had a great deal of flood experience; we've experienced a great deal of damage — that in those areas that were 100-percent federal responsibility, i.e. Indian reserves, that the Federal Government picked up 100 percent of the cost?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to reflect with precision what the past policy guidelines were. The honourable member says it was 100 percent, I'm not familiar with that, but I can indicate that it will be our intention to ensure that the Federal Government pays as much money under any settlement proposal or any development proposal in this situation as they would in any other.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, one final question. I would hope firstly, and I ask the question to the Minister, to the government, that it not now develop a multi-gear program of assistance with respect to various regions of the province, depending on their location,

and secondly, the question is: why are we prepared to increase our provincial commitment, in this instance of flood costs at the time we're reducing, or asking the municipal officials to reduce the traditional provincial commitment to the valley dykes in the communities of Morris, Letellier, St. Jean, St. Adolphe and Emerson with which the Minister is quite familiar? It seems to a contradiction. In this case the province is pressing for reduction of its obligations; in the case of the Peguis Indian Band we are seemingly accepting a far higher, 40 percent higher, obligation than heretofore has been the case.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the position that the honourable member is suggesting that this government has adopted. He knows that I have had a further meeting with the communities in respect to the valley dykes and the province is funding on the same level as it did in the past - that is 50 percent. The only reduction in funding occurred as a result of the stated policy intention of the Federal Government. Pursuant to that matter, while I have the floor, I'll indicate that at the request of those communities I have written a letter to the Minister responsible in Ottawa and have been in telephone conversation with him about the contents of my letter. What he has indicated in the course of his question as being the Manitoba policy is not the Manitoba policy. We are continuing to fund 50 percent of the cost of the valley dykes.

In respect to the Peguis and the Fisher River problem, I've indicated that in no way do we want to depart from the maximum participation from a cost point of view of the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, in the weekend press there was a situation outlined involving the Federal Tax Department and their seizure of assets of a couple from St. James. On the surface, the description of the situation is one that I find rather alarming. Although I know that the Minister of Finance for Manitoba has no direct responsibility, I wonder if the Minister could advise the House whether or not he has taken upon himself to have some sort of investigation done to satisfy himself that this procedure used by the Federal Government has indeed been done in the proper fashion and that the rights of the people involved have been protected?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. VIC SCHROEDER (Rossmere): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I have asked my department to contact the federal department involved to ask for an indication as to what exactly did happen there and I expect to get a report sometime in the near future. I might say, that with respect to this specific occurrence, I don't think it would be appropriate to be releasing any information because of the fact that the tax-gathering type of operation of the Federal Government is something which is considered to be information which is confidential as between the Revenue Department and the taxpayer.

I have also been in touch with the law firm which is acting for the particular taxpayer. I haven't had communications back from that lawyer but certainly I wouldn't be prepared to make any statement about this specific case without the approval of the individual involved.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I'm not asking the Honourable Minister for specific information; I'm asking the Honourable Minister if he will conduct sufficient investigation to assure himself and hence to allow him to assure the House that the investigation has been done according to law and that the rights of the people involved have been properly protected.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can give the honourable member the assurance that investigation can be carried out and that I will report on that issue to the House.

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

MR. G.W.J. (Gerry) MERCIER (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In view of the First Minister's election promise in writing, guaranteed and signed by him, to the effect that Manitoba New Democrats would provide security from layoffs, up to 12-month's notice or compensation to employees would be required, my question to the First Minister is: is he implementing this promise with respect to the ManFor layoffs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that similar kind of question was posed a week ago by the honourable member. I indicated to the honourable member that it pertained to changes in The Employment Standards Act, and that was a matter that the Minister of Labour had under his review at the present time; that the commitment re changes to The Employment Standards Act, in order to be more equitable, was one that we did accept to undertake during our term in office.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary then is to the Minister of Labour. Does he intend to introduce amendments to The Employment Standards Act to implement these promises at this Session of the Legislature?

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Norbert keeps referring to these election promises. I refer him to a copy of the speech that his leader made in Rossmere in 1977 where he was promising balanced budgets, which they didn't produce; where he was promising assistance for people to obtain housing, which he didn't produce; where he promised inner-city renewal which he didn't produce; where he promised, indeed, that they were going to do something to build more nursing homes and senior citizens homes and the first thing they did when they came to power was to freeze construction of senior citizen's and nursing homes. So, Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the member to give us time. We have four years; we

expect that we will, in fact, be able to implement all of our promises, unlike the previous government, which was able to deliver on very few of theirs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the Federal Agriculture Minister's statement on Friday in Vita that it is unlikely that he will bail out provincial stabilization, livestock stabilization programs; and whereas the hog stabilization in place right now terminates in December, could the Minister indicate whether he's now prepared to proceed with a Stabilization Program for the hog producers so that it will be in place when the present program ends?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. BILL URUSKI (Interlake): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should mention to the honourable member that we've had initial discussions with the Manitoba Hog Producers' Marketing Board and producers individually as well.

I've indicated to them that and I've given them our support for their position towards a national stabilization plan. We have indicated we will want to review with them and discuss further, any future proposals they might have with respect to an ongoing stabilization program in this province.

MR. DRIEDGER: To the same Minister, in view of the Minister's statement at a hog producers' meeting some time ago that he would be prepared to work out a cost-sharing formula with the hog industry, could the Minister indicate what kind of formula he is proposing?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the honourable member that we will want to sit down and discuss the implications and any views the Producer Board might have with respect to any future program. There have been no direct work or details developed at this point in time. There have been preliminary discussions with them vis-a-vis the present Stabilization Program which we are now funding because there wasn't adequate funding provided by the previous administration.

MR. DRIEDGER: To the same Minister, is this Minister going to consult with hog producer groups for their input into this program or is he going to just contact certain individuals as he did when he implemented his beef stabilization program?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member makes an assumption which is totally out of place and inaccurate. He doesn't wish to accept the statements I have made in this House whereby we have accepted basically, the principles of a plan that was proposed by MCPA dealing with various levels of insurance. We have modified it somewhat, but we have consulted with them.

The Manitoba Farm Bureau made presentations to

the Cabinet and MCPA is a member of the Manitoba Farm Bureau. I've had meetings with various producer groups as well as other organizations, as well as producers.

I don't accept the principle and the assumption of the honourable member that there has not been consultation and, in fact, the producer groups which have been established by our government in five regional committees, will be discussing the very details and best ways to advise us as to be able to implement this plan and the producers will be directly involved in this program by attending meetings, by having the advisory groups, they will be involved in making their own program. We have established the principles of the program, but the producers will be involved in advising us as to the best way to implement this program.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I've received the latest bulletin on the Grandview situation I'd like to share with the House because there are some changes.

"Results of the blood tests arrived and carbon monoxide showed up in all of the tests. At this time it has not been determined why carbon monoxide was present on those days. It should be noted that blood samples were taken randomly, specifically blood samples were taken from three students only."

On Sunday afternoon it was decided to open the school today for teaching service as I mentioned earlier, and bring the students in on Tuesday. In light of the results of the blood tests, the superintendent is unsure of the action the Board will take. The Board will be meeting at 3:00 p.m. today to review the matter.

Apparently there are two alternatives that are open to the Board; keep the school closed until the cause of the carbon monoxide is determined — and this would entail making arrangements for alternative facilities to house the students — or, open the school and monitor the condition of the air and if carbon monoxide is detected, close the school again.

The superintendent, Mr. Graves, advised that a government official is on his way this afternoon to test the condition of the air in the school.

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I have one more question for the Minister of Agriculture. The Federal Agriculture Minister was promoting the supply management for beef at the Vita meeting. Could the Minister indicate whether he supports the concept of supply management in beef?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, we do support the aspects of providing producers with a stable return based on the cost of production. In terms of Canadian produc-

tion, supply in terms of reducing supply is not a problem because we in Canada, have yet to be able to produce enough beef to feed our own people.

It would have to be a program that would encourage the increased supply of beef in this country provided, of course, the incentive would be that producers would be able to realize a return to cover their costs of production and some return for their labours. We certainly would have no difficulty with that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. (Dave) BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Thursday last the Acting Minister of Agriculture took as notice to two or three questions I asked of the Minister. I wonder if he's had an opportunity to look at those in relation to the rebuilding of the stockyards in Brandon.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I did have those questions recorded. I could only comment generally because I was away at another engagement and didn't go back to the office when I came here. But I could tell the honourable member that we certainly are co-operating with the Manitoba Pool Elevators and if there is any way that we can provide them with help — in fact, we've allowed some of our staff to assist them in looking at details that they are now pursuing — we are doing so to try and co-operate with them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the First Minister arising from answers to questions I posed to him last Wednesday, with regards to the questions asked by the Member for St. Norbert today.

I wonder if he could confirm to the House that ManFor is a wholly-owned Manitoba company?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that's a matter of record which the honourable member has access to just as well as members of the Treasury Bench.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the First Minister could confirm that no legislation is required with regard to layoffs in this particular instance, since it is a wholly-owned Manitoba Crown Corporation and that in this particular instance we don't need any legislation and the government is not practising what they promised.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to comment to the honourable member that I can recall the days when it was suggested by honourable members across the way that we were interfering with the operations of Manitoba Crown corporations, requiring them to undertake certain actions and laws that were not necessarily applicable with the laws of the Province of Manitoba.

Now it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we've gone full circle and I'm hearing representations across the

way that we do that which we have been condemned for in the past.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in light of the promises made with regard to providing at least 12 months notice of layoff before any layoffs would occur, is the First Minister saying now that was, as my colleague put it, just a promise? That in this particular instance they have a concrete avenue of approaching this and practising what they're preaching? Is he saying to the people of Manitoba it's okay if the government does it, if we lay off people at ManFor or lay people off in Crown corporations, but the private sector better not do it and we're going to go after those people?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, members across the way do not appear to yet understand that this government is moving very quickly to implement its promises. We have a four-year mandate. We've already, Mr. Speaker, implemented 10 of the 15 main commitments we made during the campaign. I would invite you to compare that record with the four-year record of the previous government.

We're implementing the Emergency Interest Rate Relief Program; the Rental Control Program; a restored health care system; income stabilization for beef; construction of senior citizens homes; new northern policies that are under way. We're also implementing the Main Street Program, the expansion of Pharmacare; the expansion of children's dental care and Farmland Protection legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if you compare that with the very dismal record of fulfilling campaign commitments in 1977, with the very good start that this government has accomplished in the first four to five months of its government, then I think, Mr. Speaker, that Manitobans are in a very clear position as to which party indeed, is taking election commitments in a serious way.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the First Minister. On Wednesday he said there was quite a difference between the termination of jobs because of bankruptcies, or layoffs. At that time he made a distinction and left a distinct impression in this House that if there were layoffs which would occur because of a lack of activity in the economic field, that was totally different and in that particular instance, their election promise would be carried forward. What he is telling us today is it doesn't matter if it's layoffs, shut-downs or anything, they are not ready to fulfill that promise.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot help if the honourable member will want to believe what he wishes to hear. But I would refer the honourable member to the comments this morning by the Mayor of The Pas, who certainly is no political friend of this government, that expressed the —(Interjection)— well, he ran for your nomination in The Pas in the last election — Mr. Speaker, who said —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is advising me that the Mayor of The Pas is a friend of this government, then I am indeed pleased because it means in the space of some five months we're winning converts from the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, what I do wish to refresh the mental powers of the Member for La Verendrye with, is that my Minister of Energy — and I again want to congratulate him for this, attended —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, if the honourable members would like to hear the response to the Minister's question — the honourable member did meet with the leadership of the union and others in The Pas. He outlined various alternatives that were available.

It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, and I think indeed that this is an example of very responsible labour-management relationship under very difficult circumstances which the workers understood; which the Mayor of the Town of The Pas understood. They agreed that the government had no alternative but the approach it did undertake in the long-term interests, in the viability of the ManFor. Unlike, Mr. Speaker, the situation which, indeed, I understand is there by way of documentation, when the previous government were advised in August of 1981 that the inventory was far surpassing the demand, I believe it was by a ratio of 14 to 1, the former government simply advised at that time it wasn't in the public interest — of course, that was three months before the election of November 17 — to undertake any changes.

MR. BANMAN: I wonder if the First Minister could confirm that every time in the last several months that the Minister of Energy has gone to The Pas, he's been announcing layoffs?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy nor anyone on this side of the House appreciates having to announce layoffs. What I do, indeed, prefer as to previous approach those announcements are made to the workers themselves and to the local people involved with municipal government at Le Pas; they're not made from a distance, Mr. Speaker, they're discussed with those that are most vitally affected. Mr. Speaker, various alternatives are discussed, joint committee is formed of management and . . . I know that honourable members don't like joint management-employee participation. They'd prefer to say confrontation but, that's not the way of this government, Mr. Speaker, that's not the way of this government.

Mr. Speaker, what we are attempting to do, and this is of mutual interest to both the workers and Manfor in Le Pas, is reduce the ratio of inventory to demand in order to ensure the long-term viability of the operation at The Pas. At the same time, the Minister, as he's mentioned in this House on different occasions — maybe the Member for La Verendrye was not present at the time — is working in order to bring about the necessary funding in order to provide modernization of the ManFor operation, the sawmill operation to ensure increased employment and viability in the years that lie ahead.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wants to talk about our record in The Pas, I invite him to compare our approach to the — let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't want to be unkind to the honourable members across the way — but, somewhat irresponsible conduct of the previous government in respect to the ManFor situation.

MR. BANMAN: I wonder if the First Minister could inform the House that under his approach, we now have the highest unemployment rates in the Province of Manitoba and we have growing welfare case loads within this province and that we are seeing a record number of bankruptcies, not according to the figures that I've put forward, but according to the figures that the member's colleagues in Ottawa are spouting. In order words, we have had a dramatic increase in bankruptcies and unemployment since they took office.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we fully understand the difficult situation that Canada is confronted with today and as a result of that, the Province of Manitoba, the result of the international recession. We also understand the impact that high interest rates have in respect to the total Canadian economy, the effects on individual provinces and particular regions such as Manitoba, regions of this country that are affected by high interest rate policies, the dislocation of capital that results from that. We understand that very well and the honourable member's facts may or may not be correct.

But I point out to him that, indeed, by way of some clear contrast with our sister Province of Saskatchewan bankruptcies in 1981 in Manitoba exceeded the number in Saskatchewan three to one. So, if the honourable member wants to bandy around figures I invite him to do so. But what we are confronted with is the impact of the recession 1980, 1981-82 upon Canada, upon Manitoba; unfortunately Manitoba got an earlier taste of recession, because of their policies that had been adopted in 1978-79, than the rest of the Canadian population.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Time for question period has expired. Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

HON. ROLAND PENNER (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, may I announce a couple of changes please, with respect to Committees. There will be a meeting of Law Amendments Tuesday, May 4, previously scheduled for Economic Development ManFor with that Committee to be rescheduled. Again with respect to Estimates in the House following Health at the beginning of next week I would assume, Finance instead of Education, with Education to follow.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON CROW RATE RESOLUTION

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask you please to call the adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable Minister of Transport on the Crow rate?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed Resolution of the Honourable Minister of Government Services standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Por-

tage la Prairie.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Portage la Prairie, who took the adjournment, had intended to speak today but he is attending a meeting discussing the Crow in Portage la Prairie and, hopefully, will be back tomorrow to discuss it.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any other member that wishes to speak on this Resolution this afternoon?

The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. MURIEL SMITH (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the actual Resolution on the Crow and I'd like to draw to the attention of the House that the Resolution on the order books is objecting, not to change, but to the method of change, to the unilateral action in which the Federal Government has introduced this proposed change in the Crow rate and to the socially and economically unjust effects of that change. In their proposal they wish to remove the statutory grain rates and yet there is no parallel obligation recognized that the CPR plow some its profits back into the railway development field. Meanwhile we have seen from the CPR and in the course of time since there was the introduction of Crow rates and the parallel special concession to the CPR, millions and millions and millions of dollars flow out of the country as the CPR made investments around the world and did not plow back into the Canadian economy - specifically into the railway system - the profits that they derived from that original grant from the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize the need to improve railways. What we're querying in this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, is the method of improvement that's been proposed. What we're concerned about, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the method is the question of who bears the burden of this change and who reaps the benefit from it. The Liberal have been chastising all and sundry; they've been saying look forward not backward. Our Conservative friends seem to say, it I can judge from the metric debate, look backwards, what has been is okay. What we're proposing is that it's important to look at where we've come from, where we're at and then decide where we're going and how we're going to get there.

Let's look at the past in regard to the Crow. The CPR received a deal from the people of Canada in terms of land with no tax. That looked good; we've benefited from that; we got a railway across the country which did - as the members opposite have spelled out in great detail and a deal of persuasiveness, I might add - help to build the country, to open it up to settlement. The farmers benefit in their turn from the other half of the bargain, Mr. Speaker; they benefited from a Crow rate, a regulated rate for the transportation of grain and we all benefited from that. The prairies were populated; we developed a viable agricultural industry here on the prairie and the volume of Canadian exports and the money that was available for the development of Canada went way up.

The manufacturing industry did suffer some slight disadvantage from this arrangement and that is something we should look at, Mr. Speaker. But I submit that

if we wish to help the manufacturing industry we must look at the problem in proportion and not assume that a complete elimination of the Crow rate will automatically benefit that portion.

Let's look at the present. We have to acknowledge that each industry has its special problems, Mr. Speaker, the farming industry has some very special problems. It exists in a context where its costs are steadily going up; its costs for fuel; its cost for machinery; its cost for chemicals, and its costs for credit, Mr. Speaker. Meanwhile, the price that the farming industry receives for its product stays relatively stable; there is very little farmer control over that price. Meanwhile, the costs are shooting up in general and they're very unevenly distributed, Mr. Speaker, because of the vast land area that farmers must work in and the very different distances that they must transport their crop to the markets and to the elevators. So, Mr. Speaker, in the farming industry some kind of managed marketing is necessary and some sort of public subsidy is necessary if, Mr. Speaker, we're going to preserve this industry for the greater benefit of all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, many farmers receive inadequate return for the labour that they put into their effort and that situation will be aggravated by the solution proposed by the Liberal Government. The solution proposed is unjust, Mr. Speaker. They have with the stroke of a pen declared that the farmer should take a big cut in the benefit they get from their industry. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, they have set up a committee that makes recommendation to moderate the negative effects of that change. But, Mr. Speaker, setting up a committee in advance of making that decision might have made sense, then the farmers would have known what the trade-offs were. But, Mr. Speaker, to set up a committee after the decision has been made to remove the Crow rates is, I submit, no guarantee to the farmers that they are going to receive a fair deal. It's not a process that I respect, Mr. Speaker, and I suspect it is not a process that the farmers of the west should agree to.

So let's look to the future, it's important, Mr. Speaker, that we plan for change, that we not introduce sudden shocks to any sector of the economy such that their ability to adjust and to make plans, to make adjustments, is minimized. We must plan for balanced regional development, Mr. Speaker. After all that's what a lot of the rhetoric was about in the recent constitutional debate and yet, immediately on the passing - well before the passing of the Constitution repatriation - what are we finding, Mr. Speaker? We're finding a Federal Government callously willing to remove one of the necessary props that the western farmers have required to order to get a fair deal in Confederation, Mr. Speaker. They have set the cause of balanced regional development backwards rather than forwards.

The changes they're proposing are aggravating the imbalance that we already have. Even within the prairie region, Mr. Speaker, the effects of this change are not balanced. Manitoba and Manitobafarmers will suffer the most. It is estimated that the loss to the Manitoba economy will be in the neighborhood of \$90 million. Saskatchewan will be affected moderately and the Province of Alberta will be affected

only slightly.

The real purpose of the change, Mr. Speaker, has not been to assist the farmers, or I suspect even to give them a slap in the face, though that may seem to be the effect, the purpose of the change is to move coal, sulphur and potash to ports more cheaply. Of course, the railways must be improved to carry out this task, Mr. Speaker, the question we must address ourselves to is, how?

Over the years the Canadian Pacific, the other benefitting partner to the early agreement when the Crow was established, the C.P. has built up an enormously profitable trans-national investment company; C.P. has invested its profits abroad; C.P. has not reinvested a reasonable share of its profits in railway maintenance and in railway improvement. It's been estimated that funds in the neighborhood of \$2.3 billion, the amount required, Mr. Speaker, to upgrade the railway in Canada, that funds of that order, that have been generated internally in Canada, are being invested abroad, and have been invested abroad. The mega sellout deal of the 1880s is coming home to haunt the Federal Government and costs the people of Canada, particularly the farmers of western Canada, the rural communities of western Canada.

The Liberals in Ottawa are still telling us that progress will result, Mr. Speaker, they are saying we should move into the 20th Century and prepare for the 21st Century; that we should look to the positive side, to the fact that we will improve and increase our manufacturing sector, that we will increase our capacity to process our raw materials. Admittedly, desirable goals and goals which I spend a lot of time promoting but, Mr. Speaker, the question is, how much will this measure improve those industries, those activities? How much, because is it a good bargain to give away 10 on one side in order to retain one on the other? It's not a good bargain, Mr. Speaker.

The beef industry could prosper from these changes but in the order of one tenth of what the grain industry will lose. The members opposite have said a lot about the CSP, the Harrowby oil crushing plant, saying that somehow, by adopting a "don't change the Crow approach," that we're somehow jeopardizing their chances for survival. Mr. Speaker, the future of the Harrowby crushing plant, as they have told us themselves, depends a great deal more on whether or not the Manitoba Government is going to match the Saskatchewan and Alberta subsidies than it is going to depend on changes in the Crow. Those factors, Mr. Speaker, are the ones that are affecting the competitive ability of CSP, not the Crow rate.

We've been told that the Port of Churchill will gain. That may very well be true, Mr. Speaker, but the question we still must ask is not whether it will gain but how much it will gain and how much it will gain in proportion to other things that are lost. Let's examine the truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, all is not what it seems in the debate over the Crow. There is going to be a slight increase in beef production but I remind you, eastern Canada and British Columbia have incentive programs in place for the beef industry; we would have to match those in order to be competitive. Alberta is going to be the chief benefactor in the beef industry because they currently have a comparative advantage.

They say we'll have lower cost feed grain in Manitoba. There will be some improvement because of that but because of the limited size of our markets here in Manitoba the prices will not generate a big improvement. There were in place, Mr. Speaker, between the years of 1977 and 1980, lower feed grain prices in Manitoba and yet there was no, I repeat, no increase in beef production. Why? There were other factors that were involved; there was a lower consumer demand for beef. If we wish to export our beef to the United States, Mr. Speaker, the extra transportation cost that we're going to have to add to our product will lower the price that the farmers receive and the net benefit to the Manitoba farmers may, in fact, be negative.

The loss of farm income is going to be in the neighborhood of 10 times greater than any gains that can currently be projected from an improved manufacturing sector and beef industry sector. Think of the effect that will have on our rural communities.

Our manufacturing sector could receive some impetus. I know that the Chamber of Commerce representatives are inclined to feel that the slow development of manufacturing in Manitoba can be solely attributed to differential transportation costs. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish the solution were as simple as removing the Crow but I can tell you if each farm family has \$500 to \$1000 less to spend, that it will have an impact on our local manufacturers and our local industry on a scale that must be taken into account.

Mr. Speaker, what we're calling for from the Federal Government is a willingness to plan for balanced development that would harmonize the needs of the manufacturing sector and the farming sector of the producer and the consumer; a plan, Mr. Speaker, that would not play the strong against the weak. Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of this resolution, to call into question the method of change and the reliability, if you like, of the liberal promises that they're trying to give a fair deal to the west. I submit that the way they're going about it, Mr. Speaker, is not well designed to bring about a good benefit for the west, therefore I urge you all to vote solidly in favour of the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Virden): Would the Honourable Minister submit to a question?

MRS. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GRAHAM: In the interests of retaining the Crow rate and beef production in Canada, does the Minister also want the retention of the Feed Freight Assistance Program as well?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, could I have the member opposite repeat the question please?

MR. GRAHAM: The Honourable Minister wants to retain or keep a level of beef production and has spoken in favour of retaining the Crow rate. Does she also want to retain the Feed Freight Assistance Program?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, what we want is a fair deal for both the grain producers and the beef producers. The retention of a specific program is not the issue; the issue is whether there's a fair deal negotiated. So, we would be willing to look at the total package and see if both the grain farmer and the beef producer have a fair opportunity to maintain their industry and get a good return. The retention of a single factor is not at issue. It's the total package that's important.

MR. GRAHAM: Then, the Honourable Minister would want to tie the Feed Freight Assistance Program in with the Crow rate and retain both, is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the former Speaker certainly knows that this question is out of order. We've allowed the first question. The question asked after a speech is just for clarification, not to invite somebody to start another speech. We've invited our friend to participate and I think that we should refrain from starting this procedure because there'll be no end to speech. This is inviting another speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is any other member prepared to speak on the resolution? If not, it will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, before calling the next motion, I'd like to inform the House that we'll receive a visit from the Lieutenant-Governor at 4:30 p.m. to pass The Paramutual Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development 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.

MR. SPEAKER: It's moved by the Honourable Minister of Health and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Economic Development 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.

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm taking this opportunity to speak now, Mr. Speaker, because this government is breaking the trust that was placed in them by the people of this province last November.

This government, Mr. Speaker, is showing first of all, that they can't be trusted to observe the traditions of this House. Mr. Speaker, they're showing that they can't be trusted to provide accurate information to the people of Manitoba and to the public, to the capital markets as well. Mr. Speaker, they can't be trusted to consult in a manner which they said they would be

consulting. They have said that they would have an open-door policy with the people of Manitoba. In fact, we're seeing after five months that it is not working that way, Mr. Speaker. They can't be trusted to carry out their election promises with respect to economic development, employment and taxation. The one thing we're finding, Mr. Speaker, that they can be trusted to do is to practice patronage to an extent that wouldn't have been thought possible to listen to them a year ago when they were in opposition.

Mr. Speaker, let me first deal with the question of the traditions of the House. Last Friday morning, the Crow Resolution was called by the Government House Leader as it had been called on a number of occasions. It was standing in the name of one of our members and as has often been the case in the House, the member asks that a Bill of Resolution be allowed to stand. Tradition says, Mr. Speaker, that unless notice is given then that opportunity to let the Bill of Resolution stand is granted. Indeed, Sir, I believe your own comment or ruling on the issue showed that to be the case, Mr. Speaker, when you said, and I quote:

"It is a long standing practice and tradition in this House that if a member is not prepared to speak on a particular motion that day that the House allow the matter to stand over with another member eligible or entitled to speak on that particular item if he wishes to do so. When no one else wishes to speak the matter stands in the name of the member who has adjourned debate. However, it is the entitlement of the House if they so wish to insist that the matter be dealt with and come to a vote if there is no one willing to speak. Those are the rules. That is the practice that we have continued."

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, as you point out, the government did have the right to do what the Government House Leader called for but tradition demanded that they should give notice prior to disallowing the debate to stand or to be adjourned by another member. There was never any indication given to this House that it was necessary to conclude debate on the Crow Resolution by a specific date. Indeed, this issue has been going on for a great length of time and there's new information that continues to be made known virtually day by day, certainly week by week as more and more discussion takes place in the country and new studies are undertaken.

It only became evident on Friday that the deadline which the honourable members opposite were working to was the Saskatchewan election. Mr. Speaker, what they were attempting to do was to force a vote, and in not being able to force a vote, Mr. Speaker, at least they had hoped prior to that, that they would be able to have members on this side of the House stand, speak on this issue and perhaps say something that they might be able to exploit to the advantage of their colleagues in Saskatchewan.

Now that was not a charge that we would have laid prior to last Friday morning, Mr. Speaker, but when it became evident on Friday morning that they wanted to force a vote on this issue even though, for example, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture had not spoken on this Resolution, a Resolution that is that important to the agricultural community and the Minister of Agriculture hasn't spoken and their House Leader wants to get up and force a vote to be taken

without any notice having been given. Had he even stood the day before, Mr. Speaker, and said we're not going to allow this debate to stand any longer, then the Opposition would have been put on proper notice and we would have had no choice but to proceed the debate or let the issue come to a vote.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. James doesn't seem to understand the tradition but you, Sir, understand the tradition and you put it on the record, Sir, on Friday, February 23 when you said that, indeed, this is the tradition of the House. To have that sort of thing put forward by the Government House Leader, Sir, I find most disturbing and to have it happen on the same day that the Minister of Energy and Mines is making a statement to the press which he denied to this House prior to that, at the same time as the Government House Leader was accusing the Opposition of not debating but of going into the halls and talking to the press. At that same moment, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy and Mines is making a statement to the press outside of this House. Mr. Speaker, that in itself is bad enough.

But, Sir, I would draw to your attention the fact that I have had a written question on the Order Paper for over two weeks dealing with the very question of layoffs at ManFor. Sir, that question was placed on the Order Paper in written form asking that government about layoffs at ManFor and what was being done to mitigate the problems that it was going to cause for people laid off. This government chose to ignore the fact that there was a question on the Order Paper and go outside of the House and make that information known to the press.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind but what the government could have made that announcement on Thursday rather than on Friday. There's no reason in the world why they couldn't have had that announcement made at 2:00 o'clock on Thursday afternoon. The Minister could have risen in the House here, made a statement at the same time as the information was being released in The Pas, the employees would have had the information at the same time that the people who are responsible for governing this province would get the information in this Chamber so, Mr. Speaker, I regard that as absolutely inexcusable on the part of the government, especially when it's combined with the display that we saw concerning the Crow Resolution.

I'm finding, Mr. Speaker, that we're having that sort of unilateral action on the part of the government even though they may have the right to do it. Tradition has said that they would not and we see again today, Sir, when the Government House Leader rises in this Chamber and makes a unilateral announcement about the order in which Estimates are going to be handled without ever having a word said to the Opposition. I realize that it's the government's prerogative to call the order of Estimates in the House but it's tradition, Mr. Speaker, that the Government House Leader at least consults with the Opposition House Leader and sees whether or not that might be convenient for them. That was not done and we're finding that it is becoming more and more prevalent in the way that this government is handling the House.

Sir, we know that the Legislature has been in Session now for over two months. We're told that there

are major bills yet to come and we haven't seen them yet, and I expect that some of those major pieces of legislation are going to come very late in the Session. Again, something that when that party was in Opposition, they decried very strongly that our government should bring any piece of legislation in late in the Session. Well, Mr. Speaker, we're seeing how they are managing the Business of this House.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of information distribution, we have dealt with this question before but it must be stressed again and again that, to begin with, one of the first actions that this government took was to begin to politicize the Information Services Branch of the government by making it report to a political appointee in the Premier's office, something that has never been done before.

Government Information Services has always reported through the Civil Service and the Director of Information Services has reported to another civil servant, not to a political appointee in the Premier's office, to the very person who served as the Premier's executive assistant when he was Leader of the Opposition. That person was quickly elevated, Sir, to a salary well in the range of \$40,000 a year and now has the Information Services reporting to him.

One of the first things we say, Mr. Speaker, was that information was being released from the Department of Finance with respect for example, to the spending Estimates of the government. Press releases were put out showing that the government was planning to have a 14.4 percent increase in spending, changing the base on which the spending Estimates had always been calculated in the past, because had the information been put out in the way which it has normally been put out, Mr. Speaker, it would have shown of course that there was a 16.9 percent increase.

I know, Sir, that this sort of misinformation was not put forward by the professional staff in the Department of Finance because those are very competent professional people, Sir, and consistency means something to them. They know the way that the information has been presented in the past has always been print over print. When this government took hold of the Information Services then they changed the system to try and make it appear as though their expenditures were not going to be as large as they really are.

Well, Sir, it might have looked good at the time, they might have gotten a headline or two at the time, but in the long run of course it's going to look very bad for them because, Sir, I'm confident that before this year is out we're going to find that far from a 14.4 percent increase, Sir, that this government is going to incur increases in spending in the neighbourhood of 20 percent.

We already have seen many items that have been placed before the House now that were not included in the original Estimates tabled, even though the government knew that they were going to have to make provision for those. They turn up almost every week, for instance, last week, Sir, we discovered that \$600,000 which had been budgeted to go towards the Music Building at Brandon University is not being budgeted in the up-coming year even though we're told the commitment still stands. Well, Sir, I'm not sure how a commitment of that nature stands when

the money isn't included in the Estimates.

We saw another example with the presentation of the prospectus which the Minister of Finance made to the capital markets. Again, Sir, let me make it absolutely clear, we're not talking about misinformation put forward by the professional staff of the Department of Finance, we're talking about information put forward by the Minister of Finance and we're talking about a situation, or where perhaps his colleagues have not made it known and did not make it known to the Minister of Finance, some of the changes in their policies that had taken place. Because that prospectus, Sir, would lead people to believe, potential investors to believe, there was for instance a Memorandum of Agreement in place between the government and International Mineral with respect to the development of a potash mine; that there was a Memorandum of Understanding between the government and the Aluminum Company of Canada with respect to the development of an aluminum smelter in the province and, indeed, there was reference made to two or three other large projects as well.

What we discovered later, Sir, was that in fact that Letter of Intent and that Memorandum of Understanding were no longer in place and that the information which had been provided to the capital markets was, in fact, inaccurate. That, perhaps, was understandable because when the original prospectus was filed, when it was written at least, those things were true, Sir, because this government, the party now on this side of the House, was in government and that Letter of Intent and that Memorandum of Understanding, etc., were in place. So when the prospectus was filed on the 23rd of December then those people filing it at the official level had every reason to believe that those statements were correct. But there was a supplemental filed in March, Sir, and by that time the Ministers in this government knew full well where those negotiations stood and they knew those statements made in the prospectus were not accurate.

Sir, we require of people filing a prospectus with our own Securities Commission in Manitoba, if any one of us were to file a prospectus for a company in Manitoba trying to encourage some investment, we would find that within The Securities Act, for instance, it says that a prospectus shall provide full, true and plain disclosure of all material facts relating to the security proposed to be issued. That's fairly straightforward, Sir, but the prospectus filed by the Minister of Finance would not meet the criteria set down in this province's Securities Act.

It further says, Sir, with respect to additional information that, if a statement required to be contained in a prospectus would otherwise be misleading the prospectus shall contain such additional information, whether or not expressly required to be contained in the prospectus, as may be necessary to make the required statement not misleading in the light of circumstances in which it is made.

Again, Sir, we would require people seeking potential investors in this province to do something which the Minister of Finance has not seen fit to do when he goes abroad seeking to borrow hundreds of millions of dollars. Sir, we will have more to say about that document in the future, but I draw to the attention of the House the fact that figures dealing with the real

gross provincial product from 1976 to 1980 have all been changed from the prospectus filed in June to the prospectus filed in December. It happens, Sir, that all of the figures relating to NDP years are up and all of the figures relating to Conservative years are down. Sir, when we get to deal with the Estimates of the Minister of Finance we will be questioning very carefully what has happened to cause the revision of figures some five and six years into the past to the extent of 100 percent or more.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the government's dissemination of information concerning the Crow rate debate. I think it's probably fair to say that we are seeing civil servants used to present information to the public in this case in a way that I don't recall civil servants being asked to present information before, in that the information being presented is very selective. It is not an effort, Sir, to place all of the information relevant to the Crow rate debate before the public. What we have seen and what we are seeing is an effort by the government to place only that information before the public which is supportive of the government's position.

Sir, that begins —(Interjection)— well the Member for Dauphin says, that's all there is, and that is an attitude of course which reflects the thinking of many of the members opposite. I won't say it reflects all of them, but there is only one position and that is the position that's taken by the N.D. Party. That pervades many areas, Sir, many areas where this government doesn't acknowledge there are other legitimate positions that can be taken and that information points to other positions. Instead, we have a situation where the Member for Dauphin says, there is only one position and that's his position. Well, I don't subscribe to that, Sir, and I believe the public of Manitoba will not subscribe to that as well. I hope this isn't a trend that we're going to see from the government, we will have this type of biased information being put forward through the Civil Service, entirely legitimate of course for a politician to stand and make his or her case to the public, but when the Civil Service is involved to put forward only that information which is supportive of the government position, then it becomes questionable, Mr. Speaker, and we're going to be watching that very carefully. I'd like to comment a bit about the question of patronage with this government as well, Sir.

During the time that we were in government there were many occasions when the New Democrats spoke so strongly against the so-called political appointees of the Conservative Government and of the patronage that was practised by the Conservative Government, and we admit it. Along with some of the members of the NDP, for instance, the former Member for Inkster who was still with the NDP for part of that time, acknowledged that a government had the right to appoint people to boards and commissions and even to senior civil service levels, to appoint people who were compatible with the government's position and we didn't especially take exception to that, Sir. There were many people in the New Democratic Party at that time that did take exception to it and so now when they come into government we see where they really stand on that issue that, in fact, they have practised patronage to a greater extent than I would ever

have thought, Sir, in listening to their speeches in this House and their comments in this House for the four years previous.

For instance, the appointment of the former Member for Seven Oaks as the Chairman of the Telephone Board and the former Member for St. Johns as the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro. The hiring of the member of this House, the former Member for The Pas, into a Deputy Minister's position in the government. Former Member for Radisson, Harry Shafransky, hired in as a Special Assistant to the Minister of Transportation; former Member for Rupertsland, Harvey Bostrom, given a consulting contract.

Mr. Speaker, these members opposite —(Interjection)— I hear the Member for Thompson say what about C. Smith? What he doesn't acknowledge is that there is a civil service structure in the province; there is a merit principle applied, or there was during our administration, when people could apply for positions and be selected and if they happened, Sir, to have some political background that did not keep them from being employed. For instance, when Harry Marden was hired to work for the government, he was hired to a bulletin position through the Civil Service, Sir, and what did we get in the House? We had the members opposite stand and say that he would be fired when they took over as government. —(Interjection)— Well, I wouldn't say that he was fired because I think that he probably realized the threat that had been made by the New Democrats when they were in opposition and took the opportunity to go elsewhere for employment.

That's the sort of think that we're getting from the members opposite. We're seeing them hasten to change appointments to the Boards and Commissions, Sir, in a way that was not practised before, people getting letters saying: "Well, your appointment expires the end of June," for instance, "but do you have any intention of stepping down earlier than that, because we may wish to appoint someone in your place." Everything is being done to get their people into place. This is something that we would expect to happen over time as a normal course of events, but what I don't expect to see it done by people who decried the same type of thing when they were in opposition.

The same sort of thing applied to advertising contracts. The criticism that was levelled at the former government for its advertising contracts and then we see this government turn about and very quickly award contracts to the advertising firm that handled their information, that handled their campaign during the election campaign. That's fine, Sir, except they give the excuse of, well, we had to do it in a hurry, we didn't have much time and so this was why we gave it to this particular company. If they simply would come out and acknowledge the fact that: Yes, this advertising company handled all our business during the election and we won the election and therefore we're going to reward them, then the public would know where they stood and we would have an honest answer from the New Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite promised consultation. They promised an open door policy, that they would be prepared to listen to the public; they promised, Mr. Speaker, that they would have an open

door policy, that they would consult with farmers and they would consult with farmers and they would consult with businessmen and they would consult with labour, giving the impression that these people would have real input into what this government was going to do, that in fact they weren't going to take decisions without going to the people who were to be affected by it.

Well, what are we finding, what are we finding, Mr. Speaker? Not that there is real consultation. Ask the Manitoba Cattle Producers if there is real consultation over the development of the Beef Assistance Program. Ask the Manitoba Farm Bureau if there was real consultation over the development of that. Ask the hotelmen or the Restaurant Association if there was consultation with them before they brought in the increases in the minimum wage. Sir, consultation, we are learning, is simply allowing someone to put forward a position and you say: "Thank you very much," and then you go ahead and do exactly what you intended to do before. That's what's being demonstrated. —(Interjection)— Well, we hear again, you do what's right. You see, the Member for Flin Flon says: "You listen and then you go ahead and do what's right." The Member for Dauphin says: "What's right is what we think."

So there it is, Mr. Speaker. Those two members have summed the entire situation up better than I could because it's not consultation at all. You give them the opportunity to express themselves and then you do what's right and that happens to be what the New Democratic Party thinks. I don't think that's going to wash, Mr. Speaker. I think the public is beginning to see what is meant by this government when they talk about consultation. They listen and then they go ahead and do what they intended to do to begin with, Sir. That's exactly what they do. That's not really consultation.

What I find even more alarming than that, Sir — and this was demonstrated in the speech that was given by the Member for Gimli — it's been implicit in what others have said but it was explicit in what the Member for Gimli said, and that is that the elected farm leaders of this province really don't represent what the farmers think.

The Manitoba Cattle Producers happen to represent about 14,000 producers and they have a system for electing their directors and for electing their president. There are some 18 commodity groups, I believe, within the Manitoba Farm Bureau, each which elects their own people and put their structure together in one overall umbrella organization that represents their interest. But, Sir, because the views put forward by those organizations don't happen to fit with those of the government the Member for Gimli stands up and says, they don't really represent what the public thinks. Now that's a very dangerous attitude, Sir, for a government to begin to take, that when they pick and choose between the representatives of the people which ones actually represent the people and which ones do not.

Well, Sir, they choose to think, for instance, that the National Farmers Union represents the public even though they may have perhaps 200 members and there's the difference, you see. The Member for Thompson says that's the same way we operated, we

said the National Farmers Union didn't represent the views of the farmers. That's correct, they don't. But we never said that they don't represent the views of their members, they do represent the views of their members. The Manitoba Cattle Producers happen to represent about 14,000 producers and this government stands and says, they don't represent those producers. Well, Sir, that's a dangerous kind of an attitude for the government to take, for a political party to take.

In the area of promises, Sir, prior to assuming responsibility for government the Member for Thompson says that we don't acknowledge anything about the North, Sir. I can assure the Member for Thompson that if he looks at the record he will find that there was far more economic activity going on in the North with respect to the basic industry from which the wealth of the North flows, and that is mining, during the period of our administration. Since taking over we have seen nothing but layoffs in the North under the government of these members opposite.

When they were in opposition, Sir, they made a great many promises and they said that it was due to the management of the Conservative Government, the Conservative Government was responsible for the state of the economy in the province. There are so many of these promises made, Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to keep them all sorted out.

Here's one from September 6, 1980, for instance, where "Government restraint policies are to blame for Manitoba's continued poor economic performance," Opposition Leader Howard Pawley says. Well, Sir, what do we hear now about who's responsible for the economic situation in the province? Is it the restraint policies? Because surely that government has the opportunity to turn those restraint policies around. They could turn them around, but now they're saying oh no, it's not the restraint policies of the government, it's Reaganomics now that's responsible, they're responsible, and the Federal government is responsible and the multinationals are responsible, but not this government. They're not taking responsibility.

Well, they made promises before they were elected, Sir, and during the election and I can quote here from another of their campaign documents, this one was entitled: "Something to Come Home to, a Home — emergency interest rate relief program," and they go on. They talk about a "two-year program will ensure that no Manitoban is forced to lose their home, farm or small business due to abnormally high interest rates," no Manitoban. Can you imagine, Sir, the impact that that kind of promise had on the public faced with very difficult economic times? We acknowledge that but when someone came along and said, no home, no farm and no business will be lost, Sir, then that was promise that had a very compelling message in it.

They went on to say, "Get moratorium legislation designed to allow time to reassess refinancing options will be part of the program," I don't know whether it will be or not, Sir, it's a promise that's made but we haven't seen any sign of it. And this, Sir, is another statement at the end of this pamphlet, "The NDP is committed to turning around economic decline of the last four years but emergency action is required now, with your support it will be done."

Now, doesn't that have a powerful ring to it, Sir, it will be done. Well, here they are in government. They began, Sir, they were promising an emergency Session of the Legislature, an emergency Session to deal with the Interest Rate Relief Program and to deal with a beef program and when the former Leader of the Opposition, the present Premier, appeared at a meeting at the InterLake he said, "And this is not something that's going to drag on into weeks or months, this is something that's going to be done right away."

What happened within days of getting elected? Well, Sir, they decided that we really don't need legislation for this. Maybe we can accomplish this through another means. So their attention was taken away from the promise that they were going to have an emergency Session of the Legislature. Now, after the House was in Session for six weeks we discovered that indeed, there did have to be legislation, and there did have to be regulations passed before they could pay out a nickel so all those promises were meaningless in terms of the urgency that they attached to it and in terms of the significance of the programs that they brought forward, because there is a very compelling promise that was made, Sir, and you can find it time and time again in the material that that government put forward; time and time again, no farm, no business and no home is going to be lost as a consequence of high interest rates.

What have we determined to date about the application of that program? Last week I think there was a possibility that seven small businesses were being recommended and that anybody that grossed more than \$350,000 a year wasn't going to qualify; that any farmer that grossed more than \$70,000 wasn't going to qualify? Sir, I venture to say that the vast majority of the agricultural produce of this province comes from farms where they gross more than \$70,000 a year — I don't have the exact figure — but there is no question that viable agriculture in this province is based on farms that produce more than \$70,000 a year and those people are in difficulty.

There are sales taking place in the country virtually every day at an unprecedented rate; there are farm-equipment dealers going out of business; there are farmers going out of business; there are people phoning saying what is this government going to do? They made promises; no farm, no business and no home will be lost. What have they been offered? There hasn't been a dollar paid out, Sir, there hasn't been a dollar paid out and they've been in government for over five months.

They promised the people of Manitoba; they promised them. They're breaking that promise and they're breaking that trust. At the time that they're breaking the promises they made they're doing things that they never promised to do. They never told anybody they were going to raise the sales tax, that wasn't part of the bargain; they never told people that they were looking at unfreezing Hydro; they didn't tell people that they were going to end the Crown Land Sale Policy. —(Interjection)— That's right. Even down to the details of something as small as returning abandoned rights-of-way we find the ideology of the government opposite standing in the way of them doing something that was already under way. They stopped those things, Sir, and they are doing nothing, they are

doing nothing to earn, to keep the trust that the people of this province put in them last November 17th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Go lick your wounds.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Flin Flon in the Chair for the Department of Health and the Honourable Member for The Pas in the Chair for the Department of Economic Development and Tourism.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN, Phil Eyer (River East): Committee come to order. We are considering Item 2.(d)(1) under the Department of Economic Development and Tourism.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Chairman, I believe we were down as far as Industrial Infrastructure and I only had one question left on it and was to ask the Minister if there is presently any requests for the Infrastructure Program from any of the towns or municipalities?

HON. MURIEL SMITH (Osborne): Mr. Chairperson, there are the continuing programs with the outstanding balance still payable to the R.M. of Russell. There are two other communities that we're currently having discussions with but we prefer not to name them at this stage.

MR. JOHNSTON: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could possibly answer a question that I was intending to ask regarding the Technical Research Centre in Winnipeg and the Food Centre in Portage la Prairie. There was a structure where they had their Boards and then there was the Manitoba Research Council Board and then the Manitoba Research Council making recommendations to the Minister and it was becoming a bit confusing in that it had a lot of Boards that seemed to have to be responsible to. Is there any move to have the Boards of those two centres responsible to the Minister or the Deputy rather than to the Manitoba Research Council?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, these Boards are set up under MRC which is currently under the Enterprise Manitoba Agreement and we have a desire to expand the scope of MRC as a Board that will look at science and technology policy for the entire province and include wider representation than it currently has. We also are interested in retaining the type of service that we're getting from the technology Boards since the Enterprise Manitoba Agreements either terminate next year or a longer sort of wind-down period can be negotiated with the Federal Government. At the

moment we're thinking it's premature to try to make major shifts in the structure. What we are doing actively is planning for the options that will be available to us at the end of the Enterprise Manitoba Agreement and to work in some kind of stability so that the technology centres can, indeed, function and that the MRC Board can carry out the wider tasks that we see appropriate to it. Now, in order to bring all that about, we will work with the current structure for the time being, but plan for the transition to a wider mission and a more stable basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas): 2.(d)(1) Salaries—pass; 2.(d)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 2.(d)(3) Grant Assistance—pass; 2.(e) Economic Development and Tourism; 2.(e)(1) Salaries.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister is planning to give us any sort of outline as to the Tourism program for the province this year? In other words, are there any major changes to Tourism?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the marketing component of the program will concentrate on primary markets in Canada and the U.S. We're hoping to increase visitation to the province in the neighbourhood of 3 percent to 4 percent and increase visitor spending by about 14 percent. There will be a fair amount of in-province promotion continuing, some special initiatives in specialty markets and for some off-season advertising. We will continue our consumer promotions at government and travel shows and at travel trade consortiums. There will be an ongoing awareness programming activity and our Outreach Take a Good Look Manitoba Show, although we may have a different title for it, I'm not too sure at this stage. The Destination Manitoba Program will be moving along. We hope to activate the programs Two, Three and Six that have currently not been in operation.

I can say, in general, that we're looking for development of the awareness by the people in the tourism industry of themselves as an industry and of how development for each one can benefit the others. It's quite an exciting industry in the sense that there's a great diversity of activities in it and people who seem to enjoy the work a great deal, but they've perhaps suffered in the past from not seeing themselves as a total industry and not always working as effectively together to bring about advances. But I see that a lot can be gained from working co-operatively with that industry and I think the launching of the Destination Manitoba Programs Two, Three and Six will give a boost to the industry that everyone should benefit from.

MR. JOHNSTON: Did the Minister say the Take a Good Look Manitoba program? I didn't catch whether it was going to be on or off.

MRS. SMITH: I said it would be on, but it might have a different title.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a few comments and draw to the Minister's attention some concerns that we have, for example, in the southeast of Manitoba. Actually with the Port of Entry at Middlebro, we have a lot of Americans coming in and using that approach into the Whiteshell development. We have some good potential in that area at Lake of the Woods, the only port that we have on Lake of the Woods on the Manitoba side and Moose Lake, the development out there and somehow as these people come into the Canadian side there is very little that we offer them in terms of any potential in the southeast.

We've counted as many as 100 boats on Birch Point during the fishing season at a given time and we have very poor facilities in some sense for our tourists out there, and we have very limited development in the Moose Lake area and I would like to see whether this Minister - I realize that part of the development comes under Natural Resources, if I'm correct but I think possibly the promotion end of it certainly is something that comes under this department here. We've had complaints at various times that even on the tourist brochures, etc. that the southeast area has been omitted on some of the maps, some of the promotional work that is there. I'm wondering if the Minister could indicate her feelings on the concerns that I've raised.

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, the Whiteshell is one of the priority destination areas under Destination Manitoba and under Program 6, private operators can certainly apply for monies to assist with upgrading and expansion. I suppose the unspoken question as to whether an information centre should be opened there for the American tourists is something that we'll be looking at. There's need for development of better information centres, higher visibility, better quality at the entry from the States on Highway 75 and also improvement on the entry point on Highway 1 from the west. These have not got onto the short list for capital development this year but they are a high priority from our department's point of view and I think this particular location that the member has drawn our attention to will certainly be thrown into the mix and looked at in terms of priority for upcoming years.

MR. DRIEDGER: Does the Minister have any information as to how many people cross under the tourism aspect at the ports of entry in the southeast? Why I ask this question, it might be that we're just speculating that there is a lot of traffic coming through there in the tourism area, but if the Minister has some figures it might give us an indication as to whether some of these projects are warranted out there or not.

MRS. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, that's the kind of information, of course, the department needs to make their recommendations and they tell me that we have that information — not here at the moment; it could be made available — but it's the collection of that kind of data that's necessary in the planning process and there's been a move to collect harder data to assist us with our planning.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, to speak in response or to speak in favour of the further development in the southeast, when you consider the traffic situation on some of the major highways that are going into the Whiteshell, the No. 12 Highway, which is a good highway; it's being rebuilt and restructured in places, has very little traffic on it and it's a very nice drive out there. We have some great potential in there in the southeast, even in the winter recreation end of it which I think is something that is being overlooked to some degree; we have great ski trails and snow toboggan trails up in that area and I think promotion, even for people from the city here, to make use of the facilities or the opportunities, if we did have the facilities, I think there's a lot of potential there. I would just like to draw that to the Minister's attention that these things are needed there. We are that close to the border and we have very little to offer to our American friends when they come across. I think with a little bit of promotion we can entice a lot more people to come across and spend some of their money that we all like to have.

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, I know that I can count on the co-operation of the honourable member to acquaint the people in the area, the local people involved in tourism, to take advantage of some of the programs in Program 6. There has been a move on the part of the department to advertise more all year-round activities and certainly the winter recreation activities the member refers to, do come under that umbrella. It is an important area for drawing in out-of-country visitors, let alone out-of-province and, of course, the more we can do that the more outside money we can bring into the economy. So, I take the honourable member's suggestions and recommendations seriously and we certainly do what we can to promote tourism in that area.

MR. DRIEDGER: I thank the Minister for the encouraging words along those lines. I'd just like to indicate to her that there is an association, I believe it's called Southeast Tourists' Association that is working there right now. It's under the chairmanship of Lawrence Nordstrom from the Sprague area and these are the people who have been very concerned and have been trying to work towards getting some more promotional work done in that area; I'll certainly refer them to get in touch with the Minister's department to possibility meet and express their concerns on a first-hand basis.

MRS. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. Under the Destination Manitoba Programs there are several that are in operation now, one of which does give organizational support to the tourist industry associations throughout the province. We deal with the central group but they, in turn, have all the area, the regional tourist organizations, and we hope to improve our co-ordinating and we certainly see those organizations as very necessary and important to the development of tourism because it is so much a collection of small-scale private-sector actors and I think that the Tourism Association helps bring their activities together and ensure that we have a good package for the tourist.

MR. DRIEDGER: I just have a final comment. I'd like to just indicate some of the feelings that have become prominent from time to time from the people there. It would appear that their feeling is that most of the action is all directed at the Whiteshell or the Falcon Lake-West Hawk areas and the lakes along there. If there's anything left at all you know the crumbs, they get channelled off into the southeast corner. I would once again like to indicate that with the group that is functioning there right now and myself, we'd like to feel that you should prioritize possibly some of the projects in that area and not treat it as an afterthought somewhere along the line.

MRS. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I think the member has done a good job of sensitizing me, at any rate, to the opportunity in that area. I think, as I said before, that is one place where we can bring outside money in, as it were; I think that certainly is a desirable goal of the industry. As some of our older tourist areas become full and you start to get the group that want to get more into the wilderness or want a less crowded environment, I think areas such as the southeast will really come into their own and we'll do everything we can to assist.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask if there's been any thought of having a Tourist Information Centre somewhere closer to the city on Highway 75. I know we have one at the border at Emerson but the success of the Information Centre that was put on the west side of Winnipeg from the point of view of people being able to see it, people stopping and receiving information on where to go in the province, was just very dramatic — I think tripled or even more than that, as far as people stopping were concerned. We just have the use of a trailer on the east side or a small Information Centre on the east side, I believe at a service station for an Information Centre. Are there any thoughts to expanding those two, one in Fort Garry and the one on the east side from the point of view of the tourists getting better information?

MRS. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, both locations are identified as areas that need a Tourism Information Centre. There's not a plan to do it this year; it'll be something that will be seriously considered for next year. There are three locations being considered at the south end of the City but there's no decision as to which is the preferred one. There are a lot of factors to be taken into consideration relating to land purchase, visibility, access, other services available to tourists and there's also some opportunities of possible co-operation with the Federal-Provincial Art Programs. With regard to the west end of the City, I think the point as been well made that we could profit from having a centre there. We'll have to weigh the pros and cons of putting one there ahead of an improved one at the border of Saskatchewan. In the best of all possible worlds, we'd do them all immediately but the reality of the situation is we'll have to phase them in but, the locations that the honourable member has identified are certainly the ones that we are looking at.

MR. JOHNSTON: I had the opportunity when I was in Nova Scotia on a convention, to take a look at some of the tourist centres that they have in Nova Scotia and the new ones that they have built, and even their old ones have put us to shame. When I think of the trailer down at the corner, going to Morden or Winkler, which does a good job and the young people working in it do an excellent job, but the Information Centres, or better still, they're called Tourist Centres, there was good parking, rest areas, coffee, information, well staffed and good communication in them to assist the traveller in all ways.

Now, fully realizing that Nova Scotia is almost an island except where it joins New Brunswick — Manitoba is structured a little differently — and the Minister indicates that there is a budget problem this year for expansion of Information Centres, is it being looked at to have better Tourist Centres throughout the Province of Manitoba?

MRS. SMITH: Yes.

MR. JOHNSTON: The Tourist Centres in Nova Scotia were hooked up to an information centre of hotels, etc. and there is a separate organization associated with the tourist branch in Nova Scotia that was recommended to this province by TIAM; is the Minister giving that any consideration?

MRS. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I've been in quite close discussion with the people who are promoting this, in fact, it's probably one of the key ways that we can cope with the tighter competition we're going to get on a Convention Centre because here we use a variety of hotels and if we want to be able to accommodate large convention groups, speed and efficiency, flexibility in the bookings and arrangements will be of immense assistance to us. We've asked for a precise costing of the service that is currently available in Nova Scotia and some description of the software required in order to make such a service operational, as well as some projection as to the costs that we could recover from such an investment, and I expect that proposal will be ready to be presented for next year's program. It sounds like sometimes a computer service adds a frill but, having looked at what such a system could contribute to the industry, my inclination at the moment is to be very favourably disposed towards it. But we can't, of course, make a firm recommendation until we have some of the tighter analysis and the cost projections.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, the figures that had been presented to the government previously showed it to be a fairly expensive structure or setup and it certainly didn't appear to be paying its way as fast as some of the projections that had been given to us. In Nova Scotia there were all kinds of smaller resort hotels, as I say, all around Nova Scotia and the number of hotels that would actually receive the benefit for that kind of expenditure in Manitoba would be fairly strictly limited to the Winnipeg hotels. There are not that many outside of Manitoba that would be able to take advantage of it. I would like to think that there's another way rather than that particular structure and I believe there have been presentations by, I think, the Hotel

Association that there is another type of reservation service that could be put in initially that would be much less costly. Has the Minister had that brought to her attention?

MRS. SMITH: Well, Mr. Chairperson, it's the way with so many of these proposals that, when you hear about them initially, you either feel very very positive or very very negative, but the stance that I've adopted towards this proposal is that, first of all, I want to understand what it can do and what it can't do and what the cost would be and what the potential gain from it. Probably, in the short run, we can accomplish the same by putting on some extra staff at peak times. There may well be, as the industry develops and we have a greater diversity of facilities throughout the province, that there'll be a cross-over point where cost of hiring extra people and training them and having them in place when you need them, and this type of a system would make sense. It's in order to get that kind of analysis and projection that I would not like to take a firm position on it at this time. It's an interesting approach and certainly for the convention business when you get a great, how should I say, your business comes in very large surges and your ability to service a convention and, in fact, to attract convention groups back year after year may hang on giving them effective good service.

Now how you can measure the effectiveness of such a program, whether there's another way perhaps to charge its benefits to the industry, all these things would need to be looked at. Initial reports from Nova Scotia are that it's working out to be fairly costly, but we don't know what factors they're taking into their analysis and, therefore, it's premature of me to really say, other than that it's interesting and we will be looking at it in much sharper detail.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, I would certainly hope that the Minister's priority of information centres and good rest areas for tourists would be very close to the top of the list or before that one.

Mr. Chairman, the media advertising; certainly we know the advertising company that had the contract has been changed. I know there have been different reasons asked about in the House, etc., but I can only say the tourism was the highest it's ever been in Manitoba in 1981 and it was moving up continually the last three years. The advertising agency we had, had a very good understanding and had done a tremendous amount of research regarding the travellers in Manitoba with the department. I know the department supplied a tremendous amount of the information. Is there any reason why that agency was changed and why it wasn't tendered?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, the reasons for changing are that in the creative field, it's customary to have several agencies bidding and it's also customary to change off and on in order to get the benefit of a fresh approach. This particular contract was not tendered because we're into a time squeeze if we were going to be ready in time for the peak tourist season. We really didn't have time to go through the tendering process, but we hope to use the tendering process regularly in future.

MR. JOHNSTON: What is budgeted for media advertising this year?

MRS. SMITH: The total budgeted, Mr. Chairperson, is \$1,175,700.00. That's up over \$1,069,700 last year.

MR. JOHNSTON: Is there any sort of breakdown — the Minister might not have it — between television and the printed media?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, we don't have a breakdown on that basis.

MR. JOHNSTON: Is it the intention to have the summer and spring or — let's go this way — the fall, winter and spring advertising programs?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, there's two main phases of advertising, a combined fall/winter approach and a combined spring/summer.

MR. JOHNSTON: Has there been any increase in the grant to the seven regions Interlake, Central Plains, EastMan, Pembina Valley?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, there's been a 10 percent across-the-board increase.

MR. JOHNSTON: And it works out on the same formula they had before?

MRS. SMITH: Yes.

MR. JOHNSTON: And the Tourism Industry Association of Manitoba, I mentioned the regions, is there an increase to the central office of TIAM?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairperson, it also has gone up 10 percent, the same formula as last year.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I was in the Estimates of the Minister of Resources and I've been in the Estimates of the Minister of Northern Affairs to ask two specific questions and I'd like to have the Minister maybe give me some idea of what work has been done with those two departments. The campgrounds in the Province of Manitoba, there is no increase in the parks budget for any upgrading of the campgrounds in the province. I have the Hansard where the Minister told me there had been no monies set aside for upgrading of the campgrounds.

There are several roadside parks along our highways and there is no money available for upgrading those roadside parks. The Minister of Northern Affairs, I asked him if there was any funding in the Northern Agreement and, of course, the Northern Agreement as far as I know, has not been signed yet, but has there been any funding basically for economic development for the North and certainly as far as the tourism is concerned for campgrounds in the North?

Manitoba has a tremendous amount going for it in tourism and has a tremendous growth as we've all been saying for many years and it has been moving up. We don't have mountains; we don't have the ski resorts that some of the other provinces have but we do have a very beautiful province with a lot of water

and a lot of sand and a lot of things to be seen.

One of the first priorities I would like to see and I was hoping to see is that we started to have roadside parks that gave comfort to the tourist and Manitobans while they're travelling throughout their province and the best damn campgrounds in the world I think. If you could ever have your advertising say that the campgrounds for tourists in the Province of Manitoba are second to none it would help attract people to come and see all of those beautiful areas of Manitoba.

There doesn't seem to be any money set aside anywhere for Capital Expenditure to upgrade, build new camp grounds - and it might be in Destination Manitoba, the upgrading, but that would be I think in the area of private camp grounds. But, the provincial, the ones that are taken care of by the Minister in charge of Parks and the roadside parks and comfort stations, there doesn't seem to be any money available in budgets anywhere to upgrade those situations because they are becoming one of the most important and one of the ones that, when I travel through Manitoba talking about tourism to people in different areas, one of the first things that would be brought up was campgrounds, better facilities for the tourist.

Has there been any discussion with the other Ministers to try and find some way to upgrade the facilities, other than hotels and motels. I know the programs are available under Destination Manitoba and I believe they are going to be moving ahead with them, but what about the campgrounds and the roadside parks that the province have responsibility for, and working with the private ones to upgrade them?

MRS. SMITH: Well, Mr. Chairperson, there wasn't a great deal of co-ordination prior to the Estimates but we've moved into a consultative relationship now. The program three of Destination Manitoba, which permits public development in tourism, could cover these programs and I guess if we'd had that program operative for a few years we would, in fact, have upgraded parks. They can certainly be considered under that program. We do recognize the tourism potential in the north and also its role as an important source of economic development, so I can assure you that we will be looking at that. But, there were no plans certainly coming from our department that we inherited that put a heavy emphasis on that, so the co-ordination and the planning with my colleagues has yet to be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is 4:30 p.m. we'll interrupt the proceedings for Private Members' Hour. The Committee will re-convene at 8 o'clock this evening

ESTIMATES — HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): The Committee on Health will come to order please, continuing with the Estimates.

The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I was saying that the official Health critic of the Conservative Party and myself had a discussion of a possible agenda for the next two days. Of course, we don't run the Committee and I would like to propose it

to the Committee to see if this would be acceptable and then we will govern ourselves accordingly.

I intend to immediately start with giving some questions that were left unfinished under the Alcoholism Foundation and then, Mr. Chairman, it will be under the item, Dental, which is the only thing left of the department proper. I want to make a general statement on that and then proceed with this with the understanding that there might be a possibility that we might move, if not this afternoon, probably this evening, to the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Then we would go line-by-line like we've done before with the understanding that we would keep the big three, that is the Personal Care Homes, the Hospitals and Medicare until the very end and I could assure the members of Committee that, under no circumstance, will that be taken tonight. No matter how far we have gone we would adjourn before going into Personal Care, Hospital and Dental; I don't think there's any fear of that, but just in case. Tomorrow afternoon we would start wherever we're at.

But the main point is, because of the interest and because it affects so many constituencies, at 8 o'clock tomorrow I would table and give a copy to each member of the House and copies would be available for the press, of our Capital program. Now, that will not be discussed at the time, it is just to give members a chance to look at it and then when we would deal with Hospitals and Personal Care Homes then, of course, it could be debated at that time. If that meets with the approval of the members of Committee we will proceed as such.

Mr. Chairman, I had some unfinished business under Alcoholism Foundation. It's just a statement that I was going to make, some information, and I might say, a correction. The Alcoholism Foundation, in co-operation with the Motor Vehicle Branch - excuse me, I'm talking about the Impaired Drivers' Program for second offenders now - have in the past year developed a special program of education and intervention for impaired drivers who have been convicted of a second offense. The program ran as a pilot project in the Winnipeg region for approximately six months and has recently been extended to include Brandon, Dauphin, The Pas and Thompson. The program is still considered, by both the Alcoholism Foundation and the Motor Vehicle Branch, to be on a trial or pilot basis and at the present time is not being extended to first offenders due to the need for further evaluation of the program and limitations of present staff and resources. The AFM will be reporting to me shortly on some recommendations for further developments to include first offenders. The education and intervention program is designed to inform convicted drivers of the physical and mental affects of chemicals on the human body, and particularly, their ability to operate a motor vehicle after consumption of alcohol and other drugs.

The drivers are referred from the Motor Vehicle Branch to the AFM for individual counselling followed by a day-long seminar. At the conclusion of the seminar the driver returns to the counsellor to discuss the client's perceptions of his/her use of alcohol. The counsellor attempts to determine with the client whether alcoholism treatment is required. The results of this interview are forwarded to the Motor Vehicle

Branch after being discussed with the client. If the client decides, after the education they have received, that they would like help with their alcohol consumption problem, they may be entered into one of the several different alcoholism treatment programs available. If not, the client is under no obligation. The AFM is not involved in determining whether the client receives their driver's license; that is handled by the Motor Vehicle Branch officials. The full details and outline of the program are available from the AFM.

Then there's a correction and added information that I'd like to give on the Youth Program. I wish to present some information which will clarify any confusion there may have been regarding our discussion of the Alcoholism Foundation's Manitoba Youth Program. This is an out-patient program for persons up to age 18 who are experiencing problems with alcohol or drugs. The program commenced last August and since that time has seen over 300 young people. There is a present caseload in the area of 190 in the program which consists of information and therapy sessions three times per week for a month, and then follow-up sessions for as long as is required.

The confusion during the debate on the Estimates concerning the ages of the participants. The information I gave with regard to the average age was incorrect. It turns out that the average age of the youth in the program is 16 years, not 14 years. The breakdown is as follows: 11 percent are age 14 and younger with only 1 percent under 12; 37 percent are age 15 and 16; 43 percent are age 17 and 18; 9 percent are 19 years of age. This presents an average age of 16 years. This is a non-residential program which is currently functioning at the Sherburn and Portage Avenue location.

Mr. Chairman, that is the information I promised to give to the House that wasn't available and now I'd like to make a short statement on the Children's Dental Services before we start dealing with this item.

Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the Throne Speech, the Children's Dental Health Program will be expanded in '82-83 to include the present 13-year-olds who turn 14 on or after January, 1983, in those school divisions currently covered by the program. Consequently, the private dentist, through the Manitoba Dental Association, will continue to provide services in the 10-2/3 school divisions currently covered by them and the department will continue to provide services in the 17-1/3 school divisions currently covered by the department.

It is estimated that this program expansion will cost approximately \$439,000 which will be funded by Supplementary Estimates. Here I'm leaving my text to explain, because of some of the statements that were made. Mr. Chairman, this is not in the Estimates at this time; I make no apology for this at all. I think it would be ridiculous to put an amount when you don't know really what the cost will be. There is no doubt that I'm not trying to hide that. This will be brought in when we talk about the Supplement; I will have to defend it at that time. The reason it isn't done is because I had two choices you can put in. When you have about a month or a month-and-a-half after taking office you can put a certain amount in there but certainly not with a chance to look at the program and discuss it with the Dental Association like I stated that I would do. So I don't apologize for this at all; under the same circum-

stances I would do exactly the same thing. I am not trying to pretend that this money will not be spent. A certain amount will be done. As you'll see by the rest of my text, I will announce the program; if not, I'll define at this time. I've agreed to meet with the Dental Association again but as soon as have something definite it'll be announced in the House if the House is still in Session — I imagine it will be. If not, it'll be announced through a press conference or press release but, whatever we feel that we'll spend at the supplement will be brought in as supplement and I'll have to defend it at this time. So, that amount of money, I've talked about 439; that is not the only amount. This is just the cost that I've talked about; there might be other costs such as maybe educating other people or whatever. I haven't got the information on this at this time but I'll inform the members later on. But, I don't apologize for doing it in this manner; anything else would have been completely irresponsible. I follow my text now.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, we would be reviewing the two programs currently in place. That is, the program being delivered by the Manitoba Dental Association and that being delivered by the Department of Health. It is my strong conviction that there should be one Manitoba Dental Program regardless of the systems that are utilized in delivering the services. Well, there was a report undertaken, the Storey Report last year to determine the relative comparison of the two existing programs. I think it is fair to say that all parties are of the opinion that the conclusions of their report were inconclusive. I might say here again, Mr. Chairman, that it is not my intention to engage in debate of the Storey Report. Not that I want to shy away from it but, I want to look forward not in the past. I've discussed this with the dental association. I think everybody agrees that it's not conclusive. I think it would be negative at this time in view of the fact that we want to have all the people that deliver the service participate in that. Later on, if members of the committee insist on debating the report unfortunately — I say unfortunately because I don't think it would be constructive — I'll certainly be ready to answer. I'm not suggesting that nobody should refer to that at all but, I want to look positively instead.

In any event, as the ultimate aim of this government will be to expand this program to all children from kindergarten to Grade 12. We have entered into discussions with the Manitoba Dental Association to determine their continuing role within the program. An important consideration within this program will be cost, standards of care, utilization and accessibility and, of course, it goes without saying the education and prevention. I think it is reasonable to expect that the government will be expanding utilization of dental nurses within the program.

However, the final decision with regard to the portion of the program to be delivered by the dental nurses as opposed to Manitoba Dental Association is still subject to further discussion the MDA. I've met with the President and past President of the Manitoba Dental Association to provide them with a broad outline of the program. However, I have also assured them that I will meet with them again to receive their comments and advice and to ensure their continued

involvement in the program. As these programs progress, Mr. Chairman, I'll be in a position to announce further details in this House.

Although not directly related to this line in the Estimates, Mr. Chairman, I also wish to refer to our commitment to provide dental services to the elderly. This program will be implemented during our term of office and it is intended that the program will involve private dentists and denturists and will be funded by the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Minister for his expansion of information and refinement of some of the information with respect to the Alcohol Foundation Programs in the impaired driving field where second offenders are concerned, and in the youth program area. I was, of course, very interested, Sir, in the opening statement that the Minister just made with respect to the Dental Services Program and projections for 1982-83. I'll be interested in looking at it in more depth and detail but, I think I took down some of the salient points that he mentioned and I would have a few questions at this juncture.

First off, we should obviously, Mr. Chairman, be dealing with the Salaries line in the Estimates book. At this point, I would like ask him about the expansion plans with respect to staffing and the Salaries complement. The requested appropriation for the coming year is \$1,759,000 as against \$1,692,000. In the list of staffing categories that he provided me with at the outset of his Estimates, the figure doesn't reflect any increase in staffing requests for Dental Services. However, I note that there are some vacancies in this branch at the present time and I would like to ask the Minister for some elaboration on the Salaries figure. It's not substantially larger than last year's. Does the figure represent a complement of SMY's that's precisely the same, but allows for an incremental increase plus the filling of the three vacant positions?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, yes, as I tried to explain earlier this budget retains the status quo of the current Dental Services Branch allowing only for a price increase in Salaries and Other Expenditures. It is not the intention of requesting staff at this time. Depending on what the final program will be, as I stated, and the final decision has been made we will use the members of the dental association as much as possible. Therefore, it might reflect the added service that we will give this year, that'll be in the supplement. But, we're not looking at any staff of the department at this time.

MR. SHERMAN: What are the categories of those vacancies, Mr. Chairman? Can the Minister advise please?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the vacancies are two dentists at this time.

MR. SHERMAN: Is there a third vacancy?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, no there's only two. If the information that I give shows three, that position has been filled since then.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that it's the intention within the program this year to include those children who are served both by the government plan, the Manitoba Children's Dental Plan and the Manitoba Dental Association Plan, and he made reference to the different numbers of school divisions that were included in both those categories of delivery. I wasn't clear as to the mathematics that he gave at that time. I would like him to recap for the Committee if he could, the numbers of divisions that are covered under the government administered plan and the number that are covered under the MDA plan. I believe that it's 17 under the government administered plan and 13 under the MDA plan, give or take a fraction which we have permitted in each case because there are some local forms of coverage that don't constitute full school divisions. Those were not the figures that I drew from the opening statement that he made but it may just have been that I didn't hear him correctly. Is that still the situation with respect to the numbers of school divisions that are covered by the two plans?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is there are 17-1/3 school divisions in the dental nurses and 12-2/3 under the Manitoba Dental Association and that is what I mentioned. The point is if we're going to make any change, if we're going to cover more people, I think it stands to reason the same as the previous government I think they went up one year. I think we would defeat the purpose if we would start another school division at this time and stop people when we're trying to go to 17 or 18, in other words, high school. I think we could pretty well rest assured that we will go one year, as these people grow older we will stay with them until they finish school. That is going to be the first priority. Then, as we start other school divisions we will do the same thing; we will start at a certain age, we might depending on how fast we can and want to go, and depending on who is finally going - the mix of staffing of professionals that will deliver the service - then once we start with a school division we'll go all the way one or two years at a time, the same as it was being done before until we cover these people all the way.

So, it will take a little while until all the province is covered. But I agree with what I think the former government was doing at this time; they kept on with those people and went up a year at a time. In fact, this is something that we had to act on when we took office; I think they were students instead of covering for a certain time we covered until the end of the year and that was the recommendation, I understand; I think the former Minister had a Cabinet paper ready to do that. We just went ahead with that. There is no changes there at all and the division, as I mentioned in my opening statement, which I understand is correct, dental nurses 17-1/3 school divisions and the Manitoba Dental Association 12-2/3.

I'm not saying that the delivery will necessarily be by the same people at this time. There is a possibility depending on other things that there could be a

change; it could be that the dental association will deliver, will pick up this extra year, even in the school division that are now served by the Dental Nurses Program.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, my next question was going to deal with that subject of age expansion and I want to ask the Minister for clarification because I was simply taking notes from his statement. Whether he said that 1982-83 programming will permit the inclusion of children who turn 14 on or after January 1, 1983, is that what the Minister's statement said, that the program will now include children who turn 14 on or after January 1, 1983?

MR. DESJARDINS: That's exactly it, the member is right on.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is some difference here in the approach being taken by the new government with the approach that was taken by the previous government, I believe; it's a difference in direction, perhaps more than in intention or perhaps a difference in selection of age priorities. The program as conceived included children up to and including the age of 12. At its inception the intention was to cover children from age 6 to age 12 and I think there has not been any change or direct legislative or programming deviation in those parameters, at least not in any official way, except to take care of an anomaly that we encountered and that arose for the first time in the 1981-82 school year. Any government dealing with the program prior to the school year 1981-82 had not faced the problem, because it came into existence in 1972, I believe or 1973 — Dr. McCormick could correct me, perhaps it was 1974, but right in that period of 1972-73-74 came into existence at that time and started picking up school children born in 1968. Those children originally going into the program would have turned 12 in 1980 and our position in 1980-81, was that, depending on the time of the year that they were born, they might have been dropped from the program in mid-school year the way the regulations were written. They were only guaranteed coverage in those school years that dove-tailed with their age, from age 6 up to and including age 12. The danger was that there would be some 12-year-olds who, because of the timing of their birthday, would be cut off in the middle of the school year. Therefore, a regulation was prepared to extend coverage and protection to those children through to the end of the school year, which would have been June. I believe, in fact, that we were looking at June of 1982 because it was during the calendar 1981 that we were looking at this problem.

The Minister is now saying that the government is going beyond that to extend the program by including a whole new age group going up to age 14 so there is some variance there — not that I'm arguing with it — but there is some variance there with the intention of the regulation which was prepared at that time. It was simply to guarantee a follow-through and completion of a school year for those children whose birthdates fell in such a way that they were threatened with termination of their coverage.

There has been considerable thought given to

bringing the age group down below the age of six. Can the Minister tell me whether those divisions that are now covered under either plan, the MCDP or the MDA plan, all those children that are eligible now include 6-year olds. There were some differences and some inconsistencies because of the addition of divisions at a later date than some earlier divisions and the division of part of the delivery between the government service and the MDA service which resulted in the fact that in some school divisions in the plan there were children who were born in 1968 who were eligible, and other children who were born in 1969 and still other children that were born in 1970. Is there now a consistency between all the divisions that are covered so that in September of 1982, for example in the coming school year in 1982-83, all children aged six will be eligible in those divisions that are included in the plan?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I recognize that the Member for Fort Garry stated the position quite correctly. When I said that we followed what seemed to be the intent of the former government, was saying exactly that because it was just the one year, I think there was enough money to go along, there was enough in the Estimate to follow the fiscal year. There was an oversight somewhere I recognize that and then the Minister was in the process of, I think, recommending that this could be done and I understand there was enough money to do that, to follow the school year. This is what I meant.

But I'll use the same argument that the member said that instead of stopping somebody in the middle of a school term — I'm not using school term but I'm saying in the middle of a program — I am saying that our intention and that was made quite clear is that eventually we would want everybody in the province covered from kindergarten, which would be below 6, to 17 or so, high school. We feel that it would be going the wrong way if we try to go in another division and leave somebody who is still at school at the age of 14. The same argument, as I say, doesn't apply for the middle of the year, it would start in September not covered, but we think it would have the same effect and that will not be the most expensive part. We feel that in most of these divisions we are going to try and we feel that we will cover it with the same staff anyway, those that the dental nurses have been doing. We're going to try that anyway.

It is consistent with all those born in 1969, the 6-year olds, but it certainly is the intention of starting eventually lowering the age but when we're limited with staff and the funds we will do this. It's not just the staff — I want the members to know that we said we are going in that direction — but that doesn't mean we'll do it all in one year, we'll look at the economy and we'll do it gradually and the staff is important also once we determine the program we're going to have. We will eventually go down to kindergarten but that is not as necessary now as it is, I think the first priority and I think the member will agree with me that we should complete if the program will eventually be till 17 or 18 whatever that we finish the year and that's what we intend to do and that will be the cheaper way. Eventually it is our hope that we will cover everybody in the province from K to 18.

There will be flexibility, for instance, if we can go in remote areas and in rural areas where the population is smaller, what we did four or five years ago. I imagine that continued if you send somebody up North and you have in a certain settlement you only have 10-15 kids and there might be 3 or 4 a certain age that just when you go to the trouble and the expense of sending a dentist in this area we would ask them to look at the whole thing and in fact maybe look at the adults while he's there if they haven't got the service. This would be the flexibility that I'm sure no members of the Committee would argue with me on that, we should leave. The program right now is those born in 1969, 6 years old, we will continue those that are 14, we'll go one year at a time, 14 this year, 15 eventually until we will finish with these kids until they are all through high school. That's what we will proceed.

The next step, of course, why I couldn't have anything in the Estimates at this time, I want not look back and there is a danger of looking back and trying to say okay it's all identical we'll go back to what we were in battle. I don't think that that would serve any purpose, I have no hangup on that if it could be done. I think that I mentioned what I feel is important is utilization, the standard. I want to say when I talk about standard that doesn't mean that's something that a militant group or groups will say this is better standard, I hope they do, I want the members of this Committee to recognize that that doesn't mean necessarily we'll have the best standards in everything. We are saying, it's just like if we say we're going to provide transportation, people can argue the best of transportation is driving in a Cadillac and you might be satisfied with a bicycle. We'll have a look at the economy, we want acceptable standards but not necessarily saying that people will be seen everyday. Again, I think I won't get much of an argument on that but we are looking at this with an open mind.

I've had good discussions with the members of the Executive or Past President of the Dental Association. I was going to announce a little more at this time, at their request they wanted to make some observations before I close the door. I've agreed to that; that's the only reason I'm not trying to evade anything or to stall and as soon as — I can understand, of course, they realize these meetings will have to be held fairly soon and that we'll have to reach an agreement and have some given somewhere, but I would very sincerely hope that it is not too programmed and I'm not blaming the past government on that. It was the way it was set up, one and then the other, and there was some difference between the two parties that shared the government at the time, but I would hope that we'll replace these two programs and have one Manitoba program taking advantage of the best people, looking at the cost and everything. I'm fairly optimistic, with the co-operation of everybody, we'll be able to do exactly that, but I am committing myself, as soon as I have more information, to keep the members of this Committee even if the Estimates are finished, and I would hope that I will have, at least, during the — while we have passed the Supplementary Supply — but then I will have to answer and I will have much more information than I have at this time.

MR. SHERMAN: So that coming into the 1982-83

school year, children coming into the program would be those children in those school divisions that are covered who were born in 1976, is that correct?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, that's correct.

MR. SHERMAN: And those who were in there, even though they are turning 14, will continue to be covered?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister give me an estimate of how many eligible children he expects to be reached by the program in '82-83? In 1981-82, I think the number of eligible children approximated 35,000. What will the new age parameters do to that figure?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, it will be very close, approximately 44,000 that will be covered with the two programs. They will be the Dental Health Services, approximately, 21,700 and — I'm not saying again that it will be delivered by the same people — but now under the program, the Dental Association, 22,750, and next year, there will be another 5,500 again. See that, next year these same children will be 15 and then we'll have the first six-year-olds that year.

MR. SHERMAN: The '82-83, there will be 21,700 and 22,700. Just to reiterate and reconfirm, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is saying that there is at this point in time, no geographic expansion contemplated for '82-83, is that correct?

MR. DESJARDINS: At least I'm not announcing it now. There is an outside possibility, but I doubt it very much this year. It should be next year for sure, but I will know a little more a little later on, but I don't expect so. I think this will cover these at this time. There might be a possibility that we'll have other expenses though in setting this thing up and maybe recruiting technicians, dental nurses, education and so on; that's a possibility.

MR. SHERMAN: So, Mr. Chairman, the \$489,000 that the Minister referred to, was it \$489,000 or \$439,000?

MR. DESJARDINS: \$439,000. That would be just for these added children covered.

MR. SHERMAN: That was what I wanted clarified, Mr. Chairman. That's for the 48 group expansion?

MR. DESJARDINS: 43, 44 anyway, yes.

MR. SHERMAN: \$439,000. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, are there sufficient dental nurses in the system to provide the delivery to the expanded age group under the government operated system? I know the Minister has said he's going to be making further reference to this question later on, but could he give the Committee an indication of how many dental nurses there are in the system in Manitoba right now?

MR. DESJARDINS: We're reviewing this at this time.

This is information that I'll be able to share with my honourable friend while we look at the supplement, but it is our hope and we feel at this time, we're under the impression anyway, that this could be delivered. If not, I don't think it will be too much of a problem because I would ask the Dental Association to deliver that part; that's what I meant a while ago. There's no hang-up there at all. They might have to do the work if we need extra staff that we haven't got.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister supply the Committee with a figure on the number of dental nurses that are in the system right now in Manitoba?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The time being 4:30 p.m., the time for Private Members' Hour, I'm interrupting the proceedings and will return at the call of the House. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

ROYAL ASSENT

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS (Mr. Myron Mason): Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

Her Honour, Mrs. Pearl McGonigal, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne:

Mr. Speaker addressed Her Honour in the following words:

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed a bill, which in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which bill I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

No. 18 — An Act to amend The Pari-Mutuel Tax Act.

MR. CLERK, Jack Reeves: In Her Majesty's name, Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to this Bill.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RES. NO. 2 — COMPULSORY METRIC SYSTEM

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Resolution No. 2, moved by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has 16 minutes remaining.

Is the Honourable Opposition House Leader aware whether the honourable member is coming in or not?

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not certain. I understand that the member wasn't feeling very well, so he may have decided not to come and in that case anyone else wishing to speak, he'll drop his name from the list.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion as amended, the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. CHARLOTTE OLESON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this resolution; it seems to be a very timely thing to talk about. The proposed resolution by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell stated quite clearly in his resolution his opposition to the metric system and emphasized by saying that whereas some 52,000 Canadians petitioned the Government of Canada in 1981, and some 127,000 signatures were added in 1982 requesting the Government of Canada to implement this system, this would seem to me that there is a great deal of interest that this system be delayed at this time.

In looking back in history I discovered that it was in 1790 that the French National Assembly appointed a committee to explore the possibilities of a rational system of measurement. The committee proposed the kilogram units which were enacted into law in France a few years later, but it took until 1840 before general use in France and other parts of Europe. So it would suggest to me that the 10 years that Canada has been working its way into metric is a very short time in the span of history. In 1870, France called an International Convention to work out a unified metric system and these efforts led to a signing of the Treaty of the Meter in Paris in 1875. The Treaty established a general conference of weights and measures which since has periodically met and to make definitions of measurement. In 1960, the conference adopted international units, system units, or SIs which is universally recognized in all languages.

So, with a history of that nature it seems unnecessary for Canada to rush in over so short a period of time and to so arbitrarily suggest, not only suggest, insist that the metric system be mandatory in Canada. The conversion to metric has been slowed down considerably in the United States. The original resolution put forward by the Member for Roblin-Russell suggested that we should wait until the United States had adopted this and I firmly believe in this and was very disappointed when this amendment was brought in.

Now, it is thought that this program would probably have gone forward quite quickly if the United States had gone forward because the United States, being one of our largest buyers of our goods and commodities, it would make sense if we were in close partnership with them in this matter. It isn't necessary for Canada to be in close partnership with everything the United States does, but in goods and trading across a border such as ours, it would seem very important that we be in tune with what they are doing. So, it would be very difficult for manufacturers in this country to have a ready market in the United States if we are immediately going to switch into metric and make it mandatory we won't have much market for our goods in that country. Since they have backed off they have seen the light, as it were, that they should go a little bit slower.

In this period of time when the economy is as it is and our small business people are finding it very difficult to do business, there are bankruptcies, we hear of problems everywhere in the province with the economy and in other parts of Canada as well, it would seem very remiss of the Federal Government to further add to their burdens by imposing this mandatory metric conversion upon them. We have heard quotations of various prices of scales and various

other equipment these merchants would need and it is not always easy for a small business person to add at least \$3,000 into their expenses for a year just to buy something to sell meat, for instance, when really it doesn't matter to the customer that they don't have any metric. It matters to the customer that they know what they're getting and what price they're paying for it.

The customer is continually being bombarded with metric and I think — I not only think, I know, from being a shopper for a household, or two households at the present now, that I find it very difficult to know just exactly what I'm getting. I probably will always refer to quarts of milk; I may come out of that but it seems to me that is one of the natural things that we have in this country is our reference to goods and materials by the old Imperial system. It is not of really great urgency in my mind to change that system and change us all over night. It crosses my mind that perhaps the Federal Government will get so concerned about metric that they'll enter into other fields and make it compulsory too, and I can see myself and others being hauled away to jail because we do not use metric crochet hooks or metric knitting needles. On that subject, if any of you that are involved in doing handwork over the years, it's been a great source of frustration to myself and I know a great many others, that there already were two different forms of measuring needlework equipment and now we have a third, so it further compounds the fracture and we have to be continually with little charts and little gauges deciding just exactly what we're using for equipment. Then, when we finally decide what equipment we're to use, we have to enter into the problem of the material we're buying is measured in a different way from what we're used to and we end up just buying some yarn to do some knitting and we haven't a clue whether we'll finish the garment or not. I know I have trouble with that.

I'm tempted also to mention another problem that I've had is cookbooks. I am an inveterate reader of recipes and I find that I'm afraid that if I'm going to enter into the realm of metric cooking that gastronomical nightmares will be the result and my family — well, I don't have much time to cook now — but they'll probably be delighted if I don't have any time at all.

I think probably in that regard we'll go back to the old, old system that my Great Grandmother used where cookbooks mentioned a pinch of salt, butter the size of an egg and various other things and perhaps we, too, may be required to pay the price if the Federal Government decides to get into that realm of things too. I can see myself smuggling measuring cups across the border from the United States if we're insisted on using this sort of thing, so that I can still use my vast collection of cookbooks.

It strikes me that if we can afford to put bilingual labels on everything we sell and buy in Canada, we should also be able to put two different labels as far as weights and measures on them as well, so that those people who find it difficult to do and to convert can probably still know what they're buying and what they're working with if the labels are put on in both Imperial and metric.

The White Paper mentioned that the Federal Government would be consulting with the people about

this system. They said that they should be consulting with the people and all of a sudden we find that it is compulsory and an arbitrary deadline has been imposed upon us as far as conforming with metric scales and such. I don't ever recall being asked whether I liked that or not and I'm sure a great many other people are in the same boat.

As far as the temperature, I suppose we'll get used to that. I sort of look upon the weather, not by the temperature anymore; I decide whether I'll wear one sweater or two or put on a coat or a parka; that's about how I gauge the temperature. I really have no wish to carry a pocket calculator around when I listen to the news to decide whether it's cold or warm out. We can usually tell by guess or by golly, I guess, without that.

I'm disappointed that the Federal Government has chosen to impose this on the people of Canada with so little input from the Canadians who will be most affected and I continue to register my disrespect for their tactics.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member of Economic Development.

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in support of the amended resolution. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the three parties did support, in principle, the conversion to metric back in 1970 and since then the debate seems to have centred on the method in which the Liberal Government in Ottawa have been implementing the metric system.

I submit that's the sensible route to go right now. We would have been much further along, Mr. Speaker, if there had been an orderly transition to the metric system as was originally recommended. It was recommended that conversion be on a voluntary basis, that it proceed sector-by-sector and that to the extent possible the conversion process be co-ordinated with what was going on in the United States. Some of the objections that have been raised to this proposal, Mr. Speaker, have come about from a failure to follow those approaches.

Mr. Speaker, we're faced with a situation now of focusing on the objecting to the process or of saying that the conversion is a mistake from the word go and should not be endorsed. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, the members on this side are critical of the process of conversion but not of the principle of conversion.

Mr. Speaker, a change in something such as measurement system is not something that should strike terror into the hearts of every Manitoban. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that every child who goes through school in this province has been exposed to this system, Mr. Speaker, and I submit that children seem to be able to get their heads around measurement systems and by the same token I'm sure that the adult population of Manitoba will be able to do it too. Mr. Speaker, like a lot of adults we tend to think that if a person doesn't immediately master the system and is not able to talk about hectometres and decametres and centimetres and so on with complete ease that somehow, Mr. Speaker, they could never master the metric system.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, the way people learn to use

measurement systems is not by mastering the theory or the mathematics of a system in one fell swoop. Anyone who has worked with youngsters knows that they start out with a feeling of something being big or small, long or short, more or less, and they get these concepts. Mr. Speaker, by handling things by trying things out and by gradually getting closer and closer to being able to use the system. Children are notoriously inventive in handling money, in handling measurements, in handling counting and they're able to master the concepts that are necessary in their daily life or that are meaningful for them. I know that the literature in teaching arithmetic to young children is full of stories of how children who fail their arithmetic year after year and are even considered retarded are able to go and purchase food or candy or whatever at the local store and, Mr. Speaker, they can tell when they've got the right change, they can even wheedle a little extra money on occasion from parents, relatives and friends and they're very canny about the value of money and how to handle it because it's important to them.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that most adults are capable of learning how to handle a change in measurement. I don't know how the members opposite deal with the morning reports on weather; I know I started off when I heard the metric with finding out what was freezing level and also what was a nice sunny day or an average temperature for my house, Mr. Speaker, and I started with a few basic concepts. If it's zero, I know it's pretty cold and things are going to freeze; if it's 20, I know it's comfortable and I go up and down from there, Mr. Speaker. I sometimes play around with trying to make conversions when it's up around 37 or 38 to see if it's really 100 degrees or 97- $\frac{1}{2}$. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that as it becomes necessary for me to know more precise measurements, Mr. Speaker, I learn how to refine my awareness. The same with kilopascals, when it's necessary for me to know if I were going sailing or if I were going out on the lake and I tend to get seasick, then, Mr. Speaker, I submit that I would find out precisely what the range is and what the conversion was and in that way, Mr. Speaker, people make conversions.

Now, those of us who spend a fair bit of time in the kitchen and they number quite a few people with that type of experience, Mr. Speaker, have spent a lot of time with tsp's and Tbsp's and cups and so on. Some of us have even lived in other countries and we occasionally had to use a recipe that might appear in a newspaper or we might hear it on the radio and, Mr. Speaker, I had that experience living in England and I submit that even there, the fount of Imperial measurement, they don't instruct their housepersons how to cook in English terms, they talk about a handful of this, a pinch of that, a knuckle of that or a fair amount of, or flavour to taste. Mr. Speaker, people there manage to turn out reasonably tasty meals because they adapt to the measurement system.

Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder if in the debate on metric we seem to sometimes dip into the ludicrous. I know I remember reading years ago when they were converting to metric in that country of India, that exotic country, Mr. Speaker, where somehow elections are still conducted with the pictures on the ballot rather than names, and would you believe that the

conversion to metric was accomplished in India in very few years because people weren't so sophisticated they thought they couldn't learn anymore. They hadn't been to school and sort of got the idea that if they didn't know it when they were 6 or 7 like that and get a 100 percent in their paper that they couldn't learn anything. So, Mr. Speaker, I submit that people can learn to change if there is a valid reason.

Now, valid reason, my friends opposite have been showing a great deal of interest, Mr. Speaker, in upgrading the technological skills here in Manitoba and they show a great deal of interest in improving our industrial system, in developing our export capacity; indeed, in becoming full, effective partners in the 20th Century world of trade and commerce. Now, Mr. Speaker, an ability to deal with different measurement systems, to deal with different exchange rates, different kinds of money, indeed, to function well in the scientific and technological field, which has been using a primarily metric base for as long as I can remember. I certainly did all my chemistry and physics labs at the university in the metric system and, Mr. Speaker, found it inordinately simple and logical to use. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if we're serious about finding our way in this 20th Century, leading into the 21st Century that if we're afraid of learning and converting to a universal measurement system, God help us, Mr. Speaker, in our attempts to enter the modern world of trade and commerce, because that kind of conversion, Mr. Speaker, is a very simple component but a necessary component if we're going to manage a change in that direction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I guess I'll leave it to the members opposite to develop the concept of hectares, etc. Let me talk about speed with relation to automobiles. Mr. Speaker, I tend not to buy, I haven't in the past, I or my family haven't gone in for new cars, with the result that we have for years driven a car which has the old speeds, the old mileages on it. I must confess that for a while I was a little bit bemused as to whether the speed I was going was permissible or not and occasionally, because I like to go at least as fast as I'm allowed to on the highway, it did take me a little while to work out what the basic conversions were and to remember them because that's the second part of it. But you know, Mr. Speaker, I got a few reference points. I knew that if I was on such and such a highway, I daren't go over there unless I wanted to run the risk of a ticket, Mr. Speaker, and until I acquired a rather fancy automobile that had all the conversions on it because it was a newer automobile, it served me quite well and I don't recall running afoul of the law because I was ignorant of the metric system.

In fact, in balance, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the metric system, a system of measurement after all, is just a means to an end. It's a convenience. It's a necessary way we have of communicating with one another, Mr. Speaker, and in the areas where ignorance or failure to comprehend the metric system is of great importance such as — and I sympathize very much with the plight of the farmer who's measuring out quantities of chemical to be used on the land. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there are few occasions where ignorance of the new system could lead a Manitoban into making a costly and dangerous error and I accept

that, but I also suggest the kind of information I listen to every day on the noon hour broadcast for the farmers or material I see that goes out to farmers has a lot of numbers in it, for a farmer to follow a little grid of figures and calculate the conversions in terms of quantity of chemical and amount of water or whatever has to be added, my respect for the farmer's ability is very high. I think if they were given encouragement and assistance which I think is coming their way, Mr. Speaker, that they would make the transition very very comfortably.

I might pun and say you have nothing to lose but your chains, except the members opposite may have forgotten that chains were one of the very popular methods of the Imperial measurement system back a few years. But, Mr. Speaker, they are no longer terribly functional, that form of measurement, nor is the rod terribly useful and so as those items of measurement have fallen into disuse, the members of the public generally are ignorant of what they mean.

The point I'm trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that people learn measurements when it makes sense to them and given a reasonable opportunity to practice with quantities, lengths, measures of temperature or wind, they are quite capable and willing to make that transition. I submit that conversion to metric is not one of those great hurdles that it takes a pentathlon athlete to leap over, Mr. Speaker. It's a very moderate little hurdle along the way to a more integrated world economy and a more advanced technology and it is one that I have full confidence that the people of Manitoba are quite capable of jumping over.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. CLAYTON MANNES (Morris): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak against the amended motion. I would like to indicate my reason for doing so isn't that possibly six or seven years ago, it might not have been the proper resolution to be debating at this time. As a matter of fact, I can safely say or honestly say that some five or six years ago, I would have and I could have supported it, but things have changed over the last five years and I would say right now that the way the present amended resolution is so worded, in fact, everything that has occurred within the whole metrification of this country has violated the White Paper of which the resolution speaks. So it appears to me that the amended resolution really has very little bearing because how much of our whole economic system, as we understand it, is left to change?

I would say that it's tradition of an NDP supporter that, in fact, you bury your head in the sand and even though all the water's pretty well gone under the bridge, you still hold on to those ideals that say, well, in principle the three parties supported it and we did, and the fact that so many things have changed in violation of that particular White Paper, people still hold on to that belief that, well, we'll wake up and we'll do it in the orderly fashion which we had promised ourselves as a nation that we would do. That's why I say right at the beginning that I have to support the original resolution as placed by the Member for Roblin-Russell as it was there previously because at least that resolution had some teeth. It said it'll delay whatever is left to change, delay it until the United

States at least finds themselves in the position to change their system or until we can voluntarily accept it. So I say to you that if any of the motions and, of course, we have to debate the amended one at this particular time, but certainly the previous one is the one that had the teeth, and that's what I think our side is looking for.

So beginning with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to then say that I reject the amendment and I do so because of the compulsory nature that has been brought to bear slowly perhaps in the beginning of the '70s, but since the last three or four years, we found almost every sector of our economy and our society being forced to change. I don't think I'll ever forget the comment made by the Minister of Economic Development. She says, change is good if there is a valid reason, and I guess we all agree. Now we have to define what a valid reason is and I suppose we'll disagree on many areas what a valid reason is to many of the changes that have been brought forward.

To me, one of the most basic areas of concern and the most unfortunate situation throughout this all is the compulsive nature of the system being brought in tied into the needless cost, and you take those two aspects, you put them together and I think you have a situation where you can expect a large part of this country of ours to reject the whole system. I think today if you took a plebiscite or if you took a vote of all those people, you'd probably find that there were a vast majority that were opposed to the whole introduction of metric. Of course, my learned friends will say, well, they're not the enlightened ones, they're only the day-to-day people who have to work in it though, I might add.

What about the cost? Well, I'd like to relate one experience to the House if I could, because we went on our own farm, we put a major expansion into one of our seed plants and we had to convert our scale. Of course, scale conversions are known through all aspects of society where you have to weigh and measure. I can tell you what that cost was to our particular farm. The weighing device in itself was some \$3,000.00. But just the additional cost — and it was a digital read-out type of scale — just to have that extra button which converted the pounds to the kilograms was some additional \$1,000.00. At least we had the opportunity to build that \$1,000 cost in right at that time because it was a new installation. Had the scale been some, oh, let's say as recent as three years old, the total cost would have been some \$2,000 or \$3,000.00. The cost which, of course, was just passed on to our seed-grain customers as the economic system says it has to be done. So there was a real cost to ourselves which was passed on to our clientele and again, for what good cause? That is the question. What good cause did it serve? Our customers have come in ever since and although we still sell out grain to them by way of bushel, pound and bushel, still an extra charge had to go on to the commodity to pay for that cost?

What about the small independent businessman? What I find intriguing in this whole area is that this is the so-called individual that my friends opposite say that they support, that small individual businessperson, the backbone of our society, the one that has no market clout who takes but cannot give. He's the one that can't necessarily pass on immediately this total

cost. He's the one that has to meet his customer up front and has to no doubt try and convince him of the argument of metric. Yet, I don't see where the members opposite in any shape or form or any way whatsoever rise to the rescue of that small independent businessman. It makes me wonder if, in fact, the people opposite, what has been their cost associated with this change? I'm willing to bet that as close as any of them have come to bearing the cost associated with the metric change has probably been the change of the bathroom scale to a metric scale. How can you judge? How can you really feel what a whole large part in a hopefully thriving part of our society is going through?

Of course, the camouflage and the change of systems. What happens when you change from one system to another? What is covered up? What changes in prices and is it a strictly proportional cost change as you increase the price of beef from X dollars a pound to something 2.2 times greater. These are the areas that lead into buyer concern and to buyer disagreement with many of their merchants.

Then we look at the propaganda system that has been used in an attempt to sell this whole thing and I suppose, personally, I find this almost a most distasteful aspect of this whole metrification procedure. You see it everywhere. I see where the three governments on this Core Area Initiative Program have spent \$600,000 just to advertise the fact that there's a program. I see where the Federal Government is spending \$8 million just to glamorize our new Constitution — \$8 million. Yet I'm told that if you go into a bookstore and you want to buy a Constitution, the unabridged version of our Constitution, you pay \$3 for it, even though I'm glad to know that at least in my small post office, we've been given Constitutional leaflets which gives us the basic Charters and that's fine. But I understand if you go into the bookstores today to buy a Constitution, it costs you \$3.00, but yet, the Federal Government can spend some \$8 million just to tell us how fortunate we are to have one and how great we are to be Canadian. Then you go to that monitor, that red magazine, red in colour, and it tells us how much we enjoy this changeover and I wonder what the true cost is of that? What purpose does it serve? I keep asking myself that question and I can't come up with an answer. I suppose it keeps people employed and that's maybe a benefit of some sort.

Well, what are the benefits then? There has to be a benefit. There have to be benefits to this whole program. —(Interjection)— Well, there have to be, you know, they have to tie in again to that Minister's comments "if there is a valid reason" and other valid reasons, are they the benefits of which all of us attempt to seek the solution? Are they the benefits that we're looking for when we try to tell ourselves that this system is proper and is one that we should have? Well, I honestly don't see where there are any local benefits whatsoever to changing to the metric system, unless of course government sees some opportunity to tax because through manufacture price increases, there's a higher tax rate to bear. Of course, there is the opportunity to keep a larger bureaucracy busy and selling the whole function.

Well, what can I accept in this whole regard? As it's been pointed out many times, our party was party to

the whole attempt in seeing the orderly evolution of a metric system in this country; I don't pretend to back away from that commitment. But, I think the key is the orderly evolution. I have a feeling that the Federal Government through the '70s has broken faith with not only our party but indeed with the NDP Party at the time who supported them in the basic concept. I can see where the benefits can accrue in those export-related areas; certainly grain was one of them and grain, of course, is traded in the world in metric tonnes for years. In those particular areas there already was a changeover and I can in other areas that, in fact, hadn't changed over that there was good reason. But again, let those industries and those parts of our economic system that saw some benefit in making that change, let them do it on their own time and in their own place.

Again, as we become a trading nation and as we see where that one-third of those nations, because it seems to me that two-thirds of our trade is with the United States, much of it in areas where there is no call for metric requirements. But in that other one-third of our whole trade portfolio where we go out and move products into those countries in the world where a metric system exists, well, by all means, let's use the gentle persuasion to have our industries make that change. But in those other areas where there is absolutely no benefit and in those areas where we trade with the United States and those products within those product lines where there is no requirement for metrification, then let us not rush into it.

In the business area and within the borders of our own country, now that the concept has been introduced some 10 years ago, as the associations within all areas as they work towards what they feel is some advantage if they change, well, then let them do it. I don't know how many industries within our country have not as yet changed, but if it is their desire to change of their own free will, then let them do it on some type of an orderly basis. Just as we've had the orderly development of a bilingual Canada and it's come through no major compulsion, well, let our metric system also develop in that same manner and, you know, in our government, our Federal Government will offend an awful lot fewer people if that is allowed to occur in that type of manner.

Mr. Speaker, I'll close at this time by again reiterating why I got up to speak on the amended resolution and I have to speak against it; again, not because of what it says, but because it says it some six years too late. I feel that the previous motion made, a resolution made by the Member for Roblin-Russell, indeed, was the one that had the teeth in it and was the one that, I think, the vast majority of citizens in Canada would care to support at this time. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. GÉRARD LECUYER (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, Monsieur le Président, j'ai déjà parlé de cette résolution lorsqu'elle a été originalement présentée. Cette fois, j'ai l'occasion de parler sur l'amendement. If I had the feeling I would be understood, I would continue in that direction.

Having heard the Member for Morris stand up and

say a moment ago that he has to ask himself the question, "What are the benefits, what are the valid reasons?" — and having asked himself these questions he says, "Well, I can't support this amendment. I have to reject it." But then he goes on to tell us some of the changes that he has made in their own operation in a seed plant and I say, how can he not support it, because if we don't support it or basically he says I would have supported the original resolution which says let's put a stop to this for the next 10 years. If you put a stop on this for the next 10 years I say, why did he go and spend this money uselessly? I say one reason for supporting the amendment is for the very fact that's he's put out some money already in this regard.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that is the case for thousands of other people in Canada, the case of thousands of small business people, thousands of farmers who spent money, making or adapting to the metric system. Now, to stop at this time is actually a much greater waste of money than what the additional expenses or expenditures that are to come down the road. They say, "I can't support it because the White Paper has violated its original, or at least the intent of the White Paper, which was supported by all parties in the House of Commons has been violated." I agree. I agree with that; it has been violated. We say in this amendment, let's go back to the principles of the White Paper. Let's get them not to make this mandatory but let's have this White Paper implemented, this metric conversion implemented in an orderly fashion, not by compulsion. That's not what we're saying.

On the other hand, to say that by implementing this amendment is to say we're putting our heads in the sand, I'm sorry I can't see it that way. I say by saying let's wait for 10 or 15 years, that's putting your head in the sand. If you say, let's wait for the United States to go at our rate, that's putting your head in the sand and say, well, we'll wait for the United States to come and pull it out for us. That's being regressive; that's going back 10 years. That's being conservative. Ten years too late, always too late.

The Member for Morris awhile ago said, "Four or five years ago, I could have supported this type of amendment." Four years ago, they were in power. I didn't see them introduce that type of a resolution. When we look at Ottawa, when it was debated and it was debated four times in the last 10 years, what do we see? We see the Conservatives having supported this in Ottawa. —(Interjection)— Regressive, regressive. The Member for Morris says, "I already spent the money making the conversion." As I said, again, a valid reason for supporting the amendment. He further says, "Anyway, I passed the costs on to my customers and whatever I haven't been able to pass on to my customers, I've claimed on my income tax." That's what has happened, so there is no additional cost for the small businessman like the Member for Morris. They say let's go at the rate of the United States, just like the rate of the United States in the economic field, let's be Reaganomics and stuff like that.

I admit there are difficulties to making such a conversion; I admit there are additional costs; and I admit that I do not like the compulsion or the mandatory aspect attached to it, and that's the very reason for the amendment that we have introduced, the very reason

for it. But, I'm not so sure that it's the expense that is bothering the members across, I'm not so sure it's the mandatory aspect that's bothering them either, because as I've said before the major expenditures have already been borne by the public of Canada. The mandatory aspects eventually, if this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris on a Point of Order.

MR. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Member for Radisson will submit to a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. LECUYER: If time permits when I'm finished, Mr. Speaker.

I was saying I'm not so sure that it's the expense or the mandatory aspect of it because eventually if we were to adopt the metric conversion in an orderly basis eventually there wouldn't be such a thing as mandatory aspects anyway, everybody would be using. Members say, well, I don't know what a hectare means, but if he goes outside of Canada or the United States nobody understands what an acre means, and I've had that experience because for five years that I was in Africa, East Africa and North Africa, throughout Europe nobody understood what I was speaking of when I was talking about a bushel and an acre. —(Interjection)— Well, if the Member for Morris who comes from the agricultural sector had taken the time out to look at some of the information that comes along with the agricultural products which he, I presume, he uses if he farms to any degree efficiently, he would have noticed that on all containers for years now both systems were used and he would have noticed, of course, that a hectare is 2-½ acres. I would think that the basic fact for opposing this amendment is basically to make a nuisance of themselves.

I sympathize with those who have difficulties in making conversions and that is why I fail to understand, I agree that the Federal Government has been spending an awful lot of money in making people understand what the metric system is all about, a way too much, I presume. But on the other hand, I know for sure what the comment would be they hadn't spent; they're introducing this and not helping us to understand. So you can't win either way.

I feel it is the responsibility of all levels of government if they introduce changes and a change which was agreed upon by all three parties then it becomes the responsibility of all levels of government to help people to understand what the system is all about and help them use it. You have tons of tools of rulers, of whatever, thermometers and whatever you want to think about to help you understand to make the metric system and if you still can't understand, I'm sure if you went to your grade two, grade three, grade four child he would help you to understand how to use the insecticides and whatnot that you need on your farm. I'm sure you wouldn't take the risk of just going blindly and spreading chemicals on the farm, you can go and ask your grade two son or grade three daughter and I'm sure she can help you and get you out of difficulty.

I can't believe, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who is knowledgeable enough to sit in this House or is knowledgeable to balance his own budget would not be able to make that kind of an adaptation or he would not be able to use the metric system in operating of his farm or his small business. I would further . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30, when we next reach this Resolution the honourable member will have ten minutes remaining.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I do move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the House do now adjourn until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. It is my understanding that Committees will continue at 8:00 p.m. this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: With the understanding that members will reconvene in Committee at 8:00 p.m. this evening, it is moved by the Honourable Government House Leader and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education that the House do now adjourn. Agreed? (Agreed).

The House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon (Tuesday)