



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 29 - 10:00 a.m., FRIDAY, 18 March, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 18 March, 1983.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions
. . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for Burrows that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where there are 40 students of Grade 5 standing from the Robert Smith School under the direction of Mr. Cartlidge and Mr. MacBeth. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

There are five students of Grades 5 and 6 standing from the Christian Heritage Academy under the direction of Mrs. Robins. The school is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

School buses

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: I'd like to address my first question to the Minister of Education. It's regarding the award of the bus contract to Thomas Bus. I'm wondering if she can tell me whether the government is satisfied that the Ontario-built buses meet all the Manitoba Department of Education safety standards.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think the member opposite has raised a very important point. When we're looking at bus contracts we have two things that are of major concern to us; one of them, of course, will be price and the other will be quality control because

the matter of quality control is a very important item. I can say that during the year Superior Bus had the contract; that we do as we always do, and that is that we have constant contact with the manufacturers and have quality checks on the assembly line. There have been some problems related to the buses. These are in the process of being - I suppose "rectified" would be the word. They have to do with heat distribution, seat-belt accessibility, the provision of service manuals. There are a few areas that my department is working with the manufacturer on and making sure that between the two organizations, we are confident that the buses are safe and the quality of the buses is adequate.

MR. C. MANNESS: I'm glad to hear that the government is, in fact, watching these buses closely for safety. I would ask the Minister of Economic Development whether, in fact, the government will be sending inspectors down to the Thomas Bus plant to ensure that there are no problems that come forward there through the manufacturing process. If the government is going to do that, what is the cost of sending inspectors to that plant?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I don't know the precise answer of the cost of inspectors. I do know though, that in the past period of time inspectors have been going to the plant to assist with what was seen as a quality control and safety factor. I'm sure the member opposite would not want us to ignore the safety of school buses and we have to ensure the quality of those buses. The pricing issue though is another issue, as I'm sure the member will agree. What we're dealing with here is a purchasing policy by a public authority using public funds and the extent to which we can, in good conscience, vary the price that we're willing to pay for buses even though it is a Manitoba producer.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister can rest assured that I will not ignore safety. As a matter of fact, that's one of the reasons I brought it up.

I'm wondering if the Minister then can tell me whether or not the factor of driving of some 75 buses some 1,500 miles each, or nearly 100,000 miles of total driving, whether in fact this was taken into account in making the decision to award the contract to Thomas Bus. What is the cost of driving one bus that distance?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the cost of purchasing the buses from the Ontario builder is f.o.b. here in Winnipeg, so their bid price includes the cost of transporting those buses here.

MR. C. MANNESS: Thank you for that answer. Mr. Speaker, charges have been made by Superior Bus that the successful bidder has tendered at a value less than an 1980 manufacturer-to-dealer price, not dealer-

to-ultimate buyer but manufacturer-to-dealer price. What action did the government take previous to the awarding of the contract in January to ensure that this was not the case?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'm a little unclear as to the detail of that question but I think the gist of it is, was the price put in by Thomas a price that was in some way improper or one that should have been queried? We've asked for the back data as far as 1978 for the cost per bus by all the bidders, the successful and the unsuccessful bidders. There are four different sizes of bus and, naturally, the prices vary for each of those, so it can be a little misleading just to do straight average figures. We've broken it down by size of bus and there's no evidence on the bid prices that Thomas did anything irregular. Their price in 1980 ranged from a 36-seat bus up to 66, from \$8,500 up to \$10,000.00. Their bid in 1982 for the same range of bus size went from \$10,000 to just over \$12,000.00.

Now, we don't deal with the manufacturer-to-retail price. That may be a catalogued pricing that is used in other circumstances, but when tenders are put out what government has to deal with is the price that's listed in the tender and I submit that there's really no other realistic way to carry on government tendering.

MR. C. MANNES: Manitoba has received a very favourable tender from an out-of-province manufacturer. I'm wondering if also we have received as a province, and maybe the Minister can take this as a direct question, has Manitoba received a favoured customer status for this company for years to come to make up for the potential loss of a local manufactured product?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'm not clear whether the member was asking whether a favourite customer status was being granted to Thomas or would in future be granted to Superior. Our intent is increasingly to look at the cost benefit to the province in the tendering process. In our purchasing policy, which again I draw the attention of the member to the speech I made on the 28th of February on the Budget Debate, our intention is to have some flexibility, but within a range, and we will not get into the situation of consistently offering a preferential price.

The members opposite should know that this purchasing policy went through a very thorough discussion at the Economic Summit, and in several consultations since, and it's been the strong message to us from our business community, who we must remember are not only selling in Manitoba, but are also bidding in other jurisdictions, that we not go for a fixed preferential price. After all, Superior Bus has had a very good order from New York. Now, Thomas Bus traditionally thought that was their area and probably were particularly determined to get the bid here in Manitoba as a result.

Now, that's the ups and downs of the competitive bidding system. It may have flaws as an overall way to conduct our economic affairs. I think we have on many occasions pointed out our concerns about those flaws, but it is the system we're working with, and we submit that once we present a purchasing policy that

the onus is on us then to apply it in a fair and consistent way.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My next question will be even shorter and I'm sure the answer of it can be shorter, too. Is the Province of Manitoba considering purchasing additional school buses in 1983 and how many?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, it looks, Mr. Speaker, as though an additional hundred will be required and they will go to open tender.

MR. C. MANNES: Does the Thomas Bus bid, the one that they made on their successful contract, did it contain price production for additional orders beyond the 75?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe they do, because there was no built-in factor, but that's not a detail that I have precise information on. I can undertake to obtain that information.

MR. C. MANNES: My final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm wondering if Thomas Bus has been offered any major part of additional requirements beyond 75 buses at this time.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development. In perusing the bids on this bus order, did the Minister of Economic Development factor in the additional costs of a Manitoba manufacturer through government taxation, such as, the payroll tax which makes them non-competitive with the Ontario manufacturer having not to pay a payroll tax?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we attempt to look at all factors. I would draw the attention, however, of the member opposite to the fact that in Ontario employers must pay the medicare premium for all their employees, because in that province they do not have free medicare covered by general revenue as we do here in Manitoba. The total package of taxes and costs is still favourable to Manitoba.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I understand that to pay the medicare premium in Ontario is optional, whereas the payroll tax in Manitoba is compulsory.

Would the Minister please answer the question whether the payroll tax and its additional cost on the cost of production in Manitoba adversely affected the ability of Superior Bus to compete effectively with Ontario manufacturers?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, my information is that that assessment is not optional. If it were optional I would be really disturbed, Mr. Speaker. If the medical protection of workers in Ontario is subject to the whim or the will of an employer I would think that would be a most disturbing situation.

Rental increases - statistics

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Housing. Does the Minister's department still maintain comparative statistics on rental increases throughout the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, the Rent Regulation Bureau is in the process of accumulating statistics which would give us figures so that we could determine what the average increase was across the province. To date, I do not think that there is any firm figure that I could give the honourable member that would indicate what the average increase was.

MR. G. FILMON: Will the Minister, or his department, be releasing comparative statistics indicating what the trend has been, say, over the past year during the advent of the rent control legislation to see just exactly how much the increases have been and how they've varied from area to area and segment to segment of the city?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, the bureau will be delivering those statistics. They have from time to time delivered rough estimates of the trends and rent increase requests and the rollbacks as put through by the rent regulation officers. I could just give the member a rough figure, that the average increase requested was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 17 percent and the average rent regulation officer's suggestion or recommended increase was in the neighbourhood of 10 percent or 11 percent.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, a rather comprehensive analysis of rent increases in the province was done in July of 1981. It's now almost two years since that time. Does the Minister have a report on, say, 1981-82 from July to July, or anything of that nature, and if so, can he produce that or share it with members on this side?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not have at hand figures of that kind, but if the members wish I will certainly undertake to see if they're available. If so, I will certainly be willing to table them.

Bill No. 37 ruled out of order

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour, responsible for the Status of Women. In view of the fact that last evening during Private Members' Hour, as a result of a procedural technicality raised by the Attorney-General, Bill No. 37 was ruled out of order, a bill which would have added to the criteria for compensation under The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, pain and suffering which would have allowed compensation to be paid to victims of crime, and particularly rape victims and other victims of crime,

would the Minister of Labour refer this bill to the Advisory Council on the Status of Women in order to obtain a recommendation from the council as to whether or not this bill should be passed and would she please do that so the bill could be dealt with at this Session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Just on a point of order. The premise of the question contains a misstatement. Rape victims and other victims of crime are covered by The Crime Compensation Act with respect to compensable items which include any loss of income, any loss of that kind. There is no coverage for any crime with respect to pain and suffering, nor is there in the Workers Compensation legislation upon which it is modeled.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the point of order, the bill would add to the criteria, pain, and suffering by which victims of crime, including rape victims, would be allowed compensation as in the Province of Ontario.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank both honourable members and I don't think there was a point of order there. It was a matter of clarification, perhaps. I would remind the honourable member that there is no bill; it was declared out of order.

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, the bill, as you said, was declared out of order so we don't have a bill to refer to. The issue is certainly one that is under advisement of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women. Certainly, it is an issue that they have been concerned with for a long time; it's not news to them.

Their recommendations will be brought to me on a regular basis now that we have an active and interested council that is concerning themselves with these issues. I will be happy to report to the Legislature on the advice given to me by this council.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister doesn't have the bill, I will gladly give her mine and she can refer it to the Advisory Committee, and I would ask her if she would obtain a recommendation early enough so that this matter could be dealt with at this Session of the Legislature. Would she undertake to do that?

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think that's the same question. I said I would be happy to refer the issue at hand to the Advisory Council. The bill was declared out of order, as I understand it.

Employment for young people

MR. G. MERCIER: Another question to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the present unemployment rate for young people in the Province of Manitoba is 17.5 percent, and in view of the fact, that we're near to the end of the university term, particularly, Mr. Speaker, what plans does the Minister of Labour have in order to provide employment for young people during the upcoming summer months?

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, the complete announcements on our Youth Employment Programs will be made very shortly.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the university term is rapidly coming to a close, and in view of the fact, that if the private sector is to be involved in any programs, and I hope that they would be, it is essential that the announcements be made very quickly. Will the announcements be made before the end of March?

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the honourable member that I do have a certain familiarity with the school year. I said that I intend to make that announcement very shortly. That statement stands.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact, and I appreciate that the Minister has a familiarity with the school year, I hope that she has some familiarity and understanding with the plight of over 54,000 unemployed persons and the fact that a large number of young people are coming into the job market very shortly and they have to have jobs.

School buses

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, a further question for the Minister of Economic Development with regard to the school bus contract. I'm wondering, it wasn't clear yesterday or in today's questions whether or not there were, in addition to the two companies which tendered for the contract, any further tenders received by the government and, if there were, could the Minister advise where Superior ranked in that full list, if there were more than two companies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, when questioned yesterday as to whether there were more than two, I didn't have the facts at hand; today I have. There were four companies that applied. The winning bid by Thomas was at \$826,900.00, the second was by Wells at \$874,000, the third by Fairway at \$901,000, and the fourth by Superior at \$1.565 million.

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

Student aid

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Education. In view of the fact that unemployment for persons under 25 is currently at 17.5 percent, is the Minister satisfied that her cutbacks on student aid that were recently announced will not further prevent people from going to university who should ordinarily be able to go?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, yes, I am satisfied that students in Manitoba, who want to go to either

college or university and who are entitled to receive student aid under the existing Student Aid Program, will be able to receive funding from that program. As I indicated before, I think the details of the parts of the Student Aid Program will better be handled through the Estimates process.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that high marks are going to be a consideration, is this not going to reduce the numbers of students, and particular categories of students, who already are faced with the problem of high unemployment rate, not being able to find jobs and now being denied student aid accessibility?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: First of all, Mr. Speaker, we would not be denying the students student aid if they really want to go to school and if they really want post-secondary education. The requirements are minimal, Mr. Speaker, absolutely minimal; and that is that they have to complete successfully 60 percent of their program in a two-year period. They've got two years to do it, to complete 60 percent of their program; that's a minimal requirement. Anybody who wants to be in school can be in school, receive the student aid that they are entitled to, and all they have to do, really, is to complete 60 percent of their program in a two-year period.

We might suggest the opposite, Mr. Speaker; and that is, if they're not able to do it, they really should pay for the privilege themselves of going to university.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that single support parents with dependents often cannot, even with the student aid available to them, survive without having part-time work or, in fact, close to two-thirds time work, in order to make themselves available to go to university. Is this not now going to prevent these very worthy people who will be working very hard and will be attempting to make their place in society through the education system, not being able to carry on because of the changes that the Minister is putting forth?

MR. M. HEMPHILL: Part-time students are not affected at all, Mr. Speaker, by the criteria changes in the Student Aid Program because they don't get any student aid now, nor have they in the past. I have identified part-time students as being the most important area to move in. If we had additional money to put into the program I can say that that is where I would want to move - to give some help to part-time students.

The Federal Government, over the past few years, Mr. Speaker, has been decreasing steadily the amount of money it has been putting into student aid. It's gone from 50 percent to 25 percent in previous years. This has caused a tremendous burden on the resources and the money of the Provincial Student Aid Program where we have had to pick up money and put in the difference to cover the deficiencies of the Federal Government program. They are in the process of improving their program; it's long overdue. It's badly needed to remove the pressure on our Student Aid Program, and Part-time Student Aid Loan Programs will be part of that.

Grain prices - reduced

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Has he received information, or can he confirm reports out of Ottawa, that this year's initial grain prices to Manitoba grain farmers will be reduced through the Canadian Wheat Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that those discussions dealing with grain prices have been ongoing for several months in terms of the Pool price versus the export price, and indications that are coming out, of course, are that the Pool is in a deficit position at the present time. As to whether or not a decision has been reached insofar as lowering the grain prices, I don't believe a decision has been reached at this point in time.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are probably 15,000-plus to 20,000 grain producers in Manitoba that depend on the Canadian Wheat Board; in view of the fact that NDP times are tough times in rural Manitoba, as well as in all of Manitoba, has the Minister made representation to the Federal Government to hold the initial grain prices at the level they are at today?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member doesn't wish to recognize the programming that the province has put in for all other areas of agriculture to stabilize incomes of farmers. The member should be aware that the Federal Grain Stabilization Plan which is in place, to which farmers contribute, would and should be triggered to make a payout in times of low prices.

It has been a longstanding contention of this government and previous governments, I believe, that the Grain Stabilization Program should be more flexible in terms of triggering payouts when there are losses in certain regions, rather than having the entire western Canada trigger when prices are down across the whole of the west. We believe that there could have been more sensitivity in that program and we've made those views known consistently.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the Minister has not made representation to Ottawa to the Federal Government on the initial grain-price issue and he's trying to tell us that he, in fact, just hasn't been a part of it. I would request then, Mr. Speaker, or ask the Minister if he will participate in those discussions and encourage the Minister of the Canadian Wheat Board, or responsible for it, to hold those prices steady as they are today.

As well, Mr. Speaker, to request at the same time that the stabilization program be recalculated, or the formula be recalculated so in fact there is an immediate payout to the grain farmers in Manitoba.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, we've made those kinds of views known consistently, even before the honourable

member rose in his seat to request that kind of action. Mr. Speaker, we have also made known that there should be in place a marketing guarantee for farmers to make sure that if their grain is not able to be moved into export position that there be incomes available, cash flow available, to farmers so they can continue farming.

The honourable member well knows that part of the depression in the grains industry has been caused by the expansion of grain production south of the border and now we are unfortunately across the world reaping some of those benefits.

MR. J. DOWNEY: In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture has indicated that he has made representation in Ottawa will he table all submissions, correspondence - will he table those documents - requesting that the Federal Government either recalculate and have a payout out of the grain stabilization so that we can be aware precisely of what he has recommended? Would he table this documents for this Assembly?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, those kinds of discussions take place at all — (Interjection) — well, I've met with the Minister a number of times. Our staff are in communication with the Department of Agriculture and, in fact, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) — the opposition obviously don't want an answer. We know, and we are very concerned about the benefits that farmers are reaping are the losses that they are sustaining as a result of the depression of grain prices in the world and the farms of western Canada are faced with those kinds of costs.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, at least to this point in time, that the honourable members opposite joined with members on this side to support a resolution condemning one of the greatest cost increases to farmers of western Canada. Now they want action on the other side. But at least they have stood up and said we don't want those costs to be borne by the farmers of western Canada dealing with the transportation costs they face.

MR. J. DOWNEY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. One year ago, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture said he telephoned the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa. I wonder if that Minister of Agriculture has answered the phone yet?

Earphone equipment - damaged

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in view of a memorandum that was circulated yesterday concerning some damage to earphone cables, earphone capsules and earphone clips in the Chamber to the extent of a couple of hundred dollars, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services and ask him whether he would be prepared to study the possibility of improving the sound system in the Chamber; whether he would, for example, attempt to amplify the existing system which is now natural voice down here which would, in fact, eliminate the need for earphones and

give greater prominence to the speaker over hecklers. It would also, I think, improve the audio quality of debate. Mr. Speaker, the old system was much superior to the existing system.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr Speaker, this matter has been raised by the honourable member during the Estimates discussion last year, and I am certain that at that time the Minister of Government Services said they would be looking at it. I know our department has considered the extra costs that would be involved in changing the sound system here. We are continuing to look at that situation and, if it seems feasible from the cost point of view, Mr. Speaker, we will definitely put a recommendation forward.

Road restrictions

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Highways and Transportation. When does he expect to have to announce road restrictions in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe one announcement has already been out, and that had to do with the normalization of load restrictions. I believe that went into effect on March 1st. There will be others, as the need arises, based on the testing that takes place on a daily basis.

Calling of bills

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General in his capacity as House Leader. Last year the government said that one of the reasons for calling the Session in December was to present legislation for early debate. Two of the major pieces of legislation presented were The Farmlands Ownership Act and The Law Enforcement Review Act. Since those bills have not been called for debate in the Session, I wonder if the Government House Leader could advise us when we might expect them to be called?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, one of them would be called today if time permits; that is The Farmlands Ownership Act. The Law Enforcement Review Act will be called next week.

Loss of employment at Superior Bus

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, a little while ago when we were talking on this question of the Superior in Morris, I heard the Member for Sturgeon Creek say that 500 jobs would be lost as a result of this, and I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development.

First, would she ascertain whether this is true, and would she then advise the House as to how many days of employment the contract that has been awarded would have provided?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the current rate of production is running about four a day, so an order of 75 would give in the neighbourhood of 18 days of work. We are not underestimating the impact that might have on a workforce of 169 and, if they don't have other orders, there may indeed be layoff requirements. I suggest that even if Superior was able to get the entire Manitoba order for school buses they would still need to market in other jurisdictions and, therefore, we have to take seriously the whole problem of retaliation. We have to work out some kind of reasonably fair way to function in these very difficult economic times.

Also, I draw the member's attention to the fact that the bids coming in now are considerably lower for most automotive supplies because their prices are getting increasingly competitive; so I guess anyone operating in that field has to be prepared to be very highly competitive.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Economic Development whether she disputes the statement by the Mayor of Morris that it will harm the town drastically; lose about 160 jobs in Morris and 500 jobs indirectly in the Province of Manitoba. Does she dispute the statement of the Mayor of Morris?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, Mr. Speaker, I sympathize very much with the concern of the Mayor of Morris. As I said yesterday, we wish that in good conscience on this side, we could have awarded that bid to a Manitoba producer; but we have found that a million dollar order for the chassis of the buses did in fact go to Morris, to the Marcel Dorge Company. So, there has been some benefit from the total order there. Superior Bus did receive quite favourable attention. In 1981, they did get several bids when they had a price 3.6 percent higher. However, earlier in the year when they had a price that was 11.7 — (Interjection) — Honourable member, they did bid at an 11.7 percent price differential earlier in the year, early in 1981, and they did not get that bid. I repeat, they did not . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: I have just to complete, Mr. Speaker. In 1982, Superior got the entire order of 173 at a price differential of 2.2 percent, so I submit that we have been dealing as fairly as we can with Superior Bus; but when the price differential gets over 20 percent, Mr. Speaker, we really do have a problem of interfering with the normal bidding process. I really challenge the members opposite, who are great espousers of letting the free market determine everything without any intervention or managing, how in good conscience, however one works out the economic benefit, they can recommend that we expend public monies in that fashion. Some variation, as I say, we are prepared to make, because we think it is important in these difficult times to support the jobs and the tax base and the viability of our small town firms but, Mr. Speaker, we just cannot go into the region of an over 20 percent price preference. It is just beyond what we in good conscience on this side can do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other questions, I would like to, by leave, make a non-political statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to call to your attention, and the members of the House, the presence in the Gallery of a Natural Resources Department Officer, Bob Burns, and his wife. Just this morning, I had the pleasure of presenting Bob, who is a member of the department since 1951, a Wildlife Officer of the Year award. It is a very prestigious award, there has only been one other person in Manitoba who has received this award and that was in 1959. Bob has been very active in developing the raw fur marketing industry in Manitoba and has been very prominent in the introduction of humane trapping. As a matter of fact, he developed the first humane trapping program in North America in 1959. It's an honour to salute him today.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: On the same non-political statement, Mr. Speaker, I just would like to personally associate myself with those remarks as well as my colleagues. I had the privilege of working with Bob Burns when I was in the department quite a few years ago and, of course, having him work in the department when I was Minister, as well, and we join the present Minister in congratulating him on receiving this award.

ORDERS OF THE DAY ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell that this House do issue an Order for Return showing:

1. Cost of relocating the Crop Insurance office from Minnedosa to Neepawa;
 - a. Present rental;
 - b. Rental rates on new office space;
 - c. How many staff to be transferred.
2. How many farmers have requested the move?
 - a. List of names and addresses;
 - b. How many complaints received.
3. Have boundary line changes been considered?
4. Has an economic impact study been completed or undertaken?
5. How many meetings have been held with farm groups relative to proposed move?
 - a. Date?
 - b. Number of farmers in attendance?
6. Is consideration being given to moving other crop insurance offices located throughout Manitoba?

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, we're going to accept this order with one caveat and that's with respect to 2.a, "List of names and addresses of farmers who have requested the move." First of all, I have no information at the moment there exists such a list, but if there did, we could not accept the release of the names of people who petition government, or members of government, or members of the House and do so in the personal capacity, but all the rest of it, we accept.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: That looks acceptable as long as we get the numbers, Mr. Speaker. We can accept that.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATE - SUPPLY MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the Adjourned Debate on the motion of the Minister of Finance that the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply be granted to Her Majesty, standing in the name of the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to have this motion pass.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. This will be to consider the Interim Supply Bill to be introduced by the Minister of Finance in the House.

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

**COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY
INTERIM SUPPLY**

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Eyler: The Committee will come to order. We are considering Interim Supply. The resolution resolved that a sum not exceeding \$905,039,160, being 30 percent of the amount of the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984.

Does the Minister of Finance have some introductory remarks?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to hear questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions?
The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: On Bill 29, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1983, it is required to provide interim spending and borrowing authority for the 1983-84 fiscal year commencing April 1st, pending approval of The Appropriation Act, 1983. Bill 29 is basically the same as the 1982 Interim Appropriation Act following the same format and containing similar clauses with one exception. Bill 29, in addition to providing interim spending authority for 1983-84, also provides authority for the government to borrow a portion of its estimated 1983-84 cash requirements.

Since the 1978-79 fiscal year, a borrowing-authority clause has been included in the annual Appropriation Act to provide authority for the government to borrow for its own cash requirements. Because The Appropriation Act traditionally has not been approved until at least the end of the first quarter of any fiscal year, the government could not take advantage of good market situations during that quarter. For this reason, the government has decided to put the authority to borrow a portion of its estimated cash requirements for 1983-84 in The Interim Appropriation Act.

Since this Act should receive Royal Assent prior to April 1st, the Minister of Finance would be able to borrow during the first quarter of the 1983-84 year

should good market opportunities be presented. The amount of interim spending authority requested in Section 3 of Bill 29 is \$905,039,160 or 30 percent of the amounts to be voted as set forth in the Main Estimates. This amount is expected to last until early July. In 1982-83, Actual Expenditure to the end of June excluding statutory items was 27 percent of the total sum voted under The Appropriation Act, 1982.

Section 2 is new this year. It has been included to clearly differentiate the Main Estimates being referred to when this term is used in other sections of this Act.

Section 4, Authority for Commitments for Future Years, has been increased from \$45 million to \$60 million, corresponding to 30 percent of the commitment authority expected to be requested in The Appropriation Act, 1983. Expenditures for these commitments may not be made in the 1983-84 fiscal year unless additional spending authority is provided.

Section 5, Limitation on Expenditure for Items, is the same as Section 4 in last year's bill. While the amount of spending authority to be granted by this bill is 30 percent of the total to be voted in Main Estimates, members should be aware that this restriction does not apply to individual appropriations. Section 5 permits expenditures up to the full amount of each individual item to be voted.

Section 6, Effective Passing of Main Appropriations, is the same as Section 5 in last year's bill, except that the section providing the government with the authority to borrow a portion of its 1983-84 cash requirements, Section 13, is not affected by this clause. The borrowing authority granted under this bill continues to have effect after the passing of the main appropriations.

Section 7, Transfer of Certain Funds to Several Departments, has been adjusted to reflect changes in the presentation of the Main Estimates for 1983-84. Reference to funding for the Northern Development Agreement voted in 1982-83 under the Department of Northern Affairs has been deleted. With the signing of the agreement, funding for northern development projects in 1983-84 has been established directly under the appropriate departmental heading and transfers from the Department of Northern Affairs are no longer required. It should also be noted that Section 7 in last year's bill, referencing the Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement, is no longer required.

In addition, provision has been made for the transfer of funds included in the Main Estimates for expenditures related to the Reciprocal Taxation Agreement with the Federal Government to other departmental appropriations as required. This section has also been modified to allow for the transfer of all money to be authorized for expenditure under those certain specified appropriations rather than quoting specific dollar limits.

Section 7(2), Adjustments in Main Estimates, is the same as Section 6(2) in last year's bill. This section is required to ensure that expenditures and recoveries related to various cost-shared agreements are properly recorded for claiming purposes.

Section 8, Authority for Expenditure in Anticipation of Recoveries, is the same as Section 8 in last year's bill. This section provides that departments, in order to render services, or provide materials, supplies or property to other departments, may make the required expenditures in anticipation of recovering the cost from the other departments.

Section 9, Emergency Interest Rate Relief Program, is basically the same as Section 9 in last year's bill. It is required to permit expenditures under this program, which is continuing for 1983-84, to be made by implementing departments from subappropriations to be established in those departments. The amounts expended will be recovered from funds authorized for expenditure under the Emergency Interest Rate Relief Program Service heading.

Section 10(1), Jobs Fund, is new for 1983 and is required to permit expenditures on approved employment creation programming to be made by implementing departments from subappropriations to be established in those departments. The amounts expended will be recovered from funds authorized for expenditure under the Jobs Fund Service heading. This section is required to ensure that the government has the flexibility needed to properly manage such a fund and achieve maximum employment impact. For public account purposes, the net effect will be to show total expenditures for employment creation programming under Appropriation 29-1, Jobs Fund, while in each implementing department a Jobs Fund expenditure will be shown and will be offset by a matching recovery and will have a nil final expenditure.

Section 10(2), Transfer of Funds to Jobs Fund heading, is required to provide for the transfer of funds freed up in the various departmental salary appropriations, as a result of the recently negotiated settlement with the Manitoba Government Employees Association, to the Jobs Fund. This money, estimated at some \$10 million to \$11 million, will be transferred to the Jobs Fund appropriation and will be used to stimulate employment in the province.

Section 11(1), Money Authorized for Agreements with Canada, is the same as Section 10 in last year's bill and provides that money authorized under this Act for expenditure in respect of an agreement with the Government of Canada may be expended in anticipation of the agreement being entered into.

Section 11(2), Money Expended in Anticipation of Agreements, has been added to provide authority to expend money on projects for which the Government of Canada will not cost-share or will only partially cost-share project costs. This section was first included in The 1982 Appropriation Act.

Section 12, Application, is a standard section which requires no further explanation.

Section 13, Power To Borrow, is, as previously noted, being included in this bill to enable the government to borrow during the first quarter of the 1983-84 fiscal year should good market opportunities be presented. This section provides authority to raise money by way of loan or loans by the issue and sale of provincial securities up to \$300 million, as may be considered necessary for making any required payments out of the consolidated fund. This represents only a portion of the cash requirements of the government for 1983-84, which are estimated to total \$800 million. The balance of the required authority, being \$500 million, will be included in The 1983 Appropriation Act.

Mr. Chairman, with these comments, I commend the bill to the members of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is a bit confused. We're dealing here with the Committee on Supply and it simply should have been a matter of providing a resolution for the amount of money that's involved. What the Minister has done is read us his notes for Ways and Means after the bill has been distributed, and it's something that we would have had in front of us as he was giving us that explanation. We appreciate getting the explanation, of course, but it's rather meaningless when one doesn't have the bill in front of them to be able to follow through. It's too bad that we have this kind of confusion but I'm sure we'll be able to adapt to it, Mr. Chairman.

I have only one question for the Minister of Finance right now, and that is: How much money has been borrowed during fiscal 1982-83 in total?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I believe it is \$920 million; \$919 million is the number that I last saw.

MR. B. RANSOM: Does that include the Canada Pension borrowing?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, it would include the Canada Pension and all other sources.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, would the breakdown, as between Canada Pension Plan borrowing and market borrowing, be as the Minister forecasted last year? What would the proportions be, roughly?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: If I could just have several minutes, I believe it was \$750 million in the public markets and \$150 million from Canada Pension and other internal sources, but I'll get that checked.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Minister of Finance getting that information right now?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, that information will be here in a matter of a few minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Interim Supply—pass.

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$905,039,160, being 30 percent of the amount of the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Burrows that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call my proposed motion on Page 5 with respect to the

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the business of the House, would it not be the Government House Leader's intention to go into Ways and Means in order that the bill might be distributed to the House, having received the explanation from the Minister of Finance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I'd be very pleased to do that if we have leave from the opposition to do so, because the motion that was passed is that Ways and Means be convened at the next sitting of the House so we require the consent of the opposition to go into Ways and Means — (Interjection) — Okay, fine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have some reservations about the suggestion made by the Member for Turtle Mountain. The specific provisions that we have with the motions that go on the Order Paper after the completion of the Tabling of the Estimates, providing for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, provide that the House can go in at its next sitting, and they're done that way for a specific reason. They were set up that way to protect the House from the tyranny of a majority which could then ram Estimates or Budgets or Taxation measures through the House and that provision was put in to require that the House could not do it until the next sitting day.

I agree with the request that we should proceed if that's the will of the House, but I have some reservations about doing that because of the precedent that it might set and allow us to move from the Committee motion into Committee into a bill all at one time. Normally we have not had a delay in the passage of that motion. It has not been adjourned and debated for some time. The member has chosen to allow it to pass today, to allow the Ways and Means Resolution to appear on the Order Paper for Monday. I have some reservations about setting that precedent of allowing both the motion to be passed and the Committee of Ways and Means to sit on the same day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, there's no precedent set when the House grants leave to do something. We're simply offering to expedite the business of government. If the Member for Springfield wishes to deny that, then fine.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members for their contribution. Perhaps the Honourable Government House Leader would care to move his motion by leave and the House can accept, or otherwise.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move, by leave, seconded by the Minister of Finance that the House do now resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means of raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: The Committee will come to order. We are considering the resolution on Interim Supply.

Resolved that, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984, the sum of \$905,039,160, being 30 percent of the total amount to be voted for departments as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Burrows that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. V. SCHROEDER, by leave, introduced Bill No. 29, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, and to authorize commitments to expend additional

money in subsequent years, and to authorize the borrowing of funds to provide for cash requirements of the Government Interim Appropriation Act 1983; and ordered for second reading immediately.

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 29 - THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1983

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER, by leave, presented Bill No. 29, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, and to authorize commitments to expend additional money in subsequent years and to authorize the borrowing of funds to provide for cash requirements of the Government, The Interim Appropriation Act, 1983, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Turtle Mountain accurately pointed out, I had provided my notes ahead of time and it may well be that I was confused in following advice I had received on this side. If the Members of the Opposition wish, I can do it again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask you to call the proposed motion of myself with respect to the extension of time for reports on Private Bills, standing in the name for the Member for Turtle Mountain.

PROPOSED MOTION RE PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution which I believe the Government House Leader introduced as being a routine motion. That's the same explanation that my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, used when he introduced a similar resolution two years ago saying that it was a routine resolution, it was something that had been done before, because the House had been called in December of that year, that reports couldn't be filed within 15 days and,

therefore, it made sense to simply extend the period of time past when the House reconvened. But, Mr. Speaker, it turned out that motion was by no means handled in a routine fashion by the Opposition of the Day, the New Democratic Party, who happen to now be in government. Therefore, I wish only to take a short period of time to raise some of the questions which were raised then and to put some of the quotations on the record.

The first member to raise the question, I believe, was the Member for St. Johns, who at the time was in the very seat that I am now occupying and I am not proud of that, but he extended the debate for a substantial period of time and he raised the question, and this is a quotation, "Why is it that it's necessary for him to go beyond the law as it is? If the law is too harsh, then what can the Minister suggest in regard to changing the law?" That's page 302 from February 5, 1981. He was attacking the point of why was it necessary to go 30 days beyond the reconvening of the Legislature rather than the 15 days.

Then, further on, on the same page, he said, "But I'm suggesting to you that it should not be necessary to extend the time for the filing of reports to the 3rd day of March," which was one month beyond the day of the reconvening of the House.

I suppose if the question was valid then, Mr. Speaker, it is still valid today. When the House reconvened on the 24th of February, why was it necessary to extend it to the 21st of March? I understand there may even be some desire on the part of the government to extend it beyond the 21st of March. Then Mr. Cherniack also went on and I quote from Page 303, he said, "The point I'm making, Mr. Speaker, is that the House Leader has brought in a resolution asking for much more time than he can justifiably require."

Well then, Mr. Speaker, that master of bombast, the Member for Churchill, who is the now the Minister of Northern Affairs, found it necessary to get into debate at the time. He said on Page 305, "So I think in this instance, it is a matter of being unable to provide the reports to the House under the time limit which was provided for by the legislation and I think that, in fact, may be symptomatic of a general sloppiness which runs through their government." He took two pages to say that, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Northern Affairs and I hope that, especially the new members in the government, will pay careful attention and will refer back to these speeches before they're prepared to launch any charges of delay at the members on this side of the House.

Now, one might have thought that having got in those few little shots, unjustifiable as they might have been, they would have been content to let it go, Mr. Speaker. But, no. The adjournment was taken and we returned to debate on February 6th. This was the Member for Burroughs, Mr. Hanuschak, who was still a member of the New Democratic Party. He went on in the most true and eloquent Hanuschakian style of delivery that day because this was really something - this was the biggest issue that he'd been on to for some period of time. I have to give a couple of quotations that are a bit more lengthy here, Mr. Speaker, but Page 372, "Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out or draw to your attention the lack of courtesy of this government in bringing in this motion in this fashion at this time. You

may - no you will not recall, Mr. Speaker, because you were not in the House at this time, but a similar motion did appear on the Order Paper, it was dealt with by the House in December of 1966. I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that at that time the then House Leader had the courtesy to ask the House for leave to bring in the motion. He brought it in at the proper time. He brought it in on the last day that the House sat before it rose for the Christmas recess." So, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the same question would be valid today. Why was that courtesy not shown to members on this side of the House? Why did the Government House Leader not bring in this motion on the last day of the sitting prior to Christmas?

Then on the same page, he is making a comparison again to the 1966 situation. He said, if at that time, in the government's wisdom, they felt they could table those reports by February 15th, then surely you can do the same thing today. In other words, the then House Leader said that I need six weeks to table all the reports for the fiscal year ended with the calendar year 1966 and by the 15th of February, I'll be prepared to table them. So, why in 1981, do you need an additional two weeks? If you are able to do it within the six week period, then surely you can do it today also. Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no justification for that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the member went on then and he used at least two and a half pages to lambast the government for the lack of courtesy and poor organization and he said, "In summing up, Mr. Speaker, I want to impress upon you again that here we have a further example of disregard for the legislation process, a further example of administrative bungling."

Mr. Speaker, we recognize this resolution as being largely a routine matter and we would not raise these kinds of questions or make these sort of allegations, but since they were raised by the members in opposition and I suppose they should be raised and require some response; but there is one thing that I would like to raise, and that has to do with the Minister of Natural Resources in that there is a report which was due within six months of the end of fiscal 1982 and is then to be laid before the Legislature. The members opposite are arguing that can be done at any time during the Session following. That may be a technical consideration, Mr. Speaker, but it was supposed to be prepared within six months.

Now, if the requirement to prepare it had been fulfilled, it would hardly seem to make sense that the report should then be held by the Minister. Now, we fully realize that this report is one which is a new requirement in the Act which our government introduced, which I introduced as Minister. I know it is a difficult exercise to go through and we do not wish to put any undue pressure on the Minister or his staff, but I do think we are entitled to have some indication from the government as to when they think that they will be able to have the report in, because we have a resolution before the House, which this report would be relevant to that resolution. I assume that we will have a constitutional resolution before the House. I believe that to some extent this report will also be relevant to that resolution.

So I would just like the Government House Leader to give some indication as to when that might be; if it might be two weeks, or four weeks, or six weeks. I

don't intend to hold them to a hard fast date, but some indication as to when that report might be due.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that there are several petitions in the hands of the Clerk now, several of which will not be ready to be received by next Monday. One, I understand, is from the Salvation Army, who is still in negotiations between the Department of Education and their office in Toronto, and they would like to present a resolution, a petition, to this House as well.

Therefore, I move, seconded by the Member for Radisson

THAT the resolution be amended by striking out the words and figures, "for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended to the 21st day of March, 1983, and that the time for presenting Private Bills to the House be extended to the 28th day of March, 1983" in the second paragraph thereof; and substituting therefor the words and figures, "for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended to the 24th day of May, 1983, and that the time for presenting Private Bills to the House be extended to the 31st day of May, 1983."

MR. SPEAKER: Are there copies for other members of the House?

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Yes, I have.

MOTION presented on the Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: I just want to confirm then, Mr. Speaker, that this does not extend the date for the filing of reports.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: That's right. It deals only with the Private Bills in order to protect a number of private institutions, of which the Salvation Army is the most notable that we can think of at the moment. There are others in the office of the Clerk that petitions can't possibly be brought in by the 21st of March and, therefore, the amendment to extend.

QUESTION put on the Amendment; MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the motion as amended?

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: The Honourable Member for Pembina has the giggles and, you know, I suffer from that from to time myself, Mr. Speaker, so he has my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, as a former Minister of Natural Resources, is concerned about the 5-Year Wildlife Report. He has questioned me in the House; I've indicated that the report certainly was in the works; I have seen a draft.

I did not see a draft until several weeks ago. I'm sure that it wasn't prepared within the strict time limits of six months from the end of the fiscal year, but I wasn't concerned necessarily about that because it was a new report, a new 5-year report. My interpretation of the legislation is that it must be tabled at the next Session and I'm satisfied that it is this Session.

As to when the report will be printed in final form from the printer, I can't give an exact date. I don't expect it will be overly long - it may be in two weeks or three weeks. Certainly it will be during this Session and as soon as is available I will table it. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I don't know the timing I haven't questioned my people as to how long it takes to do a final run. Maybe the honourable members are much more certain about that than I am, but I can assure you that it will be available as soon as the printing and the typographical and other corrections are made.

MR. B. RANSOM: Will the Minister permit a question?

HON. A. MACKLING: Certainly.

MR. B. RANSOM: What did he mean by his statement, "Maybe the honourable members are more certain of that than I"?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I only meant - and I'm not imputing anything - that the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain has been in office for a longer period of time than I have in recent years and may be more familiar with printing timing; I am not. This is the first report of its kind ever presented to the House and I don't know what the time frame is for the production of such a report or the printing of it.

The Honourable Member for Pembina is saying "Mickey Mouse" - I think that his conduct sometimes displays "Mickey Mouse" in this House but other than that, Mr. Speaker, I confirm to the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that the report ought to be available certainly within the month of April, but I can't give you the exact time.

MR. A. RANSOM: Would the Minister permit one more question?

HON. A. MACKLING: Sure.

MR. A. RANSOM: Would he tell us when he expects it to go to the printers, a rough expectation; and will he provide us with a preliminary copy of the report, a Xerox copy? I believe the Minister of Northern Affairs made some copies of the Mitchell Report available before it was finally received from the printers.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, to quote the Honourable Member for Pembina again, that may be a good idea. I'll certainly consider that. Before it goes to the printers, if there is going to be an extensive time and it's ready, then perhaps I can get sufficient copies made of the draft form. I assume that since it's a 5-year report it has to be done in a fairly attractive way - although I'm not all hung up about that - and I'll see whether or not that suggestion might be followed.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few brief remarks on the motion before the Legislature introduced by the Honourable Attorney-General. Firstly, I want to thank the Member for Turtle Mountain for reviewing some of the comments that were made previously with respect to a similar motion which I had introduced a few years ago. I would like to point out to the new members of the Legislature that the Member for Turtle Mountain was very kind in the quotations that he selected to point out to Members of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, because if they wish to examine the record, they will see that there were some completely irresponsible allegations, insults and names used by members opposite at that particular time.

The Honourable Attorney-General is being very facetious in his seat, Mr. Speaker. I would ask him to review what was said by members of the New Democratic Party when a similar motion was received and I think he will then conclude that he is fortunate, indeed, that this opposition party is being very responsible in the way it is dealing with this particular motion. That's one of the jobs, I guess, we have on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. We not only have to defeat this government, but what we're also trying to do is, when they are defeated in the next election, we want them to be a responsible opposition.

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the fundamental reasons why they are going to be defeated because this is just another thread in the long line of irresponsible, untrue statements that that party made while they were in opposition and which they made in the election of 1981. The chickens are coming home to roost every day, when once again they are unable to do what they said they would do when they were in opposition. It's just another example and they will arise every day and the people of Manitoba, every day, are becoming aware that this government cannot perform, cannot deliver what they've promised, what they said they would do in opposition, Mr. Speaker. So when they are defeated in the next election, Mr. Speaker, hopefully they will provide to the citizens of Manitoba a responsible opposition and it's in their interest because should they ever again after that, become the Government of Manitoba, then perhaps they will be a good government that time. It's because of this irresponsibility, the untrue statements that they've made, that we're seeing one of the worst governments, Mr. Speaker, that have ever been in power in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate.

A MEMBER: Let the record be clear on that.

HON. R. PENNER: I have but a few observations to make, one is that we have been witness to what might properly be called poetic justice. I think we can learn some lessons from this; one is that the events of all of our lives throw very long shadows, indeed, and that eating words is a little bit like eating junk food - heavy on calories but short on intellectual nourishment. As regards the comment about the next time we're in opposition, I should say only that we will be ever so much wiser because we will be ever so much older when that happens.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put on the Amendment; MOTION carried.

**ADJOURNED DEBATE ON
SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS**

**BILL NO. 3 - THE FARMLANDS
OWNERSHIP ACT**

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 3.

The Honourable Member for Pembina has 21 minutes remaining.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am indeed pleased to speak on this bill again after a two-and-a-half month delay.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with this bill in this legislation is directly related to the problem the government itself has. This government has told the people of Manitoba that it's going to be an open government; that it is going to consult with all Manitobans; it is going to listen to their concerns and address the affairs of government to remedying those concerns.

Another thing that we heard, and we heard it on a regular basis during the December Throne Speech Debate and the Introduction of the Legislation, of what a grand and wonderful job this new government had done in being able to bring in something like 20 or 25 bills. This was lauded by members of the Treasury Bench and, particularly, the Attorney-General as being a major accomplishment of this government; one that they could pride themselves on, a record that had not been equalled by any other administration in the province.

Well, here we have a situation where we've had a centrepiece bill of this government, The Land Protection Act; that bill, I remind you, Mr. Speaker, and I remind the Minister of Agriculture that he brought in last year, it was flawed with legislation drafting errors. It was flawed in its total concept. It was completely unacceptable to probably 99.9 percent of the Manitobans who viewed that bill because it had the basic 10 acre restriction in there and, after that, he would deem who was fit to own more land. Those were the objectionable parts of that bill that caused the Minister of Agriculture last year to withdraw it. He had an entire summer and fall to go back to the drawing board, to undertake that consultation process that they have prided themselves on in government with the effected people in Manitoba that wanted to see this legislation changed.

Having done that, Mr. Speaker, they came in with a bill once again, as is obvious by the number assigned to the bill, Bill No. 3, they assigned a great deal of government importance and priority to this Bill No. 3. The Attorney-General is asking, what has to be said about the bill. He will hear enough about the bill in due course. I remind him that, as he grows older, it is often viewed on this side that he hasn't necessarily gotten wiser, and there are examples immediately behind him to demonstrate that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister had opportunity to consult with affected Manitobans and bring in legislation which should be more in tune with the aspirations and desires of Manitobans, but we understand the reason this bill has been held up and not called in the last number of weeks is that there are amendments coming

into this bill. Amendments to a bill that was drafted and presented last year and withdrawn; amendments to a bill that was their centrepiece, that was their forward legislative thrust; there are amendments coming in. We haven't seen the amendments. We hear that they are possibly going to come in and that is why the bill hasn't been called. Well, you know, the Minister of Agriculture can confirm or deny whether there are amendments, because certainly to make this bill acceptable there will have to be amendments because, once again, Mr. Speaker, the concept and the drafting of this bill are abysmal. That is something that has been pointed out by one of the major farm groups who have viewed this legislation; theoretically, one of the groups that this Minister of Agriculture and this government would have asked an opinion of the new legislation. The Manitoba Farm Bureau should have been consulted in this legislation but, Mr. Speaker, in what we see as an open government and a government that consults, they obviously didn't talk to the Farm Bureau on this piece of legislation, because the Farm Bureau have some major concerns over the way this bill was drafted and some of the legislative intents in this bill.

They criticized the Minister in his lack of consultation with them. That led to the Minister of Agriculture sending out to every rural paper, around the middle of January, a letter to the editor - Uruski - and this one happens to be in the Grandview Exponent. In that letter, he has to take the Farm Bureau to task for their criticism of him in his legislation. They are presenting the views of the farm community, which the Minister of Agriculture said he consulted with to develop this bill; the major voice of the farm community finds flaws in it because they weren't consulted, and that leads to the Minister of Agriculture sending a letter to the editor, to each and every rural paper in Manitoba, condemning the Farm Bureau for being - if I might paraphrase and the Minister of Agriculture can correct me - rather two-faced on the issue, because he says and I will quote - in the first paragraph of Mr. Uruski's letter, he says, "The Bureau's position is questionable, when you consider that they strongly urged the previous government to close obvious loopholes in farmlands legislation." Now that the loopholes are to be closed, the Farm Bureau is saying, "We don't want you to close them so well." To me, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture is calling in to question the integrity of members of the Farm Bureau of Manitoba and this is one of the groups he prides himself on consulting with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in tabling, this bill has been fraught with problems since the Minister introduced it, with some rather questionable information presented to the Legislature where he indicated we were getting the same information that the media was getting. That, Mr. Speaker, was proven to be patently false. We attempted to censor the Minister on that and failed. Mr. Speaker, now we have the Minister out with letters to the editor, pointing out how wrong the Farm Bureau is in their criticisms of this. We have the Minister of Agriculture apparently coming in with amendments.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should see these amendments to see whether they address some of the obvious flaws in the bill, because there are flaws. I want to point one out in basic principle to the Minister just for consideration to see whether his amendments are going to rectify this problem. You can have a

situation in Manitoba where a young man establishes a farming operation, and let's say he establishes this farming operation in 1976 or 1977. He purchased his land and he purchased a complement of machinery to farm that. During the drought of 1980, the high interests of 1981, and the frost of 1982, he has found himself in severe financial constraints. He has to get out of farming, but in getting out of farming he wants to preserve his land base because he has the full intent of returning to that farm should he be in a financial position to undertake a new start in farming. Now, anyone with that objective in mind, Mr. Speaker, the last thing that person is going to do is to give up the ownership of his land. He's going to keep and protect, at all costs, his land base because when he re-enters farming, no doubt agriculture will be on an upswing, and if it is on an upswing, he will in all likelihood not be able to purchase land at the kind of dollars he's got invested from '76, '77.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's consider this young man in farming and let's say that he cannot find an employment opportunity in Manitoba. He can't get on, obviously, with Kimberly-Clark or Shell because those two operations are closing. Versatile are laying off people he can't get on there, so where does he go? He may go down to Newfoundland to work on the offshore oil rigs and get his stake back so that he can get back into farming.

Mr. Speaker, when he leaves the province, he becomes a non-resident owner of land. He's still a Canadian, he's still a Manitoban, but he's a non-resident and the Minister of Agriculture's board can force him to divest himself of the very thing that he wants to protect the most, his land base. That's the kind of poor drafting and ill-conceived legislation that we're debating in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture laughs because the Minister of Agriculture does not have an understanding of what his bill can do to the family farm in the Province of Manitoba. We intend, Mr. Speaker, over the course of debate on this bill, to point out once again to the Minister of Agriculture the errors in his ways of developing this bill without proper consultation with the farm community, the Farm Bureau and other interested farm groups in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture - and I don't often provide him advice which is good, I prefer to provide him with bad advice so he makes lots of mistakes, but in this particular issue I want to provide him with good advice, with sound advice, and with wise advice. I would ask him to seriously consider the concerns that are raised by Manitobans, concerns that are raised by the Farm Bureau and concerns that are going to be raised on this side of the House in terms of changes which have to be made in this legislation to make it so that it does not adversely impact on the family farm, as it will in the case I described of a man who has to leave this province to find gainful employment to re-enter agriculture at some future date.

If the Minister is truly concerned about agriculture and the future of agriculture and the family farm in the Province of Manitoba, he will listen to our concerns, to the Farm Bureau's concerns, to the farmers' concerns and he will make appropriate amendments to this bill to make it suit the purposes of the legitimate ideal of protecting Manitoba farmers from absentee foreign

speculators who from time to time attempt to purchase farmland in Manitoba. The way this bill is structured, Mr. Speaker, it does not do that. At the same time it imposes severe restrictions on Manitobans in their effort to retain ownership of land. Mr. Speaker, I only point out once more in the Minister of Agriculture's letter where he criticized the Farm Bureau, he says in the third paragraph and I'll quote: "In fact, however, the legislation will enable many Canadians to purchase farmland." Mr. Speaker, that is an indefensible position that the Minister of Agriculture has put into writing to every paper in rural Manitoba. This legislation will not enable many Canadians to buy land. If the Canadian happens to live in Toronto, if the Canadian happens in Saskatchewan, he cannot purchase farmland but yet the Minister in his letter to the editor says it will enable many Canadians to purchase farmland. He is not telling the truth in the farm papers in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

What he should say if he wanted to be correct is that this legislation will enable many Manitobans to buy land - that is correct. But by saying it will enable Canadians to purchase land, he is incorrect. What he is trying to refer to, I think, Mr. Speaker - and I hate to put interpretations on what this Minister of Agriculture says - but I think what he's trying to justify is the ability in the legislation for someone who is willed land by farm parents who live in Manitoba and due to their unfortunate death, they will the land to children who happen to be resident in Alberta, he will enable them to inherit their rightful ownership of family property. That is a far cry, Mr. Speaker, from the clear implication the Minister has left that Canadians will be able to purchase land. Receiving an inheritance is a far cry from the concept of purchase to all Manitobans and to all Canadians. The Minister is not correct in the impression he's leaving in his public pronouncements on the intent of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we intend to continue to debate this bill, to probe this Minister for answers and to urge him to make the proper amendments to this bill to make it fit the needs for control over absentee foreign speculators on farmland in the Province of Manitoba. We will assist him in that goal but, Mr. Speaker, we will not assist him in bringing in the kind of controls that are going to be inherent on Manitobans and Canadians in this bill.

So we look forward, over the next few days, to seeing the kinds of amendments that we hear the Minister proposing to this legislation which, I remind him once again, has been in the process of drafting for 17 months by this Minister. We look forward to amendments that now he has to bring forward after his so-called consultative process with affected parties in Manitoba.

We will debate this issue in future times, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. A. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, had we had some earlier indication from the Government House Leader we would have been quite prepared to proceed with the debate on this bill, but since no one on the opposite side appears to be in a position to defend it, we will have to take the adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: On a point of order. The Member for Pembina, having spoken, cannot second the motion to adjourn. Perhaps another seconder could be found.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: I presume that when this question is next called the Member for Thompson can rise on his feet and speak to it.

Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 6, followed by 7, followed by 14, followed by 15?

BILL 6 - THE PESTICIDES AND FERTILIZER CONTROL ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture Bill No. 6 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have a few remarks to add to this piece of legislation that's before us. I'm wondering, on these changes that are before us if in fact the program with the government, has implemented to get rid of the pigeons around this building, is included in this legislation because strychnine after all is a registered pesticide. It's rather strange to note, Mr. Speaker, since the members opposite who have implemented this program, we don't see pigeons around this building anymore. They've wiped them out, wiped them out completely. I'm a lover of birds and a bird watcher but, Mr. Speaker, we used to see the birds rest on this building and a lot of birds used it for their home. Last year it took me a long time to get this response from the Minister of Environment. I questioned him many times during the Session as to how he was making out with his report and he told me it was coming, it was coming, but finally I got it when the Session was over.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting in his comments regarding the death of that unfortunate bird, he says in here that the cause of the death of that pigeon was diagnosed as strychnine toxicosis and trauma. — (Interjection) — Trauma, right. He goes on, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister responsible for the Environment and he says that, "Strychnine is a registered pesticide for pigeon control, with its use restricted to approved pest-control

operators." So I honestly think now that this does apply under this legislation, and I'm keenly interested as to how the Minister of Agriculture is going to deal with it.

The Minister says in this letter of June 11th, "That pigeon control at the Legislative Building grounds is a matter of concern to me and alternate measures for control, such as discouragement of roosting, or biological control, are being considered co-operatively with the Department of Government Services." So my questions are very brief, Mr. Speaker.

Because of the fact that strychnine is a registered pesticide for pigeon control as mentioned in the Honourable Minister's letter, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in the definition section of the bill, because it mentions rodents and it mentions animals but it has no mention of birds in the definition section, and possibly the Minister could advise me if a pigeon is a rodent or an animal, and does apply. The letter says strychnine and avitrol are registered pesticides under the Act. I certainly would like to have the comments of the Minister of how he intends to deal with that or whether that is going to be included in the bill. On the other hand, I'm wondering if the Crown is exempt from the legislation, or by the Act as proposed by the Honourable Minister. So I sincerely hope that the pigeons do have a chance to survive in the province, especially around this building which has been their home for so many years and the Minister will help me and people like myself that do like to see the birds flying around, especially this building, if he will see if that's going to be included in the Act, or the amendments that are before us.

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

MR. B. RANSOM: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This bill was introduced by the Minister of Agriculture. Members on our side have raised some issues about this bill. Normally the Minister is here to close debate and respond to some of the concerns that have been raised. The Member for Roblin-Russell was the last speaker on our side. We were prepared to pass this bill today but we do want to hear some of the answers from the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I was planning to adjourn the bill but I was not in my seat and I expected the Member for Roblin-Russell to speak a little longer. I would move then, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member for Thompson, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 7 - THE DAIRY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 7, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have just a few comments to lay on the record with regard to this particular bill. My understanding is that a group

within the Department of Agriculture has existed for some period of time that has dealt with the matters that the Minister attempts to have this board brought forward and established.

It seems to me and I'm wondering why the Minister is attempting to bring forward the establishment formally of this particular board. I read through his speaking notes at the time and he seems to indicate that he no longer wants civil servants to act exclusively on this particular board, that in fact there should be outside members. I guess I have to question the whole strategy of setting up yet another political board within the whole dairy industry and I think we made some of these comments last night when we were moving into Estimates.

I'm well aware that the board, or whatever you wanted to call it because you couldn't call it a board or maybe it was an internal structure, has been there for a number of years. But I believe that its history has been such that it's drawn its membership from civil servants, from people within the Department of Agriculture. I'm wondering what the real intent is of expanding it such, that outside representation can come in, and as such make it yet another political board. I'd like to review the number of boards within that dairy industry.

First of all, naturally we have the politically appointed Milk Prices Review Commission and we made comments on that last night. Then the producers have their Milk Producers Marketing Board; that's not appointed, that's an elected board. Then we have also a Dairy Producers Association, I believe, which is a freely standing group of people who are allowed to come forward. Then over top of it all, particularly the producer board, we have the Manitoba Natural Products Marketing Council. Then within the processing sector we have a co-operative board. We have MANCO's elected board. That's an elected board of producers. It's not appointed, it's elected. I'm wondering whether or not we need yet another board within the whole dairy industry, even though it may have existed unofficially for a number of years. So I would like to lay that particular concern on the record, Mr. Speaker. We will then move to the duties and functions as indicated in the proposed bill, and one particular aspect of that concerns me. It says "... the board shall perform such duties and functions as may be given to it under this Act or any Act of the Legislature by the Minister . . ." and it's "or by the Minister" that concerns me.

I probably realize that indeed these are normal parts to duties and functions maybe on other boards, but again, I have some concern as to who and what is the real purpose of the particular board. Is there something other than what he says in his speaking notes, when he indicates that this particular group has existed for a period of time to determine the economic viability of proposed dairy plants in Manitoba?

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the reference to the Minister having the particular powers to direct the functions of this board, would lead one to believe that the group there assembled can do many more things than just look into the viability of plants. So I would hope that the Minister in closing debate on this particular issue would address those particular concerns.

Thank you.

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

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable members for their comments. The amendments as I recall, when I introduced the bill are basically housekeeping, to actually put into being what has existed for probably two decades in terms of the board function. Actually, it was a departmental recommendation to clear up some of the definitions dealing with the board in place. The member is correct that the majority of members on the board are staff persons. There are, I think, one or two laypersons on the board and they meet periodically if there are applications to the government for expansions, improvements to plants in the processing industry and in the milk industry. Those applications have to be approved by myself ultimately. However, those applications go through the existing dairy board; they then look at the viability of those applications that are made and that's how they are dealt with. So, Mr. Speaker, basically - I can't put any more words on it - it is recognizing what has existed for the last two decades and making sure that the Act is tidied up; no further changes in that.

In terms of other areas envisaged as to whether or not the board, as mentioned by the Member for Morris, should be disbanded, I believe that a review of applications, rather than just coming to the Minister, should go through some additional process set in - I guess why it was set up, so that any undue influence in terms of the politician involved in the approval of applications that the analysis would be done for them and if there were any problems with it, that analysis would have been done. I am assuming that was the reason for the establishment of that board. On the basis of that, I think in terms of fairness to the corporations who are applying, and to the Minister, whoever he or she may be at the time, that an independent view of those applications be made is certainly something that can't or shouldn't be argued with; that there is that process in place. Basically the amendments are, as I said, housekeeping.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry, you wanted No. 14 next?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 14, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. (Stand)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways, Bill No. 15, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Pembina. (Stand)

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Would you please call No. 27, Mr. Speaker? No, I'm sorry, I thought the Member for Fort Garry was in the House and he's not.

I think, Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House, I would ask that you call it 12:30 and if there's an

agreement there will be no Private Members' Hour and we may adjourn. If that's agreed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will accept a motion of adjournment.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, that this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday afternoon.