



**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. 39A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 5 APRIL, 1983.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 5 April, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

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

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

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

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to file the Annual Report of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission for the year 1982.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

### Rental Increases - statistics

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Housing. It follows on some questions that I placed with him yesterday. Mr. Speaker, what action does the Minister intend to take to assist the tenants of a St. Boniface apartment block, who received an unexpected annual increase of 41 percent in their rent, as a result of a decision of a government-appointed Rent Regulation Review Panel on an appeal in which they were not a party?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Housing.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, thank you. I'd like to thank the honourable member for giving me this opportunity to clear up some of the circumstances surrounding this whole issue. It was reported yesterday in the press that the landlord had applied for a 19 percent increase and received that. The landlord had, in fact, applied for an average increase of approximately 19 percent and in that application he had made it clear

that he would like to equalize the rents being paid for like suites in his complex. The Rent Regulation Officer, after a thorough review of the information that was supplied by the landlord, rolled that increase back to 5.5 percent and allowed for equalization. Contrary, as well, to reports in the press yesterday, there was an appeal to that decision. The landlord did appeal the decision and I have a copy of that appeal request and the result was that the panel met, they listened to representations from both the landlord and the tenants, and the result was an approximately 9 percent increase granted to the landlord and an equalization.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, as well that both the landlord and the tenants who were present at the appeal hearing were desirous of having rents equalized, and although there was substantial hardship to one tenant in this case, I understand that tenant did contact the Rent Regulation Bureau, and it was made clear to her that there would be some flexibility with respect to the back rent that she owed at that point.

The member will understand that part of the process is, that where a landlord makes an appeal, then by the nature of his appeal he opens up the entire block for a review and the appeal hearing is de novo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Does the Minister, Mr. Speaker, consider it reasonable that where this particular tenant had been satisfied with the increase that the landlord had originally asked for with respect to her suite, should be brought into the whole net and had a potential 19 percent increase made a 41 percent increase, because of a rent regulation review panel making a decision that went across the board?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, while the tenant may have been satisfied, obviously the landlord wasn't, because the landlord appealed that decision. As well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone denied - in fact, the tenant in question indicated in the press that despite the 41 percent increase, she was more than satisfied that she had an acceptable rent. I don't know what more the appeal panel can do. They have met the requirements; they have reduced the overall rent increase from 19 to 9 percent; they have equalized as both the tenant and the landlord have requested, and in the final analysis the tenant has said, yes, my rent is still fair despite this increase. They have, as well, agreed that the six hundred and some dollars should not have to be paid immediately and there is certainly a provision, I understand, been made between the landlord and tenant to arrange for a more appropriate repayment period.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, why then, if the Minister believes that the tenant has been satisfied, why is the tenant still pursuing this, even to the extent of writing the Ombudsman and asking for certain action to be taken? Obviously the tenant is not satisfied, so how does the Minister explain that?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I didn't suggest that the tenant was satisfied. Of course, the tenant would

have been satisfied if the rent hadn't increased. What I said was she still, by her own words, is satisfied that her rent is fair. I assume that if she understands that rent to be fair then I will accept her judgment that it is indeed fair. Of course, she would have preferred that equalization had not occurred, but the landlord and other tenants in the block had suggested that it was a desirable thing to do and the Appeal Panel acquiesced to that request.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying that under the NDP's highly touted rent controls that he considers a 41 percent increase in rents in one year to be a fair settlement and that a \$612 retroactive settlement to one tenant in 30 days is a fair way to handle rent controls?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I did not say that a 41 percent increase was fair. This is a highly unusual situation. All of the special circumstances are taken into consideration. She is not being required to pay back the entire amount in one lump sum. I would hope that it would be understood and clearly, exceptional cases do not prove the rule in this instance.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

### Grain prices - reduced

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. In view of the Federal Government's announcement today that the initial grain prices for grain producers will be substantially lower than they were last year, will the Minister of Agriculture make immediate representation to the Federal Government requesting that they do not lower them; that a lowering of them is totally unacceptable at this time in light of the current economic conditions in agriculture?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, indeed I should tell the honourable member that we are disappointed that the initial prices are lower, but we can understand the situation given the large supply and the weak world demand for grains, and of course the problems that have recently been created between the United States and the European economic community dealing with the marketing of grains.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, at this time as well, indicate that I would like to congratulate the Canadian Wheat Board for doing a good selling job on behalf of the farmers under these difficult circumstances. I'm pleased that the announcement was made as early as they did so the farmers can plan their spring seeding program in terms of what they believe should be planted.

But, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding what I have said, we have a great concern about this announcement because we believe that it will cause a decline in net farm incomes somewhere in the neighborhood of \$10 million to \$15 million in the Province of Manitoba.

We have made representations this morning to the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board,

and the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister responsible for Transportation that we believe that they should revise the initial prices upward during the course of this new crop year if markets begin to strengthen; to as well do an immediate calculation of cash flow estimates for the Western Grain Stabilization Fund and make cash advances to farmers early in the crop year in order to improve their cash flow situation; and as well request the Minister of Transportation to scrap his plans for introduction of revision to the statutory rate, the Crow rate in the Federal Parliament.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if he would table the representation or copies of the representation that he made to the Federal Government because this Minister has had a track record of saying he's made connection or communicated with them, but yet we have never seen any of the documentation or communications tabled in this Assembly. I would ask that the Minister table that information so that we can puruse it, Mr. Speaker.

I again request the Minister, ask him if he will not again make immediate representation to the Federal Government and lay out the specific details of what he has told this Assembly, the amount of costs that it will incur on the farm community.

### Interest Rate Relief Program re farmers

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Agriculture then. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there is an area that he can do something about, and in view of the fact that the Federal Government Farm Credit Corporation have lowered their interest rates to farmers through the Farm Credit Corporation, will he now lower the interest rates to the farmers from some 18 percent, that he is now charging them, to a more reasonable rate of something like the 12 percent that the Federal Government are charging? That is an area of his jurisdiction, and will he reduce those interest rates for Manitoba farmers through his Credit Corporation?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, on loans that are being made now, the interest rates have been at the current borrowing rate of the province. I believe that the long term borrowing rate of the province is somewhere in the neighborhood of 13 percent. The rates at MACC for present borrowing are in that vicinity, Mr. Speaker; that is presently the case.

Mr. Speaker, I will pleased to table a copy of the telex that was mailed, or forwarded to the federal official, that I had indicated earlier, later this afternoon.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Will he reduce the 18 percent loans, that he's been requested to reduce by the opposition, that he's charging to the farmers under previous loans made by farmers in Manitoba through MACC? Will he lower that rate from 18 percent?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I've dealt with this question before. The fact that — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, there is an opportunity available to anyone who has had a loan under the previous rates that they

can have those loans paid off at rates which they can borrow from other institutions at a lower rate. New rates in MACC are presently at the current borrowing rate of the province, Mr. Speaker, and that's where the situation is. The old loans are certainly under review. The five-year loans are under review and they are adjusted accordingly. Those rates that are in between the review period, Mr. Speaker, the option is open to the farmers to pay those loans off with loans of a lower interest rate.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, is there a penalty charged to those farmers for paying off those 18 percent loans?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that there is a penalty in MACC for paying off those loans, but I will take the specifics as notice and get that information to him.

### Removal of Dead Farm Animals - Operators

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Environment. Last year in this House, I raised a question about the problems that operators were running into, operators who were in the business of removing dead farm animals. At that time, the Minister indicated that he was consulting with these people. My question is can the Minister indicate how many of these operators are still in business at this time?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** As I indicated last year, that is a matter of concern to the government and an interdepartmental committee has been working on that. I will be pleased to review the question which the member provided to me with the committee and report back to him as soon as possible as to the exact number which he requested.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Why I raised the question with the Minister is because, apparently, I don't believe there are any operators left at all. I know that in the eastern region of the province, there is nobody that is in the business at the present time, and as a result farmers are experiencing difficulty in removal of the dead farm animals. What is happening at the present time is that certain farmers have been fined for not removing or burying of the dead animals and this creates a major problem at this time.

If the Minister is going to be checking into how many operators are in the business at the time, it is my opinion that there aren't too many. I am wondering, has he got some suggestion how these farmers are going to be getting rid of the dead animals that they have on their property at this time.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Well, as the member should be aware, there are regulations in place which do allow for the

burial of such animals and that those regulations are being enforced by the department, and I stand behind that enforcement. In fact, there are ways by which the individual farmer can dispose of dead animals and when it is done, we ask that it be done in accordance with the regulations which are intended to protect the public health. So if there are farmers that are being contacted and if there are farmers who are being fined for improper measures, then I would suggest that they are probably being fined because the measures which they have implemented are not in keeping with the regulations and if he is asking for a change in the regulations, that would be an entirely different matter. But I would not suggest that we would not be enforcing the regulations as they stand now.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** A final supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Can the Minister indicate how farmers are supposed to be burying dead animals at this time of year when there's frost six feet down in the ground?

**HON. J. COWAN:** Well, I would suggest that if there is a problem with dead animals that the farmers contact the public health inspector in the area or the environmental officer in the area and explain to them exactly what their problems are and work out a procedure which is acceptable to the department, acceptable to the farmer and is one which is in concert with the climatic conditions of the time. By doing so, they would most likely avoid being fined or avoid any sort of other penalties but at the same time, in conjunction with the department, will develop a procedure which will keep the public health foremost in mind and would be acceptable to all parties.

### Flin Flon - Capital Projects

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services concerning some remarks by the Mayor of Flin Flon a couple of days ago about the proposed Flin Flon office building. Is it true, as the Mayor has alleged, that there is monies now being spent on a study rather than government funds being spent on design or construction?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, in a recent report on television, I believe that the reference made by the honourable member is true, that there was a statement made by the television station - I don't know if it was the Mayor - that there was money being spent on a feasibility study - \$100,000 was allotted in the Budget for a feasibility study. That is not correct.

The \$100,000 that is being budgeted for the Flin Flon office building this year is for planning, specifications and then the tender documents and so on that have to be prepared in advance of the building actually undergoing construction. So it is the design work that has been budgeted for and will be carried out this particular fiscal year, Mr. Speaker, and not a feasibility

study. The feasibility for that building has been determined a long time ago, even by the previous New Democratic Government during the 1970s, that it was necessary to have a central office building in Flin Flon.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to ask the Minister, since there was a sod-turning ceremony in 1977 by the Schreyer administration, why that building did not proceed?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for that question.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** In 1977, Mr. Speaker, that building was ready to go ahead. As a matter of fact, the tender had not been let as such but had been processed, and the low bidder had been determined. However, the tender had not been awarded; that is all that was waiting to be done at that time. In November of 1977, the previous government froze that project the same as they froze all public construction at that time, Mr. Speaker, an indiscriminate freeze on public construction. The Flin Flon office building was one of the victims of that particular freeze and they cancelled the project in March and they're just saying from their seats that it wasn't needed, Mr. Speaker, so that is what the opposition thinks about the necessity of an office building in Flin Flon.

This government, the previous New Democratic Government, was committed to providing a central office building in Flin Flon. This government is committed to that and we will be sure that it will be constructed, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. S. LYON:** . . . sees your deficit, you may not build it either.

### Civil Service Commission - Hirings

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House if the agreement with the Manitoba Civil Service Commission stated that there would be no layoffs in the Civil Service at the present time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I think it's appropriate for the Minister of Labour, but I guess I can say I think the agreement covered people who were under the collective bargaining agreement.

### Disposal of Right-of-Way Properties

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Highways and Transportation. Last year we placed a number of questions to the Minister regarding the disposal of the property involved in abandoned railroad rights-of-way throughout the province. The Minister was having some review of the disposal methodology. Is the abandoned right-of-way properties that are now vested with the province being disposed of to the adjacent landowners as was in the works about a year-and-a-half, two years ago?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, that is correct, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Can I assume from the Minister's answer that there are no basic changes from the disposal to municipalities and to adjacent land owners?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, the policy that was announced about a year ago is still in effect, Mr. Speaker. I might add to that the Interdepartmental Planning Board has raised a number of questions with respect to the policy, but the policy is as it was a year ago and we are implementing it.

### Alcan Aluminum Project

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable First Minister. Last week's Annual Shareholders' Meeting of the Alcan Aluminum Corporation, and as reported on by Maclean's business writers in last week's copy of the Macleans, indicates how well Alcan has endured the recession. I don't want to get in trouble with the Deputy House Speaker, but analysts talk about the fact that the aluminum industry will be going "great guns" over the next couple of years. It points out that out of a work force of 74,000 people, only 800-some had to be laid off during this recession. It indicates the President saying that the next few years will be great years for Alcan. My question specifically is - a Miss Ann Beirne, writing for the business column of the Macleans, Mr. Speaker, "The President of Alcan reports to their shareholders that the company will be spending \$2 billion in Quebec."

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Does the honourable member have a question?

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

**HON. R. PENNER:** On the material circulated by you or at your direction to the House with respect to questions, reports and returns issued no doubt as guidelines, one of the things that is suggested with respect to Oral Questions is that a Minister should not, or a member should not be asked an oral question regarding whether or not statements made in a newspaper - and that would cover any publication - are correct or not.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I haven't yet heard the honourable member's question. I'm not sure whether that was what he intended.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** As usual, the Attorney-General is right and I'm wrong, but I wanted to lay some groundwork for the fact that, unlike some of the successful propaganda that has been propagated by members opposite that due to the recession nothing was happening in aluminum, Alcan is spending \$2 billion in Quebec. My question to the First Minister is: has he opened up any meaningful negotiations, in view of what's happened in the aluminum industry with Alcan, about inviting them back to look seriously at Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, those negotiations were never closed. If we go back to the original release, the honourable member will indicate that Alcan continues to have an interest in Manitoba, that it discontinued its efforts during that particular period of time because of the recession that the honourable member has referred to. — (Interjection) — Well, the honourable members maybe don't like the truth, and if they don't like the truth that's their business, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the shareholders were also told that the Alcan Aluminum Company is quite prepared to work with governments, provincial governments, that are prepared to work with them. My question to the Honourable First Minister, Mr. Speaker - it's awfully important, it's very important to my constituency - if he is telling me that there are ongoing negotiations now, that perhaps that's one of the reasons why the Minister of Energy is absent, that he is carrying on any kind of negotiation with Alcan officials now, I'll be very happy if the Honourable First Minister can tell me that is the case.

I ask the question again because we get these kind of motherhood statements from Ministers and the First Minister all the time. I'm . . .

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** The member is rising in his place and protesting that a question he says was asked was not answered. In fact, he simply told us what would make him happy; we know what would make him happy. There are many things that would make him happy. That is scarcely, in question period, the time to hear personal confessions of what would make people happy. I would hate to hear what the Member for Pembina, what would make him happy, if anything. But that is not what question period is for.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister: which Minister of the Crown or which senior civil servant has contacted Alcan Aluminum Company officials during the last month?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I accept the First Minister as taking these questions as notice. I want them taken as notice; he will be asked about them. I would like to then also ask the First Minister to accept as notice the question: when is the next scheduled meeting of officials of Manitoba to meet with Alcan officials with respect to the aluminum smelter in Manitoba?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister that is responsible, the Minister of Energy and Mines, will be quite pleased to provide a report at the appropriate time. I would take the question as notice. I don't know whether or not there are any meetings that are lined up over the next month or so.

Alcan indicated very very clearly, if honourable members would retrace their steps to the date of the issuance the news release by Alcan, that they were deferring negotiations in view of the recession. I have a copy of that Globe and Mail article of March 25th, that the honourable member is referring to, in which Alcan referred to its very, very substantial loss, but it was considerably less than the \$60 million U.S. loss reported for the fourth quarter of 1982. So Alcan has had a very difficult time, and I'm sure at a time that Alcan considers it appropriate, from their point of view, they will wish to further discuss.

I should also remind honourable members it was Mr. Colver who, at the time of the issuance of the release, indicated that it would be a falsehood on the part of any individuals, any members to suggest that Alcan had deferred negotiations for political reasons, that it deferred negotiations because of the recession.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I will look forward to the First Minister's answers on the ones that he's accepted as notice.

### Demonstration at U.S. Consulate

Another question to the Honourable First Minister. Yesterday in defence of the indefensible, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister on several occasions referred to some strange silly galoot wearing a mask as being the flag burner. On another occasion, he refers to as a someone wearing a mask. Well, Mr. Speaker, my question to the Honourable First Minister. I think there's something we can all agree on, that side of the House and this side of the House, that surely we know that it wasn't the Lone Ranger, Mr. Speaker. If it wasn't the Lone Ranger, is it per chance a third Cabinet Minister that didn't want to reveal himself at that ceremony.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to observe the film on T.V. and the stature and size of the individual in question would be more appropriate to the size and stature of the Member for Lakeside.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

## Alcan Aluminum Project

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister. Can the First Minister advise, if he's so confident that ongoing negotiations on Alcan are proceeding so swimmingly, can he advise why it is that Alcan is committing \$2 billion, as my colleague has mentioned, to construction in Quebec and zero dollars to construction in Manitoba? That's the first branch of it.

No. 2: Can he advise the House if Alcan has acquired any options on land in Manitoba, which they gave up after the NDP Government came into office?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the Leader of the Opposition would attempt to mislead the House as to the comments that I'd made a few moments ago. I said that negotiations weren't going swimmingly, I said that indeed they had been deferred because of the recession; those were my precise words. I did not at any point, Mr. Speaker, indicate that the negotiations were proceeding swimmingly.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Leader of the Opposition withdraw any suggestion that I made any such comment in this House.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, has Alcan taken up any options on the purchase of land in Manitoba, which options were abandoned by Alcan after this incompetent bunch came into office?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker. I don't know, I would have to ascertain whether or not that be the case. I would be surprised if it was, because of the statement that was issued by Mr. Colver some 10 or 11 months ago, Mr. Speaker. I think that the Leader of the Opposition himself knows that it's unlikely. I'm not going to be able to give him a guarantee or assurance in this House they haven't picked up some of the option, no.

## Payment of Wages Fund - Terry Balkan employees

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. While we were in government, Mr. Speaker, we established a Payment of Wages Fund to assist employees who had not been paid their wages as a result of a shutdown or closing. Could the Minister of Labour take some action on behalf of the employees of Terry Balkan Chevrolet Oldsmobile Ltd. of apparently being without wages since at least last October? Now could she take some action to provide some compensation to them from the Payment of Wages Funds while the proceedings are ongoing to attempt to recover the funds from Mr. Balkan?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to inform the House, and the member who asked the question, that we are pursuing assistance

to these workers. We are at this point investigating the best way to handle that, but we feel very strongly that these workers deserved to be assisted in every way possible and we will do that.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear that expression of opinion from the Minister, but the employees have been without these wages since at least last October.

I ask her, can she take some action today to provide some compensation to them, particularly in view of the reports that they have debts, they're out of money; the money is sitting there earning interest, as one indicated, and they're paying interest on their debts.

In view of the fact there has been at least a six-month delay, can she not take some immediate action to compensate these employees whilst the department takes its own proceedings to attempt to enforce a judgment against Mr. Balkan?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, we are pursuing this particular situation as quickly as it can possibly be pursued and we are assisting the employees in every possible way to attain the wages that are rightfully theirs.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, the Payment of Wages Fund was set up to compensate employees for wages which they had lost. It was not set up to wait over six months to provide some compensation to the employees. I'm asking her, not just for assistance, I'm asking her if she would take some steps today to provide some payment of wages to these employees under this fund which we established and not just sympathy. They need money, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, I will be delighted to hear that kind of support when we bring in the changes to the Payment of Wages Act, which will make wages a priority. That is what's going to happen. Wages are at this point not a priority. That's one of the situations we intend to rectify.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, the employees don't need changes in legislation, they need some money.

## Unified Family Court Project

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Attorney-General. In the Throne Speech, there was an indication that government is considering the introduction of a unified family court, Mr. Speaker. Could the Attorney-General indicate what, if any, action he proposes to take on that statement?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, indeed I and senior officials in my department have been working intensively on that project. I've had discussions with the Federal Minister of Justice; I've had discussions with the Administrator of Court Services; I've had discussions with practitioners in the field. I have been working with my senior officials in bringing forth or designing a program to be brought forth. I expect that I will be able to bring a proposal forward to caucus and Cabinet



before the end of this month, and it is my hope to bring in enabling legislation sometime during the month of May.

### Family Court Delays

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Just a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the Attorney-General, in bringing forward those proposals, consider what I am informed is now a six-month delay in contested domestic cases in the Court of Queen's Bench.

**HON. R. PENNER:** That indeed is one of the factors which leads me to give this particular project high priority. Because of a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada with respect to the jurisdiction of provincially appointed judges in family-related matters, many more matters than would normally be the case had to be filed in the Court of Queen's Bench. Indeed, there is a six-month delay in contested matters and that is a source of great concern to myself and, of course, to the individuals involved and to the practicing bar. That is why, as I say, high priority is being given to the project.

It had been my hope, in fact, that we could have persuaded the Federal Government to agree to constitutional amendments under Section 96 of The Constitution Act of 1867 to enlarge the jurisdiction of provincially appointed judges in family-related matters, but the Minister of Justice federally is not now inclined to agree to that proposal even though all 10 provinces supported that proposal.

### Tabling of telex to Hon. A. J. MacEachen

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I promised to table a copy of the telex forwarded by myself to the Honourable Alan J. MacEachen, Minister of External Affairs, which telex was dated March 31, 1983.

### Manitoba Horse Racing Commission

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism if she will be tabling the report of the Manitoba Racing Commission in the near future. It is now three months after the close of the fiscal year of the Manitoba Racing Commission.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I understand it's customary for that report to be tabled in the committee hearings, and that's when I intend to table it.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary if I may, under the report submitted to the Legislature under Economic Development and Tourism, it has Horse Racing Commission. It says, "The Commission to report

annually to the Minister within three months after close of fiscal year. On receipt, Minister to table report in the Legislature forthwith, if in Session; if not in Session, 15 days of commencement of the next Session."

I ask the Minister when she will be tabling the report of the Manitoba Racing Commission?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I will table it as soon as I possibly can.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Before Orders of the Day, may I direct the attention of honourable member to the gallery where we have 60 students of the Adult Education from the Red River Community College. The students are under the direction of Mrs. Braid and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

### HANSARD CLARIFICATION

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a correction in the Hansard of yesterday. On Page 1384, the first column, about half-way down, there is a sentence that says, "There is a mechanism for that." It should read, "There is no mechanism for that." Thank you.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve into a Committee to consider 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 Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture; and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Labour.

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

#### SUPPLY - LABOUR

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** Committee please come to order. We are still considering Item 1.(b)(1) - the Honourable Minister.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Chairman, I have several items that were asked for last evening and I would like to share that information with my colleagues.

The first is the Report of the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women. It's a report on their activities between December 1982 and March 1983,

obviously an interim report, as their initial mandate was to report to me at the end of six months.

The second item is the senior staff changes requested by the member between December 1, 1981 and April 5, 1983, and I will pass those along to the Member for St. Norbert.

A copy of the report of the Department of Labour and Manpower - it was called then - for the year 1982 is also available for the member. It is still in the printing stages, however, so this is the draft copy.

Another question that was raised had to do with the CN-CP decision to seize the rebate of the Medicare allowance. I have information on that as follows: The railways were deducting the 1.5 percent health and education tax from the Medicare allowance, resulting from the fact that employees in Manitoba do not pay premiums for Medicare. The Medicare allowance is contained in the 1981 collective agreement.

On September 30, 1982, Vic Schroeder, the Minister of Finance, wrote to both railways outlining their responsibility in paying the levy. The unions took the matter through the grievance procedure. It has now gone to arbitration and the case is expected to be heard within the next two weeks. So that's the status of that situation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for the information that she's provided. I would be very interested in hearing the results of this last matter that's going to arbitration, with respect to the railway employees. I wonder if the Minister, when she receives that information, could simply send me a note and let me know what the result is of that.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Of the arbitration? Certainly. I'm sure the member is aware that it's not under our arbitration - it's Federal, yes - but when we do hear of the result, we will be glad to share it.

There is one other item that came up that I would like to pass along some information on, and that was whether or not Darlene Meakin has been hired or is working, and my information is that she is working as the Media Specialist with the Information Services Branch.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I again thank the Minister for that information.

I note in the report and activities of the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women, which the Minister appointed, that the council met with a number of organizations in Item No. 3, one of which includes the Morgentaler Defence Committee. Has the Advisory Council taken a position or made a recommendation to the Minister with respect to that matter?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** No, they have not. The practice that has been adopted by the Advisory Council in the structure of their meetings is that they have a business meeting in the morning, and in the afternoon part of their meetings they hear representations from various groups who have some piece of information that they wish to share with the Advisory Council. They receive these for information and whether or not anything

comes out of that as a recommendation to the Minister is something that we will have to see at the end of the six months as they define their mandate and so on.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I have one other item I'd like to deal with relating to a question I asked the Minister yesterday on the committee appointed to seek out employment opportunities for those 132 workers laid off by Kimberly-Clark. I'd asked her how many jobs had been obtained for workers through that committee. I wonder if she has a response to that question now.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** That information is being prepared. We are doing a follow-up on all of the employees to see exactly what their employment status is right now, and I will be glad to share that with you as soon as the information is fully prepared.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, has the Minister and her department been a part of similar committees with respect to other layoffs which have occurred over the past year? I went through a list of significant layoffs the other day: Versatile, Schneiders, Shell, and the list went on and on. Have similar committees been appointed in each one of those instances?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** I would say that there has been an attempt to seek alternatives to attempt to deal with the problem of layoff and redeployment and so on, but the committees, of course, are not the same in each case. In fact, in some cases there may not be a committee per se, we may deal with it in a different way. But in each situation where there is a termination, there certainly is an attempt, and it's an interdepartmental attempt, to deal with alternatives. Now, when you have a layoff, where there is a recall date given, then you have a slightly different situation and I could relay to you the situation in Thompson where we had an extended layoff and simply nothing else to do in a one-industry town, and where we did move in and I actually worked out with all of the parties involved a very successful work program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b)(1) - the Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I don't know if this is the appropriate place to ask for the explanation, but - the Member for Radisson says probably not, so we'll take a chance.

In the Minister's opening remarks she included a reference to the fact that Manitoba, during the past year, had the lowest CPI increase of any province in the country, I think she said, or one of the lowest CPI increases. I'm just wondering whether or not, somehow by implication, she or her department are taking credit for their actions having resulted in that conclusion.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Well, if I could correct the member's recollection here, I believe that what was said was that Winnipeg had the lowest CPI of any of the cities surveyed, and I believe that is 15 major cities or so across Canada. I didn't say "Manitoba" of the provinces; I said "Winnipeg" of the cities.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I am just wondering, Mr. Chairman, how she sees that as relating to the efforts of her department in resulting in that low increase.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** I'm really not sure that this is the place where we discuss this, but I will say that the purpose in explaining the low CPI and so on is to put everything into perspective. We don't operate in isolation. We don't exist in isolation, and everything that we do is of course relative to what is happening around us. That was the point that I was making.

**MR. G. FILMON:** What then is the relevance of the low CPI increase to the efforts of the Minister's department?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Does the Minister wish to make a reply?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** I am not sure of the point that the member is trying to make or what he's trying to question. It is incredibly relevant to all Manitobans and particularly to people in Winnipeg that their cost of living has not skyrocketed as it has in some other parts of Canada. When one is looking at the situation in Manitoba, or specifically in Winnipeg where half our population does live of course, one has to do it in light of the relationship to expenses, to costs, to what is happening because of a whole lot of other reasons, which of course are not particularly the result of anything that my department does, but is the result of what happens in a whole lot of other areas, many of them outside of the province, you know, impact from outside of the province that I don't think we should be discussing here and at this point in the Estimates. But there is a relevance between employment, people's living conditions, what their needs are and so on, and what is happening around them.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister is making my point for me. That type of information seems rather superfluous to the Estimates of the Department of Labour and to the activities of the Department of Labour. I don't see that it has any relevance whatsoever. If it does have any relevance, the Minister might just as well refer to the fact that we've had the mildest winter in the last 10 years, or the fact that we had fewer forest fires last year than we had in the past five years, or the fact that we didn't have any flooding last year to speak of. It seems to me that it doesn't have any place whatsoever in her opening remarks. I would just make the point that I think her remarks in relation to her responsibilities should have some relevance to this department.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b)(1) - the Honourable Minister.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that when we properly discuss statistics under the Research and Planning Branch of my department, I can share with the member some important facts about why we gather research and why it is relevant to the entire situation. I don't think comments on my opening remarks, continued comments on them are appropriate now. That should have been done last night.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, just following on the normal practice that used to be carried out by the Minister's party in opposition, the reasoning was that

anything that came under General Administration was relevant to this department and anything that your opening statement contained was relevant to General Administration of the department. We're just carrying on a practice that was established by the Minister's party in opposition.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b)(1)—pass; 1.(b)(2)—pass; 1.(c)(1) - the Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Minister has some opening remarks she wishes to make about this section.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** I'd like to just briefly explain what the section's about, if you wish.

Basically, I would just like to inform the members present that the goal of the Women's Bureau is to provide a variety of services to and for working women or for those wishing to enter or re-enter the work force, and through such services to promote equality of men and women in the labour force. They are involved in a number of activities including career counselling, acting as consultants and resource personnel at seminars, workshops, conferences and so on. They work to create public awareness of women's contributions in the labour force, as well as certain conditions that exist in the workplace, and they act as resource persons to special committees, particularly in the other areas of involvement of our department. They participate in the planning and delivery of government programs and particular initiatives, and they maintain and provide an up-to-date resource centre of print and audio-visual materials for use by the public at large.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, we have no disagreement at all with the work done by the Women's Bureau. I just wonder if there is anything extraordinary, or significant new activity that will be carried on this year.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** One area that I think that the staff members from the Women's Bureau have been particularly helpful to us in is sitting on the committees that deal with such situations as plant closures and working with us to try to resolve some of those situations.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Are there any new seminars or booklets on any new subjects that will be printed and circulated during the coming year?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** The career selector has been completely revised and is being distributed at this point, I believe. You may be familiar with the brochure itself. It's a series of brochures and that has, as I say, been updated, revised and is ready for distribution.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I believe I asked last year to be put on the mailing list.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** If you're not receiving it, we'd like to know that. We assumed you were on the mailing list. The caucus office - most MLAs do receive this material as it comes out, or a copy thereof. If you wish, we will be happy to check on that.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can indicate if there are positive indications of a continuing move towards equality in terms of opportunities and lessening of discrimination.

I'm aware of many committees that are operating both within the provincial Civil Service, the city Civic Service and other areas of the workplace who would probably be monitoring this. Do we have any statistical information as to how successful we're being in terms of this elimination of discrimination and equal work for equal pay and so on?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** I think there are several questions involved in what the member has just asked or stated, really, and I'd like to touch on a couple of them.

The Women's Bureau and I, myself, and in fact many people within the department have been involved in not only monitoring the entry of women into, let's say, non-traditional jobs or more women in workplaces where they have not been before, this is improving - the entry of women into these areas. The wage gap though, the basic wages earned by men and by women, there still is a large gap between them.

It is our intent this summer to proceed with an intensive study of the equal pay for work of equal value-situation and, as I say, we intend to get at that this summer and recommend to the government some movement in that area. All of these are rather ongoing problems and not problems for which we are going to find solutions overnight.

In some areas, we feel good about the progress being made; in others, we think that our investigation simply shows us that there is more to do than we thought in the first place. The Women's Bureau itself has, over various summers and particularly this last summer, done several studies of women in the workplace, one related to part-time work, another related to the impact of the use of VDT terminals and so on. So these studies are ongoing. The problem is becoming a bit more clearly defined and we intend to spend time this summer looking for solutions to it.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I'm wondering if there are any ways statistically that the department or the branch has of establishing whether or not we're headed in the right direction with the increased emphasis and increased awareness, or whether we just have a good feeling about it.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** There are perhaps three areas that I could touch on to share with the member. Indicators that we have are that women are entering the untraditional jobs more freely.

One of these is the counselling that is done by the Women's Bureau and the evaluation of their counselling clearly indicates that women are more consistently and more frequently thinking of jobs, and preparing themselves to enter workplaces where they have not, you know, had a high degree of visibility before.

Also the statistics from the community colleges and from the universities indicate that women are entering education patterns that they didn't before. As an example, at the university the number of women entering Engineering doubled this year from previous years.

**MR. G. FILMON:** What are the actual figures?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Well, that's just like saying how many, what was the . . .

**MR. G. FILMON:** They're from one to two.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** I think in the Engineering Program that it's probably greater than that.

Certainly with some of our high tech programs, we have indicated right from the beginning that if we are going to put high tech programs in place we want to be very sure that the people who are guiding the entrance into this are very aware that we feel that women have an equal place in those programs.

The statistics from the community colleges are encouraging. That's not to say that they were ever good before, in some of these areas they were dismal, and in fact in some places there were no women at all in the courses, but that is improving.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for providing me with a copy of this information on Career Selector, which appears to, and I hope it does this, opens up or describes virtually every occupation as being available to women.

I note, Mr. Chairman, in the department's report of last year, which the Minister has supplied me with a copy until it's printed, but last year the bureau staff were invited to Bruce Junior High School to counsel female students on occupational sex role stereotyping. I would think, Mr. Chairman, that is a very valuable function for the Women's Bureau to perform, particularly in junior high, so that young women do not grow up with the attitude that certain occupations or professions are closed to them and that they are all open to women.

I'm wondering whether the bureau attends at a junior high school only upon invitation, or are any steps taken by the Women's Bureau to make known to, say, junior high schools or high schools that these types of seminars are available from the Women's Bureau. If they haven't, if that type of correspondence or communication to schools has not taken place, I would hope that it could be, keeping in mind no doubt the financial constraints upon the operation.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** There are several ways that this is happening. I attended this year a symposium of this sort in Brandon which brought into Brandon high school students - I think about Grades 9 and 10, if I'm not mistaken - from all around the southwestern part of the province. This was a lesson, if you will, and a series of workshops in career opportunities available to them, the problems that they might run into in sexual stereotyping within various professions, how to combat

these. The workshops were led by women who had been successful and were currently successful in these various fields.

Another way that we have been spreading the word on this particular subject is through a symposium that was held last fall, was it? I think it was last June, a non-traditional career symposium. This was for women of any age. I believe that probably most of the women attracted to it were young adults who had perhaps had a start in some career which was probably more traditional and were wishing to branch out into other areas.

Also the Women's Bureau, as a group, is a member of SCAM which is a guidance counsellors' association and through that group is able to reach young people in schools and does this through invitation or through their activities in SCAM, through displays, and as a resource for the guidance counsellors themselves. So the information is getting out that way. We don't have to hold all the symposiums ourselves. We are able to use these other mechanisms for getting the word out.

We also have recently been invited to Norway House to give the same kind of sex role stereotyping elimination and opportunities for young people to go into any career that they choose to go into, not ones in which they have traditionally been cast. This is coming up I think in May, so the word is certainly getting out there.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** My question to the Minister, and actually I would like to make a comment because she didn't answer me in the House when I asked if she agreed with her colleague on the practice of sending the single mothers out to work for \$1 an hour, especially when she's expecting or telling us that she is looking for equal work of equal value. I would like an answer to that question probably at this stage.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** The program that the Member for Kirkfield Park is referring to is a work activity project for persons who are recipients of social assistance, and the \$1 an hour that she's referring to is not their pay, but is a grant made to them in recognition of the additional expenses that they might have, such as transportation, lunches and so on, while they are in training for the workplace.

What is being offered to these people, who may in fact be single mothers - may not be single mothers, I don't know, I don't believe that having children is a criteria for the program - is basic training to enter the work force. The hope is and that intent of the program is to match them up with employers so that at the end of the program they will have a job to go to. The \$1 an hour is not their salary at all.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Chairman, I certainly have a problem listening to the Minister try and justify sending anyone out to work for \$1 an hour, because no matter how you put it, it's work. I don't see how anyone is going to want to work for \$1 hour, and I don't see how anyone can justify it, especially a woman Minister of

Labour who is spouting the cause of women and telling us how much is going to be done for women.

Actually, the program, it started out as a work experience program, that's what the money was put in for and it was single mothers. These women didn't need training. They had been out of the job market for years and maybe sometimes not years, so it was just a matter of getting them into jobs at which they had experience or, if they hadn't had experience, at least they had experience in the workplace at one time. It wasn't a great wage, but at least it was a living wage. They did not have to depend on the government for a handout first and then \$1 an hour to go onto the job.

This new modified program that they're talking about is something altogether different. Whereas the first program was very successful, I question the success and I question that anyone would try and send people out for \$1 an hour, at the same time giving them handouts. I really find that I must say how greatly disappointed I am that you would even try to justify this program. I would think you'd be in there fighting to get the program back to where it was. Let's give these people some sense of value, because I don't care how you slice it, these people are being paid \$1 an hour to work.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Chairman, I gave the member the courtesy of an answer, even though the question she is asking is not related to my department. It is another department's program that she is talking about. I believe that the question she is asking is more appropriately raised under the Estimate discussion for that other department.

The fact though that it is in another department is simply an underlining of the answer that I gave her before. It is not an employment, a job creation program; it is a training program and it is set up to be a training program. The program that she is talking about is a work activity project and is under the Department of Community Services. It is not in Labour and Employment Services.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Minister is saying, and I also understand that it doesn't matter to me too much about whether it's the courtesy of replying to me. I am the member asking and I really don't need that courtesy, I expect it.

I will be bringing it up certainly under Community Services. What I am trying to relate to you is that here we have a Minister of Labour who is espousing the cause of women, equal pay of equal value. Not only that, the program that you're referring to, whether it's in your department or in someone else's department, didn't start out as a work activity project for this particular program. The success of it was work experience and it was placing women in jobs at a salary where they didn't have a handout. I would think that the Minister of Labour would especially be supportive of women in this field and trying to get them out to work, whether it's in her department or someone else's department.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Perhaps I could refer the member to a booklet called "Employment Programs and

Services for Women" in which pre-employment courses are outlined. Now within that, the describer of those pre-employment courses, clearly a training program, there is a description of the program that she is referring to. It says at the bottom, "Arrangements are made with employment services . . .," and that is not our department. That is a branch within the Community Services and Corrections ministry. "Arrangements are made to cover the costs of child care and transportation." That's the money that she is referring to, over and above social assistance or welfare payments, that are made to the people involved in these courses. It is not an employment situation, it is a training situation in which an additional grant is given to people who are taking the training in recognition of their special needs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** I only have one more thing to say on this, Mr. Chairman, and that is that I suggest that they go back and look at where the original \$125,000 was put and that was not a training program. It was to put women into jobs. It was not started out as a training program. The modified program certainly is working this way and I think it's working against what turned out to be a very successful program and I don't think it's worth the cost of having women have to take a handout from the government.

As I say, I won't say anything further in this area, but I suggest you look at the beginning of that program, because it was called a work experience and they were very successful in placing women. Every person that the Minister talked about in the House, Mr. Chairman, was placed under the old program.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Chairman, point of order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** What is the point of order?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** The point of order is that this is not in my Estimates and it is not an appropriate subject to pursue. I have been courteous enough to allow the member to question this and I have given her answers that I have. This is not within this department, and it is certainly not within the venue of the Women's Bureau, and I think that her remarks are more appropriately made within the Estimates to which she is referring. She was referring to dollar amounts, and so on, for which we have no point of reference.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I accept that it is in another department, but at the same time, if the Minister is going to tell me what this program is about, and I don't agree, then I'm going to tell her that I don't agree, but I'm going to let it lie there.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I'll take your promise. Item 1.(c)(1)—pass; 1.(c)(2)—pass; 1.(d)(1) - the Honourable Minister.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** The Research and Planning Branch is responsible for providing information and analyses in the labour relations and labour market areas in support of effective planning, management and policy development in the department.

The main objectives of the branch include the identification of current and future labour market needs in Manitoba; the analyzed labour-relation trends and conditions; they assess the performance and effectiveness of labour market programs; they provide the department with research and technical assistance; and they conduct studies and analyze information on policy-related issues.

In August of 1982, the Research Branch of the department was reorganized, resulting in a change of name, responsibilities and reporting relationship within the department. The role of the branch was expanded at that time to include a planning, as well as a research capacity, to become a centrally located information source reporting directly to the Deputy Minister.

During the past year, the branch focused with special emphasis in a number of priority areas. Labour market trends were monitored and analyzed, reports and briefing notes were prepared on a range of topics of special interest and concern. They worked to identify skill requirements and training needs - that was continued and support was provided for the development of the Canadian Occupational Projection System, which is known as COPS. The information on labour market trends and outlook was utilized in identifying training priorities and in preparing information for career counselling purposes. Work was initiated and expanded in data collection, analysis and reporting on labour relations climate in Manitoba, including preparation of a 1982 addition of the Collective Agreement Analysis Report, a calendar of collective agreement expirations, reports on work stoppages, and wage settlement information.

A number of outcome survey studies were conducted, investigating the linkage between occupational training and the labour market. Federal and Provincial Labour Market Programs continue to be monitored and analyzed. Activities included the preparation of a program inventory, analysis of the Unemployment Insurance Program and operational assessments of some departmental programs.

The branch assisted the department with the preparation of information for a number of interprovincial and Federal Provincial meetings on labour market matters. Special analyses were undertaken to support negotiations on the new Canada Manpower Training Agreement. Background papers were developed and a number of issues of concern to the department, for example, on technological change, job creation, worker participation, pensions, and so on.

In support of the longer term planning initiative the department wishes to pursue, the branch has developed information procedures and schedules for a planning process.

I have given you a rather lengthy introduction to this, because with the expanded direction and mandate of this department, I think it's important to outline their entire structure.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, with respect to labour market trends, could the Minister advise us what predictions the Research and Planning Department are making for the next year or so with respect to unemployment?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** The department's predictions for the unemployment rate, which I believe is what you want as translating from the employment rate, are pretty much in line with what the Conference Board of Canada has predicted for Manitoba. That would be in the range of 10.4, which is not too different from the current unemployment rate.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Over what period of time?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** That's 1983.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** During all of 1983. In view of the fact that I would expect that the number of people in the job market would expand, and given that there are currently 54,000 unemployed people in Manitoba according to the official statistics, how many people are predicted then to be unemployed in Manitoba by the end of the year?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** I think the best guesstimate is 53,000. Obviously, we're not trying to target an exact figure here but given that unemployment rate, given the labour force participation rate and so on, and given the nature of predictions at best, we will say approximately 53,000.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I take it, Mr. Chairman, that's given the announced policies of the government, is that correct?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Pardon?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** That's given the announced policies and programs of the government.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Much of the information, of course, that we have been talking about is based on Conference Board figures, which is where we get our basic figures of what is happening in Manitoba. The Conference Board obviously does not have information on the Jobs Fund or indications of potential impact. That's not a part of their base variables. So the implication and the impact of that particular job creation initiative is not a part of the projections that we're talking about here.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, then how much does the Minister predict that the number of unemployed will be reduced by the Jobs Fund?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** I believe that should be discussed under the Jobs Fund Estimates, Appropriation 29.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, we're talking to the Minister of Labour, we're talking about unemployment. We're talking about a problem that the Minister and the Premier and I agree is the No. 1 problem. They've announced a Jobs Fund; the Minister of Labour is supposed to play a co-ordinating role in that whole operation. She has indicated that according to the Research and Planning Department that it is estimated unemployment will continue at the rate of 10.3 percent in Manitoba this year resulting in some 53,000 unemployed people, supposedly down 1,000 from the current 54,000. I'm asking her what the effect of the Jobs Fund will be on that number of unemployed

people? How much does she anticipate the number of unemployed will be reduced? How many people are going to get jobs in 1983?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** I believe the member is asking a question to which the answer has so many variables that even if I did attempt to answer it here, as opposed to under the Jobs Fund itself where we have a whole special section of the Estimates where these questions can be asked, I think that it has to be understood that any answer to that question is going to depend on things such as how much involvement we have from the Federal Government in this initiative; how quickly the private sector picks up on the opportunities; how long the jobs are, of what duration the jobs are that are created; what the spin-off effects are of the jobs that are created, all of these things will have an impact on the unemployment figures. We hope to create many many jobs. We hope to have long-term benefits and lasting assets for the province and we hope that we will, while we are doing this, create opportunities for people to even enter new careers when those that they have had before are no longer viable. So there are all kinds of things happening, all kinds of variables that will impact on the unemployment figures.

To be able to predict with any accuracy the exact impact on a figure that we are seeing is only a prediction in the first place, I think, would be just a speculation in which I would not care to get involved.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister strengthens my conviction that the Jobs Fund is nothing but a jobs fraud fund, and that there really is little hope that the charade of this Jobs Fund is going to contribute in any significant way in terms of jobs for unemployed people in Manitoba.

We've seen the announcement of one program, the Careerstart Program, which is identified as a new initiative, is nothing but a continuation of a previous program. Our Finance critic has identified the fact that monies have simply been taken from other areas of spending and accumulated in a so-called Jobs Fund to provide some image-making for a government that has performed disastrously for the economy and for workers in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, in describing the functions that this department provides to the Minister, she referred to labour market needs. Does this Research and Planning Department investigate and analyze the effects of government taxation policies and their effects on employment opportunities in Manitoba?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** The department has not done any specific studies on what I believe the member may be referring to. I would ask that if he has any questions perhaps he could be more specific about them.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Has the department done any study on the effects of the payroll tax in Manitoba and whether or not it has, in fact, contributed to layoffs, or to conversion of full-time to part-time workers, or to reduction in rates of remuneration for workers?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** A specific study of that nature has not been undertaken by the department, but I think

it's important to note that the health and education levy came into effect July 1, 1982. The figures that we have between June, 1982 and February, 1983, which is the most recent labour force survey estimates that we have, seasonally adjusted employment in Manitoba declined by 0.9 percent compared with a national decline in seasonally adjusted employment of 1.5 percent during that same period. So certainly ours was a better record.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, if the Minister wants to compare, we had a much better record in Manitoba for unemployment during the previous four years of Progressive Conservative Government. We had no payroll tax. I suggest to the Minister that the payroll tax has adversely affected employment in Manitoba. Does the Minister intend to have the department do a survey of businesses in Manitoba and carry out some research and analysis of the effects of the payroll tax upon workers in Manitoba?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that during the years referred to by the member, the previous government years, that the unemployment record was poorer than it has been during our couple of years in government, not quite two years.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, during those four years over 30,000 jobs were created in Manitoba. In less than 18 months, we've lost almost 30,000 jobs. If she considers that to be a favourable comparison to the New Democratic Party's performance, I would welcome a challenge amongst the electorate at any time if she can persuade the First Minister to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister whether she, through the Research and Planning Department, would carry out an analysis and study of the effects of the payroll tax upon workers in Manitoba. Is her department going to do that in the next year?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Mr. Chairman, we can monitor that. There is no need for a study. The 30,000 jobs that the member referred to were created during the years that he referred to were in fact far below the national average. Our performance in the unemployment area is better at this point in time. Everything, of course, is relative and I would never say that we are at all satisfied with the situation as it is.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, how does the Minister propose to monitor the effects of the payroll tax?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** We will follow employment changes very closely if they occur.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** How?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** We will use the official data from Statistics Canada.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Will there be any communication with employers for information as to the changes?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** I believe the member is asking for a survey of attitude and that isn't something that we do. We deal with data.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** That's exactly what I am trying to do get the Minister to do, Mr. Chairman, is deal with data and deal with the employers and the businesses who are involved in either reductions of staff, or conversion of employees from full-time to part-time, or reduction in rates of remuneration as a result of the payroll tax.

Now I would have hoped, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister would have been independent enough and strong enough in her position to act on behalf of the workers in Manitoba. I think she has a mandate to do that and I wish she would take some action. It would appear that she's not going to take any action because other members of the government have made a decision to impose this tax on employment in Manitoba and I take it she's reluctant to act on behalf of the workers in Manitoba and tell them about the detrimental and adverse effects this tax is having on workers in Manitoba. So I'll go on, Mr. Chairman, to another matter.

Does the Minister, through the Research and Planning Department, undertake any studies or analysis of plant closings, of plant shutdowns in Manitoba, of layoffs in Manitoba, in order to determine whether the economic policies of this government and rates of increase in taxations, comparatively with other jurisdictions, are causing much of the unemployment in Manitoba, or reducing, or acting as a disincentive to investment in Manitoba?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** That has never been reported to us as a reason for a closing in those plant closings in which we have been involved. The major reason for plant closings at this point in time is technological change.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, before the opposition critic moves away from his concerns about the health and post-secondary education tax effect on employment in Manitoba, I wanted to make a couple of observations.

I believe that what he was seeking, Mr. Chairman, is an undertaking by the Minister that the Minister would study the effect of this tax on employment in Manitoba. If the Minister had in any way indicated that it was what she would be prepared to do, I would also like her to study the effect of the doubling of the unemployment insurance premiums on employment patterns in Manitoba, because we are knowledgeable enough about the effect of that; that the levy equals or surpasses the health and post-secondary education tax levy.

I would also be concerned, if the Minister is going to look at the effect of taxation policies on employment to broaden the scope, to look at all of the taxation, including hospital premium taxes and health taxes that are levied on employees in various jurisdictions throughout the country, and speculate on the effect that those taxes, those poll taxes, have on employment levels in various parts of the country, and reflect on decisions by companies like Kimberly-Clark to locate elsewhere, despite the fact that the taxation levels are higher in some of those areas.

My concern also would be that the Minister indicate to me where the opposition has this 30,000 jobs. I don't



think the Minister is confirming that there were 30,000 jobs created in Manitoba. If so, where? Where is the catalogue of 30,000 jobs? This is rhetoric on the part of the opposition that has never been established, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, having heard from the apologist for the government now, there is no question, and I can provide the Minister of Natural Resources with the written confirmation of the fact that those jobs were produced during those four years. The Minister's Department knows it as well and they can provide it to them if they wish.

Mr. Chairman, if the Minister does wish to embark on the study of the effects of the payroll tax, no doubt she will keep in mind that the Unemployment Insurance Commission increase was applied nationally. I'm not defending it, but it was applied nationally. The payroll tax was a new tax applied to the Province of Manitoba.

I had asked the Minister a question, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps she has an answer.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** I'm sorry, what was his question?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Will the Member for St. Norbert repeat the question, please?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I had asked the Minister if she was keeping in mind the fact that the economic regime in the province may very well contribute to a lack of investment in employment opportunities. Does she do any studies through this department of those factors that may contribute to unemployment in Manitoba?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** My understanding is that the Department of Economic Development does studies on the cost of doing business in Manitoba and that information would be available through that department. That seems to be the specific information that the member is looking for. — (Interjection) — Well, our performance in unemployment would show that it is not a bad place to be.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Are you talking about transportation costs in Manitoba?

**A MEMBER:** The whole survey.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(d)(1)—pass; 1.(d)(2)—pass; 2.(a)(1). Does the Minister wish to make any introductory remarks?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Briefly yes.

The Pension Commission is charged with the responsibility of administering and enforcing The Pension Benefits Act of Manitoba.

The Act has three main objectives: To register new pension plans; to monitor existing plans; it promotes pension plans and retirement planning and increases

public awareness of their importance; and it responds to queries of many concerned employees and plan members as to their rights and entitlements; and where necessary intercedes so that any pension dispute is resolved in a satisfactory manner.

The highlights of their activities this year include the fact that they have received 89 new plans for registration, for a total of 726 active plans in the province. A booklet has been completed which is entitled "More Or Less Than You Bargain For", which is for trustees, union members and labour groups.

The Commission, as I'm sure members are aware, was invited by the Government of Manitoba in September to submit proposals for amendments to The Pension Benefits Act, and is involved in the public hearing part of the process right now.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Can the Minister indicate how many members of the work force presently have retirement provision coverage? I appreciate you can't be specific.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** There are about 175,000 members of private pension plans.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** That wouldn't include those who have their own registered retirement programs?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** No, it does not.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** There's no indication of that number?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** It's about 12 percent of the population.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Does the Minister still intend to introduce legislation, with respect to pensions at this Session of the Legislature, or is she awaiting a recommendation from the Pension Commission now?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** I'm awaiting their recommendation, yes, following the receipt of all of the briefs and their study of them - the briefs from the public that is and the presentations made at the public hearings.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I can tell her, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to go into a debate on this particular subject at this moment in time until we have an opportunity to see the, if we are going to have an opportunity to see the recommendations of the Pension Commission.

Perhaps that's my first question: Will members of the opposition receive a copy of the recommendations and report of the Pension Commission when it is made to the Minister?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** The Green Paper contained the 24 recommendations of the Pension Commission. The Green Paper, that I believe you received, that we made available, contained their 24 recommendations. Those are the recommendations of the Pension Commission.

What they are doing is getting a reaction to those recommendations and then they will report to us on that reaction, but the 24 recommendations of the Pension Commission, you already have.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.

What I'm asking the Minister is, will we also receive a copy of the report and recommendations of the Pension Commission, consequent upon the public hearings?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Yes, that'll be available to you.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Will the report perhaps contain a summary of the submissions that have been made?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Yes, it will.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for River Heights.

**MR. W. STEEN:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister made reference to 89 new pension plans that were registered during the past 12 months. What does that bring the total to? I missed that figure.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Seven hundred and twenty-six active plans.

**MR. W. STEEN:** The Minister mentioned that there are 175,000 persons, approximately, registered in these, what I would refer to employee/employer type pension plans. What was the approximate increase by having 89 new plans registered in numbers of persons?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** While there've been 89 new plans, there of course have been terminations of plans over the year as well, fewer terminations, but the actual net number of people involved in the pension plans has remained fairly constant at about 175,000.

**MR. W. STEEN:** To the Minister, some years ago, Mr. Chairman, a large motor car dealership in Winnipeg went into receivership and persons that were in that pension plan did not receive their rightful benefits. The then Minister of Labour, Mr. Russell Paulley, made some amendments to The Pension Act at that time. Can the Minister tell me now how persons, employees that are registered in these registered plans, have safeguards that the dollars that they have deducted from their pay cheques are going to be there for them when they retire? What are the safeguards that the Pension Commission has built in?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Since the Act came into being, there have been no situations where employees have not received their contributions and interest. In the case of closings, bankruptcies, termination of the plan, whatever reason - and I am informed that this even is the case in one situation where fraud was involved - the Commission does spot checks. Insurance companies and other groups such as that hold money in trust and keep the Commission informed as to what is happening with the plans.

**MR. W. STEEN:** How frequently can her Pension Commission review some 726 pension plans?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Every plan is reviewed every year, and spot checks are done perhaps five or six times a

month or so on those plans where they feel it is necessary to do so.

**MR. W. STEEN:** To the Minister then, it is still possible that a business concern could have their annual checkup in the month of February, and then the following January the Pension Commission could find out that the employer was withholding employer contributions and accepting employee contributions and not forwarding them onto the proper authorities, and if that firm were to go out of business, then 11 months worth of contributions would be lost by the employees?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** The report then comes from the authorities that you referred to. If those authorities have not received the contribution, they have a requirement to notify the Commission within 30 days, if not receiving that. So it wouldn't happen that a month would go by and the contributions wouldn't be received.

**MR. W. STEEN:** I believe, Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned the Pension Commission's three major responsibilities were registration, the monitoring or the policing, and did I hear her correctly by saying promoting or promotions and education?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Yes.

**MR. W. STEEN:** Could she elaborate to me in what methods they promote and use for educating the public?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** There's quite a long list of activities; I was getting as much as I could of it for you. There have been approximately 60 public appearances made by staff of the Commission, members of the Commission and so on. There is a booklet that is published. There is co-operation with the Age and Opportunity Centre and information given through that organization, the Chamber of Commerce Labour Organizations. The YWCA has quite an active program in pensions, I believe in pension information disbursement and the Commission has been involved as an equal partner in that.

There is a full-time staff person who handles inquiries from the public about pensions, retirement planning and so on. The superintendent and the assistant superintendent are out at least once a week speaking publicly or responding to questions about retirement and retirement planning, pension plans.

**MR. W. STEEN:** When the Honourable Minister mentioned 60 public appearances, could she give me a couple of examples of what is meant by that? To service clubs or to employee groupings that don't have a pension plan?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Yes, you've just named several of them, service clubs, groups who don't have pension plans, interested groups of employees. I was involved in one recently with a consumers' group and so on.

**MR. W. STEEN:** Could the Minister tell the committee how much of a staff the Pension Commission comprises of and who are the members of the Pension Commission Board?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** There are seven people on staff of the Pension Commission. I have the names of the members of the Commission itself for you. If you just wait a second, I'll find them in my other book. John Corp is the Chairperson, he is an actuary as you are probably aware; Jean Minish is the Vice-Chairperson; Mr. Battershill; Ms. Cortes; Mr. Enns; Mr. Friesen, another actuary; Professor Hofley; Ms. Thompson; and Mr. Yurchak.

**MR. W. STEEN:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's waiting for the recommendations of the Pension Commission, but in view of concerns expressed by a number of organizations that some changes might well result in a reduction of jobs, will that be a factor for the Pension Commission to consider in making their recommendations?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** I have noticed that those who are recommending that a slower process be used to implement the cost items, which are not the first 17 recommendations of the Commission but those following that in the booklet, I haven't seen that they have disputed the viability of those recommendations. But what they have recommended is that there be a phasing-in of those recommendations. I think that is perhaps a reasonable approach to use and I will look at it closely when the recommendations do come in.

I don't want to second-guess the commission and indicate what they are going to recommend to us, but I would like to point out again that the majority of the recommendations of the Pension Commission are not cost items.

**MR. W. STEEN:** To the Minister, I would imagine that the Minister would agree with me, and I think most members of the committee, that it would be desirable that every employee in Manitoba be enrolled in a pension plan. What is the Minister's personal feeling? Should pension plans be compulsory for employers to initiate?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Well, I want to point out to the member that the Canadian Life and Health Association has recommended that all people be members of the pension plan. They feel that pension plans are important for everyone to have.

**MR. W. STEEN:** Mr. Chairman, I said to the Minister that I would believe that every person attending this committee today would think it would be desirable for all Manitobans to be enrolled in a pension plan, particularly employee-employer relationships, but the facts are that certain employers won't buy into pension plans because they either can't afford it or they don't wish to or they just don't want to participate. So, I ask the Minister if she would think that perhaps it would be time that we had compulsory pension plans for all employee-employer relationships?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** There is a program that is developing with a voluntary employer pension plan program. The

intent is to take a look at that program, introduce it perhaps on a voluntary basis and see how it works, see how much take-up there is on it. It has certainly been recommended by both the Chamber of Commerce and the Manitoba Federation of Labour. They both agree that this is an important item and a way in which we should move.

The CPP is a program that is in place for everyone. That is one that I don't hear employers complaining about, at least they haven't complained to us about it, and that's something that everyone is involved in. So, I think that we have to look perhaps towards moving to a better degree of financial stability for people who are beyond the workforce age and that is perhaps what we are striving for.

**MR. W. STEEN:** Mr. Chairman, the Canada Pension Plan is a compulsory plan and it was introduced under those terms, but its benefits aren't sufficient for a person to retire on, and I believe that it is desirable that a person have a pension scheme or plan over and above the CPP. As the Minister has mentioned that the Canadian Life Underwriters and Pension Planners have said that they would find it desirable if everybody was in a plan. Madam Minister mentions that they would like to try and work it initially on a voluntary basis, but with 175,000 Manitobans, which is what? - about 40 percent or 35 percent of our total workforce currently enrolled in a pension plan. Does she really think a voluntary plan will bring the other 60 or 65 percent of the employees within the province into a plan of some kind?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** What the member is raising is a complex issue, obviously, and one in which a lot of factors have to be taken into consideration. One fact to remember, one statistic perhaps to remember, is that 40 percent of the people retiring in Manitoba do so on these compulsory programs that we've been referring to, at 75 percent of their working salary. That's not an indication of their great retirement income; it's a sad indication of their working income and their low rate of pay and so on.

I think that we have to be careful that we don't get people caught into a situation where their disposable income is removed from them at a rate that makes their take-home pay, you know, unviable. We have to do that at the same time that we look at the need to create a secure retirement situation for them. It seems to me that the important objective at this point in time is to get those people in Manitoba who have no pension income to supplement the fairly small compulsory CPP and so on, to get those people involved in a pension plan and that certainly is a way that I intend to go over the next year or so.

**MR. W. STEEN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, it's only going to be a matter of a few years and just about everybody who is retiring will be getting some benefits from the Canada Pension Plan. It has been in force for a number of years now. So, it's only going to take a few more before everybody who does retire will have something from it.

But, as I said earlier, it isn't enough and we have a large block of persons who are retiring and going out

only on the compulsory schemes that are in place now. The Minister made some reference to the fact that she would like to see, on a voluntary basis, these pensions enhanced. Would she ever consider making it compulsory that employers establish a pension scheme to enhance the CPP plan for Manitoba workers?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Perhaps I can relate to the member what the Pension Commission feels on this particular issue since it is their job to investigate these situations and advise the government on the situation and the direction that they feel we ought to be going. Their recommendation is that the voluntary plan ought to be put into place and that it ought to be monitored and that if it does not prove to be successful on a voluntary basis, that then there ought to be some provision put in place for requiring employers to become involved in pension plans with their employees.

There is also something else that I think the member may or may not be aware of and that is that besides the Pension Commission and their recommendations and so on, we have an interdepartmental working group on pensions to deal with the rather parallel problem of federal pension plans, which we have been referring to, and our Manitoba pension plans and how these two balance each other, whether the incentive ought to be entirely provincial, or whether the incentive ought to be federal, or whether each should share in creating a pension base for people who are looking forward to their retirement years. I think that's an important point and I believe the recommendations of that group, upon which the Pension Commission has representation I might add, so they are working in concert, but the recommendations from that group will be important for us to pass along to the Federal Government, who has again delayed any implementation of an improvement in pension plans.

**MR. W. STEEN:** So, I can take it, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister doesn't plan in the near future any drastic change to the method of the operation for the Pension Commission, that they will continue on as they have been. I would say that, in my opinion, they've done a good job of encouraging employers to establish pension plans, being available for employees who have concerns and don't want to go to the employer, but wish to go to an intermediate party and can go to the Pension Commission's employees for information and assistance in understanding what their benefits will be or may be, and that the Minister has no plans for any drastic changes in the operation of the Pension Commission.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Of the, I think, several questions that the member asked, I don't plan any drastic changes to the Pension Commission itself or to their mandate. Certainly their mandate has been expanded this year with the activities surrounding the proposed legislative changes.

I think also the introduction of the Voluntary Employer Pension Plan will make it possible for employers to get involved in pension plans that perhaps didn't before. The Pension Commission has a particular concern for those employees earning between about \$18,000 and \$30,000 a year, who are not involved in pension plans, and will be targeting that group with their information

and encouragement to become involved in a pension plan.

**MR. W. STEEN:** I will conclude by saying that if an employer constituent of mine asked me, is it going to be compulsory that I establish a pension plan at my place of business, I can say that the Minister, in the near future, is not planning to bring in legislation that makes it compulsory for that employer to establish a pension plan?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** That's true. That's correct.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(a)(1)—pass; 2.(a)(2)—pass; 2.(b)(1) - the Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, no doubt the Minister has a few comments she might make, and perhaps she could just explain the \$300,000 increase in Salaries.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** There are several items that answer that question. The first is the general salary increase for us, the shortfall, the share of this department's finding that difference is \$90,000.00. The actual wage increase for 1983-84, \$140,900; the 27th pay period is \$63,700.00.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Is there an increase in staff?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** There is no increase in staff.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, did the Minister wish to make any comments about any significant areas being undertaken in this appropriation?

**HON. M. DOLIN:** Are you requesting information on new ventures of some sort?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Yes.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** This department is involved, as you know, in inspection and licensing and so on. The only change from their activities previously has been the development of two correspondence courses for municipal building inspectors. Both courses are available now and are in place.

We have also been involved in the solid fuel appliances, dispensing information and so on upon request and through news releases and so on.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** There are no significant problems? A few years ago, there were problems with the gas connectors and various other areas, but there are no significant problems in this area, predicted at least.

**HON. M. DOLIN:** No, not at this time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The time being 4:30, I am interrupting the proceedings of this committee for the Private Members' Hour. The committee will resume at 8:00 p.m. this evening.

## SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Eyler:** We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, Item 1.(a) the Minister's Salary - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** A question to the Minister, Mr. Chairman. Two or three days ago, the Minister provided me with some information concerning the contract on organic farming or ecological farming. He advised me that a Mr. Michael Janssen was the economist working on that contract. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he can advise the House whether or not Mr. Michael Janssen is a relative of Mr. Bill Janssen, the former Deputy Minister of Agriculture and a person whom I believe is now under contract to the Minister of Transport.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that is the case, but I'm not positive of that. I believe that is the case.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 1.(a) - the Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister of Agriculture to have that information provided for the committee that he said he would check into. I would hope that he doesn't leave it like all the other information that he has indicated that he would provide for the committee.

Mr. Chairman, on the Minister's Salary, there were a certain number of things that were requested by the opposition. One of those particular pieces of information was just today in question period, the communication that was sent to the Federal Government on the lowering of initial grain prices. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister does not carry out his traditional record of indicating that he's made all this contact or communication and then we never have it provided for us. That, Mr. Chairman, has been a habit of his and it doesn't wash.

Mr. Chairman, I want to, in dealing with the Minister's Salary, indicate as I did in my opening remarks that under his government's term of office the Manitoba agricultural community have seen a decline in their net income for three consecutive years now. Granted, it did not come about overnight, but is a period of difficult times and particularly the drought and lowering of inventories were some of the initial reasons for the beginning years of his administration's lower returns, but the inability of this Minister of Agriculture to deal with the real problems of the farmers are becoming more evident day by day.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** He's an abject failure.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** The Estimates in the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, are again another example of the Minister not having the kind of strength as a Minister to represent Manitoba's No. 1 industry. The reduction in actual funds for the operation of the department all the way through the Estimates; the fact that he has lost staff without even indicating during the initial discussions on the Communications Branch. He has had four people taken from that branch, didn't

report it to the House that it was even being considered, but said they were taken from him.

Mr. Chairman, that's not acceptable to a province where they have traditionally felt they have been strongly represented not just during our term of office, but I would even say during the term of office by the Member for Lac du Bonnet. Prior to that, of course, the track record of provincial Ministers of Agriculture has been one that has been pretty good, Mr. Chairman. They've been strong people and have stood up, have not accepted cuts in the departmental expenditures of the magnitude without, Mr. Chairman, either reducing staff in certain areas or programs in areas that were different to a new administration or a change in policy.

So what I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is we have now a Minister of Agriculture in charge of the farm community at a time when the farm community are going through pressures from outside of the jurisdiction of the Province of Manitoba, and what are we getting from the Minister of Agriculture who is supposed to be representing that farm community? We are seeing an erosion of their representation at national levels, Mr. Chairman; we are seeing an erosion of it at international levels.

The particular Minister of Agriculture takes great pride, as I said the other night, in taking some rather unnecessary shots at the United States when they indicated that it would possibly be a good move if there was a co-operative effort made by Canada and the United States to reduce the grain supplies, the acreage, Mr. Chairman, to encourage price increases.

What this Minister of Agriculture said to the United States, the press report that I read said, tell them to go home and mind their own business. It was headlined in one of the local papers, Mr. Chairman. Rather than saying to the United States, let's see how that program that you introduced is going to work, let's complement them if we are able to obtain a higher return for the agricultural commodities. Let's recommend to the government in Ottawa that there be a co-operative effort to reduce the acreages of grain produced in Manitoba or in Canada, I should say, to encourage increased prices. In fact, part of the announcement today was just precisely that, that there is an encouragement to reduce some of the acreage to help support what the United States have put in motion. There have been no positive comments coming from this Minister of Agriculture in that regard, but just a shot at those particular people who are trying to resolve the overall problems of farm incomes, Mr. Chairman.

So the overall problem that we have is a farm community under extreme pressure, a Minister of Agriculture who said this morning that he tabled or he sent a communication to Ottawa. I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, he would have by now been able to walk into the committee or have had a staff member bring that communication into this Chamber. — (Interjection) — I'll be speaking for a few minutes and I would hope by the time I'm through speaking, he could either rise, Mr. Chairman, and interrupt me and have the document tabled . . .

**HON. B. URUSKI:** I have a draft, but . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, he says, he has a draft. Why wouldn't he give us the draft copy?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** I was going to give you the original.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I again ask the Minister, he said he would table certain documents. I want them tabled so that we can deal with it during his Estimates this afternoon. If we don't have the information, how can we truly believe what he is saying because he's on record on having been less than straightforward on certain issues?

The reduction in agriculture spending and the servicing of the farm community, Mr. Chairman, are not acceptable. A reduction in the actual expenditures, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — it's outlined through every line and I will go through one or two more then, if he wants me to.

A reduction in expenditures in the Animal Industry Branch, for example, were \$787,700 last year. This year, they are \$671,000 for the expenses.

**A MEMBER:** That's with a 27 percent increase to the civil servants?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** No, the salaries are the only thing that went up. It was the salaries that went up, Mr. Chairman, not the service, not the actual supplying of resource material or resource backup to the farm community, that reduced. But at the same time he said to the farmers who have had three years of a net decline in their income, we're going to tax you more to pay for higher wages for the people who work for the province but we expect you to take a lower income and we're not going to provide you with any resources. In fact we'll provide you with less resources to do the kinds of things you've traditionally done, so that he's going the wrong way, Mr. Chairman. He's putting additional tax costs on the producers to pay for wages, and at the same time he's reducing the resources of the Department of Agriculture. It's not acceptable, Mr. Chairman.

Another good example, and again I can't go by it without mentioning, Mr. Chairman, and that is the reduction of spending for the 4-H movement in Manitoba. I can't help but say to the Minister of Agriculture, I would have thought he'd have had a better political antenna than the one he showed that he had by allowing a reduction to the youth in rural Manitoba.

It's not, Mr. Chairman, very easy to take because I, and I'm sure many of my colleagues who have participated or have had family participate in, appreciate the volunteer work that goes into it in the country, and the least that this Minister of Agriculture could have done was to continue to support and in fact increase the kinds of funds that went into that program. Not acceptable, Mr. Chairman, and he's not going to get over it very easily, I can assure you.

I can assure you if I'm to recommend to every one of my colleagues the kind of speech they're to give in rural Manitoba, it is precisely that this Minister of Agriculture does not believe that the 4-H movement should be funded. In fact, he believes it should be reduced. At the same time he's giving the Civil Service an increase of 27.5 percent over 30 months. That's voluntarism, Mr. Chairman, voluntarism at its most unfair approach.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture has spent a lot of time in the last few months, since the last sitting

of the Legislature, trying to explain why we need a bill to control the ownership of land in Manitoba, The Farm Ownership Act. Mr. Chairman, he has not been able to substantiate, as my colleague from Lakeside put the numbers on the record, as we have received the actual figures from the municipalities who are dealing day-by-day with what is happening. The Minister of Agriculture has spent a majority of his time worrying about putting in place legislative controls that reduce the freedoms of Manitobans and Canadians without, Mr. Chairman, a substantial amount of current evidence that would give us, or give this Legislature, or give the people of Manitoba reason to believe that it's a priority item at this time.

You know, when you look at a lot of the municipalities in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, the majority of them are owned by Manitobans. This Minister of Agriculture used a 1975-76 study, took selective figures, Mr. Chairman, from that study, and painted a picture as if Manitoba was being taken over by absentee foreign ownership.

Mr. Chairman, that is not the case. In fact, our concern as an opposition representing a large part of Manitoba, with a lot of our colleagues representing urban Manitoba, realize the importance of the economy of the farm community, and it's not whether or not an absentee owner is owning the land.

I will touch briefly on what the Minister indicated on a CBC radio show a few days ago, what he indicated an absentee owner was. He indicated and, you know, I still have a hard time understanding a Minister of Agriculture who would say that an absentee farm owner in Manitoba is a person who lives in Winnipeg and farms at Melita. That, is the Ministers own words, on a CBC radio program he said an absentee farmer is one who lives in Winnipeg, but farms at Melita, but what isn't an absentee owner is one that lives at Arborg, but farms at Fisher Branch. You know, I for the life of me cannot figure that kind of a man out. I cannot figure why he would go to his own constituency and use an example of saying, if you live in Arborg and you farm at Fisher Branch, that's okay, but if you're a Manitoban and live in Winnipeg and farm at Melita — (Interjection) — That's right, anybody's son, anybody if they farm - we use Melita, he used Melita, and that's why I'm using the example, Mr. Chairman - then you don't qualify to own land in Manitoba.

I happen to be a farmer at Melita, I have a residence in Winnipeg on a part time basis. Does that disqualify me from becoming a land owner and a farmer in my time when I'm not in the Legislature? Is that the kind of a legislative program we're going to continue to see from this Minister? You know, it's not acceptable, Mr. Chairman. It isn't the priority problems that the farm community are facing today.

We've seen an increase in bankruptcies by 380 percent in Manitoba under his administration. We saw him introduce an ill-conceived Interest Rate Relief Program that had such restricted limits on it that only 400 farmers, by the Minister's own numbers, were included or allowed to participate in that program. I'm sorry I'm mixed up, he indicated that I was out by 300. 700 farmers out of 30,000 were helped by the program. Helped to what degree one doesn't know.

Then we move on, Mr. Chairman, to the responsibility that the Minister has under financing of farms through the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. He

introduced to program, leading the public to believe, and the farmers to believe that there was \$100 million available in support for farmers to help put this years crop in through operating loans supplied by the MACC or a bank guarantee, I'm sorry.

But the program that he introduced is worse than the one that was already in place, Mr. Chairman, because the guidelines from the current program, the one that was in place, allowed a person to borrow up to \$60,000. He removed that lid of \$60,000 and moved it to \$125,000. But what he did, Mr. Chairman, he said to the farmer who wanted to borrow money, you have to now own 20 percent, you have to have 20 percent equity in your operation before you can get any money or any guarantee. That increased, Mr. Chairman, from 10 percent. That increased from 10 percent, Mr. Chairman.

As well, what did he do? He told the farmers that won't qualify, or you won't qualify if you have current arrears or outstanding debts, that you can't borrow the money to participate in this program.

Mr. Chairman, I will again go on the record and say that this Minister of Agriculture's program, even though he's had banks sign up to it, even though he's had work done with the banking community, I have had information from the banking industry that's saying it will be used very little because of some of the guidelines that have been put in place, and that 10 to 20 percent equity is one of the major ones. As well, Mr. Chairman, I can go on and on and on, on MACC, or the lack of his ability to manage it, to serve the farm community.

Again today we asked this Minister of Agriculture if he would reduce the 18 percent loans that we're taking out during a period of extremely and intolerable high interest rates, and I agree. I was the Minister when the interest rates were going up, but we didn't raise them to what we were being asked to raise them through MACC. There was a restriction put on them. We did not increase them at the — (Interjection) — no, it's not, Mr. Chairman.

As well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is now reluctant - because he is now the Minister, it isn't us - he's now reluctant to say to those farmers who have been tied in at 18 percent interest, I won't change it, the only way you can do it is go and get money elsewhere, Mr. Chairman. Go and get money elsewhere and I will accept your money.

I asked him today whether he had, in fact, allowed for that to be paid off without penalty. He said he had to take the question as notice. Well, I respect a man who admits he doesn't know where it's at, but how long has he been asked about this question, Mr. Chairman? We've been after him now, for how long? And he still doesn't know that kind of basic answer to deal with whether or not there is a penalty charged if those loans are written off. Not acceptable, Mr. Chairman, not acceptable at all. He should have known that. He should have had a policy statement during these Estimates dealing with that, but he has just buried his head in his shoulders and said, well, as long as we can walk through those committee hearings and take all the lumps the Tories are prepared to give us, then I'll accept them and we'll continue to slough along. We want some specific answers and some action, Mr. Chairman, and that's what we're after.

We go to the Crown lands, Mr. Chairman. Again, the Minister comes up with what? A pretty poor record.

What is he doing to the producers who are renting Crown land - increasing, Mr. Chairman, not paying attention to the costs or the returns for livestock producers, not paying attention to Federal Government guidelines - what is he doing? He's saying to the Department of Agriculture, we want to get back the administrative costs of the operation of the Crown Lands Department so that we can make the farmers pay for the administrative costs to the department for operating of Crown lands.

My colleague from Lakeside the other night challenged the Minister, and I did as well prior to that, challenged the Minister to have all his Cabinet Ministers recover all the costs of operation of the government services like the Parks Department. Why does he burden, Mr. Chairman, the farm community with those kinds of costs when not one of his other cabinet colleagues are doing it?

Mr. Chairman, he's weak. He's a weak Minister of Agriculture, not acceptable to the farm community. He is weak and will not speak out for the farmers. It is not acceptable that the increase in Crown lands has nothing to do with the returns the cattle producers are getting for their livestock.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has floundered and continually criticized during his opposition years of us not taking action for, or moving into the area of Beef Stabilization. Mr. Chairman, we spent quite a lot of our time in the first couple of years cleaning up a mess that was left by him and his colleagues from before and the Minister of Municipal Affairs was one of those people who was part of the problem that had created a mess that the beef industry had hung around their neck.

The Minister has to admit that it was a problem because he still has \$400,000 in the books. Yet, what did the farm community hear some several weeks ago from one of his appointees to the Beef Commission? That that had been written off. The Minister, in fact, did not deny at that time that it had been written off. It took questioning in these Legislative hearings, in these committee hearings, to finally come clean because he was caught. He finally came clean and said he hadn't, in fact, written off the \$400,000 and has admitted now that the way he would have to do that is through a Cabinet order or a Cabinet paper. So that's what was happening during our term of office.

As well, the beef market went up to some degree to pay the returns that the producers needed. Yes, towards the latter time in office the beef market slipped. The Governments of Ontario and Alberta moved on a one-time payment to put in to support the beef industry, and that was the kind of recommendation that we had accepted or received from the committee that was established to recommend what the beef industry wanted. That would have been the correct way to go, Mr. Chairman.

We now, as I said in Estimates again last night, have seen this Minister of Agriculture bring in a program that is not going to increase the numbers of fat cattle or slaughter cattle for the packing house industry in Manitoba. The cattle are continually being exported to Quebec, to Saskatchewan and other parts of the country to be fed because there isn't any support for the feedlot industry.

I challenged the Minister of Municipal Affairs last night to tell me how many feedlots went out of business

during our term of office and he couldn't come up with one. But I can tell you quite a few that have gone out of business since he's been in office, and quite a few more of those that are left are very close to going as well. Why, Mr. Chairman? Because they didn't bring in a one-shot payment. If they had brought in a one-time payment, given it to the feed lot industry, that money would have showed up at ringside and gone into the feeder cattle hands, the cow-calf people and I'll tell you those cattle would have been fed in Manitoba, but today they're not going to be because this Beef Program that he's introduced, Mr. Chairman, has done what?

I asked the Minister some specific questions last night, if he's going to change the program so that the producers are treated fairly, so that they aren't going to be charged for a premium on feeder cattle when in fact they're slaughter cattle, whether the support level will be high enough to sustain the kind of feed-lot industry that we need.

The other question was, Mr. Chairman, I'll put it on the record again for the Minister. I want the Minister to respond to the question. The change that he made in the contract of saying to those cattle producers that they could only qualify for 80 percent of the cattle they had enrolled in the Beef Program, is he sticking to that or is he going to say to the producers, if you produce 100 percent calves, then you'll get paid 100 percent? I would like a statement from the Minister on those kinds of things - not a bunch of bureaucratic inspectors hired by him.

And that brings me to another problem, Mr. Chairman, that we again have a Minister of Agriculture who truly believes that he's right in appointing an inspector under The Natural Products Marketing Council Act at the same time having that inspector sit as a commissioner in judgment of the actions of himself.

**A MEMBER:** Conflict.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** That's right. It is directly a conflict or could be a conflict if a situation were to arise. The Minister won't change on those positions, Mr. Chairman. It would have been very easy for him to change and justify it. But why does he stick on that dogmatic ground that he's on. Is it to prove that he's not going to be prepared to work with the legislative process and the people of Manitoba? That wouldn't show weakness. That would show, Mr. Chairman, an ability to deal with a situation that could cause problems for farmers. But, no, Mr. Chairman, he wouldn't change.

The place that he should be showing strength, Mr. Chairman, is in his Cabinet and his caucus, but he's not. He hasn't got it, Mr. Chairman. They're stripping him of money. They're stripping him of staff, without him even participating in the decision of moving of staff. I challenge the Minister to re-employ those people who are taken from the Communications Branch of the Department of Agriculture - wherein the Wepler Report indicated they were doing an excellent job - to reinstate them so that the farm community can have the reporting, the kind of T.V. and radio series that give them information on the activities that are going on in the agriculture community.

I challenge the Minister to say he won't accept what his colleagues are doing to him, the stripping of them,

the raping of his department of people and money and that's what's happening, Mr. Chairman. He is sitting by while they're eroding the Department of Agriculture, a department that's been a proud department, a department that has had the background and the ability to hold together the kind of resource people that the farm community need.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Not any more.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** That's right, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Emerson says they're not proud any more. I can tell you they're not, Mr. Chairman. But there's another area that is becoming very obvious and it's very dangerous, and I indicated to the Minister the other night was the changing of, or the reorganization of his department, where he has the policy people now directly in charge of the Economics Branch. Changes and implementation, and introduction of a past NDP Government employee of Saskatchewan as their Assistant Deputy Minister, former strong supporters of market management in the beef industry, people who felt strongly about implementation of a Beef Marketing Board in Manitoba during the former NDP years.

Those kinds of individuals, Mr. Chairman, being put in positions of administration of the Economics Branch and the Policy Branch, and the same group won't be tolerated by the farm community. It isn't tolerated by the opposition, I can tell you that, because I don't believe that a department of government should have directly tied to it people who are directly involved in the policy picture as this Minister is going to use them. I have no problem with staff developing programs and policy directives on a neutral ground, but to any way indicate that could have other overtones to it is not acceptable, Mr. Chairman. This Minister will rue the day that he has moved in that direction, Mr. Chairman.

I want to conclude my comments at this point, Mr. Chairman, because I know there are some other individuals that want to have a go at the Minister. But I want to conclude my comments, Mr. Chairman, by indicating that this Minister has not been able to stand up for the farm community - I know my colleague for Minnedosa has got a few comments to say on that - has been overly protective of increasing wages for employees of government at a time when farm prices are being cut, are being slashed.

I would have liked to, before I conclude these remarks - I may get back at it again today, Mr. Chairman - but I am somewhat disappointed that this Minister has not given us a clear statement right now telling us the kind of opposition that he has put forward to the Federal Government on the reduction of initial grain prices. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Federal Government could have in fact moved to either loan, interest free, or provided to the Canadian Wheat Board, with funds, to maintain the current level of initial payments. That's a recommendation that I thought could have gone from this Minister.

That would have softened the impact, Mr. Chairman, particularly at a time, and again I have to refer to it, when Canadian fuel prices, because of the taxation policies of the Canadian Government, are forcing farmers to restrict their farming activities. My colleague for Pembina has again introduced a resolution asking



this government to support us, asking for support for a resolution to ask the Federal Government to exempt the farm community from federal taxation. That would take a tremendous amount of tax off the farmers. Probably it would reduce the tax on gasoline to about 50 percent, that the diesel fuel and the farm gas would probably cost about half and they won't support it, Mr. Chairman. They won't support it.

This Minister of Agriculture would sooner support - I don't know what he would support - but he won't

**A MEMBER:** Marxist funding.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** That's correct. He won't support 4-H, he supports Marxist funding for conventions in this province.

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed because he had an opportunity during the tough times of agriculture to show that he did have concerns, to show that he could do some things to help the farmers, but he wasn't allowed to, because he doesn't have the strength, Mr. Chairman, with his colleagues. He doesn't have the strength and I challenge him to change the direction that he's going, to stand up, not to take the kind of pushing around that he's taking from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who doesn't give a darn about the farmers as well, or he'd stand in and support his colleague, who is the Minister of Agriculture.

The Premier of the Province of Manitoba - where is he when it comes to defending the farmers in the farm community? What are they doing? They're burning their energy and the time of the department trying to impose unnecessary laws on the ownership of farmland in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. What kind of government would do that? What else is he trying to do, Mr. Chairman? Impose a marketing board on the beef industry, whether they like it or not, Mr. Chairman. All those things that are against the very thing that makes the free enterprise initiative and the whole business work in the farm community. Where is he at when they're lowering the grain prices, Mr. Chairman? Where is he at, Mr. Chairman? He's out, Mr. Chairman, saying we've got to oppose the changes in the Crow rate. He's got to burn up seven meetings during the sitting of the House.

I have nothing against meeting with the farm community, Mr. Chairman, but it's not a jurisdiction which we can do anything about and we have put our position forward.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, order. The Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I heard the Minister say freedom and socialism. There is a basic difference between our belief and how democracy works and how the socialist works. We believe, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the people should control the government and the actions of that government. They, through their elective powers, will determine how a government goes and how it will operate, but the socialists, the NDP, believe in reverse, that they put in the mechanisms to control

the people, Mr. Chairman. Their democracy is government controlling the people. Our democracy, Mr. Chairman, is people controlling the government and it is the basic difference between this side of the House and that side of the Chamber.

The people of Manitoba will remind them again of that during the next election. They'll remind them of the inability to govern this province, a government that hasn't been able to deal with the small business, with the home-owners, with the jobs, the unemployment rates, all the things that make this province go have been handled ineptly, and probably the most inept Minister and the weakest Minister that we have in the Province of Manitoba today is the Minister of Agriculture because he's being bullied and pushed around and stripped of his funds, stripped of his staff, and all he is doing, Mr. Chairman, is trying to find favour with those strong - the movement to the left-wing group of his caucus and Cabinet who want to put an over-amount of restrictions on the ownership of farm land, the marketing of beef cattle and he is certainly disappointing, Mr. Chairman.

He's disappointing the majority of farmers and I'm sure they will let him know at the next election and I will do everything that I can to make sure that they do, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When we were discussing the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation, the Minister took as notice and he said he would provide answers to four questions. Has he got those answers?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I have asked for that information. I have yet to receive it from the corporation.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, that probably concludes that episode of the Minister and his misleading news releases because the information, when we receive it, will demonstrate clearly that the Minister did, in fact, not present a factual case when he put his press release out.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to Agriculture Department Estimate debate now for six years. Some people have listened to it for longer, possibly the Minister of Health has listened to it for a little while longer, but I don't think we have ever had a situation in Manitoba where the Minister representing our most important industry, the one that employs the greatest number of people directly and indirectly in this province; that provides this province with the economic stability that farming does, I don't think we've ever had a Minister representing that sector of the economy that has been so weak, so out of touch and so unable to come to grips with the realities of what agriculture is facing today.

My colleague, the former Minister of Agriculture, pointed out a number of areas where this Minister has failed completely. The Minister of Agriculture from his seat naively and stupidly said, that that's why we're on this side of the House. The farm community did not put us on this side of the House, they voted us in

stronger than they did in 1977, because in 1977 although they didn't like the Schreyer Minister of Agriculture and his policies, they at least from time to time could believe his press releases and what he said. But let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, this Minister is coming fast into disrepute in rural Manitoba.

The problem is that this Minister, as my colleague has said just in the last few minutes, has no clout in Cabinet. He's representing the most important industry in Manitoba and he has no clout in Cabinet. He allows funding to go to willy-nilly organizations, Marxist conferences. The Minister of Labour just last night told us that she increased the grant to the Manitoba Labour Education Centre by \$50,000, so now they're getting \$150,000.00. Well, what happened to this Minister of Agriculture? He lost. Four-H kids get less money and a number of his programs have got less money.

At the same time, this Minister of Agriculture has been forced, because he wouldn't stand up and defend his position, to implement user pay programs in his department. He has added about 150 percent to the cost of the dugout filling program to the farm users. He has added - was it 200 percent for the Crown land leases? He has implemented user pay in the Department of Agriculture at the insistence of an urban Cabinet that cares not for agriculture, that doesn't understand agriculture, and this Minister is so out of touch that he could not make a defensive case to prevent that from happening around the Cabinet table.

That, Mr. Chairman, is a shame because there is our most important industry being neglected by a government that doesn't have a Minister that's capable of representing the farm industry, the agricultural community around the Cabinet table. The unfortunate part about it is, that outside of his colleague the Minister of Highways and Transportation, there is no one else over there that's better to do the job, unfortunately. — (Interjection) — Well, the Minister of Health says he is. I am not so sure about that. He may understand and know more about agriculture than the present Minister, but I think I would prefer him not to be the Minister of Agriculture. He is a walking example of the ability of our farm community to produce food in abundance, however, but I wouldn't want him as Minister of Agriculture.

This Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, has lost four in the staff of his Communications Branch. Now that Communications Branch provided very valuable services to the farm community. They made a number of productions that the farm community came to rely on in various ways and meetings and forums that they had access to those communication skills as developed in that department. This Minister has given them up so that the propaganda machine of this government to the urban City of Winnipeg can be increased; so that more propaganda can flow into the NDP constituencies in Winnipeg. Well, maybe the Minister figures that's all right, but I don't think it's all right.

The Member for The Pas says, tell us about 4-H. Yes. This Minister has a program that doesn't cost much money. It supports 6,000 young people in rural Manitoba to undertake a very knowledgeable and a very good medium through 4-H clubs to learn the principles of democracy, running a meeting, to learn the skills involved in a number of rural endeavours from livestock rearing to garden clubs to sewing clubs. This Minister,

because he has no clout in Cabinet and no backup from the Member for The Pas who represents a rural area in his constituency, no backup there, he lost funding to that group.

He has abandoned the future citizens of rural Manitoba, because a lot of these children that are in the 4-H program end up back on the farm. They end up in agribusiness serving rural Manitoba. They are often the backbone of the farm community and the backbone of the business community and the towns that serve those rural communities. The Member for The Pas thinks gleefully that it's a great idea that 4-H funding is dropped. You know, you can't justify that. — (Interjection) — Well, the Minister of Agriculture protests from his seat that, gee, this is not right, golly, quit picking on me on 4-H, but he's the man that allowed 4-H funding to drop. He obviously had no backup from his colleagues who represent rural Manitoba. He lost the battle. When it came time to repriorize, they did it and they took money from the 4-H children of Manitoba and they put it in any other program including funding a Marxist Conference. Well, they think that's good.

The Minister has dropped funding for the Rat Control Program in Manitoba. Now, you know, that may seem like sort of a silly sort of a thing to worry about, but you know the Province of Alberta is rat free. No, it isn't quite, there are two MLAs - no, I won't get on that subject. But Alberta is a rat-free province because of a very good Rat Control Program. But what does the New Democratic Government of Manitoba do? They are the friends of the rats in Manitoba because they have eliminated the funding for the Rat Control Program. Well, you know, maybe that shows where they have their priorities. They'd rather see rats multiply, and children involved in 4-H programs decline, because that seems to be their trend in funding.

Financial support of this Minister to the farm community has been discussed for a year-and-a-half now. We've made suggestions to him about his Interest Rate Relief Program; he didn't believe us. He got the Manitoba Farm Bureau to set up a committee. They struck that committee to study ways in which MACC and his present financial support programs, including the Interest Rate Relief Program, could be bettered for the farm community. He didn't believe us when we told him that the limit was too low on the Farm Interest Rate Relief Program, but the committee of the Farm Bureau that he asked to study it told him the same thing, and they made a recommendation to him that he increase the limit to \$150,000 and make it a realistic program that farmers would be able to qualify for. What did the Minister do with that recommendation? He threw it in File 13 - in the big round file.

They also made a recommendation to him that in evaluating loans and the equity base to make loans through MACC that they consider full market value of equipment and what not. Well, I don't think the Minister has done anything with that. He's announced a Loan Guarantee Program, \$100 million, left the farm community with high hopes that there was going to be \$100 million worth of guarantees that they could go to the bank and exercise so that they could plant their crop this spring. But after all the fanfare died down, we find out that of that \$100 million only 12.5 percent is guaranteed.

The Minister hasn't answered whether that's on a prorated basis or whether that's an entire loan basis - we don't know. But we do hear from our local bankers in the rural constituencies that they find that program is not going to provide relief to all that many people. They've raised the equity requirement from 10 percent to 20 percent as my colleague has pointed out. Every single effort that this Minister has undertaken has been a lot of glamour and press releases and very little substance for the farm community.

That is why I took such particular objection to his press release on the crop insurance rate changes. It was a phony press release; it provided false information and it distorted what the Minister was really doing. You know, he's done it time and time and time again. We've asked him to consider ways of relieving 18 percent loans that MACC currently has out amongst the farm community. He said, no, I'm not going to do that. He says let those farmers go and pay off their loan and then, you know, get a lower interest rate. He said let them pay it off and then they can go to the bank.

Well, I ask him simply, would the Minister allow those people to pay off their loan to MACC and then two days later come into their MACC rep and apply for a loan at 12 percent or 11.5 percent, such as it is now, and get the same financial assistance that they have now, only at a lower interest rate? Why not? If they're going to pay it off to MACC, then obviously MACC can retire their 18 percent money. — (Interjection) — Well, okay, the Minister has corrected me, he has said 17.5 percent.

Now, if the Minister is going to be able to retire those loans by theoretically having the farm customer pay it off, then the money at 17.5 percent is paid off, the government no longer pays their interest rate at 17.5 percent and he could renew those loans at the current 11.5 percent. He's nodding his head "yes," they could do that, but he won't allow them to do it, Mr. Chairman.

So the Minister has not accepted one single piece of concrete advice and we hear all kinds of urging by members opposite that we offer him positive criticism. We have offered him many many areas of positive suggestion and he has not followed one of them that I know of, not one of them. We've offered him advice on how to get himself out of trouble on a number of issues, he hasn't taken that advice either, and it points out quite frankly that he is out of touch with the farm community. He is out of touch with the organizations representing the farm community with one notable exception. I believe this Minister is completely in touch with the National Farmers Union. He knows what their policies are and what they want, what their direction is, but in terms of the real farm community, he's out of touch. He doesn't understand it and what is disgraceful is he isn't trying to understand it.

You know, this will resolve itself three years from now when he is no longer Minister of Agriculture. Given that the Premier hasn't got anybody better to put into the portfolio in the Cabinet shuffle that's coming up, we're going to have to stick with this man for the next three years, but after that Manitobans can expect a responsible Minister of Agriculture from a Progressive Conservative administration.

The Minister has further gone on and introduced for the second year running a terribly bad piece of legislation in that Farm Lands Ownership Bill. He has

taken an issue of concern in rural Manitoba which was quite simply a method of preventing absentee foreign owners from getting themselves involved in land purchase and speculation. That's what the farm community wants, but what does this Minister try to give them? He tries to give them a bill that will control Manitoban ownership, even despite what he says, it will control Manitoban ownership. It will control Canadian ownership and pretty soon, if he passes that bill, he'll have to have a new branch of his department set up to licence farmers, because that's what he's boiling down to. That Act will end up with this Minister having to licence farmers, because basically that's what his Act prescribes; you have to be a licenced farmer before you can own land in Manitoba. That isn't what built this country, Mr. Chairman, and his bogeyman of the speculator is not there. The absentee foreign speculator, we will assist him if he thinks the legislation that's currently in place is not adequate. We will assist him in making changes that are necessary to stop the absentee foreign speculator. — (Interjection) — Yes, we will, but not the legislation that he's trying to bring in right now.

You know, I guess we have to question ourselves, why is the Minister bringing that in? Well, the Minister is bringing it in, as he said on CBC Radio the other day, because he considers someone who lives in the City of Winnipeg and who owns farm land at Melita and farms it himself to be an absentee landowner. Now if that isn't the absolute balkanization of this province by this Minister and his definition of an absentee landowner, then I don't know what that is. That is a disgraceful position for the Minister of Agriculture to be putting out, that that is what an absentee landowner is.

He's based and he's sold to you members in the backbench and in the Cabinet, you urban members - I refer, Mr. Chairman, to you - you've probably received the sale pitch from the Minister of Agriculture on the necessity of bringing in that bill. He justified that to you, Mr. Chairman, with a set of statistics that were developed in 1976 or 1977. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, oh, now the Minister is tittering from his seat here, he must be a little sensitive about the statistical base he used and so he should be. It's 1976 or 1977 statistics; it was not directed at the issue of absentee foreign owners; it was statistics that he presented to you in the backbench of government as justification for his bill to prevent absentee foreign speculation and the statistics were wrong, wrong, wrong.

We have proper statistics given to us by the RM's. We without the facilities to do research, as the Minister has in his department, were able to come up with more accurate statistics on the problem of absentee foreign ownership than the Minister could, and that shows a disgraceful lack of concern and knowledge of what the Minister is trying to do.

Simply, Mr. Chairman, what we have to assume from that is that, No. 1, either the Minister is totally incompetent and doesn't know what he's trying to do in that bill; or No. 2, that he does know what he's trying to do and he does indeed want to end up with a licensed farming system where farmers have to apply to them on bended knee and beg and cajole the Minister of Agriculture to give them a licence to farm so they can own land in Manitoba.

I always bring back the case, going back to 1977, where we had MACC, and the Minister of Agriculture will remember this. MACC was into the, what did they call that program? It was the state farm program. Land Lease, I believe, is what they called it, and the objective of that program under the New Democratic Administration, under the socialist government of the New Democratic Party, was to own the farmland in Manitoba, the government to own the farmland. The individual farmer would not ever exercise his option to buy and if that is where the Minister is coming from, this bill that he's brought in is certainly going to help him in his striving to have the government and the state own the land.

I suppose we should well know that's where the Minister is coming from because in his Estimates last year he said, "What does ownership of farm land have to do with the provision of food?" You know, the Minister is not very much aware of the people that go hungry in Poland, and other collectivized states in the Soviet Union and their satellite countries.

This legislation is going to do nothing to help the farm community. It will hinder the farm community. It is based on non-factual information. It is based on a false set of statistics that the Minister is purporting to justify in this legislation, and it will not do the farm community any good. The farm community is facing an equity crisis right now and this legislation, should it be passed in the form that the Minister has got it in, will drop the value of land in Manitoba and will exacerbate that equity crisis to farmers.

Here we have a situation where banks are not reloading money. I imagine even the Member for the Pas might have the odd farmer in the Pas who is having difficulty arranging his operating loan for this year, and the banker is taking a look at the balance sheet as they must do. Even MACC does that as a government lending agency, and if the equity in the farm goes down, so that the balance sheet doesn't show enough equities to sustain the loan, the farmer doesn't get it. This bill will drop land prices and drop the equity of the farm community further and put more farmers in further financial jeopardy. And all this against the background of woefully inadequate financial programs that this Minister has managed to bring in with a great deal of press release fanfare and no substance.

So, Mr. Chairman, we really regret this Minister of Agriculture being so out of touch with the farming community and with the industry of agriculture in the province. We regret that the farm community may have to live with him for another three years. We know there's a lot of resilience out there. We know there's a lot of strength and there's a lot of durability. We only hope that strength and durability will last long enough to see this Minister no longer in charge of the Agriculture Department in the Province of Manitoba.

But there are number of people that aren't going to make it. They can't wait that long. They can't wait for the change. This Minister will sit there smilingly accepting the fact that farmers are going out of business, because he's out of touch, he doesn't care, and he has no clout in Cabinet, and no backup in Cabinet or Caucus to do what is necessary in the farm community to help them through this difficult time. That is indeed a failure of this Minister and indeed a major failure of this government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's difficult to follow the Member for Pembina. He usually does such a good job of presenting the argument, as he's done again.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that having been through most of the Estimate procedure this year, I suppose the one area that concerned me the most, and I can say that disturbed me, was the fact that the Minister chose not to be totally honest with us when we were discussing that Communications Branch area. I think I spoke to this a little bit yesterday. Some people would say that when you know that some areas are changing, and you have the opportunity to put on the record specifically what those changes are and you by-pass them on several occasions, that possibly you're guilty of telling untruths by omission.

I think the Minister has shown, at least to me, that he is at times capable of doing those types of things. That indeed if the specific question is not asked, that he will take the easy way out, and that being to try to slide over the whole issue, and hope that it does not see the light of day.

So I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that through this process that disturbed me the most, that indeed the Minister of Agriculture did not level with us when he had so many occasions and opportunities to do so.

I suppose when one looks at agriculture, and we realize some \$54 million is being devoted to that particular area, some \$54 million out of 3.3 billion, we do a quick calculation within our heads and we realize that some 1.7 percent of the total provincial budget is being directed towards agriculture. I'm not going to stand here and say that much more should be directed towards that, because, of course, we'll hear immediately the outcries, well you can't have it both ways. I accept that, that's fair comment, but I suppose what disturbs me the most is the lack of recognition by, if not the Minister of Agriculture, but certainly by members of his government, that agriculture, in its primary sense, and through all its spinoffs, through all the light manufacturing that supports it and all the infrastructure that, in effect, is in place to support it, that it contributes some 30 percent, or roughly \$4 billion of our total gross provincial domestic product.

So, when you put into prospective these two figures, one the fact that 1.7 percent . . .

**A MEMBER:** Did you say 20 percent?

**MR. C. MANNES:** I said 30 percent - my interpretation. The Minister has challenged me, he figures possibly 20 percent. I went to the last prospectus and there are two figures which, if you add them up, you come closer to \$4 billion, but nevertheless, let's not disagree on that one.

The point being, when you realize the tremendous contribution that this industry makes to our province, and we're criticized in some quarters, or at least some of our cousins from outside of this province will indicate at times, well, you in Manitoba don't have the real opportunities to grow; you really are a poor-off second cousin. During these times, when we have fair stability in this province, we realize what that agriculture base

means. It provides a good way of life to many, many people and affords a stability to a province, possibly second to none, excluding maybe Saskatchewan.

So we're very fortunate to have it, and I suppose what concerns me is that I don't see this being reflected in many of the statements that come from members opposite. Oh, I do at times from the Minister of Agriculture, but as my colleague, the Member for Pembina has indicated, his voice in Cabinet is indeed very, very soft. It may be loud, but when it comes to effecting and resulting in power decisions, or in decisions that are important to agriculture, indeed, it is a soft voice. He says it's a weak voice. Well, if wants to say his own voice is weak, I can accept that.

I suppose the 14 members that sit on this side that are from agricultural areas have a hard time accepting that. As a matter of fact, we totally reject it. It's on this ground that I would like then to make a few comments, Mr. Chairman. It's my observation that the Minister of Agriculture has been caught up in issues of lesser concern. I don't think he really puts the full attention that's necessary towards our whole grain side of our agricultural industry. But yet, this Minister, either in leading his government colleagues or being pushed by them - we haven't decided yet who's pushing and who's leading - we find ourselves involved in something like land legislation. We're very involved in this whole concern, as to who owns the land.

I'll make a confession, Mr. Chairman. I can tell you that two or three or four years ago, I had some of those concerns. I live in the Municipality of McDonald where there was a major concentration of land that was purchased by individuals who were not resident. I can tell you that there were many comments by those of us who had lived there all our lives, indeed for generations, who were terribly concerned as to what was happening. It seemed to be happening too quickly. Now, in retrospect, some three years later, we've noticed some significant happenings, the very sorts of things that our fathers and our grandparents, who have lived through the cycles, said would happen. They told us not to be terribly concerned about it.

And I can take you through vast areas within my municipality, indeed through my riding, which was owned by foreigners, namely Americans, up until the 1930s. Indeed the very farm that I live on and own was American-owned until 1936, lost to the trust company, the trust company could hardly wait — (Interjection) — that's right - lost it to the municipality. The municipality begged my grandfather for some 50 cents an acre just to keep the weeds under, just so that indeed that land would not lose its productivity forever, and therefore, would he assume the working of that land and he did. He did and he bought it for - at that time - some \$4 or \$5 an acre, which was an incredible, horrendous sum. It took, believe it or not, some 25 years to pay it off.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Has it increased in value?

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, of course, this is what galls the members opposite. Has it increased in value? Yes, it has and to that Minister it has. On a piece of paper like this, it's increased in value tremendously - today - but today it's worth a lot less than it was a year ago.

And people that have gone through this say don't change the system, because as long as you don't and two years from now on this same piece of paper, that land value will be down to what it's worth, indeed, to what it's worth.

I believe the Minister of Agriculture is still caught up - or at least his colleagues are caught up - in this whole area of concern as to where you focus your whole view into the ownership of land. Because if you look at it any point of time, it costs too much but the system works, as long as you leave it in place. The open market system works in land. If the members don't believe it, if they don't believe it works in land, all they have to do is look at the price of oil. That's all they have to look at is the strongest and the heaviest cartel that was ever put together on this globe and that was what OPEC managed to put together and keep together and maintain for a period of some eight or ten years.

I hope they've seen what has finally overtaken it. I hope they realize that the laws of supply and demand work, and they work in land also. Indeed, if you want to look over a spectrum, that land that the member for Elmwood says, well, what's it worth now, what's your land worth now? - will he then allow me to ask him the question, which I hope he won't answer now, but will answer on his own time, what land will be worth in five years. Can he answer that? He can't, Mr. Chairman, he cannot answer that. The Minister of Agriculture cannot answer that. There's not a member over there that can answer it. I cannot answer it. But I do know that if you bring into account legislation that is going to remove totally a large sector of those individuals who have the right to purchase, in other words, Canadians, who will now be excluded, that once you've done that, you have caused to be affected the price of land; you have caused that to happen. I ask the Minister and I ask the members opposite why they want to do that. Mr. Chairman, I'll leave the rest of my thoughts on the land issue to when we debate Bill No. 3 and I can assure you that it will happen on many occasions and it will happen at length.

The Minister then brings forward some other major concerns of his, pesticide legislation. Of course, we don't want to move into that area in great detail, but this was something that was very important to him; something that had to come forward and had to be dealt with in great detail, as did the development of another board under The Dairy Act - something else that we had to bring forward. The Minister says we had it. We've had it. It was an internal group. It wasn't politically structured like I'm sure it will happen now.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, if I have one criticism of government in general regardless of who's in power, it's the preponderance of boards that are developed. It is the wish, not to govern, but to shift a lot of the responsibility to boards. Let the boards do the governing; make the decisions. Actually, believe it or not, I was appointed to a board once and I was thankful. I learned an awful lot, Mr. Chairman. I thank the former Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Did you do a good job?

**MR. C. MANNES:** The Member for Flin Flon asks whether I did a good job or not. I can't pass judgment

on that. But the point being, Mr. Chairman, at one time when I saw the appointment, I treated it as something special; I thought it was very important and it is very important; that particular council is extremely important. Then, when I became a member of this House, I had an opportunity to go through the telephone directory and I went to that back section that said, "Boards and Commissions," and I was shocked. I was horrified. I had no idea that there were virtually hundreds of boards. Then I began to realize and finally I went through all the green Statutes with the tartan covers on them and I began to see that we're being governed by boards. I suppose, as a party, we did our share in creating them. But I would have to say that when I see the new laws that have come over the last two years, particularly in major legislation, particularly in land, that we are going to be governed in that area of major concern to each and every one of us that till the land; that there will be some super authority, some appointed body that will have ultimate authority in some respects - and that's another board.

The Minister says, surface rights. Yes, on and on and on, but within land, I object to it and I object to that whole course we seem to be taking as legislators in not being able to make our own decisions and making them by boards.

What are the broader issues? Of course then, we have the Crow Rate issue. We have that issue. The Minister of Agriculture, of course, wants to be caught up in this issue. This is a major, major issue to his way of thinking. I'm not going to stand up here and say that it's not an important issue, but I question the motives of the members opposite in attempting to discuss and make this a focal issue in the country in this time. As the Minister is well aware, the NFU, Manitoba Pool are out in the country; they're trying to stir up all public opinion and support and all of a sudden the members opposite find it an opportune time to do the same thing; to go out and hear the views of the people.

Mr. Chairman, I tell you in all honesty, having been in attendance three years ago at the Minister of Transport's hearings into this whole issue, that the concept held by people in the rural areas is one very much different than the members opposite. I question why the major emphasis to go into the country on this particular issue at this time. I can see us debating it within the House; I can see us offering our views on several platforms . . .

**HON. A. ADAM:** Why didn't you vote against the resolution?

**MR. C. MANNES:** . . . but to take a standing committee out is, to me, a sinister attempt to create concern and confusion in the rural area.

What about the broader issues? What are some of the issues that the Minister should be totally involved in? I suppose I'm very critical of any Minister, but certainly this Minister of Agriculture has such a lack of understanding of the whole grain industry, how it works, how it survives in its very health and activity. I have a criticism of him in that regard, the new technology, as the Member for Lakeside mentioned last night, a total misunderstanding and lack of appreciation

of the whole new technology that is coming into agriculture particularly as related to the grain industry and to the growing industry.

I see his lack of understanding and his confusion as related to the crushing industry. The Minister, on one hand, pretends to say that he is totally in support of domestic crushing within this province and he concedes that they have problems and he understands them fully. Yet he refuses, in any comments related to the Crow rate, to make a rationalization of his differing views and how one may or may not be directly responsible to the other. I see a total lack of understanding within that whole area. Then, of course, the shortage of incomes within that area - the Minister has obviously twigged here. He would like to get up and rebut some of it and maybe he'll have another opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, there are others that want to speak, but I would like to make a few comments on the Supply and Management areas because I know this particular Minister has a close affinity to that area; he feels very much at home within that major area of his domain. I suppose my strongest feelings in that area are the powers that the boards are exercising, not that all the individuals, the directors of the boards aren't doing what they feel is in the best interests of their industry. But I'm wondering if this Minister of Agriculture is prepared to indicate to these directors, to the people that are leading the boards, whether or not that, if they look at the long-run future - maybe the Member for Minnedosa can tell me how long he plans to speak.

Well, my train of thought has been disturbed here, Mr. Chairman. But anyway moving on quickly, I'm wondering again if the Minister understands the total contribution that is to be made by the Manitoba Marketing Council and its total regulatory control of the whole supply management system.

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say that agriculture, in spite of this Minister, in spite of this government, it will survive. In spite of all the attempts they're making to even out the flow, to take away the bus and the low points, to take away the so-called inequality, those that are debt-free, those that are efficient, I know that upsets a great number of them because they associate that with wealth and, of course, wealth is a bad thing. — (Interjection) — Well, the Minister of Agriculture says, no. Well, maybe. When he says no, I understand that he may be sincere but I don't believe the whole set of his colleagues.

So in spite of this government, agriculture will survive as long as they do not barter away their freedom, as long as they do not fall for all the incentives that encourage them into dreadful plans; indeed like this Beef Plan and indeed like the proposed land bill.

So I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that as long as this government leaves alone the basic structures within agriculture it will survive and it will have a healthy day some time in the future. So that's my plea to the Minister and to the members opposite. Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Minister, the other day I was in the Chair and the Member for Arthur made a few comments about the Saskeram and I feel that I should

take the opportunity to respond to those comments. He said that he is giving his colleague, the former Minister of Natural Resources, all kinds of credits for having created that committee to handle the Saskeram which would eliminate all the problems that have existed in that area for many years.

I just want to assure the former Minister of Agriculture that the problem has not been resolved, because the committee that was created there was dealing with the Saskeram area only under the Wildlife Management terms. There was no room on that committee to discuss agriculture. So if he felt that he was doing a good turn for the farmers of The Pas by creating this committee, I can assure him it didn't have the results that he had hoped it would have. The farmers, shortly after the committee was set up, resigned from the committee because within the rules set out that the committee had to operate under, they could make no contribution whatsoever. So they have resigned from that committee and the committee is still functioning, but without the input that the farmers would have and should have had.

When the press releases were put out concerning the creation of the committee, the farmers in the area were led to believe that the land would be utilized under a multiple land use policy which would include agriculture, but when the committee got into practice there was no room for agriculture whatsoever. So as a result of that, the farmers' representative as well as the council's representative both resigned because they had no useful purpose on that committee.

Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't think there's much that I can say that hasn't been said already by most of my colleagues on the various areas of agriculture such as their Beef Program and the various other aspects of agriculture, but I have one or two pet areas. — (interjection) — I won't get into that remark about what the banks are doing to farmers, Mr. Chairman, because that would take me another couple of hours to straighten him out, a few misconceptions he has about financing the agricultural community.

I just want to have one word with the Minister in connection with his Beef Plan, that things are starting to come to light, now the fellows that he enticed in with the carrot have a little bit of help and now has them locked into a marketing plan. When they've got to drop that \$400 or \$500 off their stock sale, they're starting to realize now that they may be locked in.

Mr. Chairman, as I've said, there have been very many areas covered and I'm not going to take the time of the committee to thrash that over again although the more those points are hammered home to the Agriculture Minister, I'm sure that he will eventually get the message if enough of us keep telling him the way it is.

Mr. Chairman, my main purpose in getting a few words on the record, of course, is in connection with the proposed move of the Crop Insurance office from Minnedosa to Neepawa and a recent news release from the Neepawa paper, "Crop insurance office to be moved here from Minnedosa." So it looks like it's a fait accompli by the newspaper.

Mr. Chairman, on the 25th of January, the editor of the Minnedosa Tribune phoned the General Manager of the Crop Insurance office and said these rumours were about and possibly there should be some look taken at some boundary changes rather than moving the actual office and he got the reply that this certainly would not be discussed in the press. It was not a matter that he would discuss with the press because there was a delegation coming to meet him and yet he has indicated to the Neepawa Press that economic conditions are forcing some measures to be taken and MCIC expects to save 2,200 in administration costs. Space is available at Neepawa and at the agricultural offices he said, following cancellation of some agricultural programs.

Now I haven't heard the Minister tell us what agricultural programs have been cancelled but, "They are looking at the move to provide better service to farmers at less cost," he said, and I was quoting, Mr. Chairman, from that article.

Mr. Chairman, the office at Minnedosa serviced per claim at lower cost than any other area office in that particular area of Manitoba. Where cost claims were less, the economics - if the Minister will take a look at the Order for Return that I put in asking certain questions - he answered that I'd be supplied with certain information. I think when he compiles the information in that letter he will see that the arguments that the board are putting forward are really not that legitimate and not that viable, if they are really interested in providing better service to farmers. I appeared before the board with a delegation of two good rural councillors, who are also good farmers in the area, one of them whose politics are well-known - and they certainly aren't akin to the policies that I support but he feels very strongly - and for once he and I thought of like minds in appearing before that committee. He put forward very, very strong arguments — (Interjection) — well, he's already signed up. If the Member for Ste. Rose wants to sign him up, it's Dean Gwyer, a counsellor from south of Minnedosa, who's quite capable of handling himself and presenting facts to the committee and he did a very good job.

I also had a counsellor from the Municipality of Minto, Mr. Blaine Burton with me, who also presented a brief for the farm business group from that area and presented some good facts. The board gave us a good hearing.

We discussed boundary changes and they gave us the argument that if you change one boundary, then you're throwing all the other offices out of whack and our retaliation to that was, of course, naturally. Because the boundary changes maybe should be looked at, they've been there for a long time. The communities of interest should be looked at, rather than the arguments that they're putting forward, that it's going to take pressure off one area and put it onto another.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Municipality of Saskatchewan and the Municipality of Harrison, which are serviced by the Minnedosa office, are not in District No. 12. They're supposed to be going to Hamiota. The area just south of Minnedosa, the boundary changes - they go to Souris. They go right past Brandon to go to Souris, so there's absolutely no community of interest there whatsoever. Those people should be serviced in Minnedosa, that's their trading area; if not there, in Brandon certainly.

So these are the things that the board, I think, should be looking at, rather than just making an arbitrary change of an office, for reasons that are maybe not too obvious to some of us, but are obvious maybe when you get right down to the real reason for it.

I would urge the Minister to take a real good look at the decision of the board. As I say, they gave us a good hearing and it appeared the decision . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** It appeared their decision had been made.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, order please.  
The Minister of Municipal Affairs on a point of order.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Minnedosa has made statements that I think should not be left on the record unchallenged, and also the Member for Lakeside from his seat, as usual, making statements that somehow I had some involvement in a board decision. He's trying to impute that I had . . .

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I made no such statement in my remarks.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**HON. A. ADAM:** . . . somehow influenced the movement of an office from Minnedosa to Neepawa and I want for the record to show that I did not learn about any transfer until it appeared in the press.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I thank the member for that clarification. It was not a point of order.  
The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I did say in my remarks that the Member for Ste. Rose had influenced the board in their decision to move the office from my constituency to his constituency - if he promised the Town of Neepawa that during the election campaign, I have no control over that. But I did not say that he influenced the board in their decision.

The Town of Neepawa, naturally, are going to welcome that office there with open arms and I compliment them for the Chamber of Commerce, I've got copies of the letters to the Minister. The Chamber of Commerce and the industrial group and the Mayor of the town have written to say there's space there and they welcome it and I don't blame them. They're just doing their job. They're happy to have it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**A MEMBER:** Power-play Pete.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Municipal Affairs on a point of order.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, again the member has indicated that during the election campaign I had made a promise to the people.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I said I didn't know whether you had or not.

**HON. A. ADAM:** But I did not.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** So the record may be clear, Mr. Chairman, I said I didn't know whether the Minister promised the Town of Neepawa that office during the election or not. — (Interjection) — The Minister has received correspondence from them. He's also received a fairly strong documented letter from the Mayor of Minnedosa, and incidentally, Mr. Chairman, the Minister hasn't replied to those two letters from Minnedosa. I hope that he will see fit to do that.

But, Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, the economics of that move are just not going to stand up under good close scrutiny, and I want to urge the Minister to take a real hard look at the final decision of that board, because they had a fairly heavy agenda and they only wanted us to bring a couple of delegates. We could have brought 100 there. In fact, if the decision is made, there may be a couple of hundred there picketing the crop insurance offices of Portage la Prairie very shortly. I just hope they don't bring any matches with them and cause any problems.

But, Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me, by what is coming out in the press in the last two days, that the board has kind of made up their decision and they gave us a kindly and generous hearing and we presented our case as strongly as we could and I think gave them some good material in opposition to their reasons for moving that office. But as I mentioned earlier, there was a proposal to move it some three years ago; the economics of it just weren't there to justify the move and it was not moved and the economics are not there today.

There are some things that could be changed in that particular area. The general manager of the Board admitted that the Municipality of Westbourne normally go to Portage la Prairie, but Portage is overloaded because they have a lot of extra-special crops, and what not, so they're very loaded there but, as you know, we have a very heavy unemployment problem in Manitoba and if it's necessary, we can hire another staff member for Portage la Prairie to carry that extra load.

The people from the Saskatchewan municipality and Harrison that normally trade and the community of interest is in Minnedosa for their rinks and their childrens' schooling and everything else, have their crop insurance claims handled in the Minnedosa office, although it is not in their district. They have no interest in going to Hamiota and the offices do co-operate in handling various claims. Their argument that they can save money by adjuster travel will not stand up either, because as I say, the Minnedosa office has handled on a per claim basis, cost-wise, cheaper than any other office in any other district in the province.

So those arguments can be looked at very very carefully. Adjusters, as we all know, are available for any section of the province if disaster strikes in Swan River or The Pas, the adjusters come from all over the province, so really, trying to settle the adjusters cost down isn't really going to hold water.



Mr. Chairman, I know my colleague, the Member for Roblin, wants to make a few comments so I will not take any longer. I did want to get those remarks on the record once more, and urge the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, to take a real long hard look at this proposed move because the arguments, I don't think, when he has all the figures at his disposal will stand up. Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, very briefly I would like to put on the record a few of the problems that have come to my attention in my constituency during the past year, since we dealt with the Estimates last year, and I think a lot of them have already been raised. The difficult problem that the farm community is facing with the escalating production costs is one that is very very difficult to resolve, but the Minister must devote a lot of attention and the government to see if we can't find some way to come to the rescue of the farm community.

The depressed grain prices that are announced today by the Government of Canada again are another basic - what do you call it? A nail in the coffin of our No. 1 industry which is going to create untold problems that we don't even discuss here today as they now are trying to put their crop in facing a marketplace that has no future for them at those prices.

The young farmers - and I've raised that with the Minister - and the problems that they're having with their debts, and the fact that they can't negotiate financing is certainly one that the Minister and the government must devote a lot of its time and energy to. The energy costs that the farm community are facing today and, of course, that was already raised earlier by one of the members, Mr. Chairman, where the members opposite refused to deal with it in a rational manner and subsequently saw fit to water the resolution down so basically it becomes a meaningless resolution.

The other thing that certainly keeps coming to my attention day after day is the user fees that this government is burdening the farm community with. We've drawn to their attention the problems of the forage leases on crown lands. I have letters here, and the Minister has dealt with some of the problems of the water rates in these rural communities and he's had user fees there, and then the production costs of producing the water bills. Again the user fee has been applied. There's an increase of 16 to 20 percent they're being asked to bear at this particular time, Mr. Chairman.

The Interest Rate Relief Program, I have yet to have anybody in my constituency come forth and say that it helped them solve their problems. The farmers that really need the help out there, the Interest Rate Relief Program didn't measure up to their expectations and so they're still searching for financing.

The conflict-of-interest matter that we raised, which is a constituent of mine, the Minister hasn't resolved that problem although he did say that these inspectors can only count, I believe he said, and verify numbers, and that they may be involved at the auction marts but that certainly is not a solution to some of the questions that are being raised.

Lucky for me that the government has seen fit to open up the bull testing station in the area, the 72 bulls that were taken into the program last year are sort of a short-notice type of thing - I wasn't officially notified of this thing, or the field day that was being held. That's, I guess, par for the course when something is taking place in your constituency, you're the last one to learn about it. I thought that the Minister and the government would have devoted more time and effort towards publicizing what happened to the irrigation project in Roblin-Russell constituency which turned out to be beyond the wildest expectations of the Minister and government. While the local community did publicize it to a great extent, I hear very little from the Minister and the Department of Agriculture.

Of course, the other thing that's happened without any help from the Minister, or without any help from my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs is the opening of the cheese plant at Rossburn again. That certainly shows that those people out there can persevere and work hard, and by themselves without any input or help from this government, and they got the plant back in production again, Mr. Chairman, because I — (Interjection) — Well, the Minister says it's not true. Well, I asked, I raised questions here time and time and again and asked for information as to what was going on and how, and no letters or anything has come forward from the government indicating to me that progress is being made. The only way I could find out what was going on was go to the cheese plant in Rossburn and ask questions there. But I certainly got no indication from the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs or from the Minister of Agriculture as to what was actually forthcoming in the development at Rossburn.

But, Mr. Chairman, I still am concerned about the election promises that this government made and that great document that's been publicized and was dropped I daresay at every doorstep in Robin-Russell constituency during the last campaign. And all the ink, and the pledges, and the promises that the New Democratic Party offered, where there would be no farmers lose their farms due to interest rates, etc., etc. I don't see that the government or the Minister has dealt with them in the Estimates.

I'm still concerned about the input and the help that this government is providing to CSP Foods. I notice that the Crow hearings are under way again, which I think is an exercise in futility for the second time around, and I have yet to hear the Minister address himself to the problems that sunflowers are not included in the proposed legislation that's coming forth; that the sunflower industry and the canola industry is going to be left out in left field, as I understand it from a release that was in the Globe and Mail yesterday by Mr. Penner from CSP Foods. We should be addressing ourselves to that problem, that the sunflowers are not being included in the forthcoming legislation. — (Interjection) — Well, that was the release that came out from Mr. Penner from CSP Foods, in yesterday's Globe and Mail. I don't have it with me but I did clip the article.

But I think that industry has proved, Mr. Chairman, that it is a viable industry in our province, and it has proved that it can deal with a crop that was frozen, their rapeseed was frozen and not the best condition.

But it has proved it can handle it better than any crushing plant in the west. I'm not that familiar with the crushers that are in Eastern Canada.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are other matters in the area out there. I'm wondering what future plans the Minister has got for further problems of irrigation out of the Shellmouth Reservoir. Is there any work, or any studies that he can provide to me, or to the people? Because that body of water is there, and irrigation now has proved to be, from the statements and the figures that the Minister put in the record the other day, that it is something that we should be looking at very carefully in the years ahead because the Shellmouth Reservoir is there. The water is there. And if this pilot project is as successful as I understand it is then we maybe should take a look at least for the forage crops in the area.

With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I'm not very happy of what we learned from the Minister during his Estimates. I'm disappointed that he saw fit to move the staff out of the Information Services Branch and move them over into the Premier's office of the propaganda machine. And as I said the other day I projected, and prophesied some six weeks ago, or maybe four weeks ago when the Member for Lakeside stood in his place and read the Weppler Report into the record that these things would happen and that the information that would be coming out of the Department of Agriculture wouldn't be as factual as it was after the propaganda aspect of it.

So with those remarks, I hope that the Minister will work hard in the year ahead and give us better leadership, better direction and more sense of how he's going to help stabilize and keep the No. 1 industry in this province, in the eyes of the public, where it deserves the full attention of every member of this House.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, before we pass the Estimates, I have the matter of the communiqué from my office to Ottawa, a copy of that was sent to me and I want to give that to the honourable member. As well, the date is April 5, 1983. 1607 - here are several copies for the honourable members.

As well, for the Honourable Member for Gladstone, I have copies of letters that we wrote regarding the matter of research that she had raised, our letters and replies to them.

Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, I certainly take the criticisms and the suggestions that are offered by the Conservative Party on the opposite side. Mr. Chairman, if one just examines what has happened within Agriculture and the budget of Agriculture over the last number of years, one will see the commitment that this party has towards agriculture. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the budget in terms of actual adjusted vote, 1981-82 at roughly \$39 million under the last year of the Conservative administration to 1982-83 of \$61 million in terms of support for agriculture, a 50 percent increase. Mr. Chairman, as well this year, in addition over the 1981-82, is a 25 percent increase. Mr. Chairman, we are committed to agriculture in terms of stability of incomes to the farmers.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 1.(a)—pass.

Resolution No. 8: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,616,500 for Agriculture, General Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee rise.

The hour is 4:30, it's time for Private Members' Hour. I will be leaving the Chair until 8:00 tonight.

## IN SESSION PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour. The first item on the agenda is the second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES - SECOND READING PUBLIC BILLS

### BILL NO. 32 - THE MUNICIPAL ASSESSMENT ACT

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, thank you. I'm just looking for my notes on this matter. The matter was dealt with at some length by the Minister of Municipal Affairs dealing with the exemptions that have been proposed in the bill by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

Mr. Speaker, the present Municipal Assessment Act does provide for a variety of exemptions from assessment, and of course when buildings are exempted from assessment, they are of course then exempted from taxation for certain types of properties. In some cases, the exemptions relate to municipal taxes, others to school taxes only and in some cases to both.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member wants to provide a certain exemption at this point in time to increase the numbers of exemptions after we have had hearings. In fact the commission, which was set up by his administration to investigate and report on some of the inequities in The Municipal Assessment Act and the whole area of assessment, I kind of really wonder how the member, as being part of the former administration of the Treasury Branch, Mr. Chairman, can now get up and advocate more exemptions when he set up a commission to deal with the whole hodgepodge of problems that we had in the whole field of assessment. Mr. Speaker, no one criticized their administration, and in fact it was being worked on . . .

**MR. H. ENNS:** Many people applauded.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** . . . Mr. Chairman, I won't go so far as to say that. In fact, some of his own colleagues have disassociated by some of the recommendations that have been put forward by the commission.

Mr. Chairman, the member, I presume, is putting his case forward - I haven't read his remarks - wanting an exemption for day care centres on the basis that they aren't being equitably treated, because there are day care centres which of course are within church

buildings and other public institutions which are presently exempt from both municipal and school taxes. These day care centres would have that kind of an exemption. However, to now add an additional number or an additional exemption into the Act for one specific class, Mr. Chairman, I think cases could be made all over the place. Arguments can be made for increasing exemptions and the like.

That's why I wonder why the honourable member, a former Minister of Municipal Affairs, would bring forward this suggestion, Mr. Chairman, when in fact his administration was trying to deal with the question of proliferation of exemptions and the real hodgepodge in the area of municipal assessment and municipal taxation. I really don't understand the thinking of the former Minister of Municipal Affairs to go this route, unless of course there are motives which I am not aware of that he is trying to bring in, unless he wants to have publicity on the matter.

I know that there is no doubt that in terms of these economic times many groups in society are facing difficult times of finances and trying to keep their operations going, Mr. Chairman. I think that is recognized but to try and deal with the problem through exemptions and creating problems for other groups in society, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe it's the way to go. I don't think the honourable member, if he really sat down and thought it through, Mr. Chairman, would have gone that way and would be prepared to support, if he were in government, that kind of a move unless there was a total approach to the whole area of assessment, Mr. Speaker. They were in office; they could have extended it while they were in office, but I don't think that was their approach and I don't fault them for it. That wasn't their approach. They wanted to take a comprehensive approach, which does take more time admittedly, and does still leave in place anomalies in the system. There is no doubt about it that for the time being, anomalies that have existed for many years will continue and are continuing, but to say now, because these anomalies are here, let's add one more because we perceive and see a problem in this particular area. I don't believe that is very responsible, in terms of the honourable member putting this bill forward.

I really think he should reconsider his position in terms of bringing forward this legislation. The honourable thing to do would be to withdraw the bill from the House, Mr. Speaker, and recognize that it was his administration and he has the Weir Commission Report dealing with assessment and the whole area of exemptions which they tried to assess. I've looked at that report and certain sections of it, Mr. Speaker, and I could quote some pages for him that I have from my notes.

Mr. Speaker, I can really see no great merits recognizing that the honourable member is trying - and I'll even give him the benefit of the doubt - to help certain groups in society. But he knows that if he was the Minister back in government, he would not allow that to happen. He would not bring in that amendment. He would not allow his colleague to bring that amendment, unless they dealt with the entire problem. His colleague, the Member for Swan River, wouldn't have brought it in when he was Minister of Municipal Affairs. He and some of his colleagues dealt with the problem in the appropriate manner, dealt with it on a

basis of looking at the whole issue of assessment and the inequities in the assessment, the exemptions in the assessment field and that's how they were going to deal with it. And no one condemns them, in fact, most people in this province applaud them for that move, Mr. Speaker. I certainly wasn't one of those that condemned them for moving along that line because that kind of thinking and development and thrust was being developed while we were still in office. Notwithstanding that fact, Mr. Speaker, they did carry it through and I applaud them for that.

They went ahead and they said, look, let's do a comprehensive review. But now, to circumvent that review by bringing in piecemeal legislation, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe is the step in the right direction.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Norbert will be closing debate.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Both the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Agriculture, who himself is a former Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Speaker, have indicated surprise that I brought this bill forward also as a former Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, they point out that in July of 1979, I brought forward and signed an Order-in-Council by virtue of which a review was undertaken of municipal assessment in Manitoba and indeed it was a substantial review and a thorough review and I think the people who did it were well qualified to do it and they made a report, "A Fair Way to Share," in March of 1982, over one year ago. We have seen no action on the part of this government, Mr. Speaker, in terms of implementing or bringing forward any policy decisions or any legislation with respect to this report and that is consistent with what they did when they were in government prior to 1977, because this was not a new problem that we had to face in 1977, it was a problem that had existed for a long time. The present Minister of Agriculture, while he was Minister of Municipal Affairs, and the present First Minister, while he was Minister of Municipal Affairs, neglected to deal with this particular problem. So now, Mr. Speaker, they stand up in their seats consistently neglecting this whole problem of municipal assessment while they were in government up to 1977 and neglecting to deal with it in any appropriate and proper way since they have been in government and since they have had the report, and they're asking us to defer and delay any sort of changes.

They have asked, why did I not address this inequity when I was Minister of Municipal Affairs, or when I was a member of the Cabinet of the previous government, Mr. Speaker? If they had read my remarks in the introduction of this bill, this problem did not exist at that time.

The facility that I am particularly talking about, the St. Norbert Nursery School, Mr. Speaker, was purchased and opened in the fall of 1981. They received a tax assessment in early 1982. Having received that tax assessment and finding that they were being taxed on a commercial assessment at those high rates rather than residential rates and had no exemption, at least were not given the credit of any exemption, they

appealed to the Court of Revision of the City of Winnipeg in the spring of 1982 and then to the Court of Queen's Bench where the learned trial judge found that, although he had a great deal of sympathy with the position and plight that they were in, felt that they did not bring themselves within the terms of the exemptions allowed under The Municipal Act, which was drafted many years ago and if any member wishes to look at the terminology and the phrases that are used in that Act, they will find that it's simply not an up-to-date piece of legislation and judges, to my knowledge, have consistently recommended that those exemptions and the wording be updated.

It is a fact simply that when that legislation was drawn there was no such thing as a day care centre or a nursery school and I'm satisfied, looking at the spirit of the exemptions in The Municipal Act, that if they had existed they would have been provided an exemption under that Act.

Members have referred to the Weir Assessment Report and the Minister of Municipal Affairs did, Mr. Speaker, but he did not refer to a paragraph at the top of Page 126, where the report states that, "The Committee would like to very clearly state that its recommendations in this section are not made as a result of presentations made to it by churches, religious organizations or charitable and non-profit institutions." Mr. Speaker, none of these groups made representation to the Assessment Review Committee and the report clearly states that, obviously, the recommendations are subject to any recommendations or briefs that might be submitted by such organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is only equitable that a facility like this should be exempt from school taxes when you look at the kinds of facilities that are exempt from school taxes under our existing legislation. A day care centre and a nursery school clearly fall within the spirit of the exemptions presently provided.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs has said that he recommends to this House that this bill not be proceeded with because he doesn't want to muddy the waters, Mr. Speaker; but he, at the same time, says he is going to continue to study the inequities of exemptions, etc., in the existing legislation. Mr. Speaker, we have no commitment whatsoever from the Minister or the government that they are in any way, shape or form going to introduce new legislation in this particular field in any way based on the report that they have had for well over a year now.

I believe, and I stand to be corrected, but I believe the Minister has been asked in recent days whether or not he's going to recall the committee that heard public hearings and he has indicated that he's not going to. He's not going to, he says, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what is happening on the other side is that there is a conspiracy among members of the government not to allow any member of the opposition to present and have passed in this Chamber a private member's bill, no matter how equitable and right that bill is; no matter how much it deals properly with justice for the people that it is intended to benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill the other day that would have given to rape victims and victims of crimes some compensation for pain and suffering. The Attorney-General chose to raise a technicality rather

than allowing a bill which is purely justifiable on its merits to pass. Mr. Speaker, what is clearly happening in this Legislature is that members opposite are not going to allow any bill to pass in this Chamber unless it is brought in by a member of the government.

I asked some of them, Mr. Speaker, to look back at what happened while we were in government. On numerous occasions, we allowed members of the opposition to present and, when they presented reasonable amendments, to have those amendments passed, and that happened on numerous occasions. Separate bills were passed. I distinctly recall one by the former Member for Fort Rouge, Mrs. Westbury, passing a private member's bill in this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, so we were clearly open when the members of the opposition presented something that was justifiable. It could be based on common sense. If it benefited the public interest, we were prepared to allow it to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I see members protesting, and that only leads me to believe even more strongly that the rationale for the speech of the Minister of Municipal Affairs is, simply, they are not going to allow any private member's bill to pass.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind members, in the election of 1981, there was a candidate in the St. Norbert Constituency called Ruth Pear. She put out a piece of information, Mr. Speaker, a little pamphlet that said, Ruth Pear is part of an NDP team that will put people first. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that puts people first. This is a bill that is going to benefit a non-profit voluntary organization, community organization, operating a day care centre and a nursery school, Mr. Speaker, who have to, at the present time, pay school taxes at the commercial rate.

Now, members opposite have already thrust upon this voluntary non-profit organization the burden of paying the payroll tax, Mr. Speaker, 1.5 percent of their payroll, which is an additional burden. I remind them, when they imposed that tax and when they imposed this school tax on a commercial rate on this kind of an operation, the only people who suffer are the children in the school. They are the ones who suffer as a result of the increased overhead and operational costs at that school.

Ruth Pear, Mr. Speaker, the NDP candidate, would obviously, I would have hoped, put people first. Mr. Speaker, she ran on the NDP ticket and she also said that the NDP were going to encourage community based, non-profit quality day care. That's what she said, Mr. Speaker, in the Constituency of St. Norbert where this day care-nursery school is located. She's going to encourage community based, non-profit quality day care. Do the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, the members of the NDP, think that they are assisting or encouraging quality day care by not only imposing the payroll tax, but by requiring the school to continue to pay school taxes on a commercial basis? I think not, Mr. Speaker, because I have talked to the people who operate this school, and these costs are a burden on their operation.

Mr. Speaker, I think any member on the opposite side who has a conscience should vote as a private member on this bill. I suggest to them that it deserves full support, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask for a recorded vote on this bill, because if members

opposite are going to vote against this bill, I am going to make sure that all of their constituents learn what the statements of the NDP mean. If they are going to vote against a bill that benefits the operation of a voluntary non-profit nursery school, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — There are no games being played. This tax is costing the operation of this school a great deal of money, as well as the payroll tax.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to members opposite that they pass this bill; that it benefits a non-profit organization and it is worthy of support.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. G. MERCIER:** The Member for St. Boniface, Mr. Speaker, indicates, did I find this all out in the last year. Yes, the school was just constructed and opened in 1981. It opened in the fall of 1981. There are only two or three in the whole province, I've since found out, who own their own building, who are in this situation. I'll explain this, Mr. Speaker, for the Member for St. Boniface. — (Interjection) — Well, there are ten of them then. If they can be benefited - fine.

The only reason this nursery school exists in this location is because it received a grant from the developer in Parc La Salle, in order to be applied to the purchase of this property, and that's why they're in the position that they are able to own their property because of a grant from the developer.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to the members opposite that this bill does deserve their support; that it is something that would encourage community-based, non-profit, quality day care, and I ask them to support this bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question before the House is the proposed second reading of Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act.

**QUESTION put, MOTION defeated.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.  
Order please.

**A STANDING VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

### YEAS

Messrs. Blake, Brown, Carroll, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham; Mrs. Hammond; Messrs. Hyde, Johnston, Lyon, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman; Mrs. Oleson; Messrs. Orchard, Ransom, Steen.

### NAYS

Messrs. Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Corrin, Cowan; Mrs. Dodick; Mr. Doern; Ms. Dolin; Messrs. Eyler, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner; Ms. Phillips; Messrs. Plohman, Santos, Schroeder; Mrs. Smith; Messrs. Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Yeas, 20; Nays, 27.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I declare the motion lost.

On the proposed second reading of Bill 36, the Honourable Member for The Pas.

### BILL NO. 36 - THE AGROLOGISTS ACT

**MR. H. HARAPIAK** presented Bill No. 36, The Agrologists Act; Loi sur les agronomes for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have a few words of introduction to this new Agrologists Act. I know that there are several members who, along with being members of this assembly, are members of the Manitoba Agrologist Association. So I know that they will be supporting me in the passing of this Act. The existing Act was assented on April 22, 1950. Since that time the agricultural industry has undergone a great number of changes. The needs of the agricultural industry, along with the role of the agrologists have changed to a great degree since that time. The new Act will make the Manitoba Institute of Agrologists more responsive to the needs of both the members of the association and also to the agricultural community.

More operating responsibility will be transferred from the Agricultural Association's membership to the council. Up to this time the membership have had to settle many of the disputes during their annual meetings. Council will have the authority to respond to issues on a more timely basis instead of getting wrapped up in all the turmoil of calling meetings for the entire membership. The council will now have the authority to handle most of the situations at the council level. In addition there will be less opportunity to practice agrology without becoming a member of the association and thereby they'll be covered by the ethics and the responsibilities required of all agrologist members.

The new Act is patterned along the lines of other professional Acts, the draft prepared by the Manitoba Institute of Agrologists' solicitors in consultation with the councils' attempts to utilize where possible the format for comparable professions. However, the Act is distinctive because of the uniqueness of the agrology profession and also of the agricultural field which it's involved in and the broad scope that it covers.

There are several changes to The Agrologists Act. The first one is the definition of the agrologist and, up to now, the current Act has been difficult if not impossible to enforce and, consequently, some of the individual members could practice agrology without being members of the association. In the new Act it will make it more compulsory, and they are going to handle that by exempting the people rather than - they're all exempted in the Act - and some of the people who are exempted are: a person carrying on the business of farming unless he holds himself out to be an agrologist; an undergraduate student who is an assistant to an agrologist, working under the direct supervision of an agrologist, and who is not responsible

for the work he's carrying on other than to his immediate supervisor; and a person who is registered and holds professional status in another profession will be exempted as well; a person who practices his profession as a chemist, forester, land appraiser, land surveyor, or a person servicing or repairing farm machinery, provided he does not hold himself out as an agrolgist; a person or his agent who gives advice relating to the quality or use of the article or product that he offers for sale, provided such advice is given under the authority of the supervisor or under the authority of the member of the Agrolgist's Association; an agricultural technician or technologist working under the supervision of a member of the association as well; and any other member of the council, that in its discretion decides to exempt, is also free from being a member.

The new council will have a membership of 15 members. The membership will be made up of five members which will be elected from the Winnipeg branch; one of which will be elected to a one-year term; two of which will be elected for a two-year term; and two of which will be elected for a three-year term. Two members will be elected from the Western branch, of which one will hold office for a one-year period and the second will hold an office for a three-year term. One member will be elected from the Central branch to hold office for a term of three years. The president of each of the Winnipeg region and the Western region and the Central branch will also be members of the council. The Manitoba National Director of the Agricultural Institute of Canada will also be a member of the council.

For the first time, there will be three members appointed to the association, who are not professional agrolgists, and these will be appointed for a three-year term. Some of the requirements to be qualified for these three positions will be: they are not members of the institute; they are residents of the province; they are appointed by the Minister of Agriculture, the dean of the Faculty of Agriculture of the University of Manitoba, and the president of the Diploma Agricultural Graduates Association.

The person appointed to the council under Subsection (1) will serve for a term of three years unless his successor is appointed earlier than that time.

The president will be appointed from those elected to the council. In previous years, the presidents have been elected at their annual conventions. I have been a member of an association, the Trustees Association, where each trustee in each territory is elected by the members after the elections are held. I think it is a more effective way of choosing a chairman or a president.

The council will be given the authority or the responsibility by their by-laws - it will not be necessary to set their annual meetings by annual conventions. The council has the authority to set the annual meetings. Also, the disciplinary and appeal procedures are clearly defined in this new Act. In the past, they have not been as clearly defined.

The major changes between the existing new Act and that of the previous Act is that teaching is no longer a specific exemption under the new Act. Other professions such as chemists are exempted as long as they are individuals who do not hold themselves out

to be agrolgists. Most agricultural professors at the University of Manitoba who meet the definition of practicing agrolgists are members of the association. A few are not members at this time. It is the opinion of the Manitoba Institute of Agrolgists that these individuals who practice agrolgy, are involved in the process of preparing information for farmers and really are in a leadership role in the agricultural industry, that they should become members of the association, the same as if they were working in the agro-business or in government.

The council is given the authority and the responsibility to conduct the business of the association. Some of the benefits of the new Act are it will enhance the quality of the service that it has given to the agricultural industry. Also, it will increase the prestige of the individuals who are practicing agrolgy at this time. As members of the MIA, individuals are required to provide sound responsible information limited to their specific area of expertise. Members failing to provide this level of service will be facing disciplinary action, and those providing irresponsible service and operating without membership will also be dealt with if the individuals can be identified as practicing agrolgy when they are not holding a membership. The new Act also exempts farmers unless they hold themselves out to be agrolgists.

In closing, I know that there are a few members opposite who will speak in support of this bill, not only because they are members of the Manitoba Agriculturalist Association, but because the changes will make the association more responsive to both the membership and the agricultural industry. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member sponsoring the bill might respond to a couple of questions of clarification at this time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas declines to answer.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Speaker, I'll respond to those questions when I'm closing debate on the bill. He can raise his questions at this time and I'll respond to them at that time.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I take it that the member isn't going to respond to questions on the bill that he's . . . Then I take it I can pose my questions to him now, is that right?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

Where there are questions to a member who has just spoken they are intended to be for clarification. Since the honourable member has indicated that he will answer any questions when he closes debate then it's up to the honourable member to raise these questions when he does speak to the bill.

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

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Swan River that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## RES. 2 - THE NATURAL RESOURCES TRANSFER AGREEMENT

**MR. SPEAKER:** The next item before the House is our Resolution No. 2., Amendment to the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement, and the Amendment proposed thereto by the Honourable Member for Radisson standing in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, if the member feels that he has time to speak within the time available, I would prefer to have him speak because I would like to hear what the member has to say and I don't intend to be in the House tomorrow. But, if there isn't enough time . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the debate that has taken place on this resolution that was first presented by the Member for Turtle Mountain and then later amended by the Member for Radisson.

I would like to begin to say that I was raised in an area where wild game was very plentiful, coming from the Swan River area. My father was a hunter and we quite often had wild meat on the table. My mother taught us how to appreciate the finer things, the natural beauty of nature and therefore that probably explains that one of the reasons why I buy a hunting licence every year but I have only been successful on one occasion. I am usually involved in gazing at the natural beauty that surrounds us and when I am out hunting, I haven't missed them, I just haven't seen them. Maybe it's because I've got poor eyesight - I am not sure what it is.

I agree with the many of the previous speakers, that there is a problem in the area of over-hunting of big-game animals. I do not believe that we can point a finger at one part of society and point a finger at the Indian people and say that they are responsible for the indiscriminate hunting that has been carried on and therefore they are the ones that are responsible for the big-game population to be at the low point it is at right now.

In the constituency of the The Pas, which I represent, there are five Indian Bands. There are a lot of members of those bands who still depend on their skills as hunters to providing the food for their families. In speaking to many of the members of the bands throughout my constituency and asking what their thoughts were on this subject it was introduced into the Legislature almost without exception, they bring up the fact that they were assured of their rights to hunt in the treaty, although it was not, as the Member for Turtle Mountain, or a few of the previous members have pointed out, it was not written out strictly in the wording. It was an agreement itself in the Lieutenant-Governor's introduction to the bill he did say that the people would be guaranteed the right to hunt. His words were, we have made your treaty, you will still be free to hunt over much of the land included in the treaty, much as wood and beyond the places where the white man would

require to go. For time to come until this land is needed for use, you will be free to hunt over it. But, make all the use of them which you have made in the past, because when the land is needed to be tilled or occupied you must not go on them anymore. There will still be plenty of land that is neither tilled nor occupied where you can go and roam and hunt as you have always done.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is some of the problems that we are faced with today. I think the Member for Radisson and the Member for River East have stated in their presentations that the natural habitat that is needed by big-game animals has been destroyed. Many of the areas in the past have had quite a few acres on the agricultural area where there was habitat that did give the big game protection. But as the agricultural industry expanded, there is more and more people who are clearing all the land that is within their confines. There is very little shelter left nowadays. As a matter of fact, the Member for Radisson, in his presentation, said that it has gone down to less than 5 percent of the title land in the southern part of the province where there is any protection left for the big-game animals.

In the past when there was some land remaining for cover, the agricultural land served as a pasture for big-game animals which helped them to thrive and multiply. Once that protection was gone, the natural habitat was gone, and they were actually destroyed as well to a great degree.

Mr. Speaker, I have had numerous calls on this resolution from the Swan River area. I guess it is because I come from that area and I still continue to go back and hunt in that area. I have gone into that area to hunt elk and I have hunted in the Durban area, where the elk are very plentiful, but again it was not successful. I did see a lot of beautiful scenery though. I was back to hunt in Cowan area last fall. I came close to being successful, I saw deer but I didn't shoot. I guess the reason I received the number of calls, more calls in the last little while, is because the Member for Swan River, as he quoted in his words, has received many calls from the Wildlife Association that is in the Swan River area and they are very concerned about the people hunting out of season. There have been several petitions that are going around in the area. I attended two curling banquets in the Swan River area and, on each occasion, there was a list circulated promoting people to sign up to restrict the Native hunting rights.

I think that there is a lot of blame being attached to the Native people which is misplaced because we know that there are problems in the hunting field, but there are also members of the white society who are abusing it as much as members of the Native society. We're not saying that anybody is blameless, but I don't think we can put the blame on one race of people and say that they are the ones that are responsible for the game being in the condition it's in now.

Recently, the number of phone calls have picked up and I was wondering why. I guess I know why, because the Member for Swan River put an article in the Swan River paper which says that - the headlines of the article says, "Gourlay Condemns Nightlighting Practice." I should also speak on this subject. I am also opposed to nightlighting and I don't think that there are too many people, no matter where they come from, who

would say that nightlighting should be allowed, because I think with the weapons we've got nowadays that game hasn't got much chance as it is. So if we throw the nightlight into there, then really - we're going to be eliminating the game. Before too long, there won't be any game left.

But in this article that the Member for Swan River puts into the Swan River paper, he goes on to give his reasons as to why he is opposed to the nightlighting, but then he goes on a little further, and he says, "The NDP Member for Radisson, Gerard Lecuyer, has proposed an amendment which would support the continuation of nightlighting for Treaty people." — (Interjection) — I think that this is really improper to be putting in an article of that sort. I am not sure, in reading the resolution, how the Member for Swan River could possibly get that interpretation from that resolution. It is just another example of the practice, the distortions that this member is choosing to use on this particular issue, as he has used it on other ones. I don't think that it is fair to be putting in an article of that sort when that isn't the intent of our resolution.

The intent of our resolution was to protect the big game animals and it is not — (Interjection) — we have never in this House said that we are in favour of nightlighting. All the members who have gotten up and spoken to this point have expressed their dissatisfaction at that practice being carried out. We know that nightlighting is being carried on in the Swan River area to a great degree, and I don't blame the Member for Swan River for being concerned about it but I don't think that he should be misinterpreting the truth the way he has done in that last article of his.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rupertsland has put forth the position of his people very clearly. I think that they have been condemned in many circles for hunting illegally and I don't think that the people from my five bands are involved in nightlighting at all. There is no

signs of nightlighting in The Pas area. The Member for Turtle Mountain has said in the past that he's sure there is nightlighting going on, or the Member for Swan River's comments, saying that there is hunting to the north of the Swan River area and he's sure it carries on into The Pas area as well. I know of no nightlighting that is going on in The Pas area, although I was aware of it when I resided in the Cowan area because it is quite easy to spot when it is being carried on.

Again I just have to come back to the comments that the Member for Swan River made, misinterpreting the truth, saying that the Member for Radisson who was proposing an amendment; we have a copy of the amendment here and it does not say that we are going to be supporting nightlighting as he makes out.

Mr. Speaker, the previous resolution that was presented by the Member for Turtle Mountain, as we are all aware, is aimed - all the whereases are aimed at Native people and I think that is a terrible way to handle . . .

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

The Chair will accept a motion to adjourn. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the understanding that the committees will continue this evening, I would move that the House do now adjourn.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. On the assumption that the House will resume in Committee at 8:00 o'clock this evening, it is moved by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Housing that the House do now adjourn. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

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