

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 21 June, 1985.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

I move, seconded by the Member for Thompson, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where there are 55 students of Grade 5 standing from the Linden Lane School. They are under the direction of Miss Watt, and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

There are 45 students of Grade 5 standing from the Fleming Elementary School under the direction of Mr. Warrehan. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Senior Citizens - government mailing lists

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Premier. Yesterday he refused to share with the members on this side of the House a list of 11,000 senior citizens that had been prepared at public expense. My question to the Premier is, Mr. Speaker, is this list available to the New Democratic Party in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I made some enquiries after our discussion yesterday and I understand that the names can be obtained by way of a service provided by the Manitoba Telephone System, and I would ask

that this contract be forwarded to the Leader of the Opposition and probably he can get the names himself, if he wishes to enter into the contract with MTS, insofar as their service entitled "Who Called Me?"

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I see a blank contract here and I see no evidence of the list. Mr. Speaker, has the Government of Manitoba paid for this list of senior citizens, this list of 11,000, from which letters were sent out to all senior citizens in Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I don't know whether it's the Caucus or the Government, but it is money well worth spending, in order to obtain a list of the senior citizens of this province, so that - certainly this government if not the opposition wishes to ensure that it maintains contact with civil servants alerting them to events, senior citizens' programs such as the event of Monday. Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies at all for sending invitations to senior citizens. I don't know why I ought to.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about invitations to senior citizens. We're talking about sending a political message to senior citizens on a list that was bought by the public of Manitoba. Since, Mr. Speaker, that list was paid for by the people of Manitoba . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . why will he not share it with members on this side of the House?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the message that was submitted to the senior citizens in this province was a message brought about as a result of a resolution of the members of this Chamber. It was a resolution that was supported unanimously by members of this Chamber; the letter so indicated.

I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition that when resolutions are passed in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, we don't cease to discuss those resolutions; we don't cease to tell Manitobans about this resolution. Certainly, a matter as serious as de-indexation of senior citizens' pensions and a resolution passed unanimously in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I will not hesitate, I will refuse to be muzzled insofar as informing the senior citizens of this province of the actions of this Legislature.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Premier seems to have a different view on different issues. He wants to cease to talk about the bilingualism issue in this Chamber. He wants to cease to talk about other areas that have been debated and discussed. He has a selective decision-making process, Mr. Speaker.

My question to the Premier is will he make that list available to members on this side of the House which was paid for by the people of Manitoba?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Leader of the Opposition has Caucus research funds. I suggest he sign his name to the blank contract form which was forwarded over to him. He could obtain the same list of names, Mr. Speaker. He will not deflect from the basic issue and that is the de-indexation of pensions by the Federal Government, the opposition of this Legislature to that de-indexation, the need to information senior citizens in the Province of Manitoba that we oppose the erosion of senior citizens' incomes by way of the Federal Budget of Michael Wilson.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . Mr. Speaker, the basic issue is the abuse of the Premier's office, the turning of the Premier's office into a mailing room for the New Democratic Party in Manitoba. That's the basic issue that I'm getting at.

My question to the Premier . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
If the honourable member has a question seeking information, would he give it?
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is, has this list been shared with the New Democratic Party in Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is no but I'm going to deal with the premise of the Leader of the Opposition's questions.

Mr. Speaker, I will never, never acknowledge that I'm abusing any privileges in responding to the senior citizens that in large numbers have contacted my office by way of letter, by way of telephone, by other means to protest what is taking place in regard to the de-indexation. Mr. Speaker, I will never admit to any abuse in obtaining the names of as many senior citizens as I possibly obtain so that we can ensure that there's no confusion that it is, as to the position of this Provincial Government and this entire Chamber, including honourable members across the way insofar as our opposition to the de-indexation of senior citizens' pensions by the Conservative Government in Ottawa.

On a . . . provincial basis, protesting actions of the senior level of government, I'm not going to share that confidential information with the Leader of the Opposition.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A further question to the First Minister. Can the First Minister advise the House if the government or anyone in the government is supplying or have supplied mailing lists of persons receiving government benefits to New Democratic Party fund raisers?

HON. H. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I believe the First Minister's answer was no. I would ask him to explain how a permanently disabled pensioner who applied for the first time this year for municipal tax rebate from the government, and when he received the cheque from the government, he received at or about the same time a fund-raising letter from the NDP Party for the first time ever.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I often wonder how it is that I am on the Conservative Party mailing list. I received an honorary Conservative Party membership just three weeks ago from the Conservative Party headquarters.

I must acknowledged that I ripped it up, but I believe that's about the fifth such fund-raising letter I received from the Conservative Party of Manitoba, so I guess that we are all on mailing lists, regardless of - and some are sent to civil servants and others, as well.

Bills 79 and 80 - translations complete

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

MR. R. DOERN: I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General concerning the notices of motion in regard to the placement of Bill No. 79, The Highway Traffic Act and Bill No. 80, The Summary Convictions Act.

Given that the government should have translated both acts at least two years ago, can the Minister indicate when in fact these translations were completed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is unbelievable. It is the Honourable Member for Elmwood that opposed any effort in order to ensure that we proceed with the appropriate translation. It is unbelievable that it is now the Member for Elmwood that is suggesting that the translation should have taken place some two years ago. Unbelievable.

Senior citizens - Government mailing list

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, given that it's unbelievable and given that the translations have proceeded over the past five years, would the Minister allow the Attorney-General to answer a question? The question is, when did the government complete the translation of these two acts that were relevant and pertinent to the Bilodeau case.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we can take that question as notice, it may have been in the last few days, the last few weeks - but what is important is that we proceed with the bills as introduced in anticipation of what could be the decision of the Supreme Court in regard to the Bilodeau case.

Mr. Speaker, Member for Elmwood should know, by way of experience, which I acknowledge must be rather bitter for him, the importance of anticipating court decisions and not waiting until the court actually hands down its decision.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, my question then to the Premier who is apparently handling this matter is, given that there are hundreds of pieces of legislation which the government was proceeding with in terms of translation, and given the fact that these two particular pieces of legislation were probably No. 1 and No. 2 in terms of priority, did the government only realize that fact lately, or did it in fact have them translated right at the very beginning, in 1983?

HON. H. PAWLEY: What is important, Mr. Speaker, is that the government is anticipating what could be a decision by way of the Supreme Court and as a result of that anticipation, we are proceeding with the two bills in question, The Summary Convictions Act and The Highway Traffic Act, in order to ensure that they be passed, in anticipation of a Supreme Court decision in the Bilodeau case which was not determined at the same time as the referral was determined. But we expect it to be determined shortly.

MR. R. DOERN: My final question to the Premier - I don't know why he's reluctant to provide this information - is simply this: Given that several years have . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I took the question as one of notice for the Honourable Member for Elmwood. I'm not reluctant whatsoever.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I simply say to the First Minister, are these two bills being introduced into the House now because they have just been ready, they have just been completed, or were they in fact completed several years ago and are now being brought forward?

HON. H. PAWLEY: They were not completed, unfortunately, several years ago. They were completed recently, Mr. Speaker, and that technical information can be provided to the Member for Elmwood. We'll obtain the dates of the translation. There's no problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Premier. The senior citizens in this province are entitled to receive a tax credit on the school portion of their real property taxes. Has the list of those recipients been turned over to the New Democratic Party for their own purposes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I responded to that question but a few moments ago.

A MEMBER: No you didn't.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes, yes I did.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, my neighbour, who is a senior and a widower, has just received in the mail from the Premier a request for funds for his party. She does not belong to the New Democratic Party; does not want to belong to the New Democratic Party. Is it the Premier's intention to fight his political battles on monies received from the seniors?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thought I attempted to explain just a few moments ago that I, some way or another, was included in some Conservative Party mailing list along with, I'm sure, many thousands of other Manitobans and I'm sure many other people even in my own Caucus, without their request, without their seeking to be included on any Conservative Party list. In the same way, Mr. Speaker, there are in the mailings of thousands of letters by New Democratic Party - and by the way, the response is very good; very very good. It's also been getting better day by day I must advise the Leader of the Opposition. There are, obviously, just as there are in the Conservative mailing list and the New Democratic Party's mailing list many, many people that received the invitations that do not share the same political conviction because the mailings are general mailing lists and many of the names probably obtained from Henderson's Directory.

MR. SPEAKER: I would remind all members that the subject matter of questions - order please, order please.

I stood up to speak to the members. I expect to be heard with a reasonable amount of courtesy. I would remind members that the subject matter of questions should be topics that are within the administrative competence of this government.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'll try to direct a question that falls within the competence of the First Minister. Does the Premier now advise this House and the people of Manitoba that anyone can ask for a specific list of people from the Telephone Company and they will be provided that list

for a fee so that they can do with it as they see fit. The Premier just tabled a contract so that if anyone wanted to get a list of all the seniors in this province, could anyone get that list and, if so, it is open then to abuse of the citizens who have to have a telephone, who have to have their name registered, but a lot of them go to great lengths to make sure that they don't show their status as a widow or a single person. Do you mean by paying a fee to the government those people's names can now be revealed to anyone who pays for it?

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . telephone system will provide any information that they have in response to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . in response, Mr. Speaker, to anyone that enters into that contract with the Manitoba Telephone System. As well, Mr. Speaker, in the Winnipeg City Directory there is also information that is there. I don't know what the cost is of the Winnipeg City Directory. There is also many magazine mailing lists, etc., that one can obtain on payment of a fee which I know that the honourable members across the way through the Conservative Party do.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the information just given by the First Minister, none of the books or information referred to reveals the identity . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. C. BIRT: . . . Mr. Speaker, why am I allowed five seconds to frame a question and they're allowed five minutes to answer? It seems to me simple courtesy allows me to state the premise of my question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. C. BIRT: . . . and then expect a decent answer to it.

Mr. Speaker, there was no answer to my first question. None of the information referred to by the First Minister identifies the personal status of an individual. What the Premier has said when he made reference to a question being tabled is that he wrote to the . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The honourable member is permitted a reasonable premise to his question. It should not be a statement to the House.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry should place his question.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would anyone writing or requesting information from the Telephone System, on the specific personal status of a group of individuals, be provided that information, because that's exactly what the First Minister stated that you could now do by writing to the Telephone System by tabling this contract?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the telephone information in front of me but I've got the Henderson Directory and we got the name — (Interjection) — I'm afraid I need some reading glasses, Mr. Speaker, but we've got the name here, Mr. and Mrs. Francis, C., retired. I guess we can go on and on through the book to find out who is retired, who is not retired.

Mr. Speaker, I think what is troubling the honourable members across the way - and I must acknowledge I'm not too happy about it either - for some reason or other, the letters that were sent - fund-raising letters by the New Democratic Party - were blue this time rather than orange. I would have preferred to have seen the colour remain orange, Mr. Speaker. I could understand their sensitivity, however, to the colour blue having been used.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, is it now the government policy to permit people to ask for a specific classification of people who hold telephones, by paying a simple fee, and is that information then made available? For example, to simplify it for the Minister. If anyone wanted to have all the names of single people, over 65, would that information be provided by the Telephone System by paying a fee?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should refer to the contract. He should make inquiries on his own with respect to that contract. In the Henderson's Book, which I also made reference to, which I have in front of me, there are clearly designated retired or generally pensioners, 65 and over. It's clearly indicated. I could forward this book over to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, if you'd like to check out my word.

Provincial Parks - Voluntary Liquor Surrender Program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister in charge of provincial parks. The province is this week undertaking a voluntary liquor surrender program at Grand Beach Park, under which it's my understanding that people who do not voluntarily submit to turn over a certain amount of liquor to the park attendants - a certain amount of liquor over some minimum established by the government - will be denied access to the park. My question to the Minister responsible for parks is, under what authority do his parks officers deny people access to the parks, who do not comply with the government's voluntary surrender program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice, but I believe there is authority for entering into any agreement with respect to the use of the park.

MR. B. RANSOM: While the Minister is looking into that, would the Minister inquire as to whether he has a legal opinion from law officers of the Crown as to whether or not this can be accomplished?

Grasshopper infestation - control on rights-of-way

MR. B. RANSOM: I have a question for the Minister of Highways as well, Mr. Speaker. There are more and more situations coming to our attention where farmers are attempting to control grasshoppers on their land next to the rights-of-way of provincial roads and provincial trunk highways. The government has so far refused to undertake grasshopper control on those rights-of-way. Since it is impossible for a private landowner, for a farmer, to have effective control, if the government doesn't control land on those rights-of-way, will the government now change its policy so that they will co-operate and control grasshoppers on land next to land where the farmer is attempting to undertake a control program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, this question was answered last week in the House by the Minister of Agriculture. Quite clearly, the Department of Agriculture has supplied, paid for the chemical that is required on public rights-of-way, the municipalities are responsible to carry that out and the chemical is paid for by the Department of Agriculture.

The Department of Highways has never been in the business of controlling insects of any nature along the rights-of-way. That's a longstanding policy that has been in place. If there is a rather large-scale, massive emergency that requires some assistance to municipalities, we have a disaster assistance program that is in place for cost-sharing and if we found that there was an extensive massive cost being incurred and we had complaints from the municipalities or concerns raised, we would consider it through that policy.

But at the present time, there is no program and there never has been a program, and we do not see any change in that program at the present time dealing with insect control and rights-of-way.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, we're quite aware of the policy which the Department of Highways has in place. The province has not suffered from the sort of outbreak of grasshoppers in previous decades. For the last 50 years, the province has not suffered to the extent it is suffering this year, and farmers' livelihoods are at stake because this government will not undertake to control grasshoppers on their rights-of-way.

My question to the Minister of Highways was, would he not consider changing the policy so that the government would accept responsibility to control grasshoppers on government rights-of-way, next to land where the farmers are attempting to undertake control measures?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I've outlined exactly what we would intend to do if there was a massive problem. We have been getting information — (Interjection) — that is not the information we're getting from the Department of Agriculture in terms of the costs that are being incurred, Mr. Speaker, they are not major costs for the spraying at the present time

and we'll monitor the situation. If it's required and the information that we get from the Department of Agriculture indicates that there is a need for it, then we'll consider it at that time.

Cream shippers - notification of full quotas

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the First Minister; the Agriculture Minister is away.

This morning and last night, some 40 cream shippers, at least, in Roblin-Russell constituency alone, have received notice that their quotas are full and there's no place for them to take the cream. The creameries in Roblin and Rosburn have shut them off and these people have asked me to contact the First Minister this morning or the Minister of Agriculture, and ask them what they should do with the cream? Should they dump it on the ground, sell the herds, or just get out of the dairy business?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I thank the Member for Roblin-Russell for bringing to me the problems that are encountered by the cream shippers - in the Rosburn area, was it? I'll take that question as notice on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture so I can obtain some information that might be of some assistance to the shippers that are involved, along with the honourable member.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I regret the remarks of the Honourable Minister of the Environment, who said, "Change it into wine."

Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister, over the weekend, get hold of his government, get together and advise the dairy industry in my constituency and across this province what future they have in that particular industry. This is only the middle of the dairy season for these farm people and most of them are dependent on these cream cheques for their income. Is there any future at all for them in this province under this government?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to engage in debate, because the Minister of Agriculture has made it very, very clear in the past in this Chamber as to the allocations that are granted to individual provinces, and from time to time those quotas are changed.

I'll bring to the Minister of Agriculture the question that he's posed in the Chamber so that we can respond to him during the course of next week.

Dehydration plant, dairy products - possibility of setting up

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I thank the Honourable First Minister. Can I ask the First Minister if he or his government have looked at, or are prepared to look at setting up a dehydration plant in this province to

powder the surplus dairy products, and let's feed some of these people around the world who are going to bed hungry at night? The Honourable Member for Steinbach just came back from Ethiopia, and we can certainly provide this surplus food in our province to some other parts of the world if this government would take a stand on it.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the honourable member has asked that question, because the Minister of Natural Resources properly reminds me of the mid-1970s when there was an attempt by the New Democratic Party Government of the time to establish what was called a Crocus Plant in Selkirk that would have done what the honourable member has just requested that we do.

That Crocus Plant was voted against and spoken against by all the honourable members of the opposition at that time, and the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell would have been a member of the opposition at that time who would have been voicing and speaking against the very proposal, Mr. Speaker, that . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . the very proposal that he is making this morning. I hear the Honourable Member for Lakeside shouting from his seat that it would be the same success as building buses, so I guess that's his commentary on the suggestion by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell this morning.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: The First Minister is not prepared to accept that proposal. How about cheese then?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Frivolous questions are not in order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I should watch out for the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell because cheese is often used as bait in traps.

Mr. Speaker, I would want to correct the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell. I indicated very clearly it was his group that had posed the original proposal, not the Government of the Day, and we are looking at all feasible industrial projects in the Province of Manitoba, this amongst others, but on a feasible basis, Mr. Speaker. What I do dislike is honourable members speaking against and voting against something one year, and then a few years later, the same honourable members rise in their place in this Chamber to try to attribute opposition to this side of the Chamber to measures that they opposed and this side of the Chamber had originally supported when that measure was brought forth by the honourable member who is the Minister of Natural Resources in this Chamber.

Budworm infestation - control of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources. I wonder if the Minister can give us an update on the budworm infestation on timber stands in Northern Manitoba and whether he contemplates a control measure program at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, we have identified a fairly extensive area that has a very serious problem. There is an intent to spray several thousand acres in Northern Manitoba, but I believe that we're watching it on a day-to-day basis and climatic conditions and of course the stage of the development of the infestation will determine whether or not in fact we do proceed.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister can indicate what chemical would be used for controlling this infestation?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I can't recall the name of it. —(Interjection) — It's environmentally improved; it's a clean chemical, relatively speaking, to the use of chemicals, but I can't recall the name of it.

Grasshopper infestation - proposed control program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question to the Minister of Natural Resources. In view of the fact that he'll be spraying the spruce budworm, will the Minister of Natural Resources be carrying out a spraying program to control grasshoppers in the drainage ditches and the Crown land areas of southern Manitoba which in fact is adding to the grasshopper infestation? Will he be carrying out a spray program in those areas as well?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Natural Resources.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the whole question of control of grasshoppers lies with the Department of Agriculture. It is their direction that has to be followed. I have not been apprised of any need for that. However, the member may be right; there may be a need. But we really have to let the lead department make that decision.

Apology by Premier - re Anti-American approach of government

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that he will be travelling to the United States next week to meet this Governor of South Dakota, and some of the comments that have come back to us from the States have been, "this government's anti-American approach", is he

prepared to apologize to the Governor of South Dakota

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . for the fact that four of his Cabinet colleagues were involved where an American flag was burned at a protest?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it saddens me very much that when we're attempting to deal with the problems pertaining to hog importation into the United States, and we have developed excellent relationships, I must say, with different Governors in the United States, including Governor Perpich of Minnesota and Governor Sinner of North Dakota and others, including the two governors this last week, that the honourable member should make such a scurrilous comment in this Chamber, such a wanton misrepresentation, Mr. Speaker, of comments made by any member of this government. I find it regrettable - I find it even worse than that, I find it an attempt to undercut the efforts that I'm going to be attempting to undertake next Wednesday.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I would remind the honourable member that the word "scurrilous" has been ruled as unparliamentary in this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: If it's not an acceptable word, I withdraw the word, Mr. Speaker, but the intent of my remarks remains. The honourable member, unfortunately, by way his actions, by way of his words, making false representations in this Chamber, is geared to only one purpose, to attempt to undercut what is a difficult challenge that the Minister of Agriculture and I are confronted with next Wednesday in South Dakota.

Plan Winnipeg - Agreement, Province and City of Wpg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Urban Affairs. Yesterday I asked the Minister a question about Plan Winnipeg, that MHRC owns 350 acres of land in South St. Vital that it wants to develop, that is outside the government's proposed line.

My question was, had the government's position changed regarding the line? The Minister's answer, I think he was trying to razzle-dazzle with his footwork in the House, if I could, he said, "Whatever arrangement will be made, it won't be subject to any action of the government through the Housing Department. In other

words, the Housing Department will not hold anything back."

I wonder if the Minister could tell the House exactly what he meant?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been discussion between the province and the city to change some of the boundaries in Plan Winnipeg, and what I was trying to convey to my honourable friend, because I thought she was aware of that - it seems that she had been talking to someone who had given her information that this would not hold back any development that the city would want to see. There is no way that the property owned by the province would be delayed to hold back any development by private developers.

Pay Equity Legislation - Necessity of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister.

Yesterday, his Minister of Labour acknowledged, after introduction of the pay equity legislation that the program with respect to pay equity in the Civil Service and Crown corporations could have been accomplished without legislation by virtue of the authority available to be included in collective agreement with the MGEA, through that sort of bargaining process.

That being the case, why then did they proceed with the pay equity legislation in its present form?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding the Leader of the Opposition is not correctly quoting the comments of the Minister of Labour, and I think it's best therefore that the Leader of the Opposition be properly informed as to what was said by the Minister of Labour.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder then if the Minister of Labour could indicate whether or not that program that is included within the legislation could have been accomplished without legislation, by virtue of the agreement with the MGEA?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: You know, Mr. Speaker, it's with some degree of concern, real amusement, I suppose on my part, that I hear the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition asking me questions about this because he's reputed to have been on both sides of the question, in very recent days.

I really don't know where he stands, Mr. Speaker, but in the Estimates review of the Department of Labour, I indicated that the route of just making it a policy

direction was a consideration that could have been made but we hadn't decided whether that was possible, or whether that was feasible or the way to go, but I indicated that we had decided that we would commit ourselves publicly by legislation and set out in legislation the formula for arriving at pay equity in a very responsible way.

I don't know what kind of responsible comments the Leader of the Opposition has been making on this question, because he's reported to have been saying one thing one day and another thing the next, to the same people.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my comments are on the record and I don't have to . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FILMON: . . . and I would suggest that the honourable member and any of his colleagues look at what I said, not what I'm reputed to have said by some third party.

Mr. Speaker, that being the case, I want to pursue with the Minister his letter that goes out with the package explaining the legislation, that says that they believe that private sector employers will voluntarily implement pay equity in accordance with the Charter of Rights and Liberties and our country's responsibility.

If they believe that to be the case in the private sector, do they not believe that they could trust themselves, in operating the public sector, to go along with the implementation?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, apparently in his response to my answer, indicates some concern for the veracity of people who are quoting him.

I would like to put on the record that Mr. Ed Martens, who is the President of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, is quoted in a newspaper today saying, quote, " 'I'll be shocked if he (Filmon) said that,' Martens told the Sun. 'He (Filmon) told us (two days ago) that if private workers were included, he won't support the bill. I guess that's politics.' "

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in respect to the role of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms of Canada, in respect to the international commitment to the United Nations, I believe that it is very, very likely that through litigation, court decision, institutions will be bound to bring justice in this country. But governments have a responsibility to lead and show responsible conduct in respect to the rule of law in this province and we should move in this Legislature to demonstrate that responsibility and not wait for people to have to take government to court.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to advise as to a Committee change.

In Economic Development, the Honourable Member for Arthur to replace the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I beg leave to make a non-political statement.

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

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: As an alumnus of St. John's Technical High School, as it was once called, as is the Minister of Culture and I believe one or two other members in the House, I would like to take note of the presence in the city of some several thousand graduates of the best high school in Canada, without a shadow of doubt, as shown by scholastic records, literary records - and by the quality of the Attorneys-General that it produces.

Mr. Speaker, seriously, there are attracted from all over the world to this reunion to celebrate the 75th Anniversary of St. John's Tech, some of the finest that this country has produced, and I think we should all, in this House, unanimously welcome them to the city and congratulate St. John's Tech on that fine record and on its 75th birthday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if I may also be permitted to make a non-political statement.

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

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: I certainly wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Attorney-General and in so doing, acknowledging St. John's Tech as my alma mater, that that grand school spawned a wide spectrum of politics and people's opinions which also included myself and others on this side. I certainly add the official opposition's voice of welcome to the returning grads.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Department of Labour has finished its work in the Estimates review and when the Estimates are called again, and this has been discussed with the House Leader of the Opposition, Community Services, Executive Council and Legislative Assembly would be moved to the Committee outside of the Chambers.

Mr. Speaker, would you call the bills in the following order: For second reading, No. 12, No. 16, No. 36, No. 37 and No. 40, please?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 12, the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Culture, Bill No. 16, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

BILL NO. 36 - THE MORTGAGE DEALERS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 36, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have no questions on the bill at this moment, though I do know some interested parties have some concerns about it, and therefore I'm prepared to move it on to the next stage so that the technical detail may be discussed.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 37 - THE PUBLIC SCHOOL ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education, Bill No. 37, the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to respond to Bill 37, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Mr. Speaker, I had some opportunity during the Estimates process to review in detail the new government support of education formula as developed by the government and there are part of it that are an extension of the former ESP Program that was in place.

There are some acknowledgments I should make with respect to the new formula. Mr. Speaker, as the Minister has said on other occasions, it does attempt to grapple with the problems school divisions have with respect to decreases in enrolment. There is some variation or factor built into the formula that takes account of decreasing enrolment. Also, it attempts in some manner to measure the impact on those school divisions having a high weighting of experienced, more highly paid teachers and I acknowledge that it makes some attempt to support, in a greater manner, those school divisions that have that type of teacher profile.

It also makes an attempt to more accurately integrate a reflection of measurement with respect to those school

divisions that have increasing enrolment, Mr. Speaker, and as the Minister has said on so many occasions, attempts to more evenly bring forward a system of equalization. Those are the changes in the formula as I can determine at this point, Mr. Speaker, and for the most part are acceptable by us.

However, there are a number of things the formula does not do, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to address those at this time. Firstly, the formula in no way spells out how there will be a decreasing reliance on property tax. I understand fully that this formula is for spending of school divisions, to cover the grant portion on regular programming and on special programming within school divisions, but people throughout the province have been waiting for some period of time, been waiting for any changes in education financing that would also include within them a redress of the problem of property on taxation.

I find it passing strange, Mr. Speaker, and I've used some of this material in Estimates, but I find it strange that four years later in consideration of a new formula in support of education that many of the same problems that were identified by the NDP members in opposition at the time in 1981 when the former Minister of Education brought forward the Education Support Program, those criticisms that were in place then, many of them are still in place today.

Mr. Speaker, in 1980 the former Member for St. Johns said this, and it's quoted on Page 3257 of Hansard, "That the property tax which has been carrying the great burden of taxation has to be relieved and that it has to eventually end up as services to property being taxed for services to property, that there has to be a shift towards progressive taxation, that is taxation on the ability to pay."

The Member for St. Vital, Mr. Speaker, said on April 2, 1981, and you may recognize these words, I think they could be attributed to you. I believe at that time you were the Acting Education Critic or the maybe the full Education Critic and you, Sir, at that time said, "I have my doubts about it, Mr. Chairman, as a new financing program that the Minister recently brought in. The impression that we get, Mr. Chairman, was that this new education support program as it is called is in reality a glorified foundation program. That is part of this Minister of forward thinking that he's gone back 25 years, dusted off an old Conservative Program, put a few more dollars in here and changed a few words there, and brought it forward and claimed that it's a brand new financing formula."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I could almost say exactly the same things that you said five years ago with respect to the new formula financing program brought in by the Minister under Bill 37.

Mr. Speaker, what we have is really a glorified education support program. There have been some fixings in some areas. Yet, no attempt is made to address the question of the reliance of education funding on property taxations. As a matter of fact, by the Minister's own indication, by way of this new program, and I haven't had an opportunity to dig it out of Hansard, but the Minister just a week ago told me in Estimates that property taxpayers within the Province of Manitoba had to find an additional several million dollars this year in support of education.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what else does the formula not do? It still relies in my view upon a very outdated

assessment practice and for years now since we've come into this 32nd Legislature, we've appealed to the government to do something meaningful to address the problems associated with assessment and the inequity therein. Mr. Speaker, nothing has been done. Yet, the Minister brings forward her new, I call it revised, but she'll say it's her new program in support of funding to public schools, and, yet, that portion of it which is so heavily based on balanced assessments in support of equalization, that aspect of it has not changed. We're still using the inequities that have been built up over decades within the area of assessment. That base, Mr. Speaker, is still being used as the fundamental base for purposes of equalization.

Mr. Speaker, nothing has changed. I suppose the greatest concern that people are going to have through the larger community once they have an opportunity to read that the Minister has brought forward another formula in support of education funding is that it does not in any way address the problem with respect to inequity in assessment practices.

Mr. Chairman, if I say Mr. Chairman one more time I'll strangle myself. Mr. Speaker, the Minister has said November 13 or some time thereafter, that the government was going to be working toward a 90 percent funding in support of education. Since we've questioned her a number of times, particularly the Member for St. Norbert, has asked her when we would approach this new goal, this new objective of government financing, the Minister said well it'll depend upon resources available, funding. Mr. Speaker, let everybody know, let the record show that when the government took over in 1981, the reins of power, that the Province of Manitoba was supporting education in the area of 81 percent. Today and over the last four Budgets brought down by this government, that funding percentage has dropped, and the Minister says it's 80 percent.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, we have a Minister on one hand saying that the goal is 90 percent and, yet, having been in power for four years that percentage has slipped a little bit every year. I, again, ask the Minister to be a little bit more definitive, tell us a little more candidly when she sees the province obtaining that goal of 90 percent funding in support of education.

The Minister said some interesting things in giving her Address, Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: Did she give you her address?

MR. C. MANNES: . . . on Friday, the 7th of June, when she introduced Bill No. 37 for second reading. She said things like this, and I quote. "We did previously move in the previous years towards recommendations that were in the report, so we've had really quite an orderly transition to move towards the new principles of the program. We brought in the small schools grant; we brought in the supplemental and equalization programs in earlier years, and this is now the completion of the recommendations that we're undertaking in the Nicholls Report."

Well there's certainly some truth to that. The government has brought in the supplemental grants; they brought in also some increases in categorial grants; and they brought in their compensatory grant, Mr.

Speaker. But the Minister says, "We have now moved to a completion of the recommendations that we're undertaking in the Nicholls Report."

Mr. Speaker, I read the Nicholls Report just recently and this is what was indicated should be considered by the way of recommendation in the area of support of education.

(1) The foundation program principle should be retained. Mr. Speaker, as you, yourself, realized some five years ago when you addressed this question, the foundation program is still basically in place. It was with the advent of the Education Support Program; it still is with the Minister's new program.

(2) The major portion of school board expenditures should be covered. Mr. Speaker, I guess that was the 80 and 90 percent argument that I've just alluded to.

(3) There should be increased provision for equalization over the entire system. That was a recommendation in the Nicholls Report. Well the Minister feels that by the advent of her new system of equalization that she is moving the system closer to the perfect ideal; and yet, Mr. Speaker, let us all realize that the very foundation of the old Education Support Program was equalization itself.

The Minister would like people to believe that there was no aspect of that program that involved equalization, Mr. Speaker, and that was the very basis of it. And yet the Minister today will come forward and say, "We introduced equalization in 1982." Well, Mr. Speaker, what they introduced in 1982 was a factoring system, yes, that took into a more up-front manner and method, developed some increased aspects of equalization. I have said so and I've given her that credit on other occasions.

(4) The fourth recommendation, that there should be opportunities for planning by school division authorities beyond the current year. Well, Mr. Speaker, what that was saying was that the old education support program did the right thing by being a three-year program. That was the basis of it and what school divisions were saying to Dr. Nicholls is, we liked that system. We liked the system where we knew we had a formula in place and we knew how we could plan over the next number of years, the same thing that the private school systems are asking for, by the way, just something in place so they know where they're going to be.

Yet, today, Mr. Speaker, we have a new formula in which those divisions who have been grandfathered do not know where they will stand in 1986. They have no idea. The Minister says, well we're going to watch closely, and yet today the school divisions within the Province of Manitoba do not know what formula will be place in 1986 - not all of them, Mr. Speaker, 20 of them have already switched over to the new government support of education program, but those other 25 or so that have not - don't really know what will be in place for them in 1986.

(5) The fifth recommendation, the principle of local autonomy should be preserved. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't see where this new program has taken a lot away, but it has taken away from some local autonomy, because now the funding support firstly is directed towards the area of special needs. In a sense, the regular portion then comes secondary. I submit, Mr. Speaker, local autonomy has been reduced, so under No. 5, the Minister, by bringing forward her new formula in the

manner in which she has, has totally worked at cross purposes with one of the recommendations of the Nicholls Report.

(6) There should be an increased share of the support program from general revenues of the province, thus effecting a shift from taxation on real property. Mr. Speaker, this has not occurred. There's been an increase on real property, some \$83 million since this government has been in place, Mr. Speaker, has been the increased taxation load that's been directed towards property in support of education.

(7) There should be incentives or categorical grants where it is considered necessary to encourage development and expansion of programs and services. This has been followed, but No. 7, Mr. Speaker, is in conflict with No. 5, the principle of local autonomy, not totally but to some degree, and the Minister has certainly done that. She's turned the formula in such a manner that now the formula will allow the Government of the Day to say, we deem these areas very important and you, as school divisions, must, if you want any support at all, or will give it in these particular areas.

(8) The eighth recommendation by Nicholls said there should be safeguards against sudden loss of revenue by school boards because of declining enrolment. Mr. Speaker, that has been attempted, at least, to have been faced and included within the formula and I acknowledge that.

(9) The support program should be reviewed and evaluated at the conclusion of its three-year mandate. Mr. Speaker, I don't know, the Minister has not indicated how long this formula will be in place, what its length of mandate will be. I'm hoping she will attempt to do so, in further explanation that she may be prepared to give the bill.

I'd also like to read some of the other expressions of opinion that were included within the Nicholls Report, within the area of financing.

(1) The inequities associated with real property assessment policies and practices are viewed as a basic weakness in the education support program. Dr. Nicholls said that, or these were opinions that were presented to him. I take it that he concurred with that, and yet, Mr. Speaker, those same inequities are in place today, nothing has changed. As a matter of fact, they have been magnified.

(2) All segments of the education community support the block grant concept. Well, Mr. Speaker, the block grant concept is still in place although the Minister now has a variable block grant for this one year in support of those school divisions — (Interjection) — That's right, block plus variable block, the variable block to cover those school divisions.

(3) Mr. Speaker, the use of 1980 as a base year for calculation of grants penalized some divisions. I think there's been some acknowledgement of that in the formula.

(4) Appreciation of the guaranteed inflation factor is expressed. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not a supporter of attempting to bring forward an education index or a locked-in inflationary factor. Yet, many people in support of education are. I don't. And I'm asking the Minister; I hope she'll respond to this some time. I want her to indicate to me whether there is some guaranteed inflation factor, whether the basic formula itself does

that like the Education Support Program did, is one of the questions I forgot to pose during the Estimates.

(5) Improvements in cash flow was an opinion and the Minister and the government have made some attempt to direct funds in support of education to school divisions somewhat sooner. I think No. 5 has probably been rectified to some degree.

(6) Provision of support for English as a second language. Mr. Speaker, there have been no changes in that.

(7) Concern that the Education Support Program makes no provisions for compensatory program funding. Well, to the best of my understanding, Mr. Speaker, the new formula still does not make provision for compensatory program funding, even though the Minister is directing larger amounts of funding. I don't see where the formula takes that into account. It's a matter of policy that the government can decide to deal with on a year-to-year basis.

(8) Concern is also expressed that the Education Support Program makes no provision for the additional costs associated with curriculum implementation. Mr. Speaker, I can't see anywhere within that formula that there's a factor built in that takes into account the costs associated with changing curriculum. Mr. Speaker, it has failed in that respect.

(9) Submissions to the review generally acknowledged the adequacy of vocational educational grants. Mr. Speaker, I don't see where there's been a major change with respect to how those grants are treated within the formula.

(10) Makes reference to the fact that the old formula did not address adequately the additional costs associated with French Language and Heritage Language Programs. I don't see where there is any significant change in how the new formula handles those particular concerns.

(11) Makes reference to the Northern cost differential.

(12) Refers to residual costs and non-residence fees.

(13) Makes reference to the concern in many parts of the province that the Educational Support Program's funding and transportation primarily on a pupil basis fails to take into account road conditions and density of populations, variations in cost.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see where the new program makes any attempt to wrestle with that particular concern as expressed to Dr. Nicholls in his recommendation.

So, Sir, my comment is when the Minister says, as she has in discussing the bill, that the completion of the recommendations that were undertaken in the Nicholls Report has now occurred, I don't concur with her at all. As a matter of fact, I submit that although a majority have been certainly attempted to have been included there are some significant number that have not.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister also talks about a couple of other areas. She indicates that this formula is less complicated than the other one. Mr. Speaker, I can't accept that. I don't confess for one moment that there's some way of formulating, developing a formula that could make it easily understood. There's no way, if one wants to look at the formulas given to me the other night, that one could ever conclude that it was easy. Whether it's more easily understood than the one that was in place previously or not is up for debate.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of specific areas, and I won't make reference to any clauses in the bill, but we wonder why reference is removed with respect to funding factors. The old bill had specific funding factors laid out within it. That's been removed and now regulation will be used in respect of funding. I wonder why the Minister wants that flexibility under the new program. It almost allows me to believe that the Minister wants to have the total freedom of adjusting any factor, many factors, with respect to the new formula. There now is no requirement to spell out eligible expenditures, the number of pupils, transportation of pupils - at least within the act. Now this is covered by regulation. It says that now we will have fewer restraints in place to prevent her from doing more of it.

Mr. Speaker, a very important part of this bill removes the requirement of government to fix portions of the estimated support that may be provided to school divisions in advance. I would ask the Minister why this change comes forward.

The Minister of Finance on October 19th implied publicly that there would be no increase in funding this year. The Minister, in January, announced that there would be a 2 percent increase in funding maybe conditional. Part of the old program indicated that portions of estimated support that would be provided to school divisions - I believe it was 85 percent - had to be spelled out in the act. Mr. Speaker, this is no longer required. I would ask the Minister specifically why this element has been removed.

Also another item that has been removed is the February 1st deadline, the date for which school divisions had to submit to the Finance Board a detailed estimate of expenses and revenues. Now, Mr. Speaker, the act will not set the date, but leave that date to the discretion of the Public Schools Finance Board. I again would ask the Minister, what was the intent of the removing the February 1st date?

One of the most important aspects of this bill is what it does not have in it. This bill repeals sections that wipe out the old Education Support Program. I can understand the logic; this is a new formula, but this bill does not in any way include within it the formula, the new government support of education formula. It doesn't bring back into statute, the formula itself. I ask the Minister, why this new formula is not placed within the act.

A MEMBER: Good question.

MR. C. MANNES: It's so obvious with its absence. Mr. Speaker, maybe that is the reason the Minister of Northern Affairs says, because every time you want to change it, you have to open up the act. I guess that's an admission then that there probably are some major shortcomings already or ones that will develop very quickly.

Another portion of the act brings in some wording with respect to the requirement of the Public Schools Finance Board. I think I made reference to this one before, Mr. Speaker, with respect to 85 percent funding. There's one area I don't understand at all. Maybe the Minister would expand on it when she has an opportunity.

There's one section of the act that seems to address mill rate reduction in a farm sense and mill rate

apportionment within the Winnipeg School Division areas. That whole major section has been removed and I would ask whether it was just housekeeping or whether it is done in response to the inclusion of the new formula.

Mr. Speaker, those are my remarks on Bill 37, but before I close, I'd like to review the principles of the old - which I guess we can call "old" now - Education Support Program in Manitoba, the principles of the program brought in by the former government.

I would ask the Minister, when I'm reading these principles, whether she would agree with me that the principles that were in place then have changed not at all by the development of her new program. These were the principles that were brought in by the Education Support Program under the Honourable Keith Cosens, Minister of Education, January, 1981:

(1) The Foundation Program principle should be retained;

(2) that the Financial Support Program should be designed to cover the major portion of school board expenditures - and of course, the goal at that time was 80 percent;

(3) that there should be increased provision for equalization over the entire system;

(4) that opportunity should be provided for planning on the part of school authorities beyond the current year - and that was the three-year program, Mr. Speaker;

(5) that the principle of local autonomy should be preserved and that provisions be made for opportunity to address local problems and needs;

(6) that there should be increased share of the Support Program from general revenues of the province, thus affecting a shift from taxation on real property;

(7) that incentives should be provided where it is considered necessary to encourage development and expansion of programs and services;

(8) that there should be safeguards against sudden loss of revenue by school boards because of declining enrolment;

(9) that a Support Program should be designed following the foregoing principles to be effective for a three-year program, during which there should be a review and an evaluation to determine (a) the effectiveness of the program reaching its objectives, and (b) changes in amendments considered necessary in the light of changing conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I read those into the record as those principles that were enunciated so clearly in 1980-81 by the Government of the Day are the same principles that are in place today. They have not changed, Mr. Speaker, and so let not the Minister and the Government of Manitoba go forward after they've received legislative support for Bill 37, and try and convince Manitobans that they've brought forward some fancy new program in support of education, Mr. Speaker, because there's nothing further from the truth.

What we have here is a glorified Education Support Program. The principles are more or less the same. There have been some attempts to measure more accurately, by formula, reflections of declining enrolment, and I give the Minister her credit for that; but let the record show that there is no major change in the formula.

I think the Nicholls Report did a commendable job within that area and I have no difficulty with seeing

some of those major identified areas in which it would be better to have those factors included in the formula, see them come forward in the manner in which they have. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, and I can't stress too heavily that the fact is what we are dealing with here is simply a revised Education Support Program.

We are prepared to pass this bill to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was going to ask that you call Bill No. 40.

**BILL NO. 40 -
THE WORKPLACE INNOVATION CENTRE
ACT**

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 40, The Workplace Innovation Centre Act, the Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: I'd like to, if I could, say a few words on this bill and I'll gladly let it stand in the Member for Kirkfield Park's name.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)
The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

This bill, The Workplace Innovation Centre Act, to establish a Workplace Innovation Centre in Manitoba, I think is one of the most fundamental and important changes and innovations that our government has entertained since we have taken off just a short three-and-a-half years ago.

Mr. Speaker, during our election campaign last time round, and in mine personally, I spent a great deal of time speaking of the need for moving away from a purely confrontational style of industrial relations toward a style of industrial relations where there's a great deal more understanding and trust between labour and business and government and the society in general, because the society in general very clearly casts a very large - I don't want to use the word "shadow" in a negative term here - but it casts a great image and it's within that general image and within that general climate that industrial relations take place in this country.

There's an awful lot of blunder and bombast from all sides quite frequently in industrial relations when the system breaks down or when the system, not necessarily in breaking down, but, but at least when the system is at its most combative nature, may I say, and exercise its most combative nature.

This initiative, the establishment of a Workplace Innovation Centre, clearly shows this government's, an NDP Government's attitude, towards being an activist government, towards facilitating co-operation and understanding between all the different parties in a modern industrial society. The goals are clearly centered around an issue and an item in our times that we cannot

ignore, and that is technological change, because technological change will stop for no man and no woman and for no society, Mr. Speaker; it shall march on. The challenge to any modern society is whether or not the technological change will rule us or whether we will get some handle on it and control the implementation of that new technology into our society.

In the last great industrial revolution that we went through, called the industrial revolution - the age of steam and mechanization of industrial engineering - we had tremendous dislocation of people from the work force and we had an out at that time which we do not any longer have for most of that or a great deal at least, of that industrial revolution took place in European countries and they had this great vast land called North America, from which many of the people who were dislocated by the advances in technology at that time were able to move to resettle and start new lives for themselves and their families. That opportunity is no longer there.

We, in modern industrial societies, can no longer export people. We must work with the technology as it is emerging. We must encourage that technological development and, above all, we must make sure that that technological development is in harmony with the needs of our overall modern societies.

This new centre, the Workplace Innovation Centre, is designed just exactly to meet those sorts of challenges. It has representation on it from government, as well as industry and labour, and provision for people outside those specific areas, including such things as education and the general community involvement. All things which I mentioned earlier are key towards our being able to keep pace in an ever-changing world.

Their objective is to create understanding, to create co-operation between the various sectors so that one sector isn't running down one road and leaving the other sectors either behind or maybe going too far down a particular by-way, which is going to end up at a river where there is no bridge perhaps. The attempt of this Innovation Centre is to look co-operatively between all sectors at new developments, as they are emerging, how can they best be managed? What are the most appropriate technologies for various industries of various sizes to adapt? What role shall the workers have in the choosing of that instrumentation that moves into the new plants?

Just a year and-a-half ago, on my own vacation, when I took it upon myself to go on a personal study tour of Finland and Sweden, one of the things I was most interested in was their industrial relations, and I met with industrialists as well as major labour organizations - right down to the shop floor in one particular company - and saw the role that the two parties play in those countries in adjusting to technology. I'm not sure if they have such a centre, as is being proposed here, but there one must recognize that the industrial relations is a great deal beyond where ours is, as far as the two sides working alongside government and the education facilities of the country, towards a more co-operative form of industrial relations.

There I was very pleased to see that before a new machine was brought into a plant, the companies who I talked to - and they were large firms, I grant you - but they actually took their employees out to look at different types of equipment that was designed for the

basic needs that the company had, and it was the employees who, more often than not, decided on which instrumentation or which machine they wanted to bring in, because it was the one that they best understood, the one that they were most comfortable working with, and the one that they felt they could reach the greatest heights of productivity with. Because if you bring in new equipment to a plant and you just force it upon the employees, they have to go through a crash retraining program, without necessarily having a great deal of support of services alongside that, more often than not they have found that you run into more troubles than successes.

So they, in their own form, largely through industrial relations and through labour negotiations, have evolved over the past 35 or 40 years, a system which we, I believe, are starting to undertake to some degree, although on a somewhat different path in the establishment of this Workplace Innovation Centre.

It is my hope that this centre will flourish in Manitoba. It is setting an example for all the rest of Canada, as a matter of fact, not only Canada but North America and much of the other European states who are far far behind the Scandinavian countries in industrial relations. Perhaps even the Scandinavians will pick up on the experience that we gain from the creation of this Workplace Innovation Centre and modify their own system to pick up the good aspects that we, in Manitoba, are introducing into the field of industrial relations.

It is very important to recognize that the board is very independent. That the board as well, in the establishment of the board, there's provisions so that the board doesn't all expire at any one time to give it some consistency. It is important to recognize as well that in the role, not only for co-operation and understanding, includes an educational segment to it so that the various parties can be very familiar with the latest stages of technological innovations that are available on the marketplace for their particular plant.

It should enable small businesses and large businesses alike, organized and unorganized labour alike, the opportunity to review, either in place or at least review alongside some experts in the area to get a professional opinion - and not just a salesperson's opinion - but a professional opinion as to what type of equipment will be most appropriate for that facility towards the enhancement of productivity in that plant.

It deals not just with industrial applications, but also, I would suggest, it deals very clearly with the service sector for an awful lot, at least, of the new innovations in the workplace are coming into the service sector and the service sector is, I believe, the largest single sector of employment in the Province of Manitoba, so it's very important that that sector be recognized within the board's purview and the review of its - I shouldn't say review - but the carrying out of its basic mandate.

It is clear to understand as well that the creation of this centre does absolutely nothing to take away from me the rights, the responsibilities or the duties from both labour and industry in their conduct of their normal industrial relations, the normal conduct of the negotiations, that they can and possibly will in future times even provide within their own negotiations within a term of their contract, the requirement for consultation perhaps with the innovation centre, I'm not really sure.

That's up to the negotiators in business and in labour to have those sorts of things included in contract down the road.

I suspect that as this centre starts to flourish, that sort of contract language may not even be necessary for I hope that it will be an automatic turn for both sides, the industrialist, the employers, as well as the employees and the unionists who will turn to this centre for advice.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned a few minutes earlier, this is certainly trend-breaking legislation. It is a typical example of how we as New Democrats feel government should be involved in the industrial sector. We feel very strongly that within the economic climate of the country and of the province the government is an integral part and we have a responsibility to foster good relations as well as modern developments within the industrial and the workplace-related issues that arise. We, as a social democratic government, will do our best to ensure and to co-operate so that we have a good - not necessarily the force of law coming down upon negotiations and when necessary we shall certainly do that. More important than that we shall facilitate, we shall create the opportunities for good industrial relations.

I think our record in the past three and a half years is exemplary in that and of every major province in this country we have the best industrial relations record. That's something we are very proud of as a government, something I am very proud of as a member of the government. As I've said earlier, it is something I committed myself very strongly to in my own election campaign, in my nomination campaign prior to that, that I would work alongside my colleagues to try and bring forward innovative mechanisms towards making greater harmony in the workplace.

With this greater harmony, and I'm sure that this Workplace Innovation Centre will be one of many steps will come forward in the future towards greater harmony in the workplace and, therefore, a greater productivity and a greater health to the economy of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Minister for bringing forward this final legislation and I look very forward to not only its passing but also its swift implementation.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the debate will stand in the name of the Member for Gladstone? (Agreed).

The Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Will you call Bill No. 7, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

BILL 7 - THE AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act, standing in the name of the Member for Roblin-Russell.

The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the bill to amend The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act has

been brought into debate today because of the questions I raised this morning with the First Minister and other reasons. There's no problem of my support for this legislation that's before us to provide Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation financing to legitimate part-time farmers, because as I see it and from the performance of the First Minister today, we're going to have more and more part-time farmers in this province. The numbers are going to escalate pretty rapidly if we don't get our hands and grip on this problem with the dairy industry.

It's not a new problem and it's most unfortunate that agriculture has such a low priority with this government because we see here time and time again what little attention they pay to the industry and what applications they offer as solutions to what was at one time the number No. 1 industry in this province. Agricultural was No. 1 for a long, long time.

We have no problem supporting the legislation, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture when he introduced the bill on the 10th of June said that basic target groups according to their preference would be previous full-time farmers who, as a result of adverse economic circumstances, had been forced to obtain full-time or part-time jobs in order to sustain their farm operations.

Mr. Speaker, the government has recognized the problem. The Minister has recognized it and I've recognized it and I wonder what we're going to do about it. The answers that I got from the First Minister today certainly are not going to be very helpful to those 40-or-so cream producers in Roblin-Russell constituency which I raised today take their cans of cream to the creameries in Roblin and Rosburn and find that they're turned away at the door and told to take it home because there is no quota. Their quota for strange reason — (Interjection) — The Minister of the Environment talked about making wine of it.

Mr. Speaker, this government has known for many months the problems that are out there with the dairy sector of agriculture. They've known it for weeks and months. What have they done? Today the problem is here again. It was here six weeks ago. It's back again today, the lack of quota and the First Minister says he's going to study it. Is he going to make a trip to Ottawa and talk to the Canadian Dairy Council instead of going to North Dakota, or is he going to call the Manitoba Milk Control Board into his office and discuss this problem, or what are his priorities on this subject matter, Mr. Speaker? Well I wonder. We sit here and wonder day after day what the priorities of this government are. It certainly is not the small-time farmers which we're addressing to in this bill.

They can talk whatever they like. I say here is a food product that is being produced in our province by honest-to-God, hardworking farmers and they take it to the door of the creamery and they are turned aside and told there is no place for it in this society today. — (Interjection) — He says hogwash. I ask the Honourable Minister of Finance to go and phone up those two creameries at his earliest opportunity and find out what they'll tell him. They'll tell him they are turning these people aside because there is no quota for them at those creameries, and that's why my phone is ringing off the wall. These are hard-working people that don't deserve that kind of treatment from a

government. They don't. These people have worked hard and they've strived all their lives to get a dairy herd in place and produce the cream and take it to the marketplace and they're turned aside.

As I asked the First Minister today, what are they going to do? Dump it on the ground? Take it home and feed it to the hogs? Well, I don't know, but there's got to be a solution to it, and as I stand here, Mr. Speaker, at this moment, there are millions of people in this world that are going to bed hungry tonight, so there's something wrong. Either our priorities are wrong, but I suspect the problem is that the government is not prepared to deal with the subject. Either that or they don't have any answers for the problem.

It's one or the other, and the problem isn't going to go away, but what we're doing here, at least, some of these people who have been full-time farmers, we're going to provide them financing in this legislation when they become part-time farmers and I'm sure as I'm standing before you today here, Mr. Speaker, a lot of these farmers in our province, half section and three-quarter section and one-quarter section farmers who are among those that phoned me are going to become part-time farmers if we don't grapple with this problem and solve it.

Sure, we're going to provide them financing as they become part-time farmers, Mr. Speaker, but it's not going to solve the problem. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the First Minister and his government had better move this problem in agriculture higher up in their priorities than it's getting at the present time and see if we can't come up with a solution to the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I said to the First Minister this morning, let's take these surplus dairy products and find some way or vehicle to provide these people in the world who are hungry today and are lacking and need food.

A MEMBER: They won't pay for it.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: What's the difference, if you're dumping it on the ground?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: They talk about the old age pensioners and the plea they have for the old age pensioners. They talk about all these minority groups. The Minister of Education was running around last winter saying what she was going to do and help the kids in downtown Winnipeg. Here we have an agricultural product, good high quality food and we're going to dump it on the ground. Where does it make sense, Mr. Speaker? It doesn't make sense. We've got to deal with the problem and grapple with it.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to belabour the point. I support the legislation but I'm very alarmed about the negative attitude that I got from the First Minister this morning when I asked him to see how we're going to deal with this problem which is going to create more and more part-time farmers, I suspect, over and above those that are already part-time farmers; and I can't see, as I stand here today, that with the priorities that agriculture has with this government, that we better call the election at the earliest possible date and let's put a government in there that will deal with this subject matter.

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

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to participate in the debate on the Bill 7, the amendment to The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act, and want to place on the record support for the amendment by our party, Mr. Speaker.

I guess I have to, as well, put the question forward as to how much of it has been carried on without this legislation? I'm sure that this in fact has been overlooked to some degree by the Credit Corporation over the past few years, that it is in fact a legislative change that has been brought forward to really rectify or allow what is actually taking place to be within the laws of the province, because I'm sure there are some part-time farmers now that are now getting support from the Agricultural Credit Corporation.

We support that and want to make it very clear, but I don't want the Minister or the government to think that this is a great revelation, that all at once there is going to be a massive amount of funds flow from the Agricultural Credit Corporation to part-time farmers, because in fact, I'm sure the Minister, if he were being straightforward, that he would say that it is in fact in practice at this point and is just legitimizing what is happening and I think it's extremely important. I think the Credit Corporation will feel a lot more comfortable now after having this taking place.

The Minister makes a couple of comments in his introductory remarks. In view of the fact, in trying to demonstrate the need for it, he did not demonstrate the actual need as far as applications are concerned. He demonstrated that there were some 350 farmers surveyed, that the basic target groups would be those people who wanted to become full-time farmers and then he goes on to say and makes a comment which is somewhat confusing and I would hope that, in closing debate, he will in fact clarify it.

I'll make reference to his comments in Hansard: "The third area being considered and being supported by farmers is those who want to gradually take over their parents' farm, the inner-generation transfer. This would assist, as I indicated, to allow farm families to transfer farms to their next-of-kin in an orderly fashion. So we want to indicate clearly that this amendment to the act is not intended to open the doors completely. It is intended to have MACC provide financing for those who wish to maintain a working career and supplement their income from farming."

What he has said, first of all, he wants to provide support for those people who are wanting to get into farming and make it a full-time occupation. Then he goes to this point that he's now supportive of those who want to continue farming. The next sentence is where the confusion comes. Then he says, "We don't want to have that occur. Our hope is that farming, the intent on farming, that farming will be a full-time occupation for those people entering it."

He's very confused or, in some way, trying to confuse - maybe not trying to; that's not fair. He's in some way confusing what he's really trying to intend to do, Mr. Speaker. I picked up a bad habit from my desk mate from Morris, as far as referring to the Chair as Chairman, rather than Speaker. I suppose that's where it came from.

MR. C. MANNES: Don't pick up any more of my bad habits.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Okay, I won't pick up any more of his bad habits. But I have, Mr. Speaker, over the last few days, talked to several people and different groups in the farm community and have asked some questions dealing with this government and this Minister and I guess we have some opposite directions being taken by the government, some inconsistencies.

We have legislation on the books, farmland protection legislation which in fact disallows almost everyone in the province from being a farmer except those people who are defined as farmers; and I hope the Minister again gives a little bit more explanation as to how he's going to define a farmer, because in Part 2 of the amendment he's got subsection 1.1 of the act is further amended by adding thereto, immediately after Clause j thereof, the following clause, j.1

Part-time farmer, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for making reference and I will get back to more of the principle of the bill, that part-time farmer means, part-time farmer as defined by the regulations.

I, Mr. Speaker, would like to know what his intent is to determine what a part-time farmer is.

A MEMBER: How are you going to do it?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, is it going to be consistent with The Farm Lands Ownership Act, where we now have regulations in place, where for that act, it says that for the purpose of the definition of farmer, The Farm Lands Ownership Act, actively engaged means participation by an individual in the supervision and management of farming operation; the application of physical labour to the farming operation unless the individual is precluded from doing so due to age or physical disability; significant portion of his income means 50 percent or more of his gross income; and significant portion of his time means at least 40 percent of his working time.

There are some inconsistencies that this government is demonstrating, Mr. Speaker, and that's what we want clarified. We want the inconsistencies clarified and would hope that the Minister, either during the closing remarks on the debate of this bill or during committee, will be able to explain to us whether, in making these amendments, he is prepared to make some other amendments to The Farm Lands Ownership Act, which will in fact open it up for more individuals in the province in which to farm.

The point which my colleague from Roblin-Russell has just raised again today, dealing with a concern that we, the Conservative Party, have - and to a large extent they are part-time farmers or could be considered part-time farmers or will be part-time farmers, Mr. Speaker. Again the government is inconsistent in their actions and their policies. On one hand, they continue to say they're very supportive and are introducing legislation to allow part-time farming to be applied to the MACC Board of Directors or to the program; yet there are many farmers who are having a hard time maintaining a living as it is, under the kinds of policies that they're administering: the cream quota restriction; the egg quota restrictions; the milk quota transfer restrictions.

I lay this example out, Mr. Speaker. Supposing an individual goes to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and qualifies as the regulations are drawn. They are now working or employed off the farm. They may drive a school bus or do something else and they want to get into farming on a long-term basis. They want to milk a few cows; they want to buy a portion of a neighbour's herd; a portion of the quota to produce the milk under. They can't do it, Mr. Speaker, they can't do it. They can't buy a portion of a dairy herd and the quota, to milk cows on a part-time basis to become part-time farmers, because of another restriction and a regulation allowed to take place under this government. So there are some inconsistencies that we're seeing this government dealing with.

Another point that was brought to my attention - and it was a very serious point - and it relates to the numbers of farm bankruptcies. We have many farmers who are full-time farmers today, who have been under the impression that because of the comments this government had been making in the last year or two and the announcements in the Throne Speech and the Budget this spring, that they would now qualify for support from the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation; that they could get up \$100,000 at 9.75 percent; for the next \$100,000, that they would be able to qualify for the going interest rate of 13 percent; and they haven't even been considered, Mr. Speaker.

They are not being considered by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and they are saying to me, as their representative, why is the government now going out and advocating that they've got another program supporting the part-time farmer in the province when, in fact, they aren't living up to their commitment that they've been bragging about as politicians for the last few months? And as a person who's a full-time farmer, in desperate need of their support, I can't get financial aid, and yet they're making a lot about the part-time farmer amendment that they're making to the Manitoba Legislature.

Again an inconsistent approach, Mr. Speaker. Again, there is a big question in the minds of many people out there - are they just playing politics with the farm community? Are they just playing politics with the farm community, making a small amendment to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, which leaves the impression that there's a wider base of people that can get support?

The person said to me, they're not fooling me because I need the support of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation; I am a full-time farmer and I am in desperate shape for financial aid and I can't get it, yet this government is misleading again a group of people in society who are part-time farmers and they're saying to them, we'll help you as a part-time farmer. Let's let them get their job that they're trying to do now done properly, Mr. Speaker, rather than mislead, rather than trying to encourage more people to support them, on other than fact.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I'll read into the record what has happened under this government's administration and it proves that they haven't been dealing with the full-time farmers. Since the NDP have been in power, from 1982 to 1984, we have had a 154 farm families declare bankruptcy. Those are declared bankruptcies. Those aren't the numbers of people that have just walked

away from their operations and just never declared bankruptcy, but just folded and voluntarily left the industry. That doesn't include those numbers.

Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) — the Member for Inkster makes the comment. He said, how many would have been bankrupt in our term of office or if we were still in office? The point I want to bring out here it is that during the election of 1981, we didn't falsely promise the farm community that none of them would lose their farms because of high interest rates. We didn't make that false promise as he and his party and his Premier signed, Mr. Speaker. We did not do that. Yes, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Turtle Mountain tells me, he says that there probably wouldn't be any because of the fact . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . they had a false promise, Mr. Speaker, there wouldn't be nearly as many as under the New Democratic administration because we, in fact, were prepared to implement policies and programs that would have supported them in a more full and equitable manner. But, Mr. Speaker, it was the Minister of Finance and his Premier who made that false promise in 1981 and we now have 154 farm bankruptcies in their term of office.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and the part-time farmers should be very suspect when they go and swallow this whole hog when the Government of Manitoba says, yes we're going to help you as a part-time farmer. It's pretty hollow. I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, it could be fairly hollow, because I don't think they really intend to help anyone in a major way, other than their own political image. That is the only thing they're trying to support and bring forward - their own political image.

Another point I want to make that was brought to my attention from individuals who said, yes, they're going to help part-time farmers get financing from MACC. What did they do to me as a full-time farmer? They raised my interest from 10 to 13 percent, Mr. Speaker, with one stroke of a pen, at the same time the Minister of Agriculture was calling for 8 percent. That's what he said. "My God," he said. "I don't need much more help like that or I will have to qualify for a part-time farmer loan."

That's the whole problem with this government. They haven't lived up to anything they've promised or said to the farm community; we've got the cream problem; we've got the egg problem; we've got the milk problems; we've got the financial problems of the farm community and they aren't dealing with it.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there'll be more part-time farmers that will qualify under this legislation if they don't take action to support the farm community in the control of grasshoppers. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Highways today has the audacity to stand up and say if it becomes a problem he'll consider doing something about it, but the Minister of Agriculture from his department last year put a report out saying that the grasshoppers were going to be two-and-a-half times as bad as last year and they ate half the farmers of Southern Manitoba out of house and home and they're two-and-a-half times as bad, and this Minister of Highways has the audacity to stand and say he'll

consider doing something if they appear to be a problem. Where has he been, Mr. Speaker, where has this Minister of Highways been? — (Interjection) — That's right, I'm sorry I didn't mean to embarrass the Minister of Highways asking him where he has been.

Why doesn't he go out, Mr. Speaker, to the farm community before there aren't any farmers left and talk to them about the farm problem? He tells us that he'll do something when they become a problem. Well my goodness sakes, Mr. Speaker! I'll tell you, he should go to the municipal meetings next week in Southern Manitoba and just find out what kind of a problem they have, but he won't go because he doesn't want to find out what's going on outside of this building. The Minister of Highways does not want to carry out his responsibilities and spray the road allowances which fall within his jurisdiction. It's not the Minister of Agriculture, it's the Minister of Highways. They spray the weed problems. The Highways Department spray the weed problems on the highways ditches, why won't they spray the grasshopper problems?

The Minister of Resources will spray the budworm for the forest reserves but he won't spray the grasshoppers in the Crown lands and the waterways which fall within his jurisdiction. What kind of a double-standard government do we have, Mr. Speaker? That's what we have is a double-standard government. There will be many part-time farmers, Mr. Speaker, if we continue to allow this government to administer the affairs of the people of Manitoba.

Maybe that's why they've introduced the legislation. Maybe that's their answer. Their answer is that their policies have led the majority of Manitobans to become part-time farmers and to make the Credit Corporation of any use at all, they're going to amend it so that it will now support the part-time farmers of the province because they were created under their administration. That's their answer to the farm problem of today, Mr. Speaker; change the legislation to accommodate or to try and solve the results of their bad policies.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to make reference to the farm bankruptcies as it compares to rest of Canada and the need for . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation changes. Remember, the 154 bankruptcies and Stats Canada point out that we have something like 29,000 farmers, that's part-time and full-time farmers. Saskatchewan - look at these figures - had 117 bankruptcies. Do you know how many farmers there are in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? Yes, there are about three times as many as we have. Yes, Mr. Speaker, about 80,000 farmers, probably a little more than that, about 80,000 farmers in Saskatchewan; that's 117. Alberta, who have twice as many farmers as we have, Mr. Speaker, came in with even less.

Go on to another comment. In Manitoba, 12 services incidental to agriculture declared bankruptcy, 12 farm service centres, people who serve the farm community. Saskatchewan didn't have any that were declared and Alberta had 10. Here we have a government who are again running with a smokescreen to the people of Manitoba just prior to an election. They're now running

around trying to get the support of people who want to become part-time farmers. They're saying we can really open the act up and help you, when, in fact, Mr. Speaker, as I said at my opening comments it's really taking place now. I'm sure there are many part-time farmers getting support from the MACC. Don't let them run and try to again fool the public that they're doing a lot.

I want to again go over the point, Mr. Speaker, that there are numerous farmers today who have been expecting support from MACC that are full-time farmers and haven't been able to get the programs that they've announced. In fact, I don't have the figures before me - I maybe do if I take a minute to check - but during the Estimates of the department the Minister made some comments of how many farmers have qualified recently under their program. This spring that was announced at \$20 million. It was a handful of people, Mr. Speaker, that were getting support. The Minister left the impression on the public that the majority of farmers would get support under the program.

Again, it's the record of this government that I want to point out to the public. It's the incompetence of this government in dealing with the farm problem, Mr. Speaker. We've got to continue to tell the people of Manitoba that what they do is suspect and the motive is not necessarily to help the farm community in general. That's the concern that I have and that's what I want to point out. We just don't trust the New Democratic Party in what they do. We have a very big question of trust.

I again go over the questions to the Minister of Agriculture that I want responded to as far. As far as the response is concerned, I would like him to point out what he plans to introduce for regulations because I think it's extremely important that he bring in regulations that are consistent with what he's already done or that he's prepared to change legislation dealing with farmland ownership in this province. I think it's extremely important that the public have demonstrated by the government that they're consistent which they haven't done to this point.

My colleague again as I pointed out earlier from Roblin-Russell, I would hope that when he stands that he can defend himself. When he says yes we're bringing in legislation to help part-time farmers through a Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, that he says he's contacted and is going to meet with Ottawa to request that the cream producers of this province have more quota to ship under, that they don't have to dump their cream on the ground. We in Manitoba need a spokesman for the farm community. We need pressure put on Ottawa; Canadian Dairy Commission; supporting our cream shippers, Mr. Speaker, for more total quota for our province. That's what we need this First Minister and this Minister of Agriculture requesting for our province. We need more room to produce, Mr. Speaker. It is somewhat hypocritical, and I say that, that it is somewhat hypocritical to say on one hand that you're going to encourage more part-time farmers but what are you going to encourage them to do. Because As I said, the current shippers of cream haven't got a market or a home for it.

The milk people can't sell quota or cows to anybody that wants to get into part-time milk production. They can't transfer quotas. If you want to be a part-time

egg producer, Mr. Speaker, you can't do it because of the regulations that are in place. We are regulated to where we have stymied the industry and put many people out of business and yet he says he wants to help part-time farmers.

Mr. Speaker, yes, we want an element of free enterprise injected so that we can, in fact, expand the agricultural base. Yes, Mr. Speaker, farmers are some of the greatest free enterprisers that there are in the country. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we want free enterprise for our farm community and the Minister of Finance doesn't want free enterprise. He wants state farming, Mr. Speaker, so the people can line up in bread lines like they do in Poland and Russia. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance wants state farming where the people have to line up and they're starving, yes. That's what the Minister of Finance would have in this country, a regulated food supply system where you, in fact, would starve to death under his system of agricultural policy. That's what he believes in state control of the agricultural industry. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's what he wants. Let the record clearly state it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we are satisfied that the legislation, the amendments to the Agricultural Credit Corporation legislation will help certain individuals. Yes, it will and we support that, Mr. Speaker. We support it.

They, Mr. Speaker, are not doing it for the right reasons. They're not doing it for the reasons in which we would expect it to be done. They're doing it for their own political reasons. They're trying to again get some support for their party when they go to the people. They're going to say that they've made big changes to the Credit Corporation when, in fact, what is happening now is actually this act is just making legal what has been practised, I'm sure. If that's not the case, I stand back down on that point that I make. I think it is, in fact, taking place that it is just legitimizing for this corporation what has taken place.

I want them to, first of all, place their priorities on those people who are currently full-time farmers and need the help of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. That's the No. 1 priority of our party. That's the No. 1 priority of the farm community. We want to keep those people who are now farming and who have been led to believe that there are MACC Programs available. We want the emphasis placed on those people. That's who we want prioritized, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we want to allow people who have off-the-farm employment get support so that they can become full-time farmers. Again, it's a matter of judgment and there's going to have to be a board, someone to determine who, in fact, qualifies and who doesn't. I hope they don't draw the regulations and restrictions so close that we have the bureaucracy so tied up with itself in such a decision-making process that it really doesn't do what he intends it to do.

Mr. Speaker, with those comments, I'm sure they have some colleagues that may want to make further comments because it is an important matter that's

before us. I would hope that immediate action would be taken by the First Minister. I plead with him, I plead with the First Minister that he take action on behalf of the cream producers of this province, that he immediately go to Ottawa whether it be today or whether it be Monday morning, but he communicate with the Canadian Dairy Commission on behalf of those cream producers who have no place to ship their cream, that he looks at opportunities and proposals like my colleague from Roblin-Russell said where there are people going to bed in the evening without anything to eat or having fed themselves all day that they could, in fact, accommodate that kind of program.

The Member for Flin Flon who is quite prepared to sign contracts for \$200,000 a year and buy cigarettes for his employees and buy golf course memberships for him, Mr. Speaker, hollers from his seat that somebody has to pay for it. Of all people to say from his seat, Mr. Speaker, that somebody has to pay to help those few small dairy producers who want to eke out a living and who don't make \$200,000 in a lifetime, he has the audacity to say from his seat that somebody has to pay for it. He is a part of a government that can write a contract, Mr. Speaker, that buys golf course memberships in Quebec. That's the kind of members we have, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of member we have from Flin Flon.

The Minister of Environment tells the farmers to make wine with it. The minute they made a drop of wine he'd have the Attorney-General go in and arrest them, Mr. Speaker. That's the kind of government.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: What I am pointing out, Mr. Speaker, is really the kind of government the farm community have governing their province. The Minister of Environment tells them to change it to wine. The Minister of Northern Affairs responsible for Manfor writes a sweetheart contract with one employee. If they took that 200,000 and spread it throughout the dairy industry, it would help, Mr. Speaker, many, many farmers and the part-time farmers that are going to qualify under the Manitoba Agricultural Corporation would be less.

I am extremely disappointed that the Minister responsible for Manfor can put the kind of comments forward that he has. The Minister of Environment wants to change it to wine. I guess you'd be a part-time wine farmer and a part-time cream shipper. Yes, you'd be a bootlegger that's what you would be. That's right. My colleague from Turtle Mountain says the next recommendation for part-time farmers will be to spin your straw into gold. That'll be their next recommendation. They're naive, Mr. Speaker, they're incompetent and should not be trusted by the people of Manitoba and they should have an election so we could vote them out of office and get some credibility back to this province and the administration. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's what we want.

I just want to again point out, I think my colleague from Roblin-Russell did have a good recommendation when he said possibly some of this surplus dairy product could be, in fact, used to feed some of the hungry

mouths of the world, that a program could be put in place to accept on a short-term basis, not on a long-term basis, to make the butters and to make the kinds of products that could be of some use to these starving people.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, I'm sure, from La Verendrye will have some comments to say about Manitoba's contributions in his recent visit to some of those starving people. Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is it could give Manitoba some visibility and it could help those 40 cream shippers, those part-time farmers who are going to be part-time farmers and need support under this program, it would help. — (Interjection) — The Minister says who is going to pay for it? Mr. Speaker, who is going to pay for the contracts that he writes in his ill-advised administration of the Manfor Forest Products? The people of Manitoba are and I can tell you that the many cream shippers in this province are worth a lot more than one highly paid executive that he goes and finds, Mr. Speaker. He says it's silly. He's the silly one, Mr. Speaker. The farm community of Manitoba are ashamed of him as a former farm boy. He should know better as a member of this Legislature and I would hope he'd stand up to defend himself.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset on this bill — (Interjection) — we support it. We look forward to the comments of the government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . in committee answering some of the questions that I've brought forward and I'm sure I have some colleagues that may want to make a further comment.

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

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to lay a few remarks on the record. First of all, I must for the record, publicly congratulate the Member for Arthur who just gave a wonderful presentation on . . . I think he's put into perspective well, the situation in Manitoba, particularly in light of how members opposite, in their capacities, see fit to squander money in such major fashions and when we realize today how far \$200,000 would go in support of cream shippers, I think he provided a very worthwhile effort in tying those two factors together.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is certainly supportable. I rise to speak, though only insofar as the bill leaves it to regulation to define what a part-time farmer is, and I agree with my colleague, the Member for Arthur. There is tremendous inconsistency over many acts of government with respect to the definition of a part-time farmer.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur has referred specifically to the inconsistency under The Farm Lands Ownership Act, as compared to the regulations that may evolve under The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act, but I point out to the government there are other acts, there are other statutes that make reference to part-time farmers or the consideration of farmers; and I would like to spell out another one and that's, of course, under The Municipal Act, as to whether an

individual gains exemption for the status of their home and that's granted on the basis of whether one is a farmer or not, under that act.

I can tell you that I've gone through the experience of having to justify that I am a farmer, and it all came about because I was also a shareholder in a farm corporation, removed from the farm. Mr. Speaker, it's rather a disturbing fact, when one day a tax assessor knocks on your door and says, under the purposes of this act, we're deeming that you're not a farmer, and he had to drive by about 10 or 12 granaries and thousands of dollars of my equipment to reach my door to tell me that he didn't think I was a farmer.

Mr. Speaker, at that time he wasn't concerned about the fact that I was also an MLA. It was because of the fact that I was a shareholder in a corporation and somebody said to him, well, you better go and check out that character Manness down the road. You never know, he may be taking dividends out of that farm corporation that are greater than what he's taking profits out of his own farm.

So, Mr. Speaker, I said, don't be ridiculous, I'm not going to show you anything. What happens if I don't? He says, well, if you don't we will remove the exemption on your farm home and you then will have to fight as if you're in the wrong, as if you are not a farmer and you will have to prove that you are. I said, what are my alternatives? He said, well, you can tell me all your personal affairs, tell me exactly what you make on this area, what your costs are.

Mr. Speaker, what I did to satisfy him - and I convinced him first of all, that this farm corporation of which I was a shareholder, hadn't paid one dollar taxes. I told him that verbally, in four years, hadn't paid one dollar. The individual didn't believe me. So what I had to do was I had to show the tax assessor where I stood, I showed him my income tax form from the previous year. He said, well, I don't want to see it; that's personal material. I don't want to see it.

I said, well, what do you want? He says, well, I want you to tell me how much money you made on crops, how much you paid your sons, how much you did this and that. Mr. Speaker, I gave him all that material; it took roughly 20 minutes and he went at it with his calculator and he says, yes, you are a farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I lay that on the record because of the fact we're bringing into place another bill today that makes reference to part-time farmers which we support, but which again leaves in the power of the Cabinet and the bureaucrats the determination as to who should be considered a farmer or a part-time farmer or not a farmer.

That's what concerns me with this bill, because this Government of the Day has seen this problem coming, particularly in the area of property taxation, and yet has done nothing to more clearly attempt to define what a part-time farmer is. When I saw it come by way of another bill, Mr. Speaker, I felt I had to rise for no other reason than to say that there are many people within the farming community who are at a loss to understand, firstly, where they stand and, secondly, are very upset if somebody knocks at their door and says, you are not a farmer.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's hope that the Minister, in closing debate on the issue, will at least try to clarify some of the criteria that'll be put into place by way of regulation to more ably define what a part-time farmer is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, could we call it 12:30? I think there's an indication that we'll dispense with Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 12:30 . . . Did the honourable member say we had dispensed with Private . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Dispense with Private Members'. There's been an indication, I guess.

I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Housing, that the House be adjourned.

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