

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have 20 students from Norway House. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kaminski, Mrs. Halcrow and Mr. Bate. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

We have 53 students of Grade 5 standing from Howden Elementary School. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

We have 40 students of Grade 11 standing from the W. C. Miller Collegiate. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

And we have 25 students of Grade 3 standing from the Stonewall Centennial School. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education.

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

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 Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have an update on the seeding conditions in Manitoba that I would like to present to the House. As a matter of interest, there are a couple of points, the percentage of seeding varies from 30 to 60 percent . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the honourable member copies?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, I have. I would also like to note that in the Russell area, there has been approximately 10,000 acres of wheat, flaxseed and rapeseed that has been seeded by aircraft this year because of the extremely wet conditions; there are areas in the province where it is very difficult for the farmers to get on the land, and there has been quite a bit of work done in this area by air. So I just wanted to bring that to the attention of the House.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. In view of the Minister of Education's announcement yesterday of the referral of Bills 22 and 23 to an sessional committee, can the Minister advise when and where these inter hearings will take place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, no specific date has been set as yet, but I would anticipate that the hearings would be held in the fall to allow people to have at least two or three months to carefully study the bills.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister advise in what locations the hearings will be held? Will they be held in locations outside the city of Winnipeg?

MR. COSENS: Particular locations have not been decided as yet, Mr. Speaker. I'll announce those as soon as the decision has been made.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the information which is coming more and more to light of the fact that more and more students will be unable to obtain summer employment this forthcoming summer, can the Minister of Education advise us as to whether or not he envisions any further thrusts or initiatives on the part of his department in order to reduce the unemployment rate among students during the summer months?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, The Private Sector Youth Employment Plan certainly handled that particular situation very well last summer. I would anticipate that it will deal with it very adequately this summer.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, is the minister advising the Chamber that in fact the Private Sector Summer Employment Program will handle entirely the unemployment situation involving students this summer?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I am not advising the Chamber that because I think we are all very much aware that many students find employment on their own, without the help of any particular government agency.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, can the minister advise whether or not he has any analysis as to the rate of unemployment that will exist among post-secondary students this forthcoming summer?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that particular analysis. It's quite possible that my colleague, the Minister of Labour and Manpower, has some indications in that particular topic that he may be prepared to put forth at this time.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, then I would redirect my question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower, as to whether he has such an analysis or whether he intends to prepare such an analysis?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour and Manpower.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, we find it difficult dealing with just simply the press releases. I noticed approximately a week ago, where one particular local paper carried two articles — one saying that students were going to be finding it difficult to find employment, and another one from Canadian Manpower, saying that they had a great number of jobs that were going unfilled. At this particular time, the programs that we have in place, there are certainly large numbers that are applying for them, and we haven't really assessed whether all the programs we have in place are going to be totally utilized or not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a sixth question.

MR. PAWLEY: A further supplementary to the Minister of Labour and Manpower. He has indicated that an analysis has not been completed. Can the Minister of Labour advise us as to when he will, in fact, have information available to us in that respect?

MR. MacMASTER: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, would the Leader of the Opposition be kind enough to specify just what particular analysis he's referring to?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I heard the Minister of Labour and Manpower correctly, he'd indicated that he had not completed his analysis as to whether or not the various programs were in place. I would ask, if that is the answer that the Minister of Labour gave, it was difficult to hear, if he could indicate when he would be able to indicate whether those programs were in place?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I'm either missing the point or the Leader of the Opposition is attempting to make a point that I can't put my finger on. We have programs that are in place. I said that the programs were actively in place, and it looked like there's going to be good participation in them. I'm still trying to find out what analysis he's asking if I have, or what he's asking that I may be doing. I want to know what that particular question is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, then the question is very straightforward and simple as is referred earlier to the Minister of Education. Does the Minister of Labour and Manpower have an analysis, or is he in the process of preparing an analysis as to whether or not there will be significant rate of unemployment among the students during the forthcoming summer?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, we're not in the midst of preparing that particular analysis. I have said that we have a variety of programs that are in place — it looks like there's a good response to them.

With the number of students that find employment elsewhere, and the number of students who choose not to get involved in getting employment in any way, shape or form, it would be rather difficult for us to pre-judge entirely just using whole numbers as to what the unemployment situation might be with students this summer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if I could have the indulgence of the House. Apparently I missed an introduction of a school class.

There are 25 students of Grade 3 and 4 standing from Westgrove School under the direction of Miss Roskam. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance who is responsible for the Manitoba Energy Council and ask the minister whether the province has any contingency plans for allocation of fuel supplies in the event of gasoline shortages in the province should such occur at some future time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Energy.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, the Energy Allocation Act that was passed in the House of Commons will be the main bodies that will control the allocation of supplies in the event of a shortage occurring, and we have assigned a person to that group from Manitoba. I believe they have just started their work in the last ten days in setting up the administrative mechanism to put into effect the Energy Allocation Act provisions, so that Manitoba will come under those provisions in the event of a shortage.

I answered a question yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that had been taken as notice on my behalf that was placed by the Member for Transcona with regards to the likelihood or otherwise of Manitoba experiencing a shortage in the same proportions that the United States is experiencing in certain parts. I think the answer I gave indicated adequately that if a shortage were to occur in Canada by a complete cutoff of crude to Canadian sources, that our net position was such that apart from the short-term distribution problem, the infrastructure problem, that it could be overcome, so that in the event that there was a shortage of that severity occurred, it would be a short-term one, and that Canada has the ability at the present time to be self-sufficient on a net basis.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I appreciate that this must be a federal-provincial matter. Can the honourable minister advise whether the province and the federal government have actually decided on priorities in the utilization of gasoline and other energy forms, or is this matter of priorities still being worked out, if I understand the minister correctly in his answer?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the actual details of the administration is now being worked on actively and started just about two weeks ago, pursuant to the passing of the federal legislation, and Manitoba has one member, a top public servant who is a member of that committee and they are currently working on those details.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of

arising out of the answer to my question which he presented yesterday. I wasn't here at that time, so I'd like to follow up by asking him another question that was taken as notice by his colleague, and that is, is the Manitoba government promoting the sale of PetroCan by the new federal Conservative government, even though private petroleum companies in Canada say that this would endanger Canada's opportunity . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable Member for Transcona care to rephrase his question?

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I'd like to ask him if indeed the Manitoba government feels that Canada's opportunity of gaining self-sufficiency in oil would be threatened by the disposal of the public Crown corporation, PetroCan, despite private petroleum companies saying that this would endanger our ability of achieving self-sufficiency in petroleum?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, those decisions are decisions that are going to have to be made by the federal government. I would think that I wouldn't lose too much sleep one way or another with regard to PetroCan. I think that the PanArctic work that has gone on as a consortium arrangement between the federal government and the private sector has proved to be beneficial in the exploration field. I don't think that there are too many questions about the product that has come out from that exploration work. As far as PetroCan is concerned I would have less concern about its operation than I would about PanArctic.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary to the Minister — Since PetroCan is a major investor in the PanArctic venture, and since it's the PanArctic stimulus which has led to far northern discoveries of oil and natural gas, which would be of importance to Manitoba especially in the transmission of said natural gas, does the Manitoba government feel that the future prospects of natural gas and frontier oil exploration will be threatened if Petro-Canada is sold off by the federal government?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that decision is a federal decision. My opinion is no.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Since the Energy Council Staff have done a great deal of background work with respect to the whole issue of natural gas exploration and the possible exportation of natural gas, I'd like to ask the Minister if his staff are looking at the alternative means by which Canada could achieve self-sufficiency in petroleum by the year 1990?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba government will be making representation to the National Energy Board hearings on the gas hearings first of all, they are the general hearings; and secondly will be making representation when the Polar Gas Pipeline people start their hearings at the NEB which they've now filed for but are not likely to take place before the end of 1979. We will, in both cases, be making representation. There are no hearings at the present time involving oil, the supply of petroleum, that we are making any preparation for, because there are no hearings that are under way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Finance. Can the Minister of Finance assure the people of Manitoba that the government of the Province of Manitoba intends to oppose vigorously the policy of the federal government of today, which says that Canada, Canadian citizens, will have to pay the world price to oil producing provinces, notably Alberta and Saskatchewan, despite the fact that that world price is set by a cartel, is overpriced, and has no relationship to cost, and will cost the citizens of our province millions of dollars every year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think it depends on what that price goes to. At the present time, the world price is the price that makes the tar sands about competitive, and I would think that the right procedure would be to ensure that that level is reached. If the world oil price goes beyond that to any substantial point, then it will have to be reconsidered.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister now has changed his position from what it was in opposition, and says that we should be paying tar price costs for existing oil, tar sands cost for existing oil which was being sold at \$2.75 a barrel in 1973, and is now being charged for at the rate of \$14.00 per barrel, would the Minister assure the Canadian people, the people of Manitoba, that he will take the same position vis-a-vis the present government of Canada that he took when in opposition, mainly that the citizens of Manitoba should not have to pay an extortionate price for oil to the producing states, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I also advocated in opposition that the Manitoba government ought to take part of the action in the tar sands project, which the former government was not amenable to. And I think that history will prove that it would have been a wise move on the part of Manitoba to have become involved in the Alberta Syncrude project at that time when it was in difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time, the official world price of oil is, I think, about \$2.00 a barrel less than the profitable price, or the break-even price in the production of the tar sands, and I think at about \$16.00 a barrel, that that point is reached. We'll support, Mr. Speaker, the former policy of the former federal government, which was supported, to reach a point where the tar sands became viable. Mr. Speaker, we'll re-evaluate that when that is reached. In the long term, if the oil prices, of course, set by the so-called cartels, go to the spot prices that are now being quoted which go as high as \$40.00 a barrel, then of course you have another consideration to make completely.

So the picture is so volatile that I don't think anybody is going to stand out at this point in time and say that the only yardstick you can use is that official price.

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

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, for my honourable friend's information, the public of the province of Manitoba, in accordance with the expressed wishes of this government, are participants in the tar sands projects through the national government of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the honourable member a question, or is he making a statement?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order because the Honourable Minister's . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. —(Interjection)— Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not even sure that question is on the record, but at any rate, I'll advise the member, Mr. Speaker, that in reply to his question, or his questions, that the position of the former government was a flexible position that had enough foresight in its consideration when in opposition to advise that Manitoba's best interest would be served by becoming directly involved in the development of the tar sands.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River. Order please. May I point out to the honourable member, if he has a point of privilege or a point of order, it should be raised at the end of the Question Period. —(Interjection)— The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is that I'm advised that my last question did not appear on the record, and that is a matter of privilege for a member of the House that he is entitled to have his questions on the record. I wish to therefore put the question on the record. .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not aware that the member's question is not on the record.

MR. GREEN: Well, I was advised, Mr. Speaker, that my last question was not on the record, and the Minister of Finance so advised me. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, if there is a doubt whether my question is on the record, I have a right as a member of this House, to have my questions on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I will take the matter under advisement and check Hansard. If it's not in Hansard, he can repeat his question tomorrow.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. DOUG GOURLAY: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him if he anticipates any changes in policy with respect to the central drug purchase for veterinarians across the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GOURLAY: I would like to then ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he anticipates any changes in the program or policy for the subsidies to veterinary district boards to help them finance the ever-increasing costs that they are experiencing in operating these veterinary clinics, and especially with respect to additional costs in heating and some deficiencies in these buildings that require substantial renovations to reduce the cost of operation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the first part of the member's question is, do we plan on changing the granting structure to the municipalities for the veterinary clinics? We do not plan to reduce them. We are looking at all the granting structures. However, I would like to say in the matter of the energy use that these buildings are using or consuming, we have put money into the upgrading of some of the buildings that are known as the MacDonald Building, some window repair and spent money that would conserve energy, and of course the other move that we have made is to freeze the hydro rates for these people for the next five years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the last question and answer given to the House by the Minister, can he tell us how much money it is going to cost the province to freeze those hydro rates, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I said it would be over the next five years, I think we will be able to indicate that better over the next period of years.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister missed the statement of the Minister of Finance a week or so ago when he said he didn't know whether it would cost us one red penny. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. And that is whether or not or at what stage are the appeal proceedings with respect to the challenge to the assessment system, from the Dauphin area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Completed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. USKIW: Yes, could the Minister indicate to the House just what the status is of the present legislation or whether there are going to be amendments required?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there was no appeal from the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench in the case in Dauphin. The status of the assessment legislation is that very shortly I expect that I will be able to announce the appointment of a commission to review assessment legislation throughout the province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland. **MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the presence of the students from Norway House in the Chamber gallery here today, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Education if he could indicate to them, so that they could return this information to their community, when the new high school in Norway House will be commenced construction and when he expects that that high school will be completed for the benefit of the people in Norway House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I regret I can't give a specific date at this time. I haven't been briefed on that particular situation lately.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Speaker, hopefully we will get faster action on it than we had last year when he announced it, and it still hasn't commenced construction.

My second question is to the Minister of Resources, or the Acting Minister of Resources, and I would ask him if he can indicate that there are no new licences being issued in the Lake Winnipeg area to fishermen for the spring season, and can he also confirm that they are receiving letters to that effect that no new vacancies, or no vacancies will be filled on Lake Winnipeg until there is an announcement of new policy and new policy is implemented?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice for my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Labour and ask him whether he has had an opportunity to review the inquest findings of Judge Baryluk?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, that report just arrived on my desk about an hour ago. I have not had an opportunity to review it and review the recommendations and alternatives that I understand are contained therein, but I will and will give them due consideration.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would also review the inspection procedures of his department to make certain that at least one annual inspection of each elevator takes place.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I understand that you can go back 10 or 15 or 20 years in the province of Manitoba and that hasn't been specifically the case but there may be reason for giving that consideration. There may also be reason for not giving it consideration when we are aware that years ago elevators certainly weren't made of the standard that they are today and weren't as technical and reliable as they are today. So I'll have to review the entire recommendations and give them serious consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct this question to the Acting Minister of Health. I had half expected the Member for Swan River to ask this question while he was on his feet during the Question Period today, but as it must have slipped his mind I'd like to ask the Acting Minister of Health if he can confirm that the Benito Medical Nursing Unit will be closed down as of June 27th of this year, forcing 16 persons out of work and also removing this vital health service from the community of Benito?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice and refer it to my colleague the Minister of Health.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, I'd like to ask a supplementary question on behalf of the Thompson residents, and specific in northern residents serviced by the Thompson Hospital, can the Acting Minister also confirm that the sterilization unit at the Thompson Hospital has been broken down since at least early May of this year, and that residents of that community are being forced to forego surgery or to travel to Winnipeg for surgery that is normally performed in the community of Thompson, and can the Minister also undertake to report back to the House as to why that unit has not been

fixed for at least the past month?

MR. COSENS: I will also take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker, and refer it to the Minister of Health.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you. A supplementary to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. As there seems to be some public conjecture as to the results of the recent lead-in-blood tests done at Weston and Lord Nelson Schools, is the Minister prepared to table the more general conclusions reached as a result of that testing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I assured this House some time ago that the procedure that would be followed in this particular series of lead tests with the children in those two schools would be somewhat different than the one that was undertaken by my friends in opposition in 1976, and the key to it was going to be, Mr. Speaker, that the parents of the children that we have determined that there is a problem will be informed first, and once they are informed and the school division of course is made aware of the situation, the results of those tests will be made public the same as the others were.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Tourism. The eastern part of my constituency where various good tourist attractions namely three major lakes, Whitemouth Lake, Moose Lake and Lake of the Woods, plus four ports of entry from the USA; in preparation of next year's tourist brochure would the Minister consider including the major tourist highlights and highways in the Emerson constituency?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the Member for Emerson, and any of the other members as I've mentioned earlier, any of their locations that have been omitted from our brochures I would suggest that they put them in letter form to my department and we are going to try to advertise where it will be of benefit to the different communities, and also we'll have it on file for next year's brochure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism. In the light of the fact that the shortage of gas in the U.S., can the honourable minister indicate to the House if our province is prepared to supply gas to the visitors from the United States without hardship to our people of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of tourism.

MRS. PRICE: I don't really understand what the member is getting at. Would you repeat it?

MR. MALINOWSKI: With pleasure. Now I said, Mr. Speaker, that in light of the shortage of gas in the United States, if our province is prepared to supply the gas for our visitors from the United States, without hardship for our people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the other day that in our advertising across the line within a one day's drive, we have made mention of the fact that we don't have a gasoline shortage here, and until such time as we're notified otherwise, I don't think we'll be placing a hardship on any of the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Acting Minister of Housing, and it's on behalf of the people of Roblin. Could the minister indicate if the sorely needed senior citizens' project, which was cancelled some 19 months ago by the Conservative government, will now proceed, now that the documented need has been shown to be greater than that which even existed 19 months ago?

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

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to draw my honourable friend's complaints to the Minister of Housing.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the people of Roblin would appreciate that. My supplementary is directed to the House Leader as well. In the light of the fact that this House unanimously agreed to establish a Legislative Committee to look into the matter of public access to government information, can the minister indicate if the government, in the name of open government, is prepared to accept the unanimous recommendation of the House and establish this committee?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, our first consideration is to complete the business of this particular session.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that it's been already indicated that a Legislative Committee will be set up to look at the Public Schools Bills, I'm wondering if the minister wouldn't see freedom of information as a similar type of priority, and indicate to the public of Manitoba that a Legislative Committee will be set up in due course, say within the next week or so — so that the people of Manitoba can rest assured that they will be able to make representation to the Legislative Committee, with respect to the matter that was unanimously agreed to by this Legislature?

MR. JORGENSEN: As I said earlier to my honourable friend, our first priority is to complete the business of this session, before we begin another one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways, and ask him if he would be prepared to tell the House what upgrading we can expect on Provincial Road 268, from Lenswood south to Provincial Trunk Highway No. 10.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, if my memory is accurate that particular piece of road requires some survey and design and purchase of right-of-way. It would be my hope that the Land Acquisition Division of the department can acquire that land this summer; indeed if they can do so at an early stage, it would be my hope that some actual construction can commence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River with a supplementary.

MR. GOURLAY: A supplementary with respect to Provincial Trunk Highway No. 20, approximately 20 miles from Cowan to Camperville, I understand is the only provincial trunk highway in the province that is not surfaced at the present time, and it's in a very deplorable condition, by the number of inquiries and calls that I'm getting. I'm wondering what program is slated for that chunk of highway this year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. Today and last week, when asked a question concerning featuring the fact that there is no gas

shortage in Manitoba to American tourists, she indicates that the ads make mention of that fact, and I would like to ask her whether that means that it's contained in small print, or whether the minister would consider that such an important and attractive feature should be in headlines and given high prominence to attract American tourists to this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't say it has been given prominence in the ad, but it's certainly very noticeable in our ads throughout the northern part of the States.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a supplementary.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also ask the minister whether the differential in the dollar between Canada and the U.S. is also given considerable prominence in headlines, or high feature in the advertisements in the U.S.?

MRS. PRICE: It is given a little more prominence than the notice that there isn't any gas rationing here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Attorney-General, and it's with respect to the matter I raised yesterday. We would ask once again whether a copy of the Chenier Inquest Report from Portage la Prairie Provincial Judges Court will be made available to members on this side of the House for perusal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my staff are working diligently with respect to the question asked by the Member for Wellington yesterday, and I hope to have a response for him tomorrow.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Honourable Attorney-General whether he could confer with the Minister of Labour and advise members on this side of the House why it was possible with respect to the Helleur inquest to provide a copy of that inquest transcript to this House and why the Department of the Attorney-General has not been able to function as efficiently as the Department of Labour?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member, that in the framing of any question it should be as brief and to the point as possible, without gratuitous information. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Member for Wellington that I, in fact, ordered that inquest to be held because I felt it a very important matter to be inquired into. As soon as I receive the information with respect to the availability of the report I will advise the member, and I hope to do so tomorrow.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. He undertook over a month ago to advise members on his efforts with respect to the move made by the Manitoba Turkey Marketing Board to allow changes in the National Marketing Agreement. Can he now report to members of the Legislature what his efforts were and what has transpired in this period of time?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In answer to the Member for St. George — I had a meeting with the Turkey Board, who have been meeting over the past few months with the national agency, discussing any expansion of turkey quota or quota for turkeys in Canada, and it is still the discussion stages, there hasn't been any finalization. The formula in which they are discussing, I feel, leaves Manitoba in a very good position. I think that, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet and the Member for St. George indicated, that they had entered into an agreement which was fool-proof, and the

sharing formula could not be changed; it was not quite correct, and in fact, it is one of the negotiable parts of the agreement. It is in the hands of the producers' board and the national agency, and it was actually initiated by the Manitoba Producers' Association.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the minister — since the issue is not in the Turkey Board hands, it is in the minister's hands, is this Minister of Agriculture going to allow the Manitoba Turkey Producers' Marketing Board to allow the change of the agreement, to the detriment of all producers in this province? What is the position of the government in this case?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, let me again let the member know that it is the producers' elected Board that is negotiating and discussing the proposal with the national agency. It was their own proposal that's in discussion, not from the Minister of Agriculture, but from the producers themselves. I discussed it with them approximately a week ago; I can see no problems to this particular date.

There hasn't been an amendment to the national program signed, and before there is, if there has to be, I will let the member know. But as far as I am concerned, the producers of turkey in Manitoba are handling the job very responsibly.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The time for Question Period having expired, we'll proceed with Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Before calling the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I understand that Public Accounts was not completed this morning, so that Committee will meet again tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would call Bill No. 18?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 18, AN ACT TO AMEND THE NATURAL PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps you might tell me how much time?

MR. SPEAKER: 30 minutes.

MR. USKIW: 30 minutes. Mr. Speaker, in the course of our debate yesterday, we were discussing the problems of marketing of agricultural commodities and how Bill No. 18 was going to compound those problems for the producers of those commodities that are involved in marketing their products through Marketing Boards, and I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is the Minister that has to play a vital role to assure that the overall Manitoba public interest is protected.

Mr. Speaker, I was trying to indicate last night, that the Minister has found himself in a tremendously embarrassing position, because he has been lobbied by particular interest groups with a view towards weakening — that is, the view of those groups towards weakening the Marketing Board system in this province. And, Mr. Speaker, it's evident that the Minister gave a great deal of sympathy to those particular views, in that when there was a confrontation between the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board and the Meat Packers in this province, the Packers decided to go on strike, Mr. Speaker — yes, they refused to buy Manitoba hogs for a period of time.

An appeal to the Minister for his intervention, and as I recall Mr. Speaker, the Minister did respond to the appeal of the packing industry in this province, and forced, through his intervention he forced the Marketing Board to go back to the status quo ante in terms of the system of marketing that was in place before the change was made.

Mr. Speaker, that is an intervention, but which caused the Minister a great deal of embarrassment; he was embarrassed to ask the Hog Marketing Board, who are representatives of the producers across Manitoba and who have been elected by hog producers in Manitoba; he was embarrassed

to have to challenge the Hog Marketing Board and to force them to market their hogs in a way which was preferable to the packing industry, as opposed to the new methods that they have adopted which was preferable and more beneficial to the producers of hogs in Manitoba.

And so, Mr. Speaker, subsequent to that confrontation, of course there was briefs submitted to the Minister suggesting to him that there ought to be a way to handle these kind of situations — that there ought to be an appeal mechanism so that the packing industry could, in essence, challenge a by-law or ruling of the Hog Marketing Board.

And of course those recommendations, Mr. Speaker, as we have witnessed to date have not fallen on deaf ears. That is precisely what Bill No. 18 is all about, Mr. Speaker. It is in direct response to those interest groups in the province who want to reduce the level of control that the producers of any agricultural product have in the marketing of that product. That is, in essence, what is involved without the direct involvement of the Minister, and that is the substance of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

on
The Minister would like to make it appear as if he was the side of the angels — that is, on the side of the producers, because he is, after all, supposed to be working for the best interests of agriculture. That is what his Ministry is all about — but, Mr. Speaker, he is caught in a dilemma. He has the philosophy of the Conservative party, which is anti-Marketing Board to the extent that they can get away with being “anti” — yes, that has been demonstrated on more than one occasion, Mr. Speaker, and he has to find a way through which he can cater to the agri-biz end of agriculture, Mr. Speaker, to the buyers.

I was attempting to point out yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that it would be worthwhile to suggest for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that the buyers of agricultural products in Manitoba be prepared to in turn sell those products in the same fashion as they want producers to sell their products to them. That would be an interesting experiment, Mr. Speaker.

What would be wrong with having Safeway, Dominion's and Loblaws bidding . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I suggest to the honourable member, as I suggested to members of the Chamber last evening, that we should make some attempt at trying to stay with the subject matter of the Bill .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I'm dealing with. I'm trying to suggest to you, Sir, that this Bill is in response to a pressure group who doesn't like the producers of agricultural commodities, who sell their products through Marketing Boards, to have the leverage that they now have in the marketplace.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to this Minister that an equal measure should apply to that particular sector of our industry. Yes, the Minister should bring in a bill that would suggest, not only suggest, but require, Canada Packers and Swifts and anybody else in the business — that they must offer their carcasses of meat on the auction block, Mr. Speaker, and allow everyone to bid on those carcasses.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Again may I suggest to the honourable member that he confine his remarks to the subject matter of the Bill at hand.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with marketing of agricultural products' essentially what we are dealing with, and all I'm drawing to the Minister's attention is an analogy where it is reasonable to expect that where a group of people want the agricultural produce to market in a certain way, that it should be assumed without question, Mr. Speaker, that they in turn would be prepared to do the very same thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in all of the submissions that led up to Bill No. 18, I don't recall noticing one passage where they have suggested that that would be an appropriate arrangement and that what is fair for the producers of farm commodities in Manitoba would be fair for the distributors, the buyers, the retailers, all the way down the chain. —(Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that the packers be required to sell their product in the same fashion as this Minister wants the producers to sell their product to the packers, and then we would see whether they would go along with it for very long, Mr. Speaker.

But at the moment, Mr. Speaker, we have the spectacle of the Minister of Agriculture kowtowing to Canada Packers, Mr. Speaker, Swift's, Burns, —(Interjection)— yes, yes, directly responding to their submission to him to put a measure of control on the Hog Marketing Board in Manitoba, who by the way I want to repeat, are elected by the producers of hogs in this province. Yes. They are not appointed by the Minister, they are elected, they have an annual meeting, they pass policy resolutions, and they are entitled to function in the way they are functioning, Mr. Speaker. And

if the Minister doesn't want them to function in that way, he doesn't need Bill 18, Mr. Speaker, all he has to do is change the regulations that empower that agency to operate as they have been. —(Interjection)— Yes, he can change the regulations in any way that he wishes. He can give them a broad range of powers, or he can give them a very narrow framework of powers and jurisdiction in which they must function.

But Mr. Speaker, that would be an open and direct attack on the producers of agricultural products in this province. So this Minister prefers to duck under the bushes, Mr. Speaker, while accomplishing the same objective. He wants to, yes, put control on these agencies so that these controls would benefit his other friends in the other side of the industry, without appearing to be personally involved vis-a-vis the producers on the control of marketing of their products in this province.

Bill 18 is totally unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, with the exception that the Minister wants to hand over additional market power to the people who have already had too much of it for all time, Mr. Speaker. So we intend to oppose this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture will be closing . debate. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to set the record straight, and I will not let the members opposite drag me into the type of debate that had nothing to do with what the proposed amendments that Bill 18 contain in it, actually do.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite refer to a hog marketing board study or a study that had taken place in the province, and that as a result of that study, that we were introducing legislative amendments to the Natural Products Marketing Act to favour the packing-house industries. In fact, there were allegations made by the Member for St. George that the producers weren't even contacted. Well, Mr. Speaker, there were meetings held with the producer board, there were meetings held with the packers, and there was a letter sent to every hog producer in this province asking them to present their ideas and their opinions to that committee. So Mr. Speaker, every hog producer in the province did have the opportunity to put their views forward, something, Mr. Speaker, which I am very pleased happened.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, why was this amendment introduced? Well, firstly there has been some confusion in Manitoba when there has been reference made to the Manitoba Marketing Board, that it was an umbrella board, that you could have been referring to any of the individual or specific producer boards. So it's a matter of distinguishing or identifying the overall board, or the overall organization that is the overall board of the producer boards.

So we are proposing a change, Mr. Speaker, which would clearly identify which board is which, and now we have changed it to the Manitoba Natural Products Marketing Council, which, for the people who are transmitting the news, or telling the people what is taking place in the province, the messenger service, that there is an identification or a distinction between the producer boards and the government board which is, in fact, appointed by the government of the day, or a continuation of the one.

And I must say that the Chairman of the Board, the Natural Products Marketing Council, is a member carrying on from the last administration, and I believe he was in place from the one prior to that.

One of the other changes, Mr. Speaker, that is being proposed in this bill is to allow the individuals who are affected by one of the producer boards, whether they be a producer, whoever, the Member for St. George today again raised the question about what is happening in Manitoba with the Turkey Producers Organization. Well, Mr. Speaker, if he doesn't like what is happening then he can appeal what they do to the Natural Products Marketing Council and they can certainly rule on that decision.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is also important to point out that the major reason that this bill is being presented or this amendment is being presented to the House, is the amendment which removes double regulations from the egg producers in this province. Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the House that they are very anxious to see the regulation that they had imposed on them, that we were under both an egg count and a hen count, that we are now just going to control, or they themselves will be controlled by the numbers of hens that they have on their farms, not both the hens and the eggs. And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that is a removal of regulations on producers, so that they are allowed to produce efficiently. If a hen can produce 20 dozen eggs a year, then she's allowed to do it. A government regulation which was left in place under the last administration, Mr. Speaker, forced the producers to kill those hens off before they were able to reach their maximum production.

So Mr. Speaker, we have had a government in power over the last few years that were unprepared

to act, unprepared to act on something that would have helped producers. And how would it have helped producers, Mr. Speaker? Well, I'll just bring some figures to the attention of the members of the House, that Mr. Speaker, since the 4th of April it has been estimated by the egg producers, since the 4th of April when this bill was stood by members opposite, that it has cost the producers of eggs in Manitoba a penalty of some \$125,000 a month, or a quarter of a million dollars, until they allowed this bill to be debated, a quarter of a million dollars, Mr. Speaker, approximately \$1,000 per egg producer in Manitoba, it has cost them since these people across the way have stood this bill.

So Mr. Speaker, do you call that responsible opposition? Mr. Speaker, they could have dealt with it, they could have dealt with it at any period of time over the past few years and were reluctant to do so . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. George on a point of order.

MR. URUSKI: Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of privilege.

MR. URUSKI: The Minister alleges that this bill was held and has cost the producers thousands of dollars of money. Who has been the government of this province for the last 18 months? If they wished those amendments brought in, they could have brought them in last session, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to again bring to the attention of the House that the misleading that took place from the other side last night and again today about the hog marketing people and the packers, why did they want to speak about that, Mr. Speaker? Because they were responsible for costing the producers while in opposition . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he confine his remarks to the contents of the bill. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, thank you for your direction. In referring to it, that is why we have the amendment here, is because we are reducing the regulations or removing one of the regulations, the production regulations, as it relates to the egg producers.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that is the main reason that this amendment is before the House, so that is why I bring those figures to your attention.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the members in voting against this, opposite, clearly demonstrate their inability to understand the farm community and communicate with them. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that we can see that, it's been evidenced over the past few months and certainly over the past few years, that if the farm people were desirous of something, then the socialist administration on the other side were bound to be as obstinate and want to go the opposite direction.

We again get into the area of the accountability of the board, and how it has affected the producer boards in Manitoba. We met with the producer boards over the past few months, and this was the urgent matter which they brought to our attention, and I agreed to proceed with it, which I am doing, and I would like to quote from a press statement that relates to this Bill No. 18. There was a concern by the producer boards, a concern by the producer boards that one part of the amended Act, would possibly cause some problems and not treat all people equally who maybe appealed to the board for a decision.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that in other areas of the amendments to Bill 18, that we have support from all the producers, all the producer boards in the province, that they are not opposing it the way the members opposite would like to mislead the public and I would certainly want to bring that to the attention of the House, that all the producer boards, in principle, support these amendments, and the only area of concern was one area of interpretation of how the appeal decision would affect all individuals.

And Mr. Speaker, I'll be quite straightforward with the producers and the public of Manitoba, I am prepared to consider an amendment to that part of the Act when it goes to committee stage. Mr. Speaker, I think that I am quite prepared to consider it. I feel that all the points that the members opposite did not deal with any of the real subject matter that we are debating, and you kept trying to get them back on, that they were gone off on some wild philosophical tangent that really has

no meaning to the amendments to the bill, and Mr. Speaker, if they want to get into the debate on those particular areas of marketing, I can back up lots of debate with — in particular when the Member for St. George in his debate suggests that I have attacked the Wheat Board. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be quite that abrupt in saying I've attacked it. I think I've offered some constructive criticism about the Canadian Wheat Board, backed up, Mr. Speaker, by resolutions from a Manitoba Pool Elevator local meeting that I have just received a copy of a resolution today, and I think that it is the fairly substantial statements that I've been making, backed up by a large majority of the farm community.

I think we have to take a constructive approach to this whole area of marketing and marketing products. We need more marketing opportunities for the farmers of Manitoba, not less. It has to be responsible to the farmers and to the people who are using it and I think competition is, of course, the way in which we can get the accountability.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't mind tabling this resolution that I have received from one of the locals of the pool organizations, as it refers to their criticism, and it is a criticism of the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not, as I said, falling into the same trap as the members opposite. I would just like to clearly state that I do have support for the statements that I have been making and here is a resolution from one of the districts, Sub-District 205 of Manitoba Pool Elevators.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, you have tried to maintain the debate within the parameters of Bill 18. The Minister is now involved with an area of legislation over which he has no jurisdiction whatever, the Canadian Wheat Board. It is not germane to Bill 18, it is not germane to our discussion whatever.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The point raised by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet is well taken, and I would hope the Honourable Minister stays within the subject matter of the bill at hand.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, unlike my honourable friends opposite, I will bow to your ruling and I will table the resolution.

So to carry on, Mr. Speaker, with the amendments that are proposed, I have discussed the name change, the appeal process that will be able to be carried out by the Natural Products Marketing Council, that the ruling in fact will be applied to all persons who appeal equally. I think that the clarification and the removal of regulations on the poultry producers financially will be not only more than welcome, it will be most appreciated.

In the area of the rest of the responsibility of the Natural Products Marketing Act, if in fact we will see problems being created, or something in that nature that may have to be looked at, I'm quite prepared to sit down with the producer boards over the coming months, coming years, to look at the regulatory powers that they have, how they're operating, and Mr. Speaker, I do not want the accusation left that I am introducing this for the packinghouse industry. It's very much the opposite. The best interests of the producers are my concern, and I will be continuing to administer in that fashion. And I'm very disappointed with the members opposite that they have indicated that they are not going to support an amendment to a bill that will put money in the pockets of the egg producers, it will clearly distinguish the appeal process for the actions of the Producers Marketing Board.

Mr. Speaker, with those I recommend that — I would like to get the support from all members — now the bill go to committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet has already spoken.

MR. USKIW: Would the Minister submit to a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, since the Minister has indicated that it has cost a quarter of a million dollars to the producers of eggs in Manitoba due to the fact that this bill was not passed on Day One on introduction, which is a two month period, would the Minister consider it reasonable

that he should resign his ministry because he has delayed this bill for 18 months and it cost him \$2.5 million, according to his figures?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite asked me a question. No, Mr. Speaker, I could not introduce this until it was prepared and that we had agreed to go with it, and the members of the producer board had brought it to my attention, in the way in which they have. I'm sure that we could multiply that figure times eight, or the amount of time that he was in office, and it would be probably four times as much as he cost the hog producers in the 2-¾ million dollars in the contract to Japan that he was a part of. He doesn't want to talk about that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in answering the question I don't say that maybe I was totally as quickly as I could have been, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I am acting responsibly. It is the members opposite who stood the bill for two months. I presented it to the House and they have stood it. I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to go to the producers and discuss with them if they feel I am responsible for what has happened, or the members opposite and let them speak to the press, Mr. Speaker. I'm quite prepared to discuss with the producers of eggs who is responsible for where they're at today.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 22 — THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Will you call Bill No. 22, and then Bill No. 23?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 22 — The Public Schools Act. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, following on the advice that we have from the Minister of Education that these two Bills, Nos. 22 and 23, will be referred to a committee of the legislature for public hearings intersessionally, we would have nothing else to say on Bill No. 22 at this time because I understand the House Leader will move the referral to the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provision in our rule, Rule No. 87, which provides that bills must be referred at second reading to committees, I move, seconded by the Minister responsible for Government Telephones, that Bill No. 22 — The Public Schools Act, be not now read a second time, but that the order for second reading be discharged, the bill withdrawn, and the subject matter thereof rereferred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 23 — THE EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Would you call Bill No. 23?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 23 — The Education Administration Act. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, with reference to Bill No. 23, ditto to what I said for Bill No. 22.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I intend to move the motion to refer this one as well but I notice some consternation on the countenance of my honourable friend from St. Johns when I indicated that the bill would be sent to the Privileges and Elections Committee. I don't think it really matters what committee it's being sent to. My honourable friends can put whatever membership they wish

on that particular committee. It happens to be a standing committee of the House and as good as any I guess. —(Interjection)— Since there is not an Education Committee that was about as close as I could get to a committee that we could refer it to.

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 23 — The Education Administration Act, be not now read a second time, but that the order for second reading be discharged, the bill withdrawn, and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MR. SPEAKER: Could I have a seconder for that?

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, the Attorney-General.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, just a correction — not consternation but surprise at the selection of the committee by the House Leader.

MOTION presented and carried.

SPEED-UP RESOLUTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would call the resolution standing in my name, and being held by the Member for Elmwood.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Government House Leader,
Resolved that for the remainder of the session, the House have leave to sit in the forenoon.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, this resolution gives me an opportunity to express some deeply held convictions in regard to the Speed-up Motions and also to make some comment on the conduct of the government in relation to the Business of the House. I want to say without qualification that as a member of the treasury benches in the last administration once matters were decided of course a member had no alternative basically but to support the government position, but now as a Member of the Opposition I have greater freedom to express some of my opinions and I want to object not to the Speed-up Motion per se, so much as to the last portion of the motion which calls for a suspension of the normal Rules of Adjournment, and means in effect that the House often grinds past the midnight hour.

Mr. Speaker, I object in principle to the late hours portion, and in practice to the late hours portion. I would also like to expand on the attitude and the manner in which we have seen the government operate in this Legislature and in the last couple of weeks in particular. So I am reluctant, Mr. Speaker, to support this motion, and I take probably as one of the best bits of advice an old saying that was quoted many times in Cabinet to the effect — in our Cabinet of course to the effect that you never give your enemy a club and then beg for mercy.

I think this is probably precisely what we are dealing with here today, that once the resolution is passed then normal rational behaviour often goes out the window. I also wouldn't at this point recall the exchanges between the masochist and the sadist, I guess, where the masochist said beat me, and the sadist said no. I am neither a masochist nor a sadist, Mr. Speaker, so I have little appreciation for either position.

But I believe that the government given the passage of this resolution which will undoubtedly pass, if not this afternoon tomorrow, that the government will then use the opportunities in the Speed-up Resolution to bludgeon or steamroller the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, as I said again I do not object to three times a day sessions, but I object to the late hours, and as the mood of the House deteriorates under late hours, or early days as my colleague suggests, I realize that all governments succumb to the temptation of grinding down the opposition. And that the opposition fights back in the only way open to it, namely by talking. So you get kind of a sick relationship between the frustrations of the government which then attempts to crush the opposition, and the opposition running on and on and on and on to counter the government juggernaut.

We have sat in this House many times past midnight; we have sat till 3:00 and 4:00 and 5:00 and, I suppose, 5:20 a.m., — 7:00 a.m. I have as the highest offer, and the decorum in the Chamber

suffers — the quality of debate deteriorates, tempers become frayed, fatigue sets in, and the stubborn continue. There are, Mr. Speaker, iron men in this House when it comes to going around the clock, and I do not count myself in that select group. I'm sure the Member for Inkster fits that bill, and I'm sure the House Leader fits that bill. These are men who will not yield to fatigue, but will press on regardless of personal consequences or public consequences. So the stubborn continue, while the weaker collapse.

But there are also some other bad features — namely, that there's often undue haste, there is inadequate consideration given to legislation, and there is little or no time for reflection and consultation, not only within a particular caucus, but also in terms of the general public and the whole political and democratic process. Because it is, Mr. Speaker, out of what I am hesitant to call the dialectic of debate, that good legislation is fashioned — that the government proposes, the opposition opposes, or makes suggestions and out of that dialogue and out of that conflict, you have often better and improved legislation.

I recall the Conservative members being quite serious in their desire to make suggestions and make improvements in the legislation that our government put forward on marital property, etc. I recall that they felt, and I wasn't on the Committee, but I take their word for it, that they made useful and beneficial suggestions that were then later incorporated by the government. I think that that process should not be lightly put aside. You need amendments and revisions and deletions, and the parliamentary process, Mr. Speaker, involves both sides of the House, not just the government side. But a degree of co-operation is necessary and I suggest that when the speed-up motion goes in and the time limitations go off, that deterioration sets in. I think that we have seen some of that deterioration in this House in terms of the mood and temperament of the Legislature, and it is not a pleasant thing.

We have also seen, in the past couple of weeks, the government avoiding certain issues; we have had in the last week the introduction of some pretty important legislation, which is all of a sudden being distributed, like the Insurance Bill and the Mining Royalty Tax, and it takes time, Mr. Speaker, to go over and reflect on that kind of legislation.

I would give a parallel to the members of the government — that one of the more interesting Federal proposals which recently was given a lot of attention in the federal election, was the Conservative Party's Mortgage Deductibility Plan, and on first perusal when one observed that type of legislation, it seemed to be without flaw — it seemed to have a lot of merit attached to it.

We used to sit in this House — I believe that Steve Patrick, the former Member for St. James, used to introduce that resolution — (Interjection)— Assiniboia, used to introduce a resolution along those lines. So when we saw that type of legislation talked about federally, it sounded like it was more or less flawless until we start to read in the paper some of the reactions to it, and some of the weaknesses of that legislation; namely, that the banks are immediately capitalizing on it; namely, that the real estate companies are moving in on it; that house prices are going to rise; mortgages will rise, and that the only real beneficiary other than bankers and real estate companies will be people in the higher economic realms with higher mortgages and higher incomes. —(Interjection)— Well, we are — I'm not sure whether the member's on speed or speed-up, but that's where we are, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: I was wondering what the subject matter under discussion was . . .

MR. DOERN: And yet, you know, it's ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the government is so intent on completing its legislative list, and yet, there is so little in that list, because we know — if I had the speech from the House Leader, he is one of those who believes that the less legislation, the better. He holds the classic Conservative position of that government is best which governs least. Undoubtedly, the best government of all would be a self-destruct government — one that did nothing and sat back —(Interjection)—

A MEMBER: That's Marxism.

MR. DOERN: Well, I think that's anarchy. One of my colleagues suggested it's Marxism, but I think it's something beyond government, and it's certainly —(Interjection)— Groucho Marx or Karl Marx, but it's also what was talked about. It is definitely what is talked about by the anarchists, who were not Marxists, but were interesting characters.

Well you know, Mr. Speaker, my friend who is reading one of the best books he has ever picked out — he keeps referring to me by making references to some prominent members of the Nazi Party, and that's an area I attempt to stay away from, because I see resemblances in their government. I have thought, Mr. Speaker, as to who the Minister of Highways would resemble in

that government in the '30s and '40s in Germany. There were some colourful characters, there were some men with ability, and there were some screwballs —(Interjection)—

A MEMBER: How about Rudolph?

MR. DOERN: Now, you see, Mr. Speaker, he got me; he just stole my suggestion — Rudolph Hess.

MR. ENNS: Rudolph the red-nosed reindeer.

MR. DOERN: Rudolph the red-nosed reindeer. I was thinking of Rudolph Hess who was an interesting lightweight, who got the wacky idea in his mind to jump into a Messerschmitt and fly to England and make peace.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please.

MR. ENNS: That wasn't such a wacky idea in 1940, Sir, it would have saved a lot of lives.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize that there is a time for levity in the Chamber, however we are trying to deal with a resolution here, and I would ask the honourable member to stay to the subject matter of the resolution.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I always enjoy debating with the Minister of Highways, although one never knows where such debate might lead. But I must say that I regret that, once again, as one who wants to participate in this debate, that we don't have the attendance of the First Minister, and I realize that —(Interjection)— my colleague says I can't talk about him, but the problem is this, Mr. Speaker, if one speaks of the First Minister of this province, one never has an opportunity to debate him face-to-face, because first of all, he isn't here very often, and secondly, when he attacks the opposition or a member personally, he then immediately leaves. A hit and run speaker and a hit and run Member of the Legislature is the technique of the First Minister; he brightens up the Chamber when he leaves it, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that one of the central points in terms of the manner in which the business of the House is conducted can be directly attributed to the manner in which he conducts the business of the House, and in the kind of leadership and the kind of model that he is presenting to his colleagues in Cabinet and in the backbench.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the technique is all too familiar — just yesterday in The Tribune, Frances Russell took a number of quotations from that famous Budget Address that we had two weeks ago. I was here — there weren't too many members here; there might have been eight or ten of us: the Member for Seven Oaks was here, and myself; there was only a few government members, and only a handful of us. I thought it was one of the worst speeches I ever heard in my life, and when I read yesterday excerpts from that speech, once again I found it an appalling speech.

It was really a classic in Red baiting and Red smearing, and what bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is that it's all right to dish it out, but if you dish it out, you also have to be able to take it. That is one of the problems, that we are sometimes confronted with people who are terrific for letting it fly, but they aren't very good at taking it. — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I think we're now getting some Red baiting from the Member for Wolseley. So, I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is one of the problems in the House, in the conduct of the House — that we're getting that kind of attitude going on night and day, and the Leader of that attitude is the First Minister. Mr. Speaker, I have many more comments to make of him, but since he's not here, I'm reluctant to speak in his absence.

One of his big lines, Mr. Speaker, one of his great lines that he loves to quote to us is, of course, that we are Marxists and his more current refinement of that speech is that there is a comparison between Karl Marx and Groucho Marx — that's one of the big, humorous highlights.\$

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member for Elmwood could be requested to confine his remarks within the relevancy of the resolution before us? I think he is straying a little far.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, my point is and I've said it before, I am referring to remarks made by the First Minister in debate, in the Budget Debate and I realize that it's not the Budget Debate, but I am talking about the conduct of the House, and I say that the conduct of the House is affected by speed-up, and I believe that with speed-up you will have a further deterioration in the manner in which the business of the House is conducted. So I'm simply saying, Mr. Speaker, that when we come to the First Minister, it is largely because of the manner in which he handles himself in this House, that you have a lot of problems in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the other point that I wanted to make is that already I think by the holding of the speed-up resolution for a number of days, there has been no real problem for the government up to now; that the government introduced this resolution a week ago, and they had an opportunity to re-introduce the resolution, but they have been holding it back themselves. I think there has already been some usefulness in the fact that Speed-up has not been introduced, and if it is passed today or tomorrow, then we probably will conclude the business of the House in another 10 days. —(Interjection)— Well, some of my colleagues are not that optimistic, but I am. I say that, with the addition of the Speed-up Resolution and the late hours' provision, you might have as a total consequence another 24 hours or 48 hours added to what would be the normal conclusion of the Legislature.

And you know, a lot of it depends on just what the government does in the next short while. We don't know yet how many more bills are being introduced. We are seeing a peculiar phenomenon in the Chamber, of the government backbenchers starting to ask an increasing number of questions during Question Period, and I don't know whether they're all set-ups, or whether they're largely set-ups, but they certainly have a peculiar ring to them. And we have also seen in the past couple of weeks members participating in debate in Committee more than ever before. The Member for Pembina sat in the Public Utilities Committee, and we gave an indication at that time to members of the Committee that we were prepared to conclude that particular Session in terms of that particular morning. We're willing to go one morning, and to end between 10 and :00 12:30. At a quarter to twelve the Member for Pembina took the floor and went for 45 minutes to run out the clock. So I'm simply indicating, Mr. Speaker, that the degree to which, and the manner in which, the opposition participates — sorry, the government members participate in the debate also has something to do with the length of the Session, and with the conduct of the Session. There seems to be almost a new strategy on the part of the government to eat up time that is normally felt to be largely for the benefit of members of the opposition.

Now, I realize that government members can also participate, but again, I talk about a matter of degree. And there is no problem, Mr. Speaker, with members of the opposition, of course, speaking. We have the right, and we have the ability to either prolong debate or shorten it.

I also want to point out that we have had in this Session — we've had some co-operation from Ministers when it came to their Estimates, in terms of not trying to grind the members of the opposition into the ground. I have to say that I appreciate the manner in which the Minister of Tourism conducted her Estimates in that regard — not all of the members of the government are willing to act in a strong-arm manner. I also want to say that we have had some difficulty getting information from the government, and I regret, Mr. Speaker, that when we attempt to get information that we are often denied it. For example, we have Orders for Return which are well over a year old, and some of them appear to be very straightforward. We have put in Orders for Return in this Session which I'm sure the government could answer quite easily, but for some reason the information isn't forthcoming. We have questions taken during Estimates which are never answered, or are answered so long a period after that they become useless. We ask questions during Question Period, and the government has a standard answer of the monitoring and the reviewing and all these other synonyms, which really mean in effect that the government is not co-operating and providing information that is legitimately requested by the government.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that when you take off the normal end of the hour, which is supposed to be around 10:00, and sometimes is 11:00, and you start to operate on an around-the-clock basis, that I think this is an undesirable circumstance in terms of the business of the House. I think that all members have business to conduct, that all of us have to concern ourselves with calls from constituents, and mail — we have material to read; we have meetings to attend. I don't know what the government does, but I know that our Party has always had daily Caucus meetings, five days a week. We usually have a dinner hour meeting on Mondays. There are committee meetings, and so on. There is a great deal of time — a great deal of time, Mr. Speaker, spent on business and meetings, and when the Sessions start to run late, then I think you find yourself in an impossible position of going to bed at one, or two, or three o'clock, getting up at eight, coming here, having meetings inbetween the Sessions, and grinding the business out. I think that the whole matter

So, Mr. Speaker, I think I will end on that point. I see that there may be some response from members of the government. I see my friend from Wolseley furiously writing. I don't know if he's going to get up. He has some material that I'm sure he's going to fling into the debate at some point that he thinks is pretty hot property. Mr. Speaker, he reminds me very much of the former Minister of Highways, Joe Borowski. Whenever the Press was stuck for a story, they would go to Joe, and Joe would give them a story.

I remember Izzie Asper making his famous comment, that when things were pretty thin in the Chamber, that they would go to Joe in desperation and say, "Joe, what do you think about popcorn?" And Joe would come out with some terrific line which would then rock, not only the media but the government. And I think that the Member for Wolseley has a similar ability, that he can always come up with a tremendous story from his incredible files. Very few of us believe what the Member for Wolseley says, however, Mr. Speaker, because we know from his record, Mr. Speaker, that the last time the Member for Wolseley spoke the truth was when he uttered the words, "Da Da". Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, let me first of all make it quite clear that I will support the Motion for extending the hours of the House so that members in the Legislative Assembly can do more work in the time allotted to us. I will not, in any way, Mr. Speaker, support ill-considered legislation, support cutting off debate, support not dealing conscientiously with the legislation that is before us. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the two areas which I will support are quite consistent with one another. I think that, Mr. Speaker, anybody who considers in a very thoughtful way the business of government will know that a Legislature cannot be without the power and the authority to deal with its legislation in extended hours if it is necessary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that I will support it, I take it that it is always the case that the use of any time by a majority of the House can be abused, and can be handled in a civilized manner, and the people who do form a majority in this House, I think should be sensible enough — although from time to time I hope they are not, and from time to time I am rewarded — to deal with this matter in a civilized manner.

For the Member for Elmwood, let me try to recall to him that ever since the change of rules, which provided for extended hours of Estimates, we have spent less late nights during extended hours than we have spent during the regular Session. In the last two Sessions of the previous government's administration, we spent almost no evenings in the Legislature, let alone late hours. We went to the procedure of calling committee meetings in the evenings, and as a result all of the members but 12 — and who were the unlucky 12 was a matter of Caucus discipline, but the unlucky 12 — and if it was Law Amendments Committee it was more than that — were working and the rest were doing something else. And I don't know what they were doing because generally I was in the unlucky group.

But the fact is that, giving the government the power, or giving the majority of the people in the Legislature the power to say, "We want to work longer, just as hard, just as conscientiously, just as sincerely, and we want to conduct debates in the same conscientious manner as we would conduct them if there was one sitting a day", I have to say, Mr. Speaker, because I believed it when I said it on the other side, that this can be done in extended hours. I have no intention of not standing a bill, and having a look at it, and if the government starts saying that we're not going to let something stand, or if we're going to ram something through, then I will argue against that, but I will not argue against extended hours of sitting. I will argue against arbitrary use of power however it is used, and it can be, and has been used during the regular hours. And I'm not going to go Chapter and Verse; I don't want to bring up debates that my learned friend will try to reverse by saying, "And what did you do in those times?" I think that those things are useless. I think that they have to be judged on the merits of the situation as, and when, they occur. And if we have a situation where, for no reason whatsoever, a majority of the House decides that they are going to sit until five o'clock in the morning, I expect that that will reflect on the majority of the House.

If, on the other hand, there is reason for it, and the people who do it are willing to face the public and say, "This was necessary under the circumstances," they will be judged by the public, and generally, Mr. Speaker, the public is right. They happen to know by instinct, by intelligence, or by other senses which I cannot attribute, or cannot identify, whether or not there has been the kind of abuse that is possible.

Mr. Speaker, we have had some of the finest debates in this Legislature during extended hours. The debate on Autopac, which was one of the most vital, one of the best, one in which almost every member spoke for his full forty minutes, and then did it again on a Motion to hoist for six

months, was held during extended hours. The Motion on Greater Winnipeg was done during extended hours. So I have heard — for honourable members — I have heard some pretty mundane, non-sensical, should I attribute that to us collectively, discussion and debate during regular hours. I have heard some pretty profound debate during extended hours. Both can take place. I have seen extended hours handled in such a way as to not involve any arbitrariness whatsoever. I've seen extended hours handled in such a way as to evolve very extended hours.

My honourable friend, the Member for Elmwood, might not recall, but in 1973 we extended the hours until approximately 7:10 in the morning, and we were back here at 10:00. And I can say that at that time a majority of the members in the House felt it was very important that the debate be extended, and it was; and by the way, as if magic, was thrown on the Legislative Assembly, the next night we were through. The entire legislative session, which involved numerous bills, went through in the next day; and in the work up to 7:00 o'clock we couldn't get a single item through. I think it was a Concurrence Motion.

MR. DOERN: Everybody asleep.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that it was a single Concurrence Motion on the particular Estimates that we couldn't pass, and the next day all of those things passed.

So, I am for the extended hours. I urge the minister, the House Leader, to try to deal with those extended hours in what was always my response — I will deal with it in the reasonable way in which I have always handled the proceedings which are under my charge. I hope he doesn't give me that answer, Mr. Speaker. I hope that we will be able to deal with the extended hours, so as to facilitate all of the members of the Legislative Assembly. And when it comes down to a point that there is adversity as between the various groups in the House, then I expect that each side will reserve to themselves to take whatever position they deem they can obtain public support for in the circumstances. But as to sitting three sessions a day, as to providing that the House may sit beyond 10:00 o'clock, I will vote in favour of it; I think it is a very necessary, desirable and facilitating Motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to say a few words on the Speed-up Motion, I've never spoken on it before. I realize that the business of the House must proceed, and that the Speed-up Motion is a necessary tool, I guess, to get the work of the Legislature over and completed with, but I do say that once that Motion has passed, that the government, and the members must use it with some wisdom. I have sat here, as the Honourable Member for Inkster has said, till 7:20 in the morning, and I can assure you that sitting that length of hours and coming back here the next day, or the same day, certainly doesn't lead to conducive thinking the following day. And so I say to the government, who in the long run will determine how long we will sit here at night, in that respect I guess it will be the member, the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs, who was introducing this Motion, in his capacity as House Leader.

But I do want to draw to the attention of the members too, that we have staff here that are working, and who come here and it's not fair to those people who have to service this Legislature, that they have to sit here long hours, and I speak especially of the gentleman at the rear of the room, our Hansard recorder, Mr. Ray Sly, and I can remember many times how sorry I felt for him, and I can assure the Clerk of the House that I felt sorry for him and others too besides feeling sorry for myself for the long hours that we spent here. And so I do want to bring this forward to the government's attention, and to the House Leader, that I think that there's no doubt that this Motion is going to pass and that it is a necessary tool.

I must say that when I view the performance of the House in the last two or three days, and in parts of last week, it makes me wonder whether I should even vote for this Speed-up Motion, because considering that we had bells ringing here for 85 minutes to have a very simple Motion — and I know, Mr. Speaker, I'm not supposed to speak on something that has been a decision of this House and I'll try and keep away from that. But before we even get into the Speed-up Motion we deteriorate to that point, then I sort of wonder just what kind of a procedure we're going to go through when we are into the Speed-up. And I say in all sincerity to the minister, that I'm going to vote for the Motion, even though I had at one time decided in my mind that I would not support it, but I realize that it is something that we have to have, but I do say to the minister let's try and get out of here at night at least at a reasonable hour. I don't see any sense in us sitting here till 2:00 and 3:00 o'clock in the morning. I don't think it is fair to the staff. I don't think it is fair to the officers of this Legislative Assembly.

Well, the Honourable Member for Wolseley says, "Some people like it here." But I can't say

that I dislike being here, but I certainly do not want to be here on a 24-hour basis. I work long and many hours to try and get a 40-hour week. I sometimes wonder whether I should be organizing the members of this Assembly to work on a 40-hour week. You know, when we start working the length of hours that we're doing, and regardless of what the Member for Inkster said, maybe some people can think logically after approximately 20 hours in this Chamber, but I can assure you that my mind is not functioning that well. I don't have that facility. I do need my rest. I'm not as young as the Member for Inkster or others in this House. I'm maybe not an old timer either, but nevertheless I think that the minister and the government when we — I realize that they will make the decision, and as I said, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to oppose the Motion, but I do intend to try and do my job here as best I can — but I say to the minister, when it gets 12:00 o'clock I think it's time that we should be going home. I don't think we should be sitting in this Chamber after 12:00 o'clock at night, unless there are very extenuating circumstances, and then I think there should be agreement on both sides of this House that we do sit past the hour of midnight. Because once we get into the witching hours of morning I don't think any of us, regardless of how great your recuperative powers are, that you are going to be able to think coherently and make decisions that will be wise and in the benefit for the members of society in the whole of Manitoba.

And again I say, on behalf of the staff and the officers of this Assembly, I don't think it is fair on them to work them the hours because they're in here before we come in here, at 10:00 o'clock in the morning. They're here at 8:30. I'm sure the Clerk of the House is here; Deputy Clerk of the House is here; the other officers of the Assembly are here, that have to service this Assembly to make it operate. And it also creates a situation that we don't get our Hansards; and one more point, unfortunately when the Speed-up Motion passes — and I'll just take a minute, Mr. Speaker, because unless there are other members that wish to speak — I'll just conclude my remarks by saying that I would ask the minister and the government to use a little bit of wisdom, when it comes 12:00 o'clock and it looks like you're not going to go anywhere, at least let us go home and come back with a fresh day. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, I'm in the hands of the House. My remarks won't be all that long. If there is general agreement, Mr. Speaker, I will proceed then to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave to proceed past the regular hour of Private Members'?

MR. JORGENSEN: I should like to respond to some of the points that have been raised, and I rather suspect that the Member for Inkster knew that I had here in my files, excerpts from speeches that he made on past occasions, and now I am unable to use them because he just simply repeated everything that he had said in past years, and I say this for the Member for Inkster, he's consistent in his attitudes. That's more than I can say, however, for the Member for Elmwood, who made an almost incredible speech here today. And I'm not going to go into the points that he made, because they were so utterly ridiculous. A member that's been in the House as long as he has, to take the position that he's taken now, particularly, Mr. Speaker, after the experiences that we've had in the last four years, since the rules were changed.

Actually, we have come to look upon the Speed-up as a break, as a relaxing time during the session. And for the reasons mostly pointed out by the Member for Inkster, which I will not go into again, I don't know where he gets his idea that suddenly, because he's on that side of the House now and we're on this side, that the method, the manner in which we proceed to deal with the business of this House is going to change that drastically. It isn't. We found a way of dealing with the business of the House during Speed-up that met, I thought, with the approval of all members of this House and there were nights that we sat late. I can't help but recall that on those nights that we sat late it was usually be consent of the House, because we felt there was a desire amongst members to proceed with the business of the House, and complete it as early as possible. After you reach a certain stage in the session then all that remains is to wind it up, and that's really the purpose of Speed-up.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre, when he spoke the other day, made reference to the number of bills that were brought into this Chamber after Speed-up. Well, Mr. Speaker, I did some checking and unfortunately, and I say this, unfortunately, the last session we brought in 11 bills after Speed-up. They had been introduced for First Reading, but we introduced them for Second Reading after the Speed-up Motion had been passed, and in spite of the fact that I had attempted to make a commitment that would not attempt to introduce any legislation into this Legislature after Speed-up had occurred.

My honourable friends, I suppose, know as well as I do, how difficult that kind of a commitment is to keep. There are things that happen that prevent you from carrying out the best of intentions. But I can tell my honourable friends it is my conscientious objective to reduce to a minimum the number of bills that will be introduced into this Chamber after Speed-up occurs. At the moment, we have 14 bills in the Order Paper — 14 that have yet to be dealt with, and there perhaps will be, maybe three or four more brought in, but there's 14 on the Order Paper now, and many of them have been there for a long time. My honourable friends can't say that they're suddenly caught by surprise with these bills.

The one that my honourable friend from Winnipeg Centre was so incensed about the other day — I can't help but think there was just a little bit of posturing on his part on that occasion. But that bill was introduced for a second reading on the 9th of May, which was some considerable time in advance of the introduction of the Speed-up Motion.

But let me, just for the record, go back over the years that my honourable friends were in office, and just recall to them so that they have some idea of what kind of a comparison we're going to make, the number of bills that they introduced for second reading after Speed-up. In 1970, there were 24 out of a total of 96 bills that they passed that were passed during that Session, that were introduced after speed-up. In 1971, there were 60 out of 88, 60 out of 88 that were introduced for second reading after speed-up, and many of them, Mr. Speaker, were introduced for first reading as well.

I'm not making an issue of it, I'm simply pointing out to my honourable friend from Winnipeg Centre that his protestations the other day couldn't help but be some posturing on his part. In 1972, there were 42 bills out of 84 that were introduced after speed-up. In 1973, there was a difference, of course. That was an election year, and there were only 35 bills introduced during the course of the entire Session, and only 6 of them were introduced after speed-up. That was what I would like to strive for as a kind of an average, that number of bills after speed-up.

In 1974, there were 31 out of 75; in 1975, there were 12 out of 44, I don't know how they managed to get down so low that particular year. In 1976 there were 26 out of 73; in 1977 there were 21 out of 62. So that has been the record in the past.

I will not repeat what was said by my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster. I don't think that speed-up in itself detracts from the quality of debate; I don't think that you get worse legislation passed as a result of speed-up; I don't think that the strain on my honourable friends is as great, as a matter of fact, as it is during the course of the regular Session, particularly when we are in the Committee of Supply.

So I invite my honourable friends to co-operate with the government, and when I say co-operate with the government, I don't mean that you bow to the government's will, I don't mean that you deny yourself the opportunity of debating what you feel needs to be debated, but the conduct of the business of the House always has been and always will be a matter of negotiation between opposing parties in this Chamber, in the best interests of the people of this province. I'd like to keep it that way.

And I want to say that during the years that I occupied the position that is now being occupied by my honourable friend for Inkster, and I hope he can say the same from my point of view, there was that kind of co-operation; there was that kind of negotiation, regardless of our differences in philosophical matters or on matters that were brought before the House. We were able to carry on the business of the House in such a way that I think would have commended itself to all members of this Chamber. I hope to continue that practice, and my honourable friends can rest assured that the government does not intend to run heavy-handed or rough-shod over anybody. We will carry out our responsibilities as we feel we must carry them out, and nobody going to be denied the opportunity of making whatever contribution that he feels he must make during the course of debate.

There was a question raised by the Member for Elmwood, who took issue with the members on this side of the House asking questions. I wasn't aware that there was any rule, written or otherwise, that denied that opportunity to any member of this House. I wasn't aware there was any denial of an opportunity of anybody to participate in debate, as he seems to suggest there is. I think that there might as a matter of fact, I raised them when I was have been — in the Opposition, but that was when we had time limits. I felt it was unfair for the government to occupy all of the time in Estimates, including backbenchers on the government side, when there was a limited time allocated for the consideration of Estimates. We do not have that limited time anymore. —(Interjection)—

Well, 40 minutes in Question Period, he says. What my honourable friend has not done is to calculate the amount of time taken up in the Question Period by honourable gentlemen opposite, as compared to the amount of time taken up in the Question Period when we were on that side of the House. The average was 15 minutes a day during the course of the Session. I don't think

there has been one or two occasions — and I'm not criticizing my honourable friends for it, the time is there — but if it's there, then why isn't it available to other people as well? I don't think there have been more than one or two occasions when the Speaker hasn't had to call the time allocated for Question Period, the full 40 minutes, as compared to 15 minutes. —(Interjection)— Of course, we used to go two hours, until the rules changed. We used to go all afternoon, before the rules changed. And that was one of the reasons I suggested that the rules change, because you weren't gaining anything.

What you gained in the consideration of Estimates, we lost in the Question Period, the second reading of bills, Concurrence, and all these other things. I think the debate is much more organized than it ever was, notwithstanding the attitude being expressed by some of my friends opposite.

But, Sir, I digress. I simply want to thank honourable gentlemen, particularly the Member for Inkster, who has indicated that his continued support for the processing of the business of this House will be available, and I can assure him that we, on this side of the House, intend to proceed in much the same way that the speed-up time has been allocated in the past. We hope that we can reach mutual consent in the manner in which we will proceed, and we hope that we can expeditiously deal with the business that is before us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre on a point of order.

MR. BOYCE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister made several references to my objecting to the speed-up motion per se. I did not object to the speed-up motion per se, and I will support the motion now that Bill 22 and 23 have been referred to the committee.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: We now proceed to Private Members' Hour. In Private Members' Hour, the first item of business on Tuesday is Private Bills. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, Bill No. 31. The Honourable Member for Kildonan. Bill No. 31, An Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate The Investors Group.

MR. FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Honourable House Leader whether he is intending that the House sit tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock in the morning?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I already indicated that Public Accounts will be sitting tomorrow morning.

MR. GREEN: What about tomorrow afternoon, will there be two sittings tomorrow or . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: No, the House will sit tomorrow afternoon as usual and whether it sits tomorrow night will be a matter that perhaps we can discuss before we make that decision.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 33, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Bel Acres Golf and Country Club. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Stand Bill No. 33 and 40, Mr. Speaker — and 37.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 41, An Act to Amend An Act to incorporate United Health Services Corporation. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Stand.

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 34 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE FATALITY INQUIRIES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member for Rhineland was holding the bill for me, if I can speak to it briefly. Mr. Speaker, during my Estimates, the question of this proposed amendment to the Fatality Inquiries Act was raised during Estimates, and there was an indication to the Member for Wellington at that time, Mr. Speaker, that the previous legislation in effect, the Coroners Act, I believe it was called, which was then repealed and the Fatality Inquiries Act was substituted for, had provided that under the circumstances enumerated in this bill, an inquest was required to be held.

I would firstly, Mr. Speaker, correct that information. Upon review of the previous Coroners Act, it was understood and recognized that that legislation did not require a fatality inquiry to be held under those circumstances.

One further correction I should make, Mr. Speaker, because I have discussed this with Legislative Counsel, Mr. Tallin, the Honourable Member for Wellington, at Page 2660 of Hansard is recorded as saying that I would be frankly, thoroughly disappointed if such support was not forthcoming. I say this with some humility, but I know for a fact that Mr. Tallin, as Legislative Counsel, in a letter to the Attorney-General, has particularly recommended and commended this bill for passage and implementation by this House.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the Member for Wellington that under Rule 100 of the Rules of the House, Legislative Counsel are required to refer to members of Executive Council any matters that may come within the jurisdiction of their departments, and accordingly Mr. Tallin, as required by Rule 100 of the Rules of the House, wrote to me enclosing a copy of the draft bill to amend The Fatality Inquiries Act for my attention. And he indicates to me that he at no time wished to enter into the question of policy as to whether or not such an amendment was required. He was simply carrying out his function as Legislative Counsel, acting on the instructions of the Member for Wellington in taking those instructions and drafting the bill for him, as he well should.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the contents of the bill itself, I would point out that it has been the policy of the Attorney-General's Department, under the previous government and under the previous government before them, that in all cases where there is an unusual death of a patient in a mental institution or a correctional institution, the policy is to have an inquest. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in the last three years, 1976 there were four inquests held with respect to two deaths in jails and two in hospitals; in 1977 there were five inquests held with respect to three deaths in jails and two in hospitals; in 1978 four inquests were held with respect to three deaths in jails and one in a hospital. So that the policy has been continued in the department to hold inquests under all of these circumstances.

One of the new requirements under this legislation would be that there would be required to be filed a report by the administrator under the Act each year. At the present time, a report is prepared by the Chief Medical Examiner for the information of the administrator each year, which is not filed in the Legislature, and I would like an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to review that with the administrator and the medical examiner prior to the next Session of the Legislature, and other improvements that I believe should be considered in the office of the Chief Medical Examiner for the province of Manitoba.

So Mr. Speaker, I would say, with respect to the principle involved in the bill, that has actually been the policy for many, many years in this province, and is continued to be carried out, that under all those circumstances, inquests are held in all cases, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would take the view personally that in view of that, I don't believe there is any necessity for the bill to be passed at this Session of the Legislature. I would like to continue to review the bill with the Chief Medical Examiner and the department, and the whole operation of the Chief Medical Examiner, may very well be at the next Session of the Legislature. Some Amendments may be brought into this bill, perhaps legislating what is in fact the policy of the department, perhaps making other improvements in the operation of the Chief Medical Examiner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon East, debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 37, an Act to Amend the Museum of Man and Nature Act. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 43 — LEGAL AID SERVICES SOCIETY OF MANITOBA AMENDMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, if I might make a few brief comments with respect to this piece of legislation. It has been referred to the Board of Legal Aid, who have it under consideration, but have not yet been able to come to a consensus with respect to the proposed Amendment; and for that reason, again, my personal preference would be to see the Board consider this matter further and come to a firm recommendation as to whether such an Amendment should be passed.

I would indicate that in Ontario they do provide for payment of cost on behalf of a Legal Aid client, but that in the number of years that that legislation and their regulations have been in effect they have only on three occasions paid costs on behalf of a Legal Aid client. This matter arose, Mr. Speaker, out of, as acknowledged by the Member for Wellington, a case in which he was involved and which he was appointed the Legal Aid solicitor, in an appeal of a Divorce Decree to the Manitoba Court of Appeal, in which the Court of Appeal granted the appeal, subject to the Legal Aid client paying costs to the other party. Mr. Speaker, prior to my being involved in this matter, Mr. Corrin had been advised through Legal Aid that there was no manner in which his client could be paid costs under the existing provisions of The Legal Aid Services Act. I asked to meet one day with the Chairman of Legal Aid with respect to this matter, and requested him to consider paying costs as a disbursement under the existing Act, and he was of the view that my suggestion could be accomplished under the existing provisions of the Act, and I asked him to contact the Member for Wellington to tell him of this decision because there was a time limit for the payment of costs. He advised me that — and in fact I advised the Member for Wellington that the Chairman of Legal Aid would be contacting him — he / advises me that he attempted to phone him on a number of occasions but his calls were never returned. In addition, my office left telephone messages for the Member for Wellington, and again, those phone calls were not returned.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, the time has gone on even further. The Chairman of Legal Aid has indicated that he is still prepared, if and when the Member for Wellington ever returns his phone call, that he would be prepared to explain to him the basis on which Legal Aid is now prepared to pay costs to his client as a disbursement, and to assist him in any application, any necessary application to the Court of Appeal for further extension of time, and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that that could be accomplished.

Again, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this bill, the Member for Wellington again refers to the fact that Legislative Counsel has endorsed this bill. Again, I must say for the record, Mr. Speaker, that Legislative Counsel write to me under the rules, as he is required to report, and forward me a copy of the draft bill for my information. He doesn't write to me to endorse Private Members' Bills, or any other legislation. His job as Legislative Counsel is to draft legislation as he is instructed, and not to enter into the policy discussion, Mr. Speaker. So, again, Legislative Counsel did not, and have not, and will not, enter into debate on policy. Mr. Speaker, I again would take the position, with respect to this piece of legislation, that it be considered further by Legal Aid, the Board of Legal Aid, and that hopefully, prior to the next Session of the Legislature, they will come to a firm recommendation as to whether there should be an Amendment to the Act to permit the payment out of costs on behalf of a Legal Aid client. And, with respect to the incident, the specific case that caused the Member for Wellington to raise this particular matter, I can only encourage him to return the phone messages of the Chairman of Legal Aid.

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

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 53, an Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act. The Honourable Member for Gladstone. Stand?

MR. FERGUSON: No, just a minute, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to clear up that last bill. I had adjourned that bill for the Honourable Attorney-General so my name will be removed from it.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 53, allowed to stand? Is that agreed? (Agreed).

SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 67 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CONSUMRR PROTECTION ACT

MR. JENKINS: presented Bill No. 67, an Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that I would not have to introduce this bill. I had hoped that the Minister of Consumer Affairs would be sufficiently moved to introduce the proposed legislation, or changes to the Consumers Act that is contained within Bill No. 67, but the Minister has seen fit not to move such legislation. —(Interjection)— Well, I'm not going to have the Honourable Minister of Highways put words in my mouth. I'm not going to accuse the Minister of being uncallous or unconcerned. What I am saying is that the Minister has seen fit not to introduce this type of legislation. What I'm saying is, we are not breaking fresh ground here in Canada; we're not breaking fresh ground here in North America. There are six American states already, and I believe there are more in the process of proceeding with this type of legislation. Also legislation changes have been made last year by the Quebec National Assembly, which in essence deal with the universal pricing code, which states that articles sold, a merchant must indicate the sale price clearly and legibly on all goods offered for sale and wrapped.

Basically, what we are introducing here, for the consideration of the House, is legislation that, regardless of whether grocery stores put in the universal pricing code system, which I believe two supermarkets already have in Winnipeg, that the prices will be marked legibly on the articles offered for sale. And especially when you realize that the cost of installing the universal pricing code in the average grocery store costs about \$150,000 for the installation of one of these computer systems, and I believe it was during the introduction of this computer universal pricing system in the United States that one of the supermarkets in California, Ralphs, I believe, stated that this universal pricing code method of — I just don't have it here now — but this chain boasted that the price consciousness of the consumers dulls within a period of time so that they would be able to bring in an additional \$1 million to their stores each year. I don't know if members here are aware of what the universal pricing code is, but if you've seen these striated strips that appear on many of the articles that we see in our stores and supermarkets today, these go through a scanner system and by feeding certain data into the computer that brings out the price. All the prices that you see in these stores that are computerized and use a computerized print-out system are shelf markings, and shelf markings for those people, especially older people, and many of the calls that I have had have been from senior citizens, and I'm sure that the Minister has had calls from senior citizens who have voiced their objections. I'm not opposed to the Loblaws, Safeway, Westfair, Dominion, whatever store may be involved, if they wish to put in a universal pricing code system, fine and dandy. All that I'm calling for in this bill is that the average shopper when he goes into that store and he picks up a can of peas and it says 39 cents, that he knows what that can of peas costs when he goes to go to the checkout counter.

Now the average person shopping in a store is not going to be able to remember the prices by the time he gets to the check-out counter, and you know these little striated strips that you have on your can or on any article, are subject through rough handling to give you wrong computer print-outs.

You know, if I might just digress a bit from the absolute what this bill is concerned with, but a few years ago the American Association of Railroads introduced what was known as an automatic car identification code system which was much the same sort of thing that we see on the computer print-outs. That thing lasted for approximately 5 years. It then became such a bugaboo, there were so many bugs in it, and after spending millions of dollars, and the ordinary consumer in Canada

and the United States and Mexico, who are all members of the American Association of Railroads and all abide by the code of rules that they set out, after spending millions of dollars found out that the system was not what it was cracked up to be. It didn't give them the train consists that they wanted. They had to do away with this system — the same thing because of the mutilation over a period of time of the automatic identification code labels.

And the same thing happens with your cans, with your products, of rough handling on the shelves, and all we are asking for is if these people want to introduce a universal pricing code then by all means go ahead and do so. All we are asking in this legislation is that you and I as consumers when we go into a store to make a purchase, that we will be able to pick up a can of peas, package of cookies or whatever it might be or a loaf of bread, that we know what the price is. I don't think that's too much to ask. If the supermarkets still want to go ahead with the UPC that is entirely up to them, but I think that members of the public have a right to know that when they go into a supermarket or a store, that they have the opportunity that when they're going to that check-out that they know that the price that they saw on the shelf and what was on the can will be there and that will be the price that they're paying out.

You know we get periodic price increases, and I see that there is one now predicted, not in the too far distant future, because of the supposedly crop failures of coffee in Brazil, and again we will be perhaps faced with a major increase in the price of coffee. Now, go into a computerized store using the universal pricing code system; old stock that we had before, and I think the review committee on prices, the board in Ottawa has stated, and I'll say to the credit of the supermarkets, they have in the past used up the stock that has been on the shelves, but now you are going to have old stock, new stock, and it's all fed on a computer, no price is on the article. New stock will be selling at the new computer price because of increased costs that the retailers, the wholesalers, have to pay for it, and no one argues with that because that's the price of supply and demand; but articles that have been bought at a cheaper price, now because of the striated stripes on the article, and my honourable friend shakes his head over there and he is certain that they are going to be able to feed into that computer system something that is going to pick up old stock against new stock. Well I can assure my honourable friend that that doesn't happen because it hasn't happened elsewhere where this has happened. It doesn't work because the computer is subject to all sorts of vagaries and bugs. You only get out what you feed into the machine and if the data is not there properly, then of course the prices will be all fouled up and people will not really know what they are paying for.

All we are asking for is that this legislation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. DON ORCHARD: Would the member permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: I'll permit a question when I'm finished, and I want to assure the honourable member through you, that you do not get the floor on a point of order to ask a question. That is definitely out of order. —(Interjections)— No, Mr. Speaker, it is the obligation of every member of this House to draw a point of order to the attention of the Speaker, and that is all I was attempting to do. If the honourable member had wished to ask a question he should have said so, but to rise on a point of order, that is not what is involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina on a point of order.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I didn't rise in the first place on a point of order, I asked you if the member would permit a question. I never mentioned a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Well then perhaps I misunderstood the member and if that is the case then I do apologize. But, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the bill before us —(Interjection)— well the Honourable Minister of Highways said I should do it more often. If I am wrong, I am prepared to apologize anytime, but if I am not wrong, I am not prepared to apologize for something that I didn't do. But the Minister is trying to get me to digress from the bill. It is my hope that the government will see fit to support the bill, and at least then let it go to Law Amendments where representation can be made by the public.

I'm sure that the Minister has had drawn to his attention — I know the Consumers Association

of Canada has contacted him, the Manitoba branch — I know people have written to the Minister because they've sent copies of letters to me that they have sent to the Minister. I don't intend to read them into the record, but I think the Minister should take cognizance of the fact that there has been a terrific battle waged on behalf of consumers in the United States, and there is one being waged in this country on the computer pricing of products that are being sold in the grocery stores.

It's states like Tennessee, which is not known as one of the most liberal enlightened states in the United States, if they can see fit to pass consumer legislation, states like California, Michigan, Wisconsin, New York, and of course our sister province here in Canada, the province of Quebec, have introduced this type of legislation.

I think that this government, or any government, owes it to their constituents and their consumers of the province that people going into a grocery store absolutely know when they go out to that checkout counter, that they have the price legibly marked in Arabic numerals so that they know, and especially our older people, the older people. You know, the markings on the shelves can get tattered and torn over a period of time, and I know the people who are instituting this program of universal pricing are telling you that, sure, we will feed the information and the data into the machines and we will not change the price once it is set. But how is the poor old-age pensioner, poor eyesight, and I must admit that those shelf markings are not that large, how are people going to know when they go to check out at that counter that the system that they have lived under and operated under, having the article called out to them — that is the process of the stores, they call the item by price — and of course I know one of the arguments that has been put forward by the people who are the advocates of this, all tell you that you get a nice computer print-out of your grocery bill. It tells you exactly what everything is when you get home.

Well, I just happen to have a copy of a grocery bill here. True, Mr. Speaker, it says, tissue so and so, a number of them are, but here is an item, grocery, 39 cents, grocery. Another item comes here, grocery tax, grocery 89 cents. Grocery tax. Grocery, \$1.95, grocery, 39 cents, grocery, \$1.00, grocery, 99 cents, grocery, 79 cents, grocery tax, 99 cents.

So when they are telling you that everybody will get a nice, computer print-out telling you of what every item is, it doesn't work that way because there are certain items that don't appear on the computer print-out neatly typed out like some here — they have Nabob Coffee, that's quite clear, but there are other items on here — and this one is not a loaded one, it was handed to me by a person who had shopped at one of these places, and so we get the nice computer print-out.

And you know, many people say well, it's nice, it gets through in a hurry. All you've got to do is have a foul-up in one of those computers and the whole line of computers goes. The supermarket checkout delays in the United States have been such that some of the firms now that have been introducing and putting in the new universal pricing code have now decided that it's not the panacea that they had decided it was to be, and many of them are starting to take the things out.

But I think that this government owes it to the consumers of Manitoba to have an opportunity to know what their prices are when they go to a store checkout, be it computerized or else. I think that they have an obligation that people will know exactly — if I'm going to pick up a pound of coffee that is marked \$3.99, when I go to the checkout I know that it's \$3.99 — and it's not a bunch of stripes on there that I don't know what it is.

And so I would ask the government to seriously consider this bill, give it the opportunity to go to second reading and hear the representations from the public, because the unfortunate thing is that we've been spending many months in this Legislature, and we don't always get to hear what the man on the street or the woman on the street is actually thinking. And perhaps when the bill gets to committee, perhaps I will be proven wrong and perhaps you will be proven wrong, but at least . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member for Logan would permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up. It would have to be with leave. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When you mention pricing of old stock versus new stock when the price goes up, it's my understanding that that computer system of pricing also serves as a method of inventory control for the retail store or the retail chain, and as a method of inventory control for restocking purposes only, but as a result of that the computer automatically prices out

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

the existing inventory at the lower price. You don't have any possibility that old inventory may go up in price to match the price of the new inventory. Is that understanding not correct?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Well, according to the write-ups that I have read from the west coast, both of Canada and the United States, that has not been the case, the markup that had fouled up in the old price and the new price. —(Interjection)— Right. That's been my understanding.

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

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Rock Lake that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there an inclination to call it 5:30? (Agreed). I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.