



**First Session — Thirty-Fourth Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**  
**(HANSARD)**

37 Elizabeth II

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan  
Speaker*



**VOL. XXXVII No. 11 - 10 a.m., FRIDAY, AUGUST 5, 1988.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Fourth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
<b>ALCOCK, Reg</b>	Osborne	LIBERAL
<b>ANGUS, John</b>	St. Norbert	LIBERAL
<b>ASHTON, Steve</b>	Thompson	NDP
<b>BURRELL, Parker</b>	Swan River	PC
<b>CARR, James</b>	Fort Rouge	LIBERAL
<b>CARSTAIRS, Sharon</b>	River Heights	LIBERAL
<b>CHARLES, Gwen</b>	Selkirk	LIBERAL
<b>CHEEMA, Gulzar</b>	Kildonan	LIBERAL
<b>CHORNOPYSKI, William</b>	Burrows	LIBERAL
<b>CONNERY, Edward Hon.</b>	Portage la Prairie	PC
<b>COWAN, Jay</b>	Churchill	NDP
<b>CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.</b>	Ste. Rose du Lac	PC
<b>DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.</b>	Roblin-Russell	PC
<b>DOER, Gary</b>	Concordia	NDP
<b>DOWNEY, James Hon.</b>	Arthur	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.</b>	Emerson	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Herold, L.</b>	Niakwa	LIBERAL
<b>DUCHARME, Gerald, Hon.</b>	Riel	PC
<b>EDWARDS, Paul</b>	St. James	LIBERAL
<b>ENNS, Harry</b>	Lakeside	PC
<b>ERNST, Jim, Hon.</b>	Charleswood	PC
<b>EVANS, Laurie</b>	Fort Garry	LIBERAL
<b>EVANS, Leonard</b>	Brandon East	NDP
<b>FILMON, Gary, Hon.</b>	Tuxedo	PC
<b>FINDLAY, Glen Hon.</b>	Virden	PC
<b>GAUDRY, Neil</b>	St. Boniface	LIBERAL
<b>GILLESHAMMER, Harold</b>	Minnedosa	PC
<b>GRAY, Avis</b>	Ellice	LIBERAL
<b>HAMMOND, Gerrie</b>	Kirkfield Park	PC
<b>HARAPIAK, Harry</b>	The Pas	NDP
<b>HARPER, Elijah</b>	Rupertsland	NDP
<b>HELWER, Edward R.</b>	Gimli	PC
<b>HEMPHILL, Maureen</b>	Logan	NDP
<b>KOZAK, Richard, J.</b>	Transcona	LIBERAL
<b>LAMOUREUX, Kevin, M.</b>	Inkster	LIBERAL
<b>MALOWAY, Jim</b>	Elmwood	NDP
<b>MANDRAKE, Ed</b>	Assiniboia	LIBERAL
<b>MANNES, Clayton, Hon.</b>	Morris	PC
<b>McCRAE, James Hon.</b>	Brandon West	PC
<b>MINENKO, Mark</b>	Seven Oaks	LIBERAL
<b>MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.</b>	River East	PC
<b>NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.</b>	Rossmere	PC
<b>OLESON, Charlotte Hon.</b>	Gladstone	PC
<b>ORCHARD, Donald Hon.</b>	Pembina	PC
<b>PANKRATZ, Helmut</b>	La Verendrye	PC
<b>PATTERSON, Allan</b>	Radisson	LIBERAL
<b>PENNER, Jack, Hon.</b>	Rhineland	PC
<b>PLOHMAN, John</b>	Dauphin	NDP
<b>PRAZNIK, Darren</b>	Lac du Bonnet	PC
<b>ROCAN, Denis, Hon.</b>	Turtle Mountain	PC
<b>ROCH, Gilles</b>	Springfield	PC
<b>ROSE, Bob</b>	St. Vital	LIBERAL
<b>STORIE, Jerry</b>	Flin Flon	NDP
<b>TAYLOR, Harold</b>	Wolseley	LIBERAL
<b>URUSKI, Bill</b>	Interlake	NDP
<b>WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy</b>	St. Johns	NDP
<b>YEO, Iva</b>	Sturgeon Creek	LIBERAL

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, August 5, 1988.

The House met at 10 a.m.

### PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for The Communities Economic Development Fund Act):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Communities Economic Development Fund Report for 1986-87.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Manitoba Municipal Employees Benefits Board Annual Report for 1987; and I would like to table The Surface Rights Board Annual Report for the 1987-88 year.

**Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General; Minister of Cooperative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present the Annual Report, for 1986-87, of The Cooperative Loans and Loans Guarantee Board.

I am pleased to table the Annual Report, for 1986-87, of The Cooperative Promotion Board.

I have the pleasure to present the Annual Report, for 1987, of the Law Enforcement Review Agency.

I have the pleasure to present the Annual Report, for 1988, of The Law Society of Manitoba.

I am presenting the Second Annual Report, for 1987-88, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1988, of The Manitoba Law Foundation.

I am presenting today the 1987 Annual Report of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission.

I am presenting today the Annual Report, for the fiscal year April 1, 1987 to March 31, 1988, of the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission.

I present today the Annual Report, for 1987-88, of the Manitoba Police Commission.

I am pleased to present the Annual Report, for 1986-87, of The Public Trustee of Manitoba.

I present today the proceedings of the 68th Annual Meeting of the Uniform Law Conference of Canada. That was August 1986.

I am pleased to present the proceedings of the 69th Annual Meeting of the Uniform Law Conference of Canada, held at Victoria, B.C., August 1987.

\* (1005)

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General)** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 14, The Regulations Act; Loi sur les textes réglementaires; and, by leave, Bill No. 15, The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act; Loi sur le fonds en fiducie de promotion de la coopération.

### BILL NO. 16—THE REAL PROPERTY AMENDMENT ACT

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood)** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 16, The Real Property Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biens réels.

### MOTION presented.

**Mr. Maloway:** I will confine my remarks to the required five minutes.

Bill No. 16, this Bill, presents amendments to The Real Property Act, which will require Land Titles Offices in the province to provide legal counsel to assist homeowners in completing their land transfers. The Bill comes about because of the case of Janet Switzer and many other homeowners in Manitoba who have lost money because of delays at the Land Titles Office.

We feel that the current system is costly; it is complicated. It is not surprising that 98 percent of all real estate transactions are conducted through lawyers, resulting in fairly high legal fees. Especially when you consider that people are buying and selling houses in ever greater numbers these days, one every four or five years on average, legal fees can add up to an awful lot of money over the lifetime of a homeowner.

The Land Titles currently publishes a "How to" book, but it is of little help to the average citizen. A lawyer at the Land Titles Office, once again for only those who wish to use the service, I think is the answer. I have suggested that legal counsel be transferred from within the Attorney-General's office, which would result in no increased cost to the Government. If the service is popular and well-advertised, then additional staff could be added as the demand increases over the years.

I am talking about allowing people to by-pass a private sector lawyer and do the transaction directly, which they can do right now but without that legal assistance. In fact, the Land Titles has signs up indicating that the staff are not permitted to give advice and I can understand how the Law Society would be.

\* (1010)

The Law Society President the other day presented a rather hysterical tirade against the idea. He represents a privileged and pampered group and it is his job to defend the right for lawyers to have a virtual monopoly in this lucrative area of the law. I believe that the laws are created by lawyers; they are created for lawyers.

In fact, the Free Trade Agreement, drafted by lawyers, also exempts lawyers. There are countless other areas for lawyers to make money.

The other concern of the Law Society was the area of liability. A malpractice liability policy can be obtained on the private insurance market for approximately \$1,200 or the Government could simply add this to their existing Government insurance policy.

Just one final comment. In terms of cost recovery, I am sure that citizens who use this service would be willing and would be happy to pay some small fee and this can be determined at a later date. I had great hopes for the Attorney-General, not being a lawyer, that he would encourage people to do things for themselves and discourage specialization and professionalism.

I encourage the Assembly to make the law user friendly and encourage all Members to support the Bill.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to remind all Honourable Members that Rule 85 does not specify any time, but it does permit a brief explanation of the purpose of the Bill so that all Honourable Members may understand why this Bill is being introduced.

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### Boards/Senior Civil Servants Dismissals

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

Every Friday afternoon for the last couple of months, Members on this side of the House, and I assume Members on his side of the House, have received phone calls from the media about boards that have been reappointed, about Deputy Ministers that have been fired. In order that we can complete our business in the House sometime this afternoon, would the Premier announce now who is going to be pink slipped this afternoon?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) for that question because, clearly, she is trying to create an impression that is not true.

We said, and I said, that when we were elected Government that we would give an opportunity to evaluate all of the staff and the personnel in the Government. We said that we would give everyone an opportunity at the senior levels—and we are talking, I think, principally about Deputy Ministers—to establish a relationship with their Ministers, and in the course of the next few months we would then make changes if changes were necessary.

We have made very few changes. There have been some deputies who have been replaced. Through consolidations, we have eliminated the need for a couple of deputies; and we have done what the Leader of the

Opposition said she wanted to do, and that is to cut bureaucracy, not services. We have operated in a careful, considered manner and we have operated in a manner, I might say, that many of the senior staff have complimented us for. They have indicated - (Interjection)- You know the Member for Concordia, the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Doer), is chuckling.

They went through wholesale and chopped people when they came into Government. They chopped the chief executive officer of Manitoba Hydro. We have not done that. They chopped Deputy Ministers in various departments—the Deputy Minister of Education for one, I recall; the Deputy Minister of Economic Development for another. They chopped the Deputy Minister of Natural Resources for another. They chopped ADMs. They went through wholesale. They created political terror in the Government. In fact - (Interjection)- That is right. The former Member for Wolseley made it a personal vendetta to get rid of an individual from one department. Those are the kinds of things they did. We have not done that.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** A supplementary question to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

George Ford, Michael Mendelson, Elizabeth Wagner, Dick Chenier, Lloyd Girman, Mary Eadie, Jay Kaufman, Tom Owen—all are gone. All of them are gone. I ask the Premier how many more are we going to lose?

**Mr. Filmon:** To begin with, Michael Mendelson was left in place as secretary of the Treasury Board, and I am chairman of the Treasury Board, and we established a very good relationship. He then, in the course of going down east for some holidays, took a job with the Ontario Government. He came back and he asked whether or not we would like him to stay until the completion of the Estimates process. We said yes, indeed, and he was very happy.

We have not made one change in the operation of Treasury Board. We have not changed one individual in that. They have produced, with our direction, an excellent set of Estimates that I am sure the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) will appreciate and will support. These are the kinds of relationships we established.

Dick Chenier is somebody who voluntarily helped us in the amalgamation of departments, said he was happy to do so, indicated that he would like our support and recommendation to assist him in finding alternate employment, because we were indeed - (Interjection)- She is laughing because we did exactly what she said, which is to reduce bureaucracy at the senior levels. Dick Chenier recognized that and helped us to do that. As usual, the Leader of the Opposition has her facts all wrong.

\* (1015)

**Mrs. Carstairs:** A supplementary question to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). We have had new Governments over the last few years in a number of provinces. In Ontario, not a single Deputy Minister was replaced after 40 years of Conservative Government; in New Brunswick, three; in Saskatchewan, 10.

What is this First Minister going to do to deal with the chaos that is developing in department after department of his Government because there is no continuity of staff and no direction.

**Mr. Filmon:** Nothing could be further from the truth. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) is doing a disservice to the public servants of this province. They thought that she had some credibility. They thought she had some integrity when she said, prior to and during the election, that the Civil Service had been politicized under the NDP. She said that she would make changes. She said she would wipe out more than half the staff of the Premier's Office because they were political. She said she would replace senior staff, wipe out administration in MPIC. She said that among the moves she made, and it is in writing, in her promises during the election campaign, she would make changes in the bureaucracy.

Now, because we have made some very limited—and I stress that—very limited changes, just a few areas in which the relationship could not be established between the new Minister and their senior staff, we have made a limited number of changes, and now she has gone completely back on her position and her word and is suggesting that somehow we have created chaos. That is absolute nonsense!

### Civil Service Professional Image

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** With a new question, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

Professionalism is the essence of the Civil Service—people who are hired on the basis of their qualifications through competition, by getting the most talented individuals to serve this province.

I ask the Premier: What measures does his Government intend to take to repair the damage he has done to the sense of professionalism in this province with regard to the Civil Service?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, you see, now we find out the inexperience of the Leader of the Opposition. She does not understand, as the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) does, because I heard him say, "Those who live by the O/C, die by the O/C." He recognized, as did his Government, that Order-in-Council appointments are at the prerogative of the Government. They are not senior Civil Service appointments; they are not established Civil Service appointments of people who rise up through the Civil Service. We are doing that.

What did we do in health care? We appointed an individual as the Acting Deputy Minister, Mr. Maynard, who has been in the Civil Service since the 1960s. We have appointed people all the way through who have risen through the ranks of the Civil Service, unlike the great armada of people who came in from out of province, from Saskatchewan, under the New Democrats. We have been looking to people in the Civil Service to fill the needs that are there. In many cases,

we have evaluated people who came in here from other provinces under the NDP, and we have left them in place because we believe that they are fine quality people and they are doing their job. That is the basis upon which we make our judgments.

\* (1020)

### Board Membership Replacements

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** With a supplementary question to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

Not only has he destroyed the professionalism of the Civil Service, but he is also emasculating board after board after board—this week alone, the Cancer Foundation, the Lotteries Board, the Licence Suspension Appeal Board, and the Land Value Appraisal Board—and we hear that there is going to be major changes to agricultural boards. Mr. Speaker, without continuity on board membership, there is no advancement of the interests of the needs of people of this Province. When will this emasculation stop?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, firstly, we have increased the productivity and improved the attitude of the Civil Service. The Civil Service is telling us that there is a much better attitude and much better morale than there ever was under the NDP because we are acting.

I repeat, that when she was running for office, she said that she would replace the boards of our major Crown corporations, especially in areas where they were not doing the job, and she listed ones like MPIC and so on. We have left in place the CEO of Manitoba Telephone System, of Manitoba Hydro.

Who is she opposed to? Did she think that we should have released Professor Paul Thomas? We have left him as a chairman of the Manitoba Telephone System. Is she going to be saying that these people are not qualified to serve on Manitoba Hydro—Professor John McCallum from the university or Dr. Harold Perkins or Darlene Hildebrand? Which of these does she say are not qualified to sit on that board? How about the Law Reform Commission that we reconstituted? The former Lieutenant-Governor, Pearl McGonigal, who I believe supported the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) and was a delegate to support her for the leadership of the Liberal Party in Manitoba, is she saying that these are not good appointments?

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Mr. Speaker, would the Premier tell us today how many more boards in this province will be decimated by this Government, with no continuity, and therefore an inability to perform their functions adequately in that they will not have the knowledge to address the issues facing the boards of this province?

**Mr. Filmon:** In terms of continuity, let me say that in virtually every single case, we have left people on the boards to retain the continuity. We have left people on the boards. For the most part, we have left in place

the senior executives except where there were vacancies.

We have operated with common sense and diligence and a desire to create new directions, because we said before that obviously the boards that were there were doing a bad job. We are into millions of dollars of losses at MTS, millions of dollars of losses at MPIC. We could not continue. She disagreed publicly with the policies, the development policies of Manitoba Hydro. She referred to Limestone as "Lemonstone, Lemonstone" because, she said, that the boards had been politically motivated and so had the chairman. We have not done that. We put in place quality people to do a quality job.

**Some Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** I am glad you kept the meritorious appointments on the Telephone System.

### Free Trade Agreement Senate Legislation

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** My question is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

He has stated on two occasions that he has not read the trade agreement but has stated that he understands it. I wonder how the First Minister can justify to Manitobans, and indeed Canadians, his position, as stated yesterday and continuously throughout the debate on the trade agreement and its impact on Manitobans, that Manitobans do indeed have access, unfettered access to the United States for their goods, when in fact the Senate has just passed a Trade Bill that overrides the trade agreement and does not provide any exemption or any reference to the Canada-U.S. proposed trade agreement. How could he possibly say that when the Senate, in fact, has the overriding power?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, we have heard throughout the course of the debate that one of the reasons we need to enter into a Free Trade Agreement with the Americans is because of the growing protectionist sentiment in the U.S. In fact, one of the objectives of the Free Trade Agreement is to overcome that attitude and to secure access. So there are those factions within the Senate of the United States that have expressed desires and, in fact, obviously a majority of them wanting to protect American markets.

We need to have that Free Trade Agreement so that the long-term effect will be that we will have secure access and that we will not be fettered from that access, and we will not be subject to the protectionist policies of the Americans. That is why we support the Free Trade Agreement.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, you do not understand. Yes, that was one of the stated objectives of the proposed Canada-U.S Trade Agreement. That was one of the stated objectives; that

is one of the reasons Mulroney is selling this agreement. But the U.S. Senate Trade Bill, the protectionist Bill that he says he is going to protect us against, does not exempt Canada, does not refer to the trade agreement as a subservient part, and indeed, we are subject to that same Bill that was the objective of this trade agreement.

Does he not understand that Manitobans do not have any access to the United States under this Senate Bill? Does he not understand that?

**Mr. Filmon:** That is the reason the Canadian Government has been going into the negotiations and entered into agreement with the Americans. They know what the sentiments are in the United States. They know that there are those factions in the Senate who want to seek to cut off trade, who want to seek to raise the protectionist barriers to prevent Canada from having access to their markets.

The fact of the matter is that is the reason why we need the Free Trade Agreement to ensure that in future we will override and overcome those protectionist sentiments and that we will ensure that we continue to have a good, strong trading relationship and systematically remove the barriers to trade with the United States.

**Mr. Doer:** The Free Trade Agreement was overridden by the Senate legislation. If you do not understand that, it is a fundamental weakness of your argument.

\* (1025)

### Free Trade Agreement Energy Resources Protection

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** I would like to know, given the fact that we do not have access to the United States, and given the fact that we have given away our energy resources in a North American continental agreement—the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has stated that he has legal opinions on the state of our Hydro and that he has legal opinions on the ability of Manitobans in times of crisis and energy crisis to protect ourselves—can the First Minister please table those legal opinions in this House today?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** It is the former NDP Government that gave away our Hydro resources. They are the ones who entered into agreements to sell our energy to the Americans at cheaper rates than they were selling it to our Canadian consumers. They are the ones who entered into a long-term agreement for a 12-year sale to Northern States Power of 500 megawatts of firm power to the Americans with huge penalties if they were to withdraw any aspect of that energy commitment to the Americans. They are the ones who, by policy choice of their Government, entered into agreements that gave away our energy and based it on a price that was based on American coal fire production, not on our cost of production. They are the ones who know about giveaway of energy.

**Mr. Speaker:** May I remind all Honourable Members that a supplementary question should not require a preamble.

The Honourable Member for Concordia.

**Mr. Doer:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My final supplementary is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

Given the fact that we do not have guarantees of access to the U.S. and given the fact he cannot table the legal opinions on the energy resources, this philosophy of the unfettered North American market has manifested itself in the fact that Manitoba has gone from the second to the third lowest unemployment rate and our unemployment rate has gone up higher than most other provinces, one-half percent in the last month, the first month the Tories took office, what are they going to do for employment in the future? Is this the same continuation of the Lyon days when unemployment continues to go up under Tory regime?

**Mr. Filmon:** We now know the legacy of NDP policies—NDP policies that put a tax on jobs so that everytime anybody wants to invest in this province and create jobs, they get taxed in a way that they are not taxed in virtually every other jurisdiction in North America.

And when we talk about where we were under the NDP, the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) does not recall that in March of this year we had the fourth lowest unemployment rate, which was worse than we are today, and that for the first time in 15 years, in the month of March, we were above the national average in our unemployment rate. That is thanks to six-and-a-half years of NDP Government.

\* (1030)

**Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert):** Perhaps my honourable friend, on this side of the House, should consider running federally if he wants to take on federal issues and American Senates. I am more concerned with Manitobans and the concerns of Manitobans.

### Potato Industry Protection

**Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert):** I would like, very sincerely, to ask a question of the Government, either the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) or the Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery), perhaps, as it is his constituency that is going to be most potentially adversely affected.

Would the Minister of Labour express whether or not he has any concerns about employment at McCain's plant in Portage La Prairie in light of the concerns of the potato industry? And I am not arguing against free trade.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** I am glad that the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) is now not arguing against free trade. I am delighted to hear it. It is a very positive change of position.

I might indicate that just within the last few weeks, my Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) met with, I believe it was the Vice-President of McCain's?

**An Honourable Member:** The president.

**Mr. Filmon:** The president of McCain's. During the course of that conversation, the president of McCain's did not even bring up any concern about free trade with respect to the plant in Manitoba, No. 1; and, No. 2, indicated that the plant was currently exporting 50 percent of its production to Japan, so that they would not have any worry about free trade from this particular plant because 50 percent of it was being exported to Japan.

It seems to me that the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) is not operating with good information on that question.

### Free Trade Agreement Potato Industry Aid

**Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert):** Perhaps then I should direct my questions to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst).

Does the Minister see any comparisons between the grape aid proposal that was successfully negotiated between the federal Government and the provincial Government of British Columbia to bring money and protection to the grape growers in the Okanagan Valley, does he see any comparison between that and the potato growers in Manitoba? Will he offer any advice on what he can do, and what action will he take to negotiate the same type of deal?

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** As the Premier (Mr. Filmon) indicated, the president of McCain Foods, Mr. Harrison McCain, was met by the Honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery) and myself in June. We went to his plant in New Brunswick and discussed a variety of issues. His indication was, at that time, that the plant in Portage La Prairie was exporting a significant portion, up to 50 percent of its production, to Japan.

They were also concentrating—and I do not think it is confidential information. He also indicated that the entire focus of McCain's export production was aimed at the Japanese market, and that he anticipated that plant would increase its exports to Japan while still serving its existing Canadian customers. In terms of the Free Trade Agreement, I do not think there is any concern. He had no concern and expressed no concern during that meeting.

**Mr. Angus:** My final supplementary is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst).

Given that he is not concerned about the potato growers and does not see that there is a comparison—

**Mr. Speaker:** Would the Honourable Member please place his question?

**Mr. Angus:** I am sorry. The question then is: In correspondence that I have got, in communications that were given to me this morning, verbally, in a press conference that was held, there was a rationale and an explanation as to the jeopardy of the Portage plant. There must be odds between whoever the Honourable

Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism was talking to and the vice-president this morning, who I was talking to.

With respect, the indication I have, in correspondence to John Crosbie and to the . . . are the Portage plant is in jeopardy and it was confirmed this morning. What are you going to do? The question is: What you are going to do about it?

**Mr. Ernst:** This Government, for the first time in a long time, is one that is concerned about agriculture in this province. We have had neglect for far too long over the last number of years from a Government who did not care about farmers, who did not care about agriculture. So, Mr. Speaker, our Government is the Government that is going to be concerned about the producers, and certainly, we are concerned the producers. We are also concerned that the plant in Portage la Prairie operates under full production.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) indicated "who had I talked to?" Well, I talked to Harrison McCain, who is the President of McCain Foods, who is the principal shareholder of McCain Foods, and who is the person who started a company from a very small operation into a multimillion dollar giant that it is today. I assume, Mr. Speaker, that he knows what he is talking about.

### Free Trade Agreement Potato Industry Aid

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** With a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst).

I, too, have had lunch with Harrison McCain, and Harrison McCain indicated, in no uncertain terms, that he believes the free trade deal between the U.S. and Canada, orchestrated by our Prime Minister to our disadvantage, is a bad deal for Canada. He further indicated that it cost him \$9 an hour, plus 26 percent in benefits, for workers in Portage, and he could operate the same plant in South Dakota at \$3 in wages and no additional benefits.

This plant is in danger in this province, and I ask the Minister what he is going to do to make sure that we maintain that kind of processing in this province?

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** Mr. Speaker, I must say this to the Leader of the Opposition: For one thing, we would not reduce the wage rates of the workers in Portage la Prairie to \$3 an hour. We would not take away their benefits.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), I assume, intimated that somehow a Government under her direction would follow that course, would reduce the wages of the people in Portage la Prairie and take away their benefits. I do not think that is fair. That is not something this Government would do.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** With a supplementary question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst).

It may come as an amazing surprise to the Minister, but the Government does not own the plant in Portage la Prairie. It is owned by McCain's.

I ask the Minister: What is he going to do to ensure that that kind of industry remains in this province when Mr. Vander Zalm is able to get \$28 million for grape growers and this Government is not able to get any compensation for potato growers in this province?

**Mr. Ernst:** As we indicated earlier, the production from the Portage la Prairie plant primarily is shipped out of the country to Japan. That is their primary market; that is also the focus according to Mr. McCain.

And by the way, Mr. Speaker, I did not have lunch with him. I met with him, along with my honourable friend, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery), in order to discuss serious issues with respect to his plant in Portage la Prairie. We made the effort to go there and to discuss those issues with him.

In terms of compensation to potato growers, I am not aware, nor has there been any indication to this Government that potato growers require compensation. They are good, honest, hard working producers in this province.

### Free Trade Agreement Economic Impact

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, with a final supplementary to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of this province.

In his speech, he said there were absolutely no difficulties affecting Manitoba with regard to the free trade deal with the United States.

Does the First Minister still maintain that everything is rosy in Manitoba and not any industries will be severely affected by this deal and will not impact unfavourably upon the citizens of this province?

\* (1040)

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** I recommend that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) read my speech so that she does not misquote me.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I said that we believe that there will be tremendous positive net benefits to Manitobans, that those will include areas of manufacturing, that those will be our primary producers, that those will be in the area of agriculture, our red meat producers, our grains and our oilseed producers. All of those will recognize positive benefits. On a net-benefit basis, every empirical study says that we will gain between 10,000 and 15,000 net new jobs. We are talking about unemployment rates in Manitoba. That is the best thing we can do to help the unemployment rates in Manitoba. That is why we support the Free Trade Agreement.

### Brandon Air Pollution Burns Rendering Plant

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery) with regard to a problem that is existing in the good city of Brandon.



Recently, citizens of the city of Brandon have been very distressed and annoyed by the terrible stench emanating from the Burns Meats Rendering Plant in that city. Some people have been reported to be ill. People have been required to close windows, close doors. The smell has swept across the city right to the extreme east end of Brandon. The problem stems from improper procedures of the company, as they have stated publicly, and also from additional material, namely blood and offal, being shipped in from the Neepawa hog plant.

Can the Minister advise what action, if any, he and his department have taken in this matter, and can he give the House a report? I am sure the Minister has information on the matter. I wonder if he could give a report to the House exactly on what he is doing about this very annoying, very vexatious, very serious matter.

**Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Environment, Workplace Safety and Health):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from the Member, and it is a concern that our department is addressing. We have been apprised of it. I have had several phone calls. The Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) has talked to me about this very serious problem, and we are very concerned with the smell and with the discomfort that the people of Brandon are experiencing. Our staff is investigating the proper method to resolve the situation. When we have a proper method in place, it will be acted upon and we will bring the message back to this Legislature. I thank you for that question.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Mr. Speaker, since the petition is being circulated by many people, and in fact, not only are citizens annoyed and distressed and hurt but also the tourist business is being hurt along the Trans-Canada Highway—McDonald's Restaurant, golf courses, hotels are reporting loss of business and are being—

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable Member have a question?

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Can the Minister tell us precisely what plan of action he and his department will follow to resolve this matter? It is a very serious matter. Can he advise of a particular plan of action that he will take? I know he is concerned about it, but exactly what measures will he take or is he taking right now?

**Mr. Connery:** Obviously, the Member did not listen to my answer. We said that the department is appraising it.

Is the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) suggesting that we walk in today and close the plant down? Is that what you are suggesting, that we just go in? That would be decisive action. We hope to come up with a solution that will see the rendering plant continue with the jobs in Brandon, because I am sure you need those jobs in Brandon as much as anywhere else in Manitoba. But we will also make sure that the environment is esthetically palatable for the residents of your wonderful city.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if he is aware what standards are being required

by his department? My advice is that they are operating under an industrial licence, a licence that provides industrial standards rather than residential standards.

I would like to ask the Minister, in view of the fact that licence is a relatively old licence issued early in the Seventies, whether he would now consider taking a rational, sensible approach, an approach that everyone would welcome, and I believe, including the company because this was used with Simplot. That is, as Minister, call upon the Clean Environment Commission to hold public hearings. He has that authority under the Act and that is the duty he has to give the public, the company, everyone concerned an opportunity to review this publicly—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** —and see if we need new standards.

**Mr. Connery:** We are concerned, but we are not going to close the plant in the interim. I imagine that is the only immediate solution we have. We will take the appropriate action. My department will be back to me with the appropriate direction that we should be taking. We will act at that moment, and you will be apprised of the action that our department will be taking.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) did ask a question and I would hope, even though it is Friday, that all honourable ladies and gentlemen would contain themselves.

### Land Titles Office Lien Error

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) is no doubt aware, the Winnipeg Land Titles Office has apparently admitted error in the placing of a lien of approximately \$10,000 on a piece of property in St. Clements, Manitoba.

My question is: Has the Honourable Attorney-General investigated this apparent error, and will the Honourable Attorney-General undertake to compensate this property owner for her legal fees out of the Land Titles Office assurance fund?

**Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General):** Mr. Speaker, the provincial Government provides an assurance fund to compensate parties that have a claim based on errors made by the Land Titles system. The fund is available to the person involved in this case. Our officials, together with our departmental solicitor, will arrange to meet with this person and her lawyer to discuss compensation or other procedures to deal with her concerns.

**Mr. Edwards:** Again for the Honourable Attorney-General: Will the Attorney-General please further tell this House what investigation, if any, has been done into the merits of this particular lien and whether or not the lienholder is to be paid the apparent \$10,000

or approximately \$10,000 claim out of the insurance fund as well?

**Mr. McCrae:** As I said, Mr. Speaker, this question is a matter that this claimant and the officials of the department can work out together. I suggest the Honourable Member wait until we have a resolution of that.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for St. James, with a final supplementary question.

**Mr. Edwards:** Speaking of waiting, I am glad that the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) has raised that.

If in fact this property owner has been wronged by the Winnipeg Land Titles Office, will the Attorney-General undertake to investigate why she has had to spend hundreds of dollars and wait upwards of four months to clear her property when, apparently, the Winnipeg Land Titles Office admitted error almost immediately and that lien yet remains on her title?

**Mr. McCrae:** The Honourable Member can be assured that if there are mistakes made at the Land Titles Office, steps will be taken to assure that those mistakes do not happen again.

We are dealing with a business that does an awful lot of business and deals with an awful lot of people.—(Interjection)— The Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) suggests that is no excuse. I suppose I could say that every time the Honourable Member brings incorrect information to this House and makes a mistake, there is no excuse for him either. The fact is that these things can happen.

As I said, the Land Titles Office is indeed on top of this matter and is working on this matter.

\* (1050)

### **Drought Assistance Grain Handlers**

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, the drought in rural Manitoba is affecting not only the farming community themselves and the farmers and their families, but also all of the workers and their families and businesses will be affected by the drought in the rural communities. The pressure will grow and is continuing to grow. For example, 50 percent of the elevator workers in rural Manitoba are faced with the impact of layoffs.

My question is to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery). I was bitterly disappointed yesterday to hear the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) indicate that the Conservative Government was not willing to assist those workers in their plight with these layoffs with regard to changes in unemployment insurance because of previous management-labour disputes because of pettiness and vindictiveness on their part.

I am asking the Minister of Labour if it is this Government's position that the plight of rural elevator workers and their families in the rural Manitoba—

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, on a point of order.

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not hear the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) say in this House anything like the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) just put on the record.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member does not have a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Speaker, I have asked a question on the basis of the information that I have, and I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery) what this Government's position is with regard to the elevator workers in this Province, 50 percent of whom face layoffs because of the drought. Will they assist those workers?

**Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Labour, I am very concerned about the plight of these elevator operators, as well as the plight of the farmers. This is a serious problem that we have. If this group of people come to me and come to our department with suggestions, we will do everything within our power to ensure that they are properly and adequately looked after. We are very concerned about it. Hopefully, nothing will come to fruition; if it does, we will address it.

**Mr. Speaker:** The time for oral questions has expired.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

**Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General):** Mr. Speaker, I think this could be considered a question of privilege and it has to do with myself.

Yesterday, I raised a matter relating to the Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) in his reference to the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) in certain terms, which he withdrew, and I think Honourable Members of this House appreciate that.

During the course of my raising the matter, I used language which, to some, might be taken to be somewhat improper in the sense that they may have been perceived by some to have had a racial connotation.

I want to assure Honourable Members that the expression I used—"lily white"—was to refer to myself as being not free from sin, in the biblical sense of the word, in terms of language such as the language used by the Honourable Member yesterday and for anyone who would perceive that I meant any other connotation.

I would like to set the record straight and tell them that no such intention was there, and if anyone's feelings were hurt, I apologize for that.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to thank the Honourable Attorney-General. I do not think anybody did think otherwise.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

**Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General):** Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Bill No. 6.

### SECOND READING

#### BILL NO. 6—THE FIRES PREVENTION AMENDMENT ACT

**Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Environment, Workplace Safety and Health)** presented Bill No. 6, The Fires Prevention Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la prévention des incendies, for second reading.

#### MOTION presented.

**Mr. Connery:** Mr. Speaker, Bill 6 is not a very major piece of legislation, but it really is very important in the sense of us assisting other people who need to be trained in firefighting.

We have, in the Province of Manitoba, three fire colleges. We have one in Brandon, one in Winnipeg and one in Thompson. The Manitoba Fire College was established in 1978, utilizing rental and leased locations for the delivery of jointly certified training courses of Manitoba Labour and Community Colleges.

In 1979, a fire college facility was constructed in the City of Thompson to accommodate fire training for the northern communities. One staff person is permanently assigned to the Thompson facility. This location is utilized by fire departments, institutions and police for training. As required, staff from Winnipeg or Brandon will attend to assist in specific training programs that require certain areas of expertise. Many of the students are from small communities and a small mini-pumper is stationed there for training. Assigned staff of one full-time and one part-time contract, basis of fee for service. The facility was not used in 1987 or 1988 due to a staff vacancy. As of August 1, 1988, the position in Thompson has been filled and will resume all the training.

The Manitoba Fire College facility in Brandon was built in 1983, with the registrar located there and a staff of two full-time and two part-time positions. The Brandon facility allows for year-round training and may be provided indoors with the exception of live fires. Hopefully they would not practise that indoors. At the Brandon location, there are two fire pumpers and a fully equipped rescue van for the students to train with, as well as other state-of-the-art built-in training aids. As of June 30, 1988, there have been three classes, a total of students, that have graduated from the 40-week pre-employment public fire protection program. These classes require one full-time instructor and, as required, other instructors with specialized areas of expertise.

The Winnipeg Fire College location was acquired in 1984 on a lease rental from the City of Winnipeg. The adjoining training area is operated as a shared facility with the City of Winnipeg Fire Department. This limited facility restricts training to weather and no burning and shared facilities. A staff of three operate from the

Winnipeg location and are responsible for the operation of the Thompson facility. We do have staff persons located at Portage la Prairie and Waterhen and are used as required at all locations. The students in attendance at the Winnipeg location were all for training.

You can see that the fire colleges are in operation. They are doing a very important job. I think we need to recognize the importance of firefighting in the Province of Manitoba and in all the various cities and towns. We hope that through a properly trained and very adequate firefighting force, we can minimize the loss of fire to property. As you know, we carry fire insurance but it does not adequately cover the loss that you have, and often there is the loss of memorabilia, things that you have had for a long time which you cherish very well, and of course, with a major fire you lose these things. So a properly trained fire department that can respond quickly can prevent a lot of damage, a lot of loss and a lot of heartache to people.

More important is the prevention of injury and loss of life in fires. We have had far too many injuries and loss of life over the course of a year, and I must say that I had one experience on our farm where an employee of ours burnt to death in a house fire, and I can assure you that it is not a very pleasant experience.

Training requirements are becoming much more sophisticated, and it is because of this high degree of sophistication and complexity of equipment that we have to have a very adequate fire college system in Manitoba. We do have that and we still hope to improve upon it. The equipment is very, very complicated and people cannot be hired off the street to just get into this equipment and function properly and safely. We have to be very sure, Mr. Speaker, that we protect the lives of the firefighters who are working for our benefit and for our safety. Every once in a while we see some tragic loss in a major fire. It is our hope, through the proper training in the fire colleges, that we can prevent this sort of tragedy from occurring.

\* (1100)

We also have to be very aware of the complexity of the hazardous goods that we are now experiencing in our everyday life. When there is a fire or there is a traffic accident or spill of some kind, the fire department is the first responder. As first responders, they are subject to some pretty hazardous chemicals. There is a Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act in place to protect firemen. But if they are not apprised of the Act and apprised of the regulations and the methods of handling dangerous goods, then they are at risk when they are responding to a fire.

We do have, within our department, a fire investigation system that I think is quite good, to find out the source of fires and what and who is causing them. They are working, Mr. Speaker, to reduce the incidence of fire.

But there is also the possibility of the need for another college. As we have indicated, there is one in Winnipeg that is inadequate. There is a very good one in Brandon, and there is a very small regional one in Thompson. There is possibly the need for another fire college to serve Winnipeg more adequately in the southeast corner

of Manitoba. Possibly a town close to Winnipeg, such as Steinbach, could be a good location for a fire college.

We also have some funds for this particular type of operation or for building colleges, and it is through the Fire Prevention Fund. As you may know, there is a 2 percent premium on the fire insurance premiums that you buy. This goes into a fund to aid in such things as to prevent fires or for educating people in fighting fires, alarm systems, whatever method that is in the best interests of preventing fires. This is the main goal of the Fire Prevention Fund.

Mr. Speaker, in winding up the discussion on it, basically, what we are looking at is the ability to charge for training for those groups who are not within the fire system or the Government of Manitoba. We could, for instance, charge the Government of Canada. The Province of Saskatchewan is quite interested in our Brandon College, but according to the Act, we are not allowed at this point to charge for those services.

So all that the Act is doing is now allowing the Government of Manitoba to charge for the services of our fire colleges to those people outside of the province, and to those people who are outside of the firefighting system, whether it be provincial or within city jurisdictions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Allan Patterson (Radisson):** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), that debate be adjourned on this Bill, being Bill No. 6.

**Hon. James Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** On a point of order. I had assumed that the Honourable Member was going to speak to the Bill. If he is going to be moving that it be adjourned, as I suspect he is, then I would adjust my right to speak to the Bill at this time. I was simply waiting for him to speak.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for the opportunity to say a few words on this Bill. The firefighting system in Manitoba has been one that we can be extremely proud of for many, many years. Certainly we are on the leading edge of dealing with both fire and hazardous chemical prevention and cleanup and so on.

The Winnipeg Fire Department, one which I am extremely familiar with, is an extremely well-trained, dedicated force of people, people who day after day after day put their life on the line. Many, many times we have people look at the Fire Department and see them playing volleyball in the parking lot and somehow called them down for the kind of job that they do. I think it is something we all have to adjust to, to know that those people are well-trained, highly trained individuals and they are there to meet the crises that occur from time to time in our society.

Mr. Speaker, that training comes, in part, from this fire college that the Province of Manitoba operates. In addition to that, we have people from outside the direct firefighting system, people who are not either working for the Department of Transport, or working for municipalities or other types of Government firefighting capabilities. They come from private industry because industry knows it must maintain its facilities and must

have people available from time to time to act as a first response to incidents that occur.

While we may wish, at the taxpayers' expense, to operate a college for the governmental firefighting system in Manitoba, I think we have to take a hard look at the kind of costs that are associated with training people outside of the governmental system.

During the election campaign, and for many months and years prior to that, our Party has indicated that it said, efficiency in Government provides good services. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we need to provide those kind of training capabilities for a private industry, and I do not think, quite frankly, it is beholden upon the Province of Manitoba and its taxpayers to pay for the cost of training firefighters from outside our province.

I think, by introduction of this Bill and allowing the Government to start charging fees at the fire college, we are now going to be in a position where we can say, yes, we will provide the very excellent training that is provided, we will continue to accept people from outside governmental firefighting forces outside of the Province of Manitoba, but we will expect them to contribute to their education. I do not think that is a wrong move at all. I think the taxpayers of Manitoba ultimately will understand and know that for the first time in a long, long time we are bringing some semblance of reason back to Government, some semblance of requiring people to pay the cost of their education if they come here from outside the province, particularly in this area of the fire college.

I fully support the Bill introduced by my honourable friend, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery). I think it is, again, one more step in the right direction for the Government of Manitoba. Thank you.

**Mr. Allan Patterson (Radisson):** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), that debate be adjourned on this Bill, being Bill No. 6.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would just like to remind all Honourable Members that when you do get a Seconder, the Honourable Member should be sitting in his chair—just so that you are aware.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## **ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING**

**Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General):** Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Bill No. 8. I understand the Bill stands in the name of the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), but by leave, the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) wishes to speak today, and we would agree that the matter stand in the name of the Honourable Member for St. James.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable Member have leave? (Agreed)

**BILL NO. 8—THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH SMALL CLAIMS PRACTICES ACT**

**Hon. James Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** One of the important things we do in this House, Mr. Speaker, is we deal with Bills. Many of them appear to be minor or trivial, or do not seem to have a lot of impact on the public. This Bill certainly does not fall into any of those categories.

The whole question of the small claims process in Manitoba has been one that was implemented a number of years ago as a sort of a trial arrangement, and has proved to be immensely successful for the carrying out of justice with respect to minor matters that either do not require legal counsel or where, if legal counsel would be required, it would be exorbitant and/or very, very long in terms of the time process it would take to have those claims adjudicated.

I personally have availed myself of that process on two or three occasions over the past number of years during my private business practice. As a small businessman, I found it invaluable. But I was able to go to the Small Claims Court process to have adjudicated small amounts of money owing or alleged to be owing to me in the process of my business practice.

Many, many people in this province have taken the same course of action. On the occasions that I have been in the court, I have seen a variety, a whole spectrum of people dealing with problems that they have had over the collection, primarily collection of debts. I think the whole process is one that needs to be applauded, and needs to be beefed up and it needs to be further enhanced.

\* (1110)

When the original limit was set on small claims adjudications, it was presumably reasonable in terms of the kind of cost relationships there were at that particular time. Those have changed. We now have a situation where inflation has gone on for a number of years, and those claims that were considered small in the past now are even smaller because of the type of inflation that has gone on. Those that seemed somewhat major now can fall within that minor category. Small amounts of money, under \$5,000, are the kind of concern, I think, that many members of the public have, and want that opportunity to allow those claims to appear into that Small Claims Court process.

I think that we have an opportunity here, with this Bill, to further enhance legislation that provided for a system for people of Manitoba to carry on without having to encumber the normal legal process, without having to fill up the courts any more than they are presently filled up, with adjudicating matters in civil litigation relating to the collection of funds. It is not a system that is going to put anybody out of work, unlike the Bill that was introduced earlier by my honourable friend, the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), who seems to want to put a number of Honourable Members here, members of the law profession, out of a job. This system really does not do that. This system deals with

a small individual with small amounts of money who need to have some method of obtaining judgment.

The system is not perfect because what happens is, even though you get judgment in the Small Claims Court and even though you are able to do it yourself, the process of collecting the money after the judgment is the major problem associated with that process. That is yet to be dealt with. That is a challenge, a very great challenge for any person or Party in Government today to try and introduce some method or some mechanism to allow that, once the court has adjudicated and a judgment is rendered, to be able to collect what is rendered under that judgment.

It is not good enough, quite frankly, just to leave it in the system of sitting on a table or in a registry somewhere, to say that it is owing and never, ever gets collected. That is not the purpose. I am sure most people do not go into a court system just to have their name on a piece of paper or to obtain that judgment piece of paper, because that is not the object.

The object is to collect the debt that is owing. If they have that opportunity to have it adjudicated, they also ought to have the opportunity of having some mechanism available to them for the collection of that debt. All too often, we see people go before that court system who really cannot afford to be without the funds that are at stake.

I would hope that the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) would, in due course, be able to deal with that particular issue as well.

The whole question of the small claims system is one that ought not to be taken lightly. I think all Honourable Members in this House need to recognize the importance of having that kind of a system, need to recognize the importance of having the amount of money, or at least a reasonable amount of money, so that they can continue without having to go into the more cumbersome and certainly more very expensive Queen's Bench process.

With those few words, I commend the Attorney-General for bringing the Bill forward. I think all Honourable Members in the House should give their very strong consideration to this Bill and, hopefully, in due course, that will occur. I gather, too, that the Bill will now stand in the name of the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) as originally agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 8 will continue to stand in the name of the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), which was done accordingly by leave.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Cummings), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee to deal with the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) in the Chair.

### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY SUPPLY—INTERIM SUPPLY

**Mr. Chairman, Mark Minenko:** The Committee of Supply will come to order, please, to consider the resolution as presented yesterday. Does any other Member wish to speak to this resolution?

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**Mr. Jay Cowan (Second Opposition House Leader):** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

It is standard procedure, when in Interim Supply, for the Ministers to be in the House to answer questions. I had indicated earlier to the House Leader of the Government (Mr. McCrae) that we were prepared to go into Interim Supply today and I know there are a number of my colleagues who wish to ask specific questions of specific Ministers.

What I would like to do is indicate which ones so that not all the Ministers have to come back, but at least those who are here in the building can be brought in for some questioning.

I believe the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) wishes to address questions to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery).

I believe the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) wishes to address questions to the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey).

I believe the Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery) would receive questions from the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman); and I, of course, would like to continue on and clarify some of the matters which were addressed in the Port of Churchill debate yesterday by addressing some questions to the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger).

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to find the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) and also the Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery). I must indicate, though, that the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) has left the building and is flying to northern Manitoba to meet with people there. So I will endeavour to quickly bring in two other Ministers.

**Mr. Cowan:** Perhaps if the other Ministers are not here, we would hope that in the future that they could make themselves available for Interim Supply, but I understand they have other responsibilities as well. This is a matter that comes before the House on rare occasions, hopefully, so we will deal with the Ministers that are present.

I would also ask if the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) could be present because I would like to ask some questions of him.

**Mr. Manness:** I might indicate, if Members opposite are willing, that maybe we could move through three steps of the procedure and that will bring us right back again dealing with the resolution respecting Interim Ways and Means. We will have the same opportunity over the next five minutes to bring these Ministers in, but we just maybe could do some of the procedural efforts. We will be in the same place we were.

\* (1120)

**Mr. Cowan:** I appreciate the suggestion. However, we would, in going to those steps, I understand, go through some of the stages of the Bill. Would that not be the case? -(Interjection)- So we would not get into the Bill.- (Interjection)- Okay. Then I think we would be agreeable to moving those two steps if I can just have a look at the list off of which the Minister is working to ensure that we are not losing an opportunity for debate inadvertently.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Chairman, I just would indicate that maybe we can go from 8 to 12 and we would still be dealing with the resolution.

**Mr. Chairman:** And this is with respect to the Interim Supply procedure papers that were prepared for us by the Clerk's Office, is that correct?

**Mr. Cowan:** Just to confirm my understanding, by moving into step 12, we lose no opportunity to debate in exactly the same manner that we are now conducting the debate and we do not pass through any of the Bill stages. If that is the case, we are prepared to facilitate to the extent possible the discussion of this Bill and move through to stage 12, but staying on stage 12 which would put us into the Committee of Ways and Means.

I predicate those remarks on the assumption that the Liberal Opposition would have no objection to that as well, so I think perhaps we should double check with them and make certain.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is it the will of the committee to accept the resolution that

RESOLVED that a sum not exceeding \$2,626,074,640, being 70 percent of the total amount voted, as set out in The Appropriation Act, 1987, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1989? (Agreed)

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

### IN SESSION

**Mr. Mark Minenko (Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House):** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer), that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) in the Chair.

## COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS INTERIM SUPPLY

**Mr. Chairman, Mark Minenko:** The Committee of Ways and Means will now come to order, please. The question before the committee is the following resolution:

RESOLVED that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenditures of the Public Service, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1989, the sum of \$2,626,074,640, being 70 percent of the total amount voted as set out in The Appropriation Act, 1987, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Does the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) have an opening comment?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** No, I do not.

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes to raise a matter of great concern to me and the citizens of Brandon and, of course, it affects the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery) and his administration.

As I indicated during the Question Period today, there is a great deal of concern, a great deal of annoyance in the community because of the smells coming from the expanded level of operations of the rendering plant of the Burns Meats Company on the North Hill of the City of Brandon.

The problem, as the Minister might say in debate, has been around a long time, and indeed it has. The rendering plant has been there for years. In fact, it is operating under a licence—I know that one licence dates back to 1974, so the problem of some smell coming from rendering plant is not a new one, and it does vary from time to time depending on the weather conditions, the heat, the wind direction and so on. I appreciate that. I would also say this, that the company has taken steps, the Burns Meats Company has been trying to wrestle with the problem. They publicly admitted that they made some errors, they publicly admitted that they have not been handling the material the way they should have been and leading to more annoyance than would have been case.

The fact is, what is going on there is that the blood and awful waste products from the Neepawa Hog Plant are being shipped to that rendering plant for processing. Therefore, that rendering plant has a higher level of

throughput, it is engaged in more processing, and that type of processing always has its smells, so obviously there is going to be more smell.

The question is: Can the company take more steps to correct the situation? Is it working adequately? I know they are working quickly. They are trying to do what they can, but is there anything else that should be done?

Now the Minister, in his reply this morning to my question said, do I want to close the plant down, do I want the company to move out of the city? Of course, I do not. Burns Meats makes a significant contribution to the local economy, that I am not suggesting. I do not think that is, for moment, been inferred or suggested in my questions.

But the Minister has a responsibility, he has a capable staff. I was concerned about the degree to which he had information and was engaged in a plan of action as the Minister of Environment operating under the environment legislation of the province. Whether he was aware of the reading levels, whether he was aware of the licence that company is now operating under, the licence, as I understand, was issued back in 1974. It is a licence which permits them to reach a level for the industrial category or the industrial area, which as I am advised, is seven units per cubic foot, as opposed to a residential standard which is two units per cubic foot, so there is quite a spread.

I suspect, but I do not know, whether the company is operating within the terms of the licence. I do not know really whether it is under the seven. I have not seen any data on that, but I would not be surprised that it is operating under the seven because if they were not operating under the seven, then there would have to be steps taken immediately under the legislation to take action with the company.

\* (1130)

I believe there is a reasonable approach that can be taken in this matter, and I offer this suggestion in a very positive way. I offer it based on the experience we had with the Simplot Company a few years back in Brandon which had also been annoying the community with excessive amounts of odour, pollutants in the atmosphere. Hearings were held by the Clean Environment Commission. Everybody had an opportunity to make an input. Certain requirements were made of the company. The company put in new equipment and did other things, and now that matter is more or less under control. I walk very often in that area of the city for a little exercise and so on and breathe that air, and I can tell you it is a lot better than it used to be. It was a practical suggestion. The company is thriving, the employees are working safely. The community feels a lot safer and everyone is happier.

I am suggesting a reasonable approach, a reasonable solution would be, as Minister, to call upon the Clean Environment Commission to conduct public meetings and hearings to obtain advice and recommendations from everyone concerned, from the company and certainly from the public, from environmental officials who may wish to appear before the commission and

so on. Let the commission do its thing to gather evidence and information from the public. The Minister has that authority to call upon the commission to have these hearings, and I would suggest that it is well time for hearings, given the fact that the licence is 14 years old, given the fact that there is this additional product or additional waste material being handled. A reasonable solution could come out of this.

I do not think that is hysterical and I do not think that implies anything. Some people have said—I know there has been a petition circulated by some of the businesspeople, because the business along the area is being hurt. As I said, the tourism industry is being hurt, some restaurants have been hurt by it. There is circulating a petition among businesses, among citizens, and I know some of those people are talking about the rendering plant being moved as that being the only solution. Maybe that is an ultimate solution. I really do not know.

Maybe there could be a better location. As it is now, it is in the path of the prevailing winds. It is on the northwest, north side of the city, northwest of a great portion of the city and of course, when the winds are prevailing from that direction, which they often are, the smell is transported over a large part of the community.

I would refer the Minister to section 48 of the new Act whereby he can engage in an abatement project whereby the Government could—and I am not suggesting that this again is a course of action, but at least it is something that should be looked at—assist any company in Manitoba in this kind of a situation in moving. Maybe there is an opportunity for the city itself to assist the company in moving their plant. It is not a huge building. I do not think it is that expensive. Again, I do not have that information. I am not pretending I do, but it is worth looking into.

So there are ways and means for the Government to assist industry. When I say this, I would remind the Minister that the federal and provincial Governments are committed to putting in millions of dollars into Burns Meats both in the St. Boniface facility and in the Brandon slaughter-house facility. So the company has been a recipient of provincial and federal assistance so Governments in the past and, I am sure, this one will want to keep it there, want it to expand, want it to provide jobs, want it to assist the economy and so on.

I do not think requiring the company to spend a bit of money on this perhaps, if this is what it comes down to, with some financial assistance perhaps from Governments, that it is not an unreasonable solution. Again, I am not saying that is necessarily what it has to come down to. I am simply saying, where we should start, Mr. Chairman, is with hearings. There is nothing wrong with hearings, there is nothing sinister. Everyone is to gain by it: the community, the company, I would suggest the Government. Everyone can gain by these.

I am not sure whether the public at large itself can call and formally request the Environment Commission to hold hearings. I think the normal procedure is for the Minister, once he is aware of the situation, to then call upon the commission. In fact, it is laid down in

one piece of legislation we have: "Specific duties of the Commission. The Commission shall, upon the request of the Minister provide advice and recommendations . . . conduct public meetings or hearings and provide advice and recommendations," and so on.

So I just wanted to put those thoughts on the record. I cannot document all this, but I have had many horror stories told to me. Someone spoke to me last night. He said, I never had this experience before. In driving past the plant a few days ago, he almost passed out. Now he was quite near the plant. Other stories have children throwing up because of the smell. Again, I do not have hard data, but a lot of this has been given to me verbally and I will take it however at face value. So there is some illness being caused by this.

The tourism industry is certainly adversely affected, and there is a great deal of annoyance. I would like really for the Minister to take a positive approach. He could be a winner in this if he would call upon the Clean Environment Commission to hold public hearings and to make recommendations and provide advice to him to see whether there is some reasonable, rational solution.

**Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Environment, Workplace Safety and Health):** I appreciate the concern of the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), as I said in Question Period and I think I said it erroneously. It was actually the Member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae) who, a few days ago, already had brought this to my attention. Our staff was alerted to it, and a request to the staff was to come forth with some recommendations as to the appropriate action that the department would take.

I am very cognizant of the problem of odours within a city, as the Member for Brandon East will know. The sewage lagoon system at Portage is one of the worst in the world and, coming to Winnipeg from Brandon, he has experienced it when the wind direction is in the right place. So we are very aware of the discomfort of an ongoing bad odour. The concerns, yes, are there, and the discomfort for people is unacceptable.

We also though have to be cognizant that the rendering plant services a large farm community, so we cannot act in irresponsible haste. There are two sides to the equation, so we have to recognize that those jobs, that business is very vital to the City of Brandon. Now because it is vital does not mean we are going to allow them to pollute and maintain a very poor atmosphere for the people. That is not the role of the department. The role of the department initially is to ensure the environment is good. As Minister of Labour though, I am also concerned about the jobs. As you know, our labour stats are not where anybody would like to have them. Our unemployed and the well over 30,000 unemployed people in Manitoba are not acceptable.

I understand the responsibilities of the department. We have gone over this and, yes, the Minister has the right to ask for clean environment hearings. Then the commission advises the Minister, and the Minister



makes the final decision. So we are not going to play funny games. I know, as you said, it is an old licence, as you found out yesterday in talking to Mr. Eagleton that it is an old licence, 1974. There could have been several changes. I guess we could be critical of the previous Government for not acting when they were in power, but that is not the concern. We are in power, it is up to us now. The spotlight is on us, and I accept that spotlight.

All I can say to the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) is, yes, we will act, and hopefully we can have some sort of decision in a very few days because it is this heat. If people have not got air conditioning and their windows are closed, it is almost like a prison. That is not an acceptable way to live.

I appreciate what the Member has said, that the plant is located north and northwest of town and, of course, that is the prevailing wind direction and that is where most of the odour concerns are. Unfortunately in Portage, the lagoon is to the south and to the east of town, so it is an east wind or a straight south wind that does affect it, but we still get those.

\* (1140)

The other interesting thing, though, is that the stockyards have moved out of Winnipeg, and where did they get allowed to locate? On the northwest side of Winnipeg. My gosh, we know that is the wrong spot for anything. Nothing that has an odour or some offensive thing to it should ever be built on the west or southwest or northwest part of a city. It should be east of it. So the minimal damage to people is there.

So we are very cognizant. I do not take this very lightly, I take it very seriously because I have experienced it. It is not a case of, in some instances, where people move next to or build a house next to an airport and then they complain about the noise, or they build next to a plant and then they complain about the smell and the activity. This is affecting a whole city. So it is not a case of a few crybabies. I think the whole city is suffering because of it. This is what the Member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae) has said that it is hurting tourism. So while we want to protect the farmer and make sure they are not prevented from shipping their hogs, the tourism industry is very important to Manitoba and to the City of Brandon, all the jobs that go with it. The people who work in industry should not be subjected to the uncomfortable conditions.

So this matter is being investigated at this very moment by our staff. As soon as a recommendation is in, and I can assure the Member if I do not have something by Monday—in fact, today we will be asking where the report is and at what stage they are at. These are not simple little problems that you walk out to Brandon and you snap your fingers and you solve it. It took some time to develop, but we cannot allow a long time for the cure because it is just not possible.

So I appreciate your concern. I appreciate the concerns of the Member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae). You are both working for the benefit of the city. It is up to the department to react in the most appropriate and most efficient and the quickest way to resolve the problem for the benefit of all people.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** I thank the Minister for his comments.

I wonder if I can ask him very specifically—and I look forward to the report and the information he will be getting for us. Two points, even though he can get a report from his department and so on, and I know he has a good department and will be fully advised, I refer him to the Simplot situation where the Clean Environment Commission was asked to hold hearings and something really good came out of that. So there is some value in having a formal hearing process to allow the community to have an input, to allow the company to formally explain because the company is taking some action but let it formally advise the commission. Let the commission, as an independent body, make some recommendations to the Minister and to the public.

But the other point I wanted to make just very briefly, that is there is, as I understand, in the new Act a provision for an abatement project. Would the Minister—and this is my specific question—be at all willing to look at that section to see whether, if it came down to that, maybe the long-term solution at some point may be relocation to the east side—way, way east?

The City of Brandon incidentally, in 1970-71, had a major expansion in its boundaries. That was the election commitment I made in 1969, and our Government, the Schreyer Government, fulfilled that. We expanded the boundaries to give the city a huge industrial area to the east of it. So there are locations well to the east of the city, southeast of the city as a matter of fact.

But regardless, would the Minister be willing to look at the possibility of the abatement project section and see whether, if it came down to that, the Government would be willing to spend some money to help the company in relocating that plant, if it came down to that?

**Mr. Connery:** As the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) knows, I personally cannot commit our Government to spending money. It has got to go through a process.

The clean environment hearings could be a very useful tool but, as the Member is aware, there is some time lag in hearings. What can we do in the short term? There is the short term, there is the mid term and the long term that maybe it has to be looked to fully resolve it. In the short term, maybe we can do something very quickly. Maybe we can have the company change some things minorly (sic), I do not know. Until the report comes through, we will not be able to make that decision. Once the report comes through, then we will know what we can do in the short term. We will know what we can do in the long term.

I am not opposed to holding hearings, hearings can be very useful. We have had them in Portage. I have been involved in a clean environment hearing on our own farm to resolve a problem or to have a licence granted for a lagoon, so I know the process and the input that goes into it. If this is the case, if this is what is required, then that is what will transpire. But until

I get the report from our staff to find out the severity and what the company is doing and would do, then of course we will make those decisions and we might have to make some short-term decisions along with some long term. I hope that we have that report very early in the week, and that the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) will be apprised and this House as to what action we possibly can take.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Mr. Chairman, again I would like to, in a very cooperative, positive way, make a suggestion to the Minister. I agree, there is the short-term solution and short-term action has to be taken. There is mid term and there is indeed long term. Maybe the hearing process is part of the long term, I do not know, but there is nothing preventing action going on simultaneously. I agree, his officials should be working right now. The company should be working right now on a short-term solution. Whatever can be done should be done. Maybe a mid term is perhaps the public hearings, and maybe the long term eventually involves the removal or the transfer of the plant to another location.

What I would really urge the Minister is to—there is nothing to be lost, he can hold the public hearings now. He can have the commission have the public hearings now and let the public have an opportunity to have a say in this besides Government officials, besides company officials; let the public, whether it be doctors in the public, whether it be the tourist industry, whether it be citizens at large, or if City Council wants to make representation, or whoever. There is nothing to be lost. The Minister could be a real hero by calling those hearings now. There is nothing to be lost, and it does not take away from any other action that his staff may be engaged in.

So I would really urge the Minister to reconsider and say to his Clean Environment Commission, please now begin the process of public hearings. Let the people of Brandon, let the community at large, let everybody involved have an opportunity to have an input into this. Then let the commission rationally study the data and eventually make recommendations to the Government.

**Mr. Connery:** The Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) knows that this Minister is not afraid to make decisions, unlike the previous Government where we see, as we get into the books, the problems that were there and the problems that were not addressed. It is almost criminal, Mr. Chairman, to see what was not done in the past.

As you know, when the problem of the Dow Corning material that came into Flin Flon under the previous Government, when there was a concern, the reaction and the action taken was in a matter of hours to ensure the safety of the workers in Flin Flon. It only took a matter of hours. The necessity to act can be taken very quickly, but you also have to take responsible action. To just make a decision, okay, there is a problem in Brandon, we will close the plant down, that would be a very quick decision to eliminate the smell. I know the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) is not suggesting that, so I do not read that into the record on his—he is not suggesting that.

\* (1150)

We will be looking at it very carefully. Yes, you are right. Clean environment hearings would be the middle. Short term and abatement, whatever we can do would be short term. What can we do in the short - (Interjection)- the money. Money would take a long time. Money would take some -(Interjection)- there could be some sort of slowdown or some change in the operation of the plant is how I am using that terminology, slowing it down. Maybe there is too much blood. That is something that is short term. The mid term maybe is clean environment hearings and maybe long term is relocating of the plant. Those are the things that we have to look at.

If it is in the best interest of the people of Brandon, and the best interest of the plant and the people of Brandon will be first and foremost, keeping in mind we need the jobs—that we are not afraid to have clean environment hearings and have an input into it. I know the value of them. But it also costs money and it is not just something you do just because you want to look like a hero. That is not the goal of our department. It is to act expeditiously but very carefully.

**Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill):** Because the Minister brought up the record of the previous Government, perhaps I can spend just five minutes or so explaining to him how there may be a lesson in what the previous administration did under similar circumstances which could provide some guidance in this particular circumstance. It just so happened that this situation transpired when I was Minister of the Environment so I had some active participation in the decision-making process and faced some of the same questions that the now Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery) faces.

The situation at that time concerned Simplot and as well odours which were emanating and causing difficulty for residents in the area. At that time, we did in fact strike a public hearing process through the Clean Environment Commission. I think it worked extremely well because what it did was allow for residents to come forward and express their concerns in a formal and structured way. They allowed for them to organize around those concerns to build a level of awareness in the community that was structured within a framework that would provide for the most constructive discussion of the problem possible. And that is what public hearings allow for. They allow for the residents to come and face the industrial groups that are under question in the public hearing, or, are appearing before the Commission because of their operations in a formal structure that puts them on equal footing with the project owners; in this case, it would be the Burns plant.

Without that structure, without the hand of Government willing to be exercised in order to provide that framework, all that they have available to them is appeals through their MLA in this Legislature, which I do not wish to diminish the impact of those appeals, but it is a limited form. They have petitions which they are signing in Brandon right now. They have opinion references in the paper. For example, in the Brandon Sun, we asked your opinion, the odour from the Burns

plant. The Sun recently asked residents and business people in the city's North Hill: what is your opinion of the odour from the Burns Meat Rendering plant? Have you considered not buying Burns products as form of protest?

Here is a sample of some of their answers. One person said it really is a sickening smell and indicated that she smelled it every night coming home from work. Another one said it has never been this bad before and complained about bringing the waste in from Neepawa and said that it seems like every night we get the smell. Another one said that he has signed the petition. Another one said if they do not do anything about Burns, sure will not be selling any meat products to me. Another one said thank goodness for central air conditioning, not everyone can afford central air conditioning. That person suggested that they should either upgrade the equipment or move the plant out of city limits. Another one said the second you open the window you get the smell of the plant and you cannot get the windows closed fast enough. We know how hot it has been in that area. So it is a real problem for residents.

\* (1150)

What the public hearings would allow for is those residents to group together, come forward, make those presentations to Burns, and allow for Burns to answer those presentations on the spot so that it is an empowerment process that puts the two on equal footing. That is where Government can be extremely beneficial, because as it stands now there is not that equal footing and that is why you are getting this sort of reaction.

The other thing that public hearings do, which is extremely important, is it allows for people to talk in a constructive fashion about how to solve the problem. The Minister of Environment does not have all the answers and that is not a reflection on him as an individual, because when I was Minister of Environment, faced with the Simplot situation, I knew I did not have all the answers.

The Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) does not have all the answers. The Clean Environment Commission in the department does not have all the answers. Burns does not have all the answers. Obviously, if someone had all the answers, there would be no problem. There in fact is a problem that is an escalating one and a very serious one.

The public hearings allow for the groups to get together and in a constructive fashion talk to each other and try to develop solutions to those problems using their own expertise and their own ideas and their own suggestions. It is sort of a melting pot for new ideas. I believe that it plays a very useful role in that way as well.

To address the Minister's primary concern, though, he says that you have actually three tiers of action. You have a short term which he says he is undertaking right now—and I am not certain as to what all the details of that is, but let us assume that the short term is in place to the extent possible. I do not know that

to be the case, but for the purposes of this discussion we will make the assumption. There is a mid term which is the Clean Environment Commission hearings, and then there is the long term which is some sort of structural change to the operation if that is required.

There is nothing that prevents two of those tiers from operating at the same time, that is the short term taking place and the public hearings taking place. They are not mutually exclusive. As a matter of fact, I would suggest that they are complementary to each other. Because it does allow for the Minister to have his department do whatever is possible at the time that it is required, but it also allows for the general public to come in, and for the company to come in and immediately begin to talk about how they are going to deal with the third term which is the longer term in the structural changes.

The Minister can right now initiate public hearings. He has the power to do so under the Act, under section 6(4), through the Clean Environment Commission. It takes time for public hearings to be established for a couple of reasons. One, you have to give notice to the project owner; and, secondly, you have to give notice to those people whom you are going to ask to attend the public hearings so that they can have an opportunity to develop a case and present the case.

(Mr. Deputy Chairman, Harold Gilleshammer, in the Chair.)

So if that is the case, he could give notice today that they are going to have public hearings. People can start preparing for them. He could then establish a date for the public hearings a week, two weeks or three weeks in advance, the public hearings to carry on while the first tier was being conducted. That is the immediate solution and we would be that much closer to a longer-term solution. I would ask the Minister: Given that approach, an approach that worked previously in respect to Simplot, is he not prepared now to commit to public hearings at a time in the very near future? There is a cost to it, but the cost I think is well worth the fact that it would bring people together to try to find a constructive and perhaps a less expensive solution to the problem than would otherwise be the case. Can he not at this time commit to those public hearings in that way?

**Mr. Connery:** It is obvious to this House and it is obvious to me, and I am sure obvious to anyone who is listening to the position of the Opposition and to the Opposition House Leader (Mrs. Carstairs), that what they are trying to do is to set it up. If indeed Clean Environment Commission hearings are required, they were the ones that forced the Government to take that. So they are playing their cheap little politics with a very important issue—(Interjection)—very cheap politics.

**Mr. Cowan:** On a point of order, the Minister again is imputing motives and I have tried very much to be as conciliatory and as non-political in my approach to this problem as is possible. I do not care who takes credit for the Clean Environment Commission. The Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) does not care who takes credit for the Clean Environment Commission

hearings. What we care about is that the matter is dealt with in as effective and efficient a manner as possible.

Let me assure the Minister that it is not those political -(Interjection)- if the Minister will let me continue - (Interjection)- I would ask your assistance in quietening the Minister down so I can continue my comments, Mr. Deputy Chairperson.

What we are trying to do is offer constructive suggestions to the Minister based on our own experience. It is not, to use his words, a cheap political ploy or cheap political trick, whatever it is. It is based on the sincerest of motivations to help the Minister be a better Minister which is what Opposition is all about. In this instance, we do have some experience which might be helpful. I would ask that the Minister withdraw those imputations of motive on our part.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** A dispute over the facts is not a point of order. Would the Minister please continue.

**Mr. Connery:** It is unfortunate because it is a very serious issue. First of all, the issue was raised in this House today by the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans). The issue was raised to me by the Member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae) a few days ago and that is what put into place the investigation to find out what is the best line of action that we should take. So when it comes to representation, the Member from Brandon West was a long way ahead.

(Mr. Chairman in the Chair.)

The Minister also knows—and I would not ever have expected when he was the Minister that all of a sudden somebody says we got a problem and he says we are going to hold hearings immediately. He would go back to his staff responsibly and say: here is the problem that is being addressed, what is the best line of action for us to take? That is what a responsible Minister would do. That is what I am doing. It will not be a long time in the decision making but we are acting responsibly and the Member knows fully well the proper route that it should be taking. We are doing that and we are not dragging our feet. We are working to ensure that the discomfort that the people of Brandon are experiencing is minimal and it can be shut off as soon as possible. It is not a very quick fix problem. As you know, the hearings are going to take some time and before the report comes through, if we indeed hold hearings—and this might be the best direction for the Government to take. After getting the report of my department, the decision will be made as to the direction this Government will take and our department will take, and you will be informed of that direction.

**Mr. Cowan:** When does the Minister expect that report from his department?

**Mr. Connery:** I would hope that it would be available early in the week.

**Mr. Cowan:** Is the Minister then prepared to table the report in this House immediately upon receipt of it?

**Mr. Connery:** I will report back to this House.

**Mr. Cowan:** The specific question was: Is the Minister prepared to table that report in this House immediately upon receipt of it?

**Mr. Connery:** . . . read my lips, I said I would report to the House.

**Mr. Cowan:** Once again, we see the arrogance of this Minister, but I am going to let that pass because I think the issue here—and he laughs from his seat now about this issue. I think the issue here is more important than—

**Mr. Connery:** I was laughing at his comment, not at the situation. The comment that he would say that somebody else is arrogant is a laughable matter.

**Mr. Cowan:** The question to the Minister directly is he prepared to table the report that he has from his staff, which Members in this House have shown interest in, which he says will provide guidance to him on how to deal with this issue?

**Mr. Connery:** As the former Minister should obviously know, a report given to me could contain some confidential information. I do not know what the report is going to contain. It could have some confidential information that cannot be released to the public. The essence of the report can be put forward.

I suppose the previous Minister of Highways says we are not an open Government, so then if somebody had a trade secret that you had and did not want to divulge that you would be an open Government and do it. That is not responsible. We have to be responsible.

\* (1200)

**Mr. Cowan:** No, the Minister is absolutely right. We would not divulge a trade secret because that would be in violation of not only principles and guidelines but in violation of legislation. But what we would do and what we have done in the past in providing information was to eliminate from the report any matter which could be considered to be that of corporate confidentiality, and the Government, when it was in Opposition, agreed with that particular process.

I ask the Minister, and knowing full well that there may be some matters in there that are matters of corporate confidentiality, and we would agree to those being stricken, is he prepared to then table the report with all references deleted from it that might be matters of corporate confidentiality?

**Mr. Connery:** The report that I give will be the report that he can look at. He can keep on asking the same question 10 times, but he will get the same answer.-(Interjection)- You will get the report that I give. I do not know what is going to be in the report of the staff, so you will get -(Interjection)- That is not arrogant.

**Mr. Cowan:** The Minister is digging himself deeper into a hole that he does not need to have swallow him up. We are trying to offer him help and assistance in this. We did, in fact, table reports that were made when we

were in Government that were of benefit to the House and the general public in making decisions about issues of importance to the general public. I know the Minister can stand in his place and give the same answer over and over again, even if it is the wrong answer. So I am not going to press him any further than that, although the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) may wish to. What I am going to say, however, is that there is an opportunity here to work in a cooperative fashion with the MLA for the area, with the Opposition, to ensure that the concerns of the residents are met. In order to accommodate that, there has to be some flexibility on the part of the Minister. I appreciate full well the fact that the Member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae) probably brought this matter to the attention of the Minister previously.

I would hope that the Member for Brandon West in doing so would have suggested that there be public hearings, because in speaking on behalf of his constituents, I know he would want them to have the opportunity to make their concerns known in a public form, in a structured way, that would ensure they could have direct contact with Burns. (Interjection)- The Minister for Brandon West has said, just drive through Brandon and you will know what the concern is. That is exactly the point. Those are the concerns. I think he will admit, and maybe admit is too judgmental a word, he will agree with me when I say that the public hearings around the Simplot problem were a positive factor in resolving a long-standing problem in that community. I would ask him to nod his head, yes or no, on that.

**An Honourable Member:** He agrees.

**Mr. Cowan:** He agrees then. Having agreed, then I would ask him to use his influence with the Minister, along with that of the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), to ensure that public hearings are held in this particular situation so that we can have that same sort of resolve.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** I was approaching this in a very calm, collected, rational, positive manner, and I really regret the very defensive remarks being made by the Minister, imputing motives to this side. I am also surprised that he said, if I heard him correctly, he took action after the Member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae) drew it to his attention. I would have hoped that he would have taken some action after he got reports from his own field staff who are in the area and who have a responsibility to monitor and keep surveillance over the environment and to help protect the environment.

Obviously, the Minister has had some information on this, has had some discussion with his staff. What I would like to know specifically from the Minister—since that is the case—exactly can he tell us just how many units per cubic feet of pollution has been recorded, is now being registered at that plant? It can vary from day to day. It was worse a few days back with the heat and the wind and so on, those conditions made it worse. Can he advise the House just what readings have been taken by his department? I ask that now because he said that he has been looking into this for a few days,

since the Member from Brandon West (Mr. McCrae) apparently brought it to his attention. And secondly, to what degree is the plant being overloaded? Is the plant being overloaded? Has he got that information? And if it is being overloaded, and I suspect it is being overloaded because of the fact that Neepawa does not have a rendering plant and is shipping all of its waste products to Brandon, to what degree is the plant being overloaded? Could he provide us with that specific information based on the previous reports he has had from his Department?

**Mr. Connerly:** The Member knows that I said our department was investigating it. When they have a report, and they will report on all those aspects, then I will have the information available to make the decisions, and if there are concerns that the Member from Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) has, then I will bring those answers to him.

We are not going to try to hide something. If the plant is overloading, then we will make sure that he is aware. When the report is in from my staff, then I will make that report available, not confidential material, but you will have a report given to you.

I am as concerned as much as the Member for Brandon East is and as the Member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae). But this is a terrible situation, and it happens from time to time, and I think it has happened in many cases because of lack of adequate planning in the long run. I am not going to lay blame because that would be just playing politics with it. It has been there for awhile; they have had an opportunity to do something. The problem is today. I am sure the problem has been there in the past, but maybe was not as serious. Our department is very concerned. We are not going to make any quick jumps at it, and as the previous Minister knows, the day somebody brings something to your attention you do not immediately call for a clean environment hearing. You wait for the report, you look at it, then you make the appropriate decisions in the best interest of the business in Brandon and the citizens of Brandon. The citizens of Brandon come first in our department, and with my direction.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** I am a little confused now. I had thought that what we were going to get was a plan of action, next week, a plan of action; and that the Minister had said that for the last several days he has been discussing this with his staff, because the Member from Brandon West (Mr. McCrae) had drawn it to his attention previously, and I am a little surprised. Is the Minister telling us he does not have any data now, he has no information now as to what degree of pollution has been occurring? Has he not had any measurements given to him? Has his deputy not advised him on the degree to which that plant is being overloaded? Does he have no information on just to what degree there is a problem going on at that plant? Maybe he can clear that in my mind; I am a bit confused now.

The way the Minister talks now is as though he does not have any information. He has the general idea that there is a problem, but he has no specific information. No data on exactly what is going on in terms of overload, if any, and in terms of the degree of pollution that is

occurring. I would have thought that he would have had some information, at least preliminary data, yes, preliminary information, and that what we were going to get next week is perhaps an elaboration of that, but also a plan of action, what short term steps the department and the Minister will be taking.

**Mr. Connery:** I would hope the Member from Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) would be patient to know, and then he can condemn us next week. He is saying what is going to happen next week. Next week will be next week and we will be reporting back to the House. We are not going to present material piecemeal. When we have the material ready, and we have been able to analyze it, but I guess the previous Minister would like to look at a little bit of information and make a decision on a little bit of information. This would not be appropriate. When the full picture is in, and it will be shortly, I hope, then we will make a proper decision, and this House will be informed of that decision.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** A very specific question. Can the Minister advise whether or not the company has exceeded the conditions, the terms of the licence? Has the company exceeded that or has it not and, if it has not, what exactly is the reading? Surely that is a critical matter, whether or not the company has exceeded the terms of the licence. As I understand it, it is seven units per cubic foot. That is the standard that has been applied. It is an industrial standard; it is not a residential standard. Very specifically, does the Minister not know whether or not the terms of the licence are being abided by?

\* (1210)

**Mr. Connery:** Part of the problem is that seven is an industrial level and two is for residential. The problem is that it has gotten too close to the town and it is affecting the people. Of course, we are going to have to decide whether we can move it or what we are going to do.

My staff to this point have not fully reported to me, a very little report. They are working on that, so I do not have the specific load numbers to be able to give the Member. When those are available, we will make them available to you.

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Mr. Chairman, I just want to indicate before I have some questions, following up with Question Period. I thank the Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) for coming in, in order to respond to questions, but we will be meeting at three o'clock on the issue of Churchill. We had some questions there, but we are going to delay those questions instead and leave them till the meeting.

I have a question following up with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery) from the discussion that we had very briefly during Question Period today. That dealt with the elevator workers in rural Manitoba. The drought is going to be causing a great deal of dislocation and problems in rural Manitoba and western Canada, not only with the farmers. We are very concerned about the impact on the farmers themselves and their families

and their ability to continue to operate. This drought comes at a time when it compounds the situation for them because of the low commodity prices that they have had to face and difficulty with high interest rates and so on over the number of years.

They are in a very precarious situation. Now they are faced with an unprecedented drought that may very well jeopardize the rural economy itself, and affect not only those farmers but almost all the businesses in rural Manitoba, in rural communities that depend on a healthy farm economy, and the workers who work in related industries, in support industries. That is of great concern, I think something that all of us in this House should be very concerned about. It may, in fact, mean that there has to be a rural strategy developed to deal with this serious issue as it develops. Certainly, we should be prepared ahead of time.

I was very distressed when I was informed that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) had indicated on public television last night, when asked about this issue—and we cannot deny that this actually took place, as the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) tried to do today, say that he did not know that the Minister of Agriculture had actually made those statements, in which he implied, perhaps more than implied, stated quite clearly that those workers should not expect any support and help from this Government because they did not care. I would like the Member for Ste. Rose, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Cummings) also to perhaps respond to this issue. The workers did not care about the farmers when there were labour management disputes and lockouts and strikes a couple of years ago, and therefore they should not expect any support from this Government. The Members may feel a bit uncomfortable over there, some of the Ministers, that one of their colleagues would speak for the Government and say that. I hope he was not speaking for the Government.

I ask, first of all, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery) to indicate his Government's policy, his department's policy with regard to these workers who, we are informed, will be laid off to the extent of some 50 percent of those in communities throughout the province. It will mean a lot of families out of work, and these people are asking for some special consideration with regard to qualifying for unemployment insurance claims, and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) says that they can expect no help from him. I hope it was only him. I ask the Minister of Labour if he supports the statements that were made by the Minister of Agriculture, and whether he will talk to his colleague and tell him that he disagrees and that he should cease and desist from making those kinds of statements.

**Mr. Connery:** I am rather distressed that the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) would be very selective in the one group of people that he is concerned about who are being affected by the drought. He is saying that it is only the grain handlers who should be looked after. Unfortunately . . . .

**Mr. Plohman:** A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

I clearly stated to this House that this would affect all areas of concern, all areas, all families in business

and the workers as well as the farmers affected by this drought, and I had expressed concern for all of those. Clearly, this Minister is misrepresenting my remarks in this House. Just apologize and go on.

**Mr. Connery:** I think Hansard is a great tool, and so I would hope that the Minister would read Hansard, because he was relating specifically to the grain handlers who were going to be laid off and to those - (Interjection) - sure, in many towns.

Our department, the Department of Labour, is very sympathetic to those people, but there is a bigger picture out there in the rural community. There are people who work in the service industry, there are people who work for implement dealers, people who work for automobile dealers who are going to lose their jobs also because of the drought. The picture is a very big global picture that has to be addressed.

As he knows, the UIC is a federal jurisdiction but, if there is need for provincial input, then we will take a look at that. We are very concerned with every worker in this province. During the Sterling Lyon days, we use to be very disappointed when we had 20,000 workers unemployed, but what do you see now? It is a way up in the mid-30,000's the people who are unemployed, and they are bragging about their job position. We are concerned about everybody, and we are not only concerned about people in the rural area. We are concerned about the people in the City of Winnipeg because the Department of Labour relates to every working person. We will react to every working person in this province. That is why we are doing the things we are doing, looking at labour codes.

\* (1220)

**An Honourable Member:** What about cutting the Labour Education Centre?

**Mr. Connery:** The Member says: "cutting the Labour Education Centre." We feel that that was one area that we could cut in the presence of prioritizing to ensure that we do not have to close hospital beds like the previous Government did.

So when we work, we work very closely as departments and with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst). We have to develop strategies so that we can make sure that people are employed. The Department of Labour cannot work in an island, unlike the previous Government. They did not do very much consultation because, the action they took, it was obvious that it affected a lot of other areas. We will make sure that the people, the labourers in Manitoba are well served when they have concerns. They can come to our department. We have a lot of various areas that people are coming to us, asking us for advice. We are looking at the appropriate solutions and, when we have them, we offer them.

**Mr. Plohman:** Based on the comments that were made by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery), I would assume that he does not support the comments that were made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay). I would ask

him if he would formally disassociate himself with those remarks, and ask his colleague to come back with an apology for those statements that were so callous with regard to those people who are affected and their families.

I would think that it is important that this Government consider immediately undertaking and mobilizing a number of Ministers to develop a rural strategy to deal with this drought on all fronts. I ask the Deputy Premier whether he would consider immediately putting together such a mechanism to deal with this issue. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery) just indicated that it is not just those workers in the elevators. They are very important and their families, but it is much more as I had indicated as well, that it is the farmers and the service workers and many different businesses. All businesses depend on agriculture, as I stated earlier, in rural areas, almost all of the businesses, all of the workers.

So it is imperative that there be a strategy to deal with this growing problem in the rural areas. I am asking the Deputy Premier whether he would immediately put in place a mechanism to develop a strategy to deal with this growing problem that affects almost all of rural Manitoba and workers, people in business and their families, and the farmers of course.

**Mr. Cummings:** I find it a little ironic that the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) is now suddenly realizing that rural Manitoba has suffered from neglect and downright being ignored by the previous administration for the last six years, while we ranted and raved on the other side about the impact and the neglect that was coming from the administration which was in place.

We have come into office dedicated to make sure that the economic base of rural Manitoba is not a single-industry base, that agriculture maintains itself as the most important single industry we have, but that other industries and other jobs have to be available out there. That is part of a strategy that will make it easier for the people of this province and the rural parts of this province to get by the very tough, tough situation that arises from climactic disasters that arise from time to time.

I think the Member, the former Minister of Transportation has gone on at great length about various groups which are affected by the economic situation in the rural part of this province. But I would draw to his attention something that has been going on for the last five or six years out there. I do not remember him raising one finger in this House in defence of the jobs that were lost in my home town. He did not even notice that about 60 to 65 jobs in the farm machinery trade alone disappeared out of a town of 3,500 people. Where was this Government that was supposed to be looking after the workers of this province? Now they are in Opposition, all of a sudden they are concerned. Where were they when they were in Government? The questions were raised innumerable times on that side and the Minister knows it.

We have an unemployment insurance system in this country, Mr. Chairman, that is there to provide an underpinning. Certainly I have a great deal of concern

and distress for anybody who would find himself unemployed as a result of the lack of grain that may be going through the system this year.

We also have to be concerned, when you look at the companies that are responsible for the employment of those people, that they are in fact companies which are owned by the farmers. Those are the cooperatives that handle the grain and provide those jobs in rural Manitoba. Unfortunately, they are going to have to look at the economic impact of what they are going to do.

The company that has indicated it may have to proceed with some layoffs has suffered an extreme loss the last couple of years in its operations, and will probably end up with a loss this year as well. So that loss ultimately comes out of the hands of the farmers who are also ones who are in the front line in terms of losses when it comes to the results of the drought that we have out there right now.

This Government, Mr. Chairman, is composed and has been accused a few times of being much too rural. I think that it shows a certain amount of desperation on the part of the Opposition to be indicating that we may not, for whatever reason, be concerned about what is going on in rural Manitoba. All you need to do is look at the makeup of the this caucus to know that the vast majority of our people are very concerned because of the impact that it has back in their own constituencies. The first line of defence this Government has put forward, Mr. Chairman, a line of defence that I think is indicative of the understanding that we on this side have of rural Manitoba, is the fact that we move very quickly in cooperation with the two western prairie provinces and the federal Government to put in place a program that would make sure that the livestock industry in western Canada was maintained. After all, if you lose your breeding stock, if you lose the foundation herds which will produce next year's crop, then you will not have a crop next year. We have demonstrated that we have a great deal of concern about the costs that are out there. Our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) moved quickly to meet with the Ministers of Agriculture in Saskatchewan and Alberta and coordinated with the federal Government a response to that one part of the very serious situation that is out there.

I find it somewhat amusing that we have a Government with the kind of understanding of the rural problems that is now being harassed by the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) because he realizes that there are some elevator jobs across the province that are in jeopardy when, in fact, he ignored for the last number of years—when they were in Government, he ignored the very real problems of the people of rural Manitoba were facing, the loss of jobs. But they were not unionized jobs. The fellow who pulls the wrenches fixing my combine is not necessarily a union man. His

plight was not heard by those Members when he lost his job. He had to look for a job driving a school bus. He had to move to the city for a job because there was not a caretaking job in the Land Titles Office perhaps. He had to look to western Canada for jobs—and some of my employees in fact went to the timber fields in B.C. to get employment during the winter months because there was not enough work in this province because of the economic problems of agriculture. We understand those problems and we will be working to make sure that the rural parts of this province are looked after.

**An Honourable Member:** Where were you when the T. Eaton people needed you? Where were you when the Sooter people needed you? Where were you when the Springhill people needed you?

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Dauphin says that I am afraid of more questions. I will be quite glad to hear more of his questions. What he is afraid of is hearing the facts about what has gone on in rural Manitoba under the jurisdiction of a Government that the people of rural Manitoba just kicked out. That is what happens.

I indicated the other day when I had an opportunity to be interviewed on Peter Warren, and it seems to me that the very dramatic situation that we are faced with in rural Manitoba these days has finally brought the people—galvanized all the people of this province to the reality of the problems that we are facing in rural agriculture. I see the people in the City of Winnipeg all of a sudden starting to be much more interested in what is happening to the agricultural scene, what is happening to the jobs in this province in relationship to agriculture.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hour being 12:30, committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION

**Mr. Mark Minenko (Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House):** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has considered certain resolutions, directs me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch), that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**Mr. Speaker:** The hour being 12:30 p.m., according to the Rules, this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m., Monday next. Have a good weekend.