

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 9 February, 1981

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Committee on Rules of the House.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on the Rules of the House beg leave to present the following as their First Report.

Your Committee met on Tuesday, January 27, 1981 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 255 Legislative Building with all members present.

The Chairman read a letter from Robert Foskett, member of the Legislative Television Consortium in which permission was requested to conduct an experiment aimed at improving the existing lighting system to the Chamber. Mr. Foskett recommended the use of long life metal halide luminaries, permanently installed at ceiling height in the arches at an estimated cost of five to six thousand dollars. The CBC, according to Mr. Foskett had offered to temporarily light the Chamber during the regular televising of the Question Period to allow evaluation of the improved lighting. Your Committee approved of the experiment and, if it proves successful to the Committee, recommends to the Minister of Government Services that the expenditure of funds to provide for a permanent installation be made.

On the matter of the taking of still photographs by the printed media, your Committee recommends that the taking of still photographs from the Press Gallery be permitted, that no limit be placed on the number of cameras permitted and that sharing of photographs not be required.

Your Committee recommends that Rule 33(2) be amended whereby a leader of a recognized political party could, by prior notice to the Speaker, designate a member of his party to speak for him. It is recommended that the existing Rule be modified to clarify the intent.

Your Committee recommends that the reference contained in Rule 88(6) to "24 hours" be deleted and the words "one sitting" substituted. It is also recommended that amendments to Bills proposed at the Report Stage not be subject to amendment and the Rules be amended accordingly.

Your Committee also recommends the repeal of Rule 93(e) by which the Clerk of the House must, personally, attend each meeting of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House.

It is recommended that Item 18 of the 1971 Report of the Rules Committee be repealed. It is suggested that transcripts of all Committee meetings should be

made unless the appropriate Committee decides to the contrary in keeping with the present trend whereby transcripts are expected.

Your Committee recommends the following rule changes:

That the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba be amended

- (a) by striking out sub-rule 33(2) and substituting therefor the following sub-rule:

Designation of substitute.

33(2) The leader of the government, the leader of the opposition or a leader of a recognized opposition party may each designate one member to speak in a debate for such period as he desires if

- (a) the leader of the government, the leader of the opposition or the leader of the recognized opposition party has given notice of the designation to the Speaker not later than 1 hour before the sitting of the House at which the member speaks in that debate; and
- (a) the leader of the government, the leader of the opposition or the leader of the recognized opposition party, whoever has given the notice, has not previously spoken in the debate for more than 40 minutes; and if the member designated speaks in the debate, the leader of the government, the leader of the opposition or the leader of the recognized opposition party, whoever has given notice of the designation, shall not speak in that debate for more than 40 minutes.

- (b) by striking out sub-rule 88(6) and substituting therefor the following sub-rule:

Requests for deferment of consideration of amendment.

88(6) Where written notice of a motion to amend, delete, insert or restore any clause or provision in a Bill is given prior to the consideration of the Report Stage of the Bill, and the Order of the Day for consideration of the Report Stage of the Bill is called before the end of the first sitting of the House after the notice is given, any member may request that the consideration of the Report Stage of the Bill be deferred until after the end of the first sitting of the House after the notice is given and, unless the House by vote, unanimous except for that member, refuses the request, the consideration of the Report Stage of the Bill shall be deferred until after the end of the first sitting of the House after the notice is given; but if the consideration of the Report Stage of the Bill is deferred once under this Rule, the consideration of the Report Stage shall not again be deferred, except by resolution of the House.

- (c) by striking out sub-rule 88(8) and substituting therefor the following sub-rule:

Debate on amendments.

88(8) When the Order of the Day for the consideration of the Report Stage of a Bill is called, any amendment of which notice has been given in

accordance with sub-rule (5) is open to debate but no motion to amend the amendment shall be accepted except by resolution of the House; and (d) by striking out clause (e) of Rule 93.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I ask that the final report on the Fairlane fire by the Building Standards Board be tabled. I have sent copies to the Clerk's office for circulization.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. WARREN STEEN (Crescentwood) introduced Bill No. 16, An Act respecting the Montreal Trust Company and the Montreal Trust Company of Canada.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, may I have permission to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

It is my pleasure to announce that three Manitoba artists have won the international prize for snow sculpturing at the Quebec Winter Carnival. Judging on the competition took place yesterday in Quebec City. The artists are Don Berg, an illustrator with Travel Manitoba, Ral Brard, an artist with the Department of Health, and Miguel Joyal, a wood sculptor who is working this year with the Festival de Voyageur. The team was co-sponsored by my department and the Department of Economic Development and Tourism and it was hosted in Quebec City by the Quebec Winter Carnival. Our team actually tied for first place with Morocco and competed against 12 teams from ten other countries.

The Manitobans first did a sculpture illustrating the book, "Where Nests the Water Hen" by Manitoba born author Gabrielle Roy and this piece won the national award. By the win they become the official Canadian national team. Their winning international entry was taken from The Legend of the White Horse, a romantic Manitoba Indian tale involving a young couple and a beautiful white horse. I understand this piece of sculpture, composed of two horses and the young couple took from Wednesday until Saturday of last week to complete and that the artists worked practically around the clock.

I am sure that the members of this House are as proud as we are of these Manitoba artists.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could make a non-political response or comment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the honourable member leave? (Agreed)
The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted at the kindness of the government in this regard, and I would like to join with the Minister in congratulating those particular Manitoba artists on their accomplishment. It's well known, Mr. Speaker, that Manitobans have some of the finest painters and sculptors in the country and I think that we must attempt to make further advancement in the support of the arts. I point with some pride to the record of our administration which had a program . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member was given leave to make a non-political statement and I would hope that he stayed within the bounds that he himself had asked when he asked special permission of the House. — (Interjection)—
The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, just on the point of order. I may have been skating on thin ice but I didn't identify the previous administration.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Economic Development. This past weekend statistics were released by Stats Canada indicating that the increase by way of volume sales in Manitoba's departmental sales stores were such that the volume of goods being sold December 1980 were likely not greater than the volume of goods sold in 1973. In view of the obvious slump as indicated by way of these retail sales in Manitoba, can the Minister advise what action is anticipated by way of his department on behalf of the government in order to stimulate retail sales, particularly departmental sales, in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition mentions that they were released over the weekend and I was at Bristol Aircraft this morning where they were receiving a plaque for the marvellous work they do in the aerospace industry, and I haven't as yet seen the statistics and I really don't want to comment on them until I have had the chance to review them.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the Minister would agree then in reviewing the statistics if he would advise why it is that the BC departmental stores increased by 23 percent, December 1980 over December 1979; Alberta 19 percent; Saskatchewan 17 percent . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I suggest to the honourable member that questions of agreement are hardly questions that are soliciting information. If the honourable member wishes to solicit information that's a different matter, but questions of agreement hardly fall within the realm of the question period. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition care to rephrase his question?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I regret, if indeed I indicated to you or to the House that I was asking for agreement as to the figures. I asked the Minister if he would review the figures in question for a purpose which I was coming to. I was not asking the Minister to concur or to agree with the figures in question — the Maritime increase of some 14 percent; Quebec 7.1 percent; Ontario 10. some percent; Manitoba 5.8 percent. If the Minister would advise in view of the record advertising and other methods being used by his department, just what is the factor which accounts for the sluggish growth for departmental stores in Manitoba in relationship to all other parts of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could fill some of the information in for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, as he seeks to find out more about retail sales. He is perhaps not aware that only 15 percent of Manitoba's retail sales take place through department stores. That is not necessarily the same ratio that takes place elsewhere. I can also advise that the first 11 months of information for 1980 on total retail sales within the province and across the country would indicate that Manitoba ranks about fifth.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if he would review the information weekly bulletin which I understand is the most recent bulletin out indicating that Newfoundland and Manitoba alone record down fractionally reported retail sales in Manitoba.

I would like to ask the Minister, since he's taken this opportunity to participate in the question and answer period, if he intends to move up the date of the presentation of his budget in view of the fact that there is continued stagnation, sluggishness, pertaining to retail sales, departmental sales in the Province of Manitoba — much of that, by the way, Mr. Speaker, being demonstrated by the layoffs which are presently under way in Eaton's.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member refers to a sluggish situation in the economy in Manitoba. We should draw the honourable member's attention to the situation that prevails across this country and in the United States and elsewhere in the western world especially. Our government has shown that we are indeed capable managers in getting our act together in an earlier period of time than was previously the case and I would say that it would not be unlikely that

accordingly a budget might be presented earlier than normal.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, a question to the same Minister, in view of their talking about getting the act together. In view of the statement made approximately a year ago following the Crosbie budget, the statement made by the Premier of this province that he agreed, and in fact the budget didn't go far enough and he still preached restraint; and also in view of the fact that a few days after, following the 18th of February the policy was abandoned, can the Minister tell us what caused this radical change of getting away from their restraint? Is it a question because there was more inflation in Manitoba since then, is it because the dollar is devaluated more, is it because there is more bankruptcy; is it because there is more people out of work, or is it because the per capita debt is larger than ever; is it because we've had a larger deficit? Could the Minister tell us why this policy of restraint has been abandoned by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. RANSOM: The course of action which we are now pursuing, Mr. Speaker, we are able to pursue now because we have been able to bring under control the ungodly mess that was left us . . .

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

MR. DESJARDINS: To the same Minister then, Mr. Speaker. Should we interpret the remarks of the First Minister at this time, and I want to quote him, "that the Canadians have to learn how to take their medicine sooner or later" — does that mean a little later, for instance after an election; is that the intent of the government?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that if the honourable member wishes to seek information from the First Minister he can ask the First Minister directly when he returns. Any comment that I would make, I'm sure would not alter the honourable member's opinion in that regard.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I would like to thank the Minister if he could pass it on to his First Minister, and while he's doing that he can ask the First Minister also and I'm sure I'll get the reply. The First Minister at the time dealing with the people who said that by conscience they couldn't vote for that, said that they spell conscience "gallup". I wonder if this new spelling of conscience is also accepted by the First Minister. Would you please ask your leader then.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker I find it odd to be lectured on conscience by the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Fine. Then maybe we'll have an answer and we'll find out why you abandoned the

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

MR. VIC SCHROEDER (Rossmere): Yes, Mr. Speaker I have a question for the Minister of Education. Recently he had indicated that there would be an increase of \$70 million.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, Order please. I find it somewhat difficult to hear the questions being proposed by the Honourable Member for Rossmere. I would ask the indulgence of the Members of the House for the courtesy to hear the Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you Mr Speaker I was having difficulty hearing myself think. Question to the Minister of Education. Could he tell the House how much, if any, of the \$70 million in increase in public school financing he recently announced, how much of that will be coming from increased property taxes in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the honourable member's question correctly the 70 million comes out of provincial revenues. That is the answer to his question. From provincial revenues, not from property tax at all.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary to the Minister of Education. Is he then saying that the increase from 5 to something like 35 mills on residential and from somewhere around 35 to 70 on business properties for the provincial portion of property taxes will not increase the amount of property taxes paid by the property taxpayer into the provincial portion of the calculation?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker I'm sure the honourable member understands that there are two aspects to property taxation. One being what we understood as the old foundation levy and the other one being special levy. It's quite true that under this new program the foundation levy does increase across the province; the fact it's therein that we find the equalization principle in body. But the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honourable member's question, is that the special levy will decrease quite dramatically.

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

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister of Education then advise the House as to the amount recovered by the province in the last year on the education levy and the amount expected to be recovered by the province in that same levy under the new calculations in the next year, that is in the year 1981?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I believe those particular figures were contained in the background

paper that I sent out to all members at the time I announced the plan. If there are some of the figures that the honourable member requires perhaps he can write his request down; I'd be very pleased to provide him with those particular figures.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs and ask her if she can report on the success to date on the efforts of the committee that she established to raise funds from the private sector.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, two committees have been formed, one for a deficit retirement committee, it is headed up by Mr. Alan Sweatman and Mr. Harold Buckwald, two very prominent citizens in Winnipeg, with a number of other community-minded people, and also a sustaining committee has been formed under the leadership of Mr. Bill Draper. They have had several meetings. As you know, between the three levels of government we have been able to give some \$550,000 to the Symphony towards the deficit reduction and it is looking very good as far as the response from the private sector is concerned, both corporate and the individuals.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, again on the Symphony's problems. In view of a \$1 million deficit which was projected as of last December and in view of what the Minister just said, I wonder whether she could clarify whether a single penny has been raised by any of these committees established. I wonder if she could indicate how much money has been raised, because my impression is little or none. And secondly, can she indicate what target has been set for private fund raising?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, the goal for the retirement of the debt is I guess what is left of the debt which would be some \$350 to \$400,000. The one for the sustaining committee is \$206,000, I believe it is, and both are very confident that their goals will be reached this year.

MR. DOERN: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister could also indicate when the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra will be announcing the hiring of their new conductor.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, for the rest of the year there is a series of visiting conductors. There hasn't been any announcement given to me at this point although the new board has been selected. They are having their first meeting tonight and then after they get running smoothly then the board of trustees will settle back and they will take over the running of the orchestra.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Community Services. Would the Minister please

tell the House whether personal care homes have been instructed to set their thermostats below 70 degrees?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the honourable member refer that question to the Minister of Health.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, as far as I know the answer to that question is an unequivocal no.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would investigate any cases reported to him where the thermostats are set below 70 degrees, in view of the fact that specialists in the area of hypothermia, specialists in the United States, I understand, consider that it's very dangerous for people under 65 years of age to be kept in residences where the temperature is allowed to fall below 65, would he investigate this possibility and perhaps issue directions to the personal care homes to this effect, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that the operators and the staffs of our personal care homes are very aware of the physical conditions of their residents in their care and very aware of the medical and physical kinds of regulations and practices that should be applied. I have had no such complaints. The member has referred to investigating complaints that have come to me, but no complaints have come to me. I would suggest that well-meaning as it may be, the question emanates from pure speculation.

MRS. WESTBURY: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are always these patronizing adjectives such as simplistic and well-meaning, however, I think we're all trying to do a job here and I'm one of those that is trying to do a job here.

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister then advise the House — I was going to ask him this privately but, in view of the kind of answers I get, I will ask it publicly — is he interested in the fact that patients have been charged for warm pyjamas when the thermostats were turned down below 70 degrees? They have had to pay for them themselves out of their own private money. This may be amusing to the Minister of Agriculture . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't know how many times I have to advise members of the Chamber that the question period is a period for seeking information, not for providing it. Would the honourable member care to ask a question?

MRS. WESTBURY: I beg your pardon. I was under the impression that I had asked a question about patients being made to pay for their own warm pyjamas as a result of the thermometers being turned down below 70 degrees, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I must say that this question is reminiscent of some other highly, wildly

speculative questions in the area of health that stretch back some years in terms of experience in this Chamber. I reject the implications in the honourable member's statement, I dismiss them as emanating from the realm of pure speculation. Of course, since she has raised them, she's a member of this House, I will cause a check to be run on the situation. But I find the question, both questions, particular offensive, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Cultural Affairs. Could she advise as to whether there is any moneys still owing by the provincial government to Interlake Festival Incorporation as a result of its 1980 season in Gimli?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

MRS. PRICE: No, there isn't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. Were there any undertakings by the province to pay funds to that Festival in the event that it successfully concluded its 1980 season?

MRS. PRICE: It didn't successfully conclude its 1980 season, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that you suggested to me that a private resolution could be anticipating, I wonder if I could at this time ask the House Leader if it is the intention of the government of bringing a resolution soon dealing with separatism? I would ask the Minister if we should expect a composite resolution dealing with all kinds of things or could we have a clear-cut resolution dealing with the separatism and as soon as possible because it's quite urgent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I think the Throne Speech speaks for itself.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I thought that I was only asking the co-operation of the Minister to let us know. I know what the Throne Speech says. It talks about unity, it has the word unity. I'll repeat my question because I'm sure that the Minister would want to co-operate. You suggest, Sir, that I should wait with my resolution, I'm ready to do that. But I would hope, in view of the fact there are so many people that are trying to destroy this country at this time in preaching separatism, I would hope that this government will agree, or at least inform me so I can go ahead with my resolution, seeking the complete co-operation and endorsement of this House fighting separatism and trying to stop it before it gets started.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Member for St. Boniface that it is not this

government that is trying to divide this country. Mr. Speaker, there will be a resolution presented to this Legislature, I would expect, at the outset, within ten days.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour and I'd ask the Minister if he can take this opportunity to update members on this side of the House, as well as the general public, as to when we can expect the review of the Workers Compensation procedures to be placed before the House, a review which was promised to us as of last fall and has yet to be forthcoming from the Minister's department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the members of that review committee have informed me that within the next short period of time, and I would guess at two to three weeks to a month, that report will be printed and in my hands and distributed.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to the Minister while speaking of reports, I would ask the Minister if he can indicate what action his department is taking in regard to following up on the recommendations of the Wright Committee on Mine Safety in the Province of Manitoba and when we can expect some action on those many recommendations which were forwarded to the Minister approximately one year ago at this time?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, that entire mine review of safety in the mines took longer than I think a lot of us had hoped it would. You may recall that we were in office approximately a year when we instituted the first inquiry into workplace safety in the mines that was ever held in the history of this province. It was delayed somewhat, the original review, by the unfortunate accident at a Toronto Airport where the steelworker representative, that the steelworkers had brought in from Ontario, was injured and that held up the original part.

The Claude Wright Report, as its called, was brought down, it was issued to myself, tabled, everybody was made aware of it, our provincial government hosted a Mines Safety Conference in Flin Flon, where it was decided by the union members, steelworkers, and the mining industry, they would form a joint committee to suggest to government how best those recommendations should be implemented. That committee has been meeting, and I'm guessing at the number of times, but I suspect, if I remember right, it was October, November, December, a couple of meetings in January, I understand they have approximately three meetings slated for this month. I further understand that they didn't want to bring in a recommendation or two or three or half a dozen or a dozen at a time, they wanted to totally review the report and then bring in a total report to myself, going on to the Minister of Mines. I really think, Mr. Speaker, that the union people and the industrialists are quite capable of putting that report together and bringing it

forward to me and I don't wish to tell them how to run their business.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister avoided the question which was can he give us some indication of when we can expect those recommendations to come forward so that action will be finally taken on the report. I only need refer the Minister to his quick action on other reports and have commended him for that action and would hope that he would apply that lesson as well to this very important report which has been outstanding for some time now and there has been no movement on the part of government.

I therefore ask the Minister if he can indicate when it is that he expects, as he has promised to do in this House, to move the mines inspectorate to under the jurisdiction of the Workplace Safety and Health Branch, a recommendation of that report which was made quite blatantly so within the recommendations, an area which has been awaiting some action from the Minister for quite some time now? When does he expect to make that very rudimentary but important change in the location of the mines inspectorate as he has promised this House on numerous occasions?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Member for Churchill's concern over safety in the mines. It's just too bad it hadn't been shared by the members opposite when they were in government when they did absolutely nothing about looking at mine safety when they were in government. I appreciate the concern of the Member for Churchill. It's recognized.

The particular recommendation that he is talking about is one of 70 some odd contained within that report and it was unanimously agreed by the union people and by the industrialists and us, by government, when we were at that conference in Flin Flon that this committee would be established, names were submitted by both industry and unions. They were appointed. They have been meeting and the one particular recommendation the member is talking about is one of many that will be forthcoming. I don't remember concurring or saying that any one of them would be acted on either individually, promptly or whatever. I was waiting for the recommendations from that particular body, and as I say, I emphasize, it was unanimously agreed by the unions and the industrialists that that's the way they'd handle it. I am prepared to let them handle it in their own way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Deputy Premier and ask the Deputy Premier, in as much as spending estimates are up 14.6 percent for the 1981-82 fiscal year, can the Honourable Deputy Premier indicate to the House what approximately will be the increase in the size of the Civil Service as measured by staff man years, if that's possible at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, the answer to that will have to come out of the

examination of the Estimates. I can probably indicate to him I don't think there are substantial changes in the size of the public payroll associated with the estimates that are before the House now. The Minister of Finance indicated a couple of days ago that the number in 1981-82 were still in excess of 1,300 fewer than were under the previous government.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable . . . yes, I'm talking about staff man years, Mr. Speaker, as presented to us in the estimates. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this as a supplement. We are now in the Department of Economic Development and Tourism and the Minister advised us that the staff has increased there by 18 SMY's. It's gone up from 221 to 239, which is an increase of about between eight and nine percent. I was wondering therefore, Mr. Speaker, whether this is a pattern that we might see throughout the Civil Service now, that spending increases are expected or whether this is an exception. An eight to nine percent increase in the size of the civil service in one department, is this an exception or is this going to be a pattern that we'll see in SMY's in the next year?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in departments where there are Canada/Manitoba agreements that are under way or getting under way you will find some increases in the SMY count. The pattern that you see in Economic Development is not representative of the pattern overall in the government.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him whether he is now prepared to announce some assistance program to hog producers in the Province of Manitoba as they are continuing to face drastically reduced incomes in terms of market prices?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Not at this particular time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister how long does he expect hog producers to continue in operation having to face the disastrously low prices that they have in excess of one year already?

MR. DOWNEY: I appreciate the difficulty, Mr. Speaker, that the livestock producers are having this particular year with the higher costs of interest and other operating expenses. We have looked at it over the past year and in fact saw a substantial price increase in returns to producers about the first of July when they went up to the low 70 dollars per 100. It's unfortunate the market has slipped back to the low sixties but it is my understanding at the end of last week there was again evidence of an increase in price. I haven't had an opportunity today to assess the market but we will be looking at the industry as a whole and if there is anything to announce, if and when, it will be announced in this Chamber.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister explain the reasons for approximately 1,500 to 2,000 hogs having to be shipped outside the province, as they are not being able to be processed in the Province of Manitoba, and as well, whether or not there are any funds, since the Minister indicated that his drought assistance program was underspent by some \$20 million earlier in the year, whether or not those funds could be channelled for assistance to producers in the province?

MR. DOWNEY: I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the hogs being shipped out of the province are being done so to obtain higher returns for the producers. It is unfortunate that we had the closing of a packing plant last year in the Province of Manitoba, one that was largely due to the fact that they were enjoying the hog kill from Saskatchewan, which back in 1973 was restricted from coming into Manitoba by an action of the last government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister responsible for MHRC whether he can indicate why the government chose to make SAFER assistance contingent on pension income. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, for your benefit and the benefit of other members, it is our understanding that in order to receive such allowances it is necessary that a recipient prove if he is between the ages of 55 and 65 that some 50 percent or more of his income derives from this source; if over 65 necessary to prove that he or she has a pension benefit. Could we ask why?

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

HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister a further supplementary question. Since many persons between the ages of 55 and 65, particularly those who are at or near the minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, do not have pension benefits making up 50 percent of their meager income, we would ask whether it's the government's intention to accord them with parity with those other poor people who do? Will the government assist the working poor of this province and provide equality as between themselves and the other poor in the province?

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

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker I'll take that as notice as well.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with respect to senior citizens in this program, we would ask whether the government will amend the SAFER eligibility criteria in order to afford new Canadians who have not been in Canada more than ten years since coming from their country of origin, and therefore, do not qualify for our Old Age Pension, will he

consider with his government amending the eligibility criteria so that these senior citizens can share in the Shelter Allowance Benefits provided by the government? I note, Mr. Speaker just as for clarity and as clearly establishing the record that I understand that many such new Canadians come from countries where they do not have any pension benefits at all, countries such as the Phillipines and others and therefore these people are not currently accorded any SAFER allowances at all.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, as the Member knows I am rather new to my portfolio and because I know that he would want a very full and complete answer, I would prefer to take this question, as well as, notice and bring back the answers to all three.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Minister for Social Services whether there are persons now entitled to receive allowances under The Blind Persons' Allowances Act or The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act who have not received, in February, the moneys, the allowance equivalent to that which they received in January last?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker I'll have to take that as notice, however, I can assure the honourable member that when the Bill is approved he'll see that its retroactive so that they will received that amounts of money back to February 1 of 1981.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it is obviously a retroactive legislation that is being proposed by the Honourable Minister, may I ask the Minister whether there are people today who have not received moneys which the Minister thinks they ought to have and which therefore will be denied that money until this legislation is passed?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the honourable member I will take that as notice. If the honourable member would like to know the numbers of people involved, there are 34 people who are disabled and 19 people who are blind who are affected. The offer was made to those particular citizens who qualify for social allowance if they would go onto the social allowance rolls, those that have accepted will be paid; those that have refused to go onto the Social Allowance Assistance would come under this particular Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services concerning the poor quality of sound in this Chamber whereby hecklers are often heard above speakers and earphones are now necessary for the first time in Manitoba history. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Ministers are now confirming my comments since they can't hear my remarks. Mr. Speaker, you can

see that they are drowning me out and yet I have the microphone. I wanted to ask the Minister if he can confirm or indicate how many tens of thousands of dollars were wasted on this system, was it \$70,000 or can he tell us how much we've spent to bring in a system which is worse then the one that we had previously?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Beauty is in the eyes of the beholder. Apparently my Honourable Friend has not recognized the advantages of the present system. First of all, they were brought in to enable honourable members to receive what they wanted to hear and I notice my honourable friend never uses the ear plugs that were brought into the system for that very purpose. If he doesn't want to use them then the quality of his reception is going to be somewhat impaired. I suggest he learn to use them because I don't know of any other Legislature that does not have this kind of system. It was introduced into the House of Commons a number of years ago. The first purpose of introducing it into the House of Commons was to provide for the simultaneous translation which may occur in this legislature. So his argument and his suggestion that money was wasted installing this system is pure bunk because that's not the case. If my honourable friend wants to get quality of reception, all he has to use is the device that is provided for him and he'll get the reception at the level that he wants it, when he wants it, and when he doesn't want it. All he has to do if he doesn't like it he can take the earphone off. But if my good friend has watched the question period in the House of Commons he will note that there are other uses for the earphone. You can twirl them around like this, you can stretch them out like this from time to time and there are so many things that you can do to keep your hands busy while you are speaking and I would suggest that my honourable friend learn to use the system that is provided because it is provided for a purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Time for question period having expired we'll proceed with orders of the day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried

**CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY
SUPPLY — ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
AND TOURISM**

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden), Chairman: I call the Committee to order. We're on page 42, 1.(d)(1) pass; 1.(d)(2) pass.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: As a matter of information, Mr. Chairman, I was wondering whether the Minister has any answers for some of the questions we asked. I thought some of them were taken as notice. I don't have a list here, but I wonder if he had any answers now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'll table these with the committee, they are the answers to, I believe, the provision for travel, travel ratios in the province and out of province, out of province travel, and private vehicle mileage expenditures. Those were the questions that were asked of me and the answers are here if you'd like the list.

MR. EVANS: For clarification then, did we pass (d) last time or are we still on (d)?

MR. JOHNSTON: Did we pass (d)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declared 1.(d)(1), 1.(d)(2) passed. It wasn't signed so I assume we're on it.

MR. EVANS: I just have one question on that area. I could ask it under the Bureau of Statistics too and elsewhere. I just was wondering whether there was any attempt at all by the economists in the branch or in the department to come up with some sort of an economic development plan. After all this is the name of the department and I appreciate the fact that we are a province, we don't have that many levers to be able to manoeuvre as we'd like to, unlike the federal government that controls the money supply and the tariffs and rail transportation, etc., but nevertheless, I know it's difficult, but has there been any attempt to formulate some sort of a plan as to where Manitoba may be proceeding in the future? I know over the years there's been attempts to look at growth sectors and possibilities where there are greatest opportunities for our industrialists and businessmen, but is there now any current effort under way to formulate some sort of an economic development strategy over and above the speech made by the Minister last year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Last year in the Estimates, and I believe the year before, the province identified food and beverage, light machinery, transportation equipment, aerospace, health care products,

electronics, as all sectors of Manitoba that we believe were the ones that should be concentrated on and worked on. We also have the fashion industry which is another one that we have declared is one that should be worked on as well. We have private sector boards and the names are all submitted of the people that are on those boards last year and they're available again if the honourable members want them. There's a couple of small changes because of people who resigned or retired or felt they did not want to serve again on those boards. Those boards are advisory boards in those particular industries to the government of Manitoba.

Now we do have the occasion with these boards, such as the aerospace industry, there's a study being done at the present time on the aerospace industry. It's cost-shared with the Federal Government under Enterprise Manitoba; in fact there are several studies going on at the present time. When I say several, I mean larger ones. There is continuing feasibility studies being done by the Research Department. When the sector board recommends that we take a look at the viability of having some smaller industry go into Manitoba, or the viability of — let me put it this way, looking at the freight rates, etc., those studies are done on request.

But when you say the overall economic policy, the overall economic policy of the Province of Manitoba is first and foremost a resource industry, using our own resources to create jobs by manufacturing and processing those resources within our province, and secondly, to find industries that are properly geographically located into sectors that we have mentioned. And I might say that the food and beverage industry value of shipments has increased over '78, '79 and '80. The light machinery industry has increased, '78, '79 and '80; the transportation equipment has increased; aerospace; the capital expenditure has increased considerably in the province to produce more goods; the health care products, we just can't quite get a handle on those figures as yet. Electronics has increased in shipments over '78 and '79, a small decrease of 3.7 '80 over '79, but the capital expenditures in '80 were 50.2 percent over 29 percent in 1979. And your total manufacturing is up.

The member questions the policy of the government to increase manufacturing in the Province of Manitoba and it is being done. If the member wants to bring up the service industries, it's another ball of wax.

MR. EVANS: The Minister is going way beyond what I asked him. I asked him a very simple question, whether it was a macro economic development plan, a comprehensive economic development plan and I gather there isn't. I wasn't asking him to justify why one was up and the other was down or anything like that. There is no comprehensive plan whereby you attempt to see where you've gone and where you may be going in terms of employment of labour, in terms of future investment, in terms of future output, in terms of future personal income growth. I gather there is no general comprehensive approach being made, that the studies that are being made are microscopic, in other words, they are made of specific industries and there is not sort of overall general plan where you are trying to develop a map more or less of where

the province may be going. That's what I'm talking about, sort of a general map of where we may be going. There is no sinister meaning intent in that question. I just want that information and if there isn't any, well so be it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(d) pass. The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, we have laid down what our policy is as far as the economic development of the Province of Manitoba is concerned. The Enterprise Development Agreement is one that is identifying the areas that we believe the province should increase in. I really don't know what purpose it would serve putting people to work within the department doing a great big study that probably nobody would read, rather than work consistently on what we know are the areas of the province that should be advanced on the advice of business people and qualified people in those fields.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(d) pass; 1.(e)(1) pass.
The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: On the Bureau of Statistics there is reference in the Annual Report, page 21, 1979-80 Annual Report of the Department, to the fact that the Bureau of Statistics, or some officer thereof, chairs the Data Users Planning Committee, an inter-departmental statistical committee composed of 34 members, and that during 1979-80 three meetings were held along with several consultations. I gather one of the purposes of this planning committee is to try to avoid duplication of effort in the field of statistics within the government, and I wondered if the Minister can comment and advise whether any progress has been made toward elimination of any statistical duplication that might exist in the government service. Another question I would ask him, to what extent has the department and the bureau been able to provide its expertise to other departments thereby lessening their needs, their requirements to higher statisticians or to engage in surveys, work that could well be done by this bureau?

MR. JOHNSTON: There is a survey review system commencing April 1981 to implement a review of all new provincial government surveys under the Regulations Review Committee of Cabinet to ensure a statistical quality and to minimize response and burden. This is being worked on very steadily and then we are, in an effort to reduce duplication of efforts in future departmental data collection, agricultural MBS is co-ordinating a project, small area data development. This project is designed to determine the data needs of the various government departments by the type of data. As a result, it is expected that the MBS along with government departments will undertake to develop regional statistical information. So there is the department, the Bureau of statistics of the Province of Manitoba, MBS, is a gathering of information for all departments. I am not about to say that other departments do not have people who are not requesting information and analysing that information that comes from the Bureau of Statistics.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Could I ask the Minister specifically whether the Credit Union statistics are still done in the Bureau of Statistics or whether they have gone back to the Department of Co-op Development?

MR. JOHNSTON: I believe you asked me that question last year and I think that I answered it then. It's the same now; it's done by the Department of Co-op.

MR. EVANS: Well, okay, I expected that was the answer. Perhaps I should have rephrased it a bit. Is it still in the Department of Co-op?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, it is.

MR. EVANS: I don't recall, but what is the reason for continuing to have that done in the Department of Co-operative Development? The point as I understood, Mr. Chairman, of all this was that this was the beginning of a centralization of the collection of statistics because surely there is some benefit to have specialization in statistical gathering; you could have greater efficiency, in effect, collect reliable information at lower cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba, they were supposed to be concerned about as members of the Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, it seemed to me that we would do well to follow the path of the Statistics Canada which has successfully provided what I consider to be reliable, as reliable as you can get, statistical information and it's available to the public at large, both individuals, research groups, companies and so on, and that there was some advantage in doing it that way. The Government of Canada has seen fit and this has been the way it's proceeded since the First World War, and there was some merit, it seemed to us, that we attempt to do the same thing in Manitoba whereby you would have a bureau that could be the focal point of statistical collection to avoid unnecessary exercise. There is some advantage in a volume through-put so to speak, where you put everything under one roof and then you get the advantage of a particular expertise that could therefore presumably do the work much more expeditiously and therefore cheaper than if the work was done scattered through a dozen or two departments.

I think it's regrettable that the credit union statistics went back to the Department of Co-op Development. It was in the Bureau and it should have stayed there. It seems to me that a lot of other data, statistics that are collected by other agencies should be done in the Bureau of Statistics, hopefully with their expertise bringing about eventually a lower cost of statistical collection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Statistics sets as its objectives to plan, promote and develop integrated social and economic statistics, and I'm interested in any involvement that they had in relation to a decision made by the Minister that there was too much doom and gloom in Manitoba. I assume that there was some basis upon which he made that decision and I would like to know what the basis was, whether this was a gut reaction or whether he received information from the Bureau of

Statistics which suggested that a response be undertaken, namely a response to spend \$62,000 to promote the province and change people's attitude. My question is, was the Bureau of Statistics involved or did they initiate an action which led the Minister to undertake a program to attempt to counter it?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, I don't recall the Bureau of Statistics supplying me with any statistics regarding doom and gloom.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, then I ask the Minister on what basis he decided to expend those amounts of money which are sizable? How did he know that this was a prevailing attitude? Is this his impression from reading the press or did somebody say something to him or did a little bird tell him this or did an advertising agency come up to him and say here's a good program that you should undertake? What was the basis of his decision?

MR. JOHNSTON: I don't know that I ever, while discussing this program and I could stand to be corrected, used the words doom and gloom. I have said the program is there to encourage people to live in Manitoba, to invest in Manitoba, and know that Manitoba is a good place to work. There seemed to be some feeling that Manitobans maybe being second-class citizens as compared to the larger resource provinces to the west of us, and those are the reasons I gave for the program.

MR. DOERN: The Minister is telling us then that there was no scientific basis for his decision to spend these funds.

MR. JOHNSTON: If you mean did we spend a lot of money on a survey; if you mean did we spend a lot of money on a questionnaire; if you mean that we took a very large poll as being scientific basis; no, we didn't.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would also ask the Minister on what basis he has said repeatedly, as have other Ministers, that the fault of a negative attitude in the province, or what he perceives to be a negative attitude in the province, is solely because of the attitude and actions of the media or the political opposition in Manitoba. These apparently are the people that he sees as the parties responsible for this attitude. I ask him on what basis he makes that decision?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I answered this question Thursday night, I believe, last Thursday night, regarding the media and the Opposition.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, my question relates not to impressions of an individual but a question as to whether or not there was a scientific basis such as a survey, such as a survey taken by the Bureau of Statistics, and the answer the Minister gives is that he just felt this way or he just feels this way, and that's the basis of his decision to undertake an advertising program and spend public moneys, that there was in fact no statistical basis, or no scientific polling basis, underlying that decision. Is that what he is saying?

MR. JOHNSTON: That's not what I'm saying, that's what I said about two minutes ago.

MR. DOERN: So then the Minister has an impression, and to satisfy his impression he's spending public moneys. Mr. Chairman I say that is not an effective way to operate, namely, that is not my impression. His impression is that there are problems in the Manitoba economy which can be attributed to negative comment by the media and the political parties. It is my impression that there are problems in the Manitoba economy because of the fact that the Government has failed to tackle those problems; that the Government does not have a program to counter the serious problems in our economy and that, in spite of the fact that there are national and international problems which affect Manitoba, there is room for manoeuvre and there are programs that could be undertaken by the Government; and that instead of tackling those difficult problems head on that the department's attitude and the government's attitude and the Minister's attitude is simply to spend money on packaging rather than deal with fundamentals, spend money on paint and cosmetics in an attempt to turn people's attitudes around. I say that that is not the way to run a department or to run a government, that the government must attempt to stimulate employment and halt out-migration.

The kind of programs we're getting are simply not going to affect the real problems, they're simply going to waste money on promotional programs, and when we come to tourism I'll give an example of what I regard as a silly program that I believe the government funds in that regard, so you know I have to say to the Minister that I assume that the Bureau of Statistics is his statistical arm and are the people who would logically undertake surveys to — well they certainly undertake social and economic statistics and I assume that is the area where we should determine what some of our needs are. The Minister is saying that he simply woke up one morning and decided that they were going counter this doom and gloom and so he undertook an advertising program to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: 1. (e)(1)
The Member from Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister about a service that is now provided by the Bureau of Statistics. Again I'm reading from his last report, Annual Report of the Department, page 21: "Labour force and economic indicators are produced in computerized report form and provided monthly to departmental users the day the data is released by Statistics Canada. Monthly release dates of Statistics Canada economic data series are also provided to departments to facilitate usage". My question is, can that information be made available to others as well as to departments? It's from Stats Canada. It's public information. Could it be made available to MLA's on request?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. EVANS: Is there a mailing list for this?

MR. JOHNSTON: In the labour one it's made available the next morning, pretty well. The information comes through regarding the statistics you are speaking of. It's gathered by Statistics

Canada and it's given to the departments as they require it.

MR. EVANS: If you have some sort of a mailing list, I think it would be in the public interest to make it available to any MLA that had an interest in that. I do have an interest and I would like to be put on the mailing list.

MR. JOHNSTON: We have a series of key economic indicators to be released by Statistics Canada. This will be released in February 1981. Housing starts in urban centers, building permits, retail trade, labour force surveys, consumer index, are all released by Statistics Canada and the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics analyse those statistics.

MR. EVANS: If you have a mailing list or something like that, I would like to be put on the mailing list, Mr. Chairman. It is public information, it's just a little handier that's all. I get the daily reports of Stats Canada, but you have to pour through them and it's just a matter of convenience really, looking for material that's relevant to Manitoba.

A lot of the material that comes out of the Statistics Canada of course does not necessarily apply directly to the province of Manitoba; they're national figures or there in such a way that they are not as useful as one might like to have them, but this would be an excellent service and I commend the Bureau for undertaking it to the departments. I think there is nothing better than to have departments of any government having full knowledge that's available to make their job of administration easier. I would welcome being put on the mailing list, indeed maybe other MLA's would like to be put on the mailing list as well.

The other question I have relates to the Manitoba Statistical Review, which incidently is an excellent quarterly report and it brings together a lot of Manitoba statistics. I am surprised that there are so few subscriptions however. There are 186 subscriptions and a complimentary list of 42 for Ministers of the Crown, Statistics Canada and other statistical bureaus. It would seem to me that this statistical review too, should be made available to some members of the Legislature that might be interested in it and others, I think other agencies. It would be good to have this review, because there is a lot of work goes into it, made more available.

I am not suggesting people don't pay for it, but it seems to me that there should be more of an effort made to publicize the fact that that Bureau publication exists. I know many people in business and economic research who refer to it and know of it, but it's not known by many many others who I think could use it. I think a lot of people in the business community should be advised that it's there. It's a very useful report and I think it would be very good if the Minister would direct the Bureau to send out a letter or a pamphlet or something to a lot of the business community to tell them that there it is, some information that they might find of use to them.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, we can let the members know that this is available, if that's what the member is requesting.

MR. EVANS: And the business community. All the money is spent to put it out; 185 people pay for it,

and then there is another 42 on a complimentary list. It seems with all the money that goes into preparing we should get the maximum benefit from that effort and let as many people know, as many businesses know, as many organizations know about it, as we possibly can.

On the food price survey, I see that is continuing. Can the Minister tell us whether these departments are still utilizing the food price survey? Is it still of interest as it used to be I know to Manitoba Hydro, for example? That food price survey, I believe, compared the cost of living in various communities spatially, say to Winnipeg, whether the cost of living was higher in Gillam, for example, in various food items than it was in Winnipeg, and the same is true for, I think, 14 other Manitoba communities covered.

MR. JOHNSTON: It's still made available to Hydro, Finance, for the Department of Community Services and Corrections, Manitoba Telephone System. It's on a cost recovery basis at the present time to them.

MR. EVANS: What about the energy price survey. It says in this report is currently being conducted in 15 communities with home heating fuel indexes and average gasoline prices being produced. Is that made available to the public also?

MR. JOHNSTON: It's part of the Manitoba statistical review.

MR. EVANS: It's in the review eh? What about the accommodation occupation survey conducted monthly for travel Manitoba. It says quarterly reports along with several special reports were produced. Is that made available to the public?

MR. JOHNSTON: It's made available to all the operators and anybody in the travel industry and the public who wants that information.

MR. EVANS: The point I am making, and maybe everything is done that can be done or should be done, but the point I am making is that I think we should try to emulate Statistics Canada in the sense that we should make whatever statistics are collected of a general nature, they should be made available to the public at large, and the public at large should be advised of them. But I won't make any more of that.

Just another question then. There is reference again in your annual report to a mail survey conducted in the summer of 1980 of all manufacturing firms in the province. These firms will be contacted to identify their production capabilities. I was just wondering whether that survey was conducted and what information is available on that survey?

MR. JOHNSTON: In Manitoba the Bureau of Statistics is working with us on what we call the Sourcing Project which is for the marketing of products manufactured in the Province of Manitoba and they developed a computerized sourcing data base which identifies the supply capabilities of Manitoba manufacturing firms, and as of October 1st, 1980, 1,591, and 2,061 individual products are catalogued in this data base. There are books at the present time that have been produced that have this information in them. The sourcing program is also

used by the marketing people, they're used when the development officers are calling in their particular territories throughout Canada — not throughout Canada, mainly in western Canada and parts of United States. If we identify a project, we also use the information that we receive regarding projects to let the manufacturers know what projects are going on and then we endeavour to put them together with the people who are requiring different materials and the Sourcing Program is now starting to be very successful. There are people really starting to use it. It's an identification of products that are supplied by Manitoba manufacturers and it works the other way as well. We also identify projects that the Manitoba manufacturers can take advantage of.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask a few questions again about the government program on promotions. I don't know if it's appropriate to ask them here, if not, I'd like to know where.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would look like, committee, to be 2.(5) probably, —(Interjection)— 2.(a)(5), right. 1.(e)(1) pass; 1.(e)(2) pass; (e) pass; 1.(f)(1).

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: This is on the horseracing industry and the Manitoba Horseracing Commission, in particular. There is quite a substantial increase here in the Grant Assistance and there is also, at this time, talk of selling the track. I wonder if the Minister could begin by giving us a short justification for this increase of 60 percent and particularly what he expects to get in return for an additional \$600,000.00.

MR. JOHNSTON: The grant support, the thoroughbred purse support in 1980-81 was estimated at \$848,000 and the actual was \$1,093 million. The thoroughbred breeders' awards was \$61,700 and the actual was 243.1, giving a total for the actual of \$1,336,000.00. The Great Western Racing Circuit purse support was estimated at 69.7; the actual was 100,000; breeders' awards were \$34,000 and the actual was \$42,000.00. Sire stakes support were estimated at \$15,000 and they became 16.5 and the total of those three is 159.7. The commission administration costs were estimated at 62.6 and they were 65 bringing that total of the actual that was paid out to \$1,561,000, the explanation for the increase in the 1980-81 vote to the 1980-81 actual of 469.6. The thoroughbred purse support was raised from 1.7 of wagering to 2.25 of wagering bringing that 229.3. The thoroughbred breeders' awards were increased from a flat amount of \$61,700 to .50 of a total wagering which gave them \$181,000. Wagering at Assiniboine Downs increased from \$47.7 million to \$48.6 million requiring an increase in the funds for purse support of \$15,200.00. Support to the Great Western Racing Circuit was raised to allow for an increase in racing days from 24 to 77 days plus cost increases which was \$41,000; and a general increase to the commission for net requirements was increased \$2,700 for your total of 469.6.

At the time of the Estimates preparation, the estimated requirement for 1980-81 was \$1.6 million as provided in the 1980-81 vote plus Special Warrants. In 1981-82, request remains at this level,

subject to the decisions that may be taken as a result of present departmental review of a study of the horseracing industry in Manitoba.

The background and explanation for the passing of the Special Warrants. On Friday, April 18, 1980, the Manitoba division of the Horsemen's Benevolent and Protective Association and Manitoba division of the Canadian Thoroughbred Horse Society voted unanimously to withhold any and all entries and refuse to race at the meet scheduled to commence at Assiniboia Downs on May 2, 1980. As a result of representations made by me, by members of these organizations, it was agreed that negotiations take place between the representatives of the government and the representatives of the major parties involved in the provincial thoroughbred industry. As a result of these negotiations agreement was reached between government and the thoroughbred industry which provided for the following summary:

The first support would be a minimum of 1.75 of averaging plus an amount of \$163,000 to assist the horsemen to repay past purse overpayments.

(b) Purse support would be retroactively increased to 2.25 of the wagering if the industry review study recommended it and it was agreed that the purse support should be increased, the industry review recommended it. The study did recommend increased purse support and it was agreed that it should be provided.

The Breeders' Awards Program was to be based on .25 of the wagering and the industry review study recommended a greater amount, it should be raised to a maximum of .50. The study did recommend an increased amount and the program was retroactively adjusted upon .50 of wagering. So the increase came about because of the negotiations we entered into at the time when the horsemen had decided not to run, so we feel that 1.6 should be enough to handle this year's operation.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I think one of the key questions here is, given that the province is going to spend 60 percent more, does the Minister have any estimate on the impact on employment and taxation revenues generated by this? For example, he said in a press release last September, titled "More support set for Horse Racing", that there is about 2,000 people in the industry and that it generates some \$8 million to \$10million worth of expenditures on goods and services. Can we deduce from this that, given that kind of an increase, that there might be a substantial increase in employment like several hundred more jobs or a substantial increase in wagering and other expenditures, maybe of the order of several more million dollars? Does he expect some sort of a return on the investment that he's making on behalf of the people of the province?

MR. JOHNSTON: The tax revenue from the industry this year in 1980-81 was \$2,048,300 net and when the honourable member suggests that the increase in jobs will be created because of the increase in purses, I would like to say to him if there had not been any increase in purses whatsoever there wouldn't have been any jobs at all. The horsemen were determined that they would not run in 1980 unless there was some adjustments made and we sat down and negotiated with them.

MR. DOERN: Is the Minister saying that in terms of employment that by providing an additional

\$600,000. there will not be any increase whatsoever in employment that he anticipates?

MR. JOHNSTON: There may be some increase in employment regarding the breeders in Manitoba which is what we are trying to establish, and that is to have a stock in Manitoba which is one of the most successful ways to have a good racing industry. If the breeding stock is enlarged in the Province of Manitoba that naturally is a breeding industry which will be increasing the amount of money that they spend within, I guess, the community, the agricultural community for feed, etc., but the increase in the purses does not guarantee any increase in jobs.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, haven't the horsemen argued over the years that by having better purses and better support for the industry that you will have more public interest, better quality of horses, better quality of racing and consequently more, presumably more wagering and more expenditures. Hasn't this always been their argument? They will produce a better horse which will produce a better race which will generate more public interest. Has that not been the logic that they've put forward?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes and we agreed that they should have increased support.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask the Minister, there was a series of recommendations made on the horse racing industry, did he accept that report or did he accept the main recommendations made?

MR. JOHNSTON: At the present time we've asked every part of the racing industry, the different organizations, thoroughbred breeders and the harness, I was going to call it the harness horsemen, the track owners, etc., to review the . . . report and have meetings with our representatives that have been set up to study the report and make recommendations to the Minister.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman the Minister said in his press release through Information Services last September that the development of the industry is "being restrained" by comparatively low level of purses. Will this grant assistance now put purses in Manitoba in line with other provinces and/or states in the U.S.

MR. JOHNSTON: It will not put them in line, we will still be below, generally below the western provinces and some of the United States.

MR. DOERN: Was the purpose of this grant to raise the level of purses as well?

MR. JOHNSTON: The purpose of what grant?

MR. DOERN: The \$600,000. grant assistance.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well the assistance was paid to them on the basis of thoroughbred purse support, thoroughbred breeders awards, Great Western Racing Circuit the same purse support, breeders awards, sire stakes support. They were paid on the basis that it would increase and help the racing industry in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. DOERN: Some of those funds will go to higher purses and consequently the purses will be more competitive than before.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes

MR. DOERN: I'd also like to ask the Minister whether, given that there is — I don't know whether this has taken place — can the Minister confirm that the track has been sold? Is he aware of whether that transaction has been completed?

MR. JOHNSTON: No I can't confirm whether the track has been sold or not.

MR. DOERN: In the event that it is sold or changes hands, does the horseracing commission approve or determine the acceptability of either the new owners or any new conditions that they might impose on horseracing in Manitoba? Do they make any judgment on the owners or on the manner in which Assiniboia Downs operates in the industry?

MR. JOHNSTON: We have no control who the owner of the track sells his track to but there is The Parimutuel Tax Act of the Federal Government, there is investigation by the Finance Department. It does not necessarily follow that they will be accepted by the Federal or Provincial Governments unless extensive surveys are made. I believe there was extensive surveys made when Mr. Wright bought the track and I imagine the same thing would happen again.

MR. DOERN: I think that's all I have for now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Henry J. Einarson (Rock Lake): The Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to enquire of the Minister and I am speaking now mainly of standard bred I guess and question from the Member for Elmwood, who owns the track, is one that comes to me quite often and I have never been able to answer it. They know and the people who are in the standard bred realize they've got to somehow have an extended meet to have a healthy industry because at the moment just having a few weekends and its growing and its great to see that growing, speaking of the great western circuit. Has a Minister any change in the breeder incentive grants, I know some of racing people were in about a week ago to talk to him or his department regarding a change to make it a little more encouraging, how that's doled out in the future? Is there any basic change for next year?

MR. JOHNSTON: There has been no change recommended to me as yet. As I mentioned earlier all parties involved in horseracing in Manitoba have been asked to give their submission on the racing report, or a study, and those recommendations that they give will be taken into consideration and will have to very soon constitute a policy of the government regarding the racing for 1981-82, or 1981 in this case. I would like to be able to say to the honourable member that has been decided but it has not been completely decided as yet.

MR. MCGREGOR: What encouragement would the Minister say, or his department give, to this organization that might try an extended meet at

Portage or Carman somewhere far enough to be legally possible and yet close enough to the biggest population centre. I know they've talked, I've been at meetings in Brandon when they've talked of building a new track. Then I hear at Portage — now I don't know, what encouraging things can I take back to those groups? Because as you know, when you touch a track, Mr. Chairman, they are talking a million or a million and a half as the very minimum and that's not stables, etcetera, as the proposal just east of Winnipeg, a year, a year and a half ago, that was 7 or 8 million as I recall.

MR. JOHNSTON: Are you speaking of a new track for standard breds or are you speaking of extended . . . meets?

MR. MCGREGOR: Either one. There's a proposal to build a track at Brandon, and was also encouragement both at Portage and Carman, I believe, for an extended meet.

MR. JOHNSTON: We've had discussions with them on extended meets, at different areas. They make the proposals, they are also requesting some financial assistance to be able to do that, and that hasn't been decided as yet.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (f)(1) pass; (f) pass. 2.(a)(1) Administration: (a) Salaries, \$161,500.00

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of order. I think you now have to pass Resolution 48. —(Interjection)— One item missing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Okay. On (a)(1) we have an item providing moneys for administration and program development of Enterprise Manitoba. This is pursuant to the Canada Manitoba Industrial Development Sub-Agreement. I wonder if the Minister could advise us as to the progress that has been made at these Enterprise Centres? I believe there is one in Winnipeg and there is one in Brandon. I wonder if the Minister could give us a report on the progress of these centres both in Winnipeg and the City of Brandon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the member that we are getting into the same area as we did last year because of the Enterprise Manitoba that it does get a little bit confusing. The whole Enterprise Manitoba agreement comes under Canada-Manitoba Industrial Development Sub-Agreement that has all of the small business development centres. It has the Manitoba Food Technology Centre. Where we have it here is the administration of Enterprise Manitoba by the department, but if the member is asking me the numbers of people, etcetera that have been helped by the Manitoba branch or the Brandon branch, that all comes under the Canada-Manitoba Agreement.

This expenditure here includes the provision of 5 staff; an Assistant Deputy-Minister, manager of industrial development agreements, a director of

program development for the industrial agreements, secretary to the Assistant Deputy-Minister, and an administrative secretary. Five people are involved in this area. They are the people who ensure consultation with the private sector in the process of development programs. They are the people that bring together the sector boards that are set up, from industry, to work with them on the recommendations on the development of the program to the government and they identify and co-ordinate potential directions, opportunities and programs and resources to stimulate economic growth. Again, I think I mentioned that earlier.

Those recommendations come from the private sector boards in the different sectors and expresses this information in the form of particular business development plans and program proposals to encourage and assist the private sector. This group also works with the private sector to find and what the government should be doing to assist certain types of business and also to evaluate any studies or any surveys being done. This is the group within the province and they are a very important group that work with the agreements and with the private industry on the agreements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Could the Minister tell us the names of the Board members for the Enterprise Centre in Brandon?

MR. JOHNSTON: I'd be going from memory at the present time. I can have that for the Minister tonight very quickly, the members of the private sector board in Brandon for the small enterprise centre. I believe I have with me at the present time the members of the different private sector boards . . . I'd be going completely by memory if I were to give him that list and it's available very quickly.

MR. EVANS: A more general question then. Are the members of this board serving in a strictly honorary role, are they serving without pay or is there some form of remuneration for meetings attended and what about out-of-pocket expenses?

MR. JOHNSTON: They serve without any remuneration. There's just out-of-pocket expenses for those boards. If the Board made a decision to take a trip say around Brandon to go and look at something in Virden or there was lunches involved or travelling involved, that would be the out-of-pocket expenses; they do not receive any remuneration.

MR. EVANS: How frequently does the board meet? The Brandon board or the Winnipeg board, I guess probably follow a similar schedule. Do they meet monthly or do they meet as problems arise or just what is the pattern?

MR. JOHNSTON: Monthly, sometimes more than monthly. I know it was monthly but very often they'll meet more than that if an occasion arises.

MR. EVANS: This applies both to the Winnipeg and the Brandon Board?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. EVANS: It would seem to me among the decisions made probably the most critical decision that the board is called upon to make is with regard to who shall be a tenant in the incubation centre in this Enterprise Development Centre. I call it an incubation centre, we had done research on this in the department years ago and we were following a model. I think we're following a model in Manitoba that was in place or still is in place in Prince Edward Island. The point is of course that there are technical services available to fledgling enterprises, new entrepreneurs and that a certain amount of space is made available to such entrepreneurs after suitable screening and so on. So it seems to me that one of the most important decisions made by the board as to who, from all those who may be interested, shall come into the premises to get this assistance and virtually get a form of subsidy because the rent is quite reasonable and so on. The question is, is that correct, am I correct in that assertion and also, does the board really have the final say or is the final say made by the department?

MR. JOHNSTON: I guess you could say that the final say is made by the Minister, as I related last year the board receives recommendations from the staff. The board then sends it to what is called the Federal-Provincial Committee in the agreement. The Federal-Provincial Committee then makes a recommendation to the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a) — the Member for Brandon East.

The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: The Minister said that the recommendation first of all comes from the staff. What staff is he referring to, his staff, or does the board have a . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, to begin with, there's a lot of applications for space. The board examines that and then the staff who are working with business, in say, the Brandon area, or the Winnipeg area, department staff may recommend to the board that this particular company could be better operated and economically advanced by having space in one of the buildings. Now that is discussed by the board and recommended by the board and, as I say, it goes to a committee of federal and provincial, because the federal are our partners, and then ultimately to the Minister and I naturally take the advice of three different people who are part of the recommendation.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm asking because I'm not sure, I'm a little concerned. I've seen too many times that you have boards like that and they become rubber stamped, I mean between there and the public, for some reason. I'm certainly not saying this is the case but I'm a little concerned because the Minister stated that, first of all, the recommendation is from the staff and it's the Minister's staff to start with. At times, again I'm not accusing or anything, but the possibility is there that the government could suggest through the staff to a board, and the board can, in effect, become a rubber stamp. I hope this is not the case because you see, the staff is still the department's staff. Can the Minister elaborate the

independence of that staff, do they meet with this board before or do they have to have their recommendation, does a copy of that go to the Minister before or at the same time that it goes to the board? I'd like the Minister to elaborate, make sure that my concerns are not justified.

MR. JOHNSTON: I don't have any contact with the staff, not in my experience have I had any contact with the staff, regarding the original recommendations as far as applications or recommendations to the board are concerned.

MR. DESJARDINS: Not even policies, they're not left with policies of government . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: The policies are laid down in the Enterprise Manitoba Agreement as to whether you qualify or not. And I might say to you, the boards that we have had in place for the last two years are very independent boards. As a matter of fact I meet with the boards probably once a year at the most to just have discussion with them on how things are going. It's reported to me by my staff, the number of meetings, etc. that they have, but they are very independent boards. And the businessmen that are on them have to be approved by both Federal and Provincial government.

MR. EVANS: Of the recommendations made by these independent boards, what percentage of the recommendations are turned down ultimately by the Federal-Provincial Committee because I presume that's where the first, either agreement or disagreement occurs, because I'm not clear. Let's say the board recommends businessman X to go in, and for whatever reason, there could be a legitimate difference of opinion by some staff members or by this Federal-Provincial Committee. What percentage of these recommendations have been accepted or has there been any turned down, or invariably do these boards' recommendations get accepted as a matter of course by the committee.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, to my knowledge there have been several applications turned down by the boards and if the person wants to make a representation to the Minister, he can.

MR. EVANS: That's fine, but what I'm talking about is a board decision saying industry X or businessman Y, in their opinion, should be approved to come into the centre and then subsequently this recommendation goes to the Federal Provincial Committee. What I'm asking is, are there any of these recommendations that are turned down by the committee, or 100 percent, or is it just a matter of course that the board, the businessmen board that we talked about, these independent boards, submit recommendations and the Federal Provincial Committee more or less rubber stamp their recommendations. Is that the case?

MR. JOHNSTON: The Federal-Provincial board, in the case of Enterprise Manitoba, could turn them down coming to the Minister but I don't believe that they have turned any down coming to the Minister. Basically the decision as to whether they go in or not is with the board of the Enterprise Centre. And

certainly they submit all the information that they made their decision on.

I believe I haven't turned any down regarding — no, I haven't. I've had representation from people who have been turned down.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the Minister turns down or accepts the recommendation of the Federal-Provincial Committee. But what I'm asking is, what evidence do we have of the Federal-Provincial Committee disagreeing with the recommendations of the private boards, or has the experience been — and there's nothing wrong with a difference of opinion, I'm simply seeking information — has the experience been that the recommendations of the private boards, or the boards that are made up of private businessmen or whatever you call them, or however you may describe them, are these recommendations more or less holus-bolus accepted by the Federal-Provincial Committee or do you have experience whereby the Federal-Provincial Committee, for whatever reason, turns down a percentage, let's say, of the recommendations of the board?

MR. JOHNSTON: No. The Federal-Provincial Committee is basically there, or is there to make sure that any recommendations coming from the board qualify under the Federal-Manitoba Agreement.

MR. EVANS: That's fine but there can be a difference of opinion. The board may say, yes, businessman X should go into this particular Enterprise Centre in our view. I understand that recommendation then goes to the Federal-Provincial Committee for approval. You either approve or you disapprove of the recommendation of the board. So what I want to know is what percentage, if any of the board's recommendations are turned down by the Federal-Provincial Committee?

MR. JOHNSTON: None are turned down.

MR. EVANS: None.

MR. JOHNSTON: Because as I said, the Federal-Provincial Committee is there to make sure that the people that are recommended by the board meet the qualifications and there are qualifications laid down as to whether they qualify for the program. There hasn't been any come before the Federal-Provincial Board that did not qualify.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I heard the Minister say awhile back that there are more people that want to come into these centres than there is space for, so therefore it wouldn't be a matter of perhaps simply whether you qualify or not as to whether who goes in first, who comes in second, and who comes in third, let's say of space available. I mean there is that type of problem.

MR. JOHNSTON: I'm informed that we're not 100 percent full yet. I knew we weren't as of the beginning of January, not 100 percent full and we're not 100 percent full now.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, this was my question earlier on, but I understood we were going to get the

information this evening, and that was with regard to what the capacity of the centres were and how many establishments were in them so we could see to what extent they were being fully utilized. So I was going to reserve a discussion of that until this evening, because I thought this was where the numbers would come up.

MR. JOHNSTON: The actual numbers will come up under the Staff that's here. I'd be going again by memory, or a month old, as to how many of the areas in Brandon are empty at the present time or in Winnipeg, but it will come up under the Manitoba Industrial Development agreement, Sub-Agreement "Enterprise Manitoba".

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a).
The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of information, what about the assistance in Regional Development Corporations? Is the administration for the Regional Development Corporations still under this item? I think it is and I want to know also where are the moneys for the Regional Development Corporations, or is that under the Canada-Manitoba Agreement also?

MR. JOHNSTON: The funds for the Regional Development Corporations were two years ago turned into the Manitoba Industrial Development Sub-Agreement "Enterprise Manitoba".

MR. EVANS: The administration of the Regional Development Corporations — by administration, I mean the departmental concerns specifically with the RDCs — come under this item, do they not?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, if you have a question now, yes . . .

MR. EVANS: We can discuss it here later but it's comme ci, comme ca. Is that okay? Is it still the case that we have six regional development corporations in the province? As we know, about a couple of years the WestMan Development Corporation decided on their own to fold up, so we had seven then, we reduced to six. Your last annual report refers to six. I'm just wondering has there been any change in that or is there any indication of any change?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, there is no change in that. There is still six. WestMan has not decided to have a Regional Development Corporation since they went on their own, packed it up, I think, it was three years ago.

MR. EVANS: I appreciate the department has the enterprise centre there, but inasmuch as the main centre in the WestMan region is in the City of Brandon and inasmuch as there is no WestMan Development Corporation now, has the department or the Minister given thought to providing some funding to the City of Brandon and other communities that might have some industrial development thrusts to assist them? Because as it is now, there is no funds in this area going into the WestMan area. I mean it's unfortunate; it's a decision

that was made there. I know some of those communities I think would like to have some continuing assistance and I was wondering whether there is any consideration given to providing some financial assistance. I know the City of Brandon incurs quite an expenditure to maintain an industrial development office, and I repeat I know the centre is there so that is something, but in terms of the general assistance that used to be provided with three of the regional development corporations, that no longer is available.

MR. JOHNSTON: Brandon decided to have its own industrial commissioner and they made that decision on their own. We have had discussions with other areas in the WestMan region of forming a WestMan group held without having Brandon in it, and that is still being pursued, but it's not a fact at the present time. But there is going into the Brandon EDC, Industrial Development Centre of the province, about \$460,000 through Enterprise Manitoba. The fact that we have the EDC there is a very large benefit to Brandon and the surrounding area, but Brandon, I know, wants to have their own industrial commission.

MR. EVANS: To what extent has the Minister become involved with some of the general thrusts of the Regional Development Corporation? Is there any attempt to co-ordinate what they are doing? Does the Minister meet with the presidents from time to time or just what if any guidance, that is with regard to co-ordination and liaison goes on between the department and the Regional Development Corporations?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, certainly with EastMan we have had some discussions with their director. You see, the member is well aware of how these are set up. They are set up, boards are elected by the towns who support the Regional Development Corporation. They vote on and set up their own president and directors of their corporation. They hire their own director and if they have 60 percent, I believe, of the towns and population if I'm not mistaken, as members of their corporation we fund them to the extent that we have been for the past many years. The decisions on what their development corporations do is very much up to their boards. Certainly we're concerned that they spend time with each of their members assisting them in any way they can for development within their area. We have a person who is in very close contact with most of them all the time. Mr. Bergman is retired and on staff as my special assistant, but he keeps a very close contact with the industrial development corporations, but it certainly comes under the Assistant Deputy Minister, but their operation is one that we don't control.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1) pass; 2.(a)(2) pass; 2.(a)(3) pass.
The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: 2.(a), I thought you were going to say 2.(a)(b). Did you say 2.(a)(b), 2.(b) rather?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(2) pass; 2.(a)(3).

MR. EVANS: 2.(a)(2)(b) Other Expenditures, \$767,000.00. Could the Minister advise what's under

that? I was under the impression that most of the other expenditures on technology were covered by the Canada-Manitoba Industrial Agreement relating to technology and if he could elaborate on that large item we would appreciate it.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the increase on the Other Expenditures, \$767,700, and the major items and professional fees is 26.9; grants to persons in non-profit organizations, science fairs are \$3,000.00; the University of Manitoba Engineering Department, \$722,000.00.

MR. EVANS: Could the Minister elaborate on what that — I think he said \$722,000 to the Engineering Faculty at the University? Could he explain what is that money meant for?

MR. JOHNSTON: The University of Manitoba Engineering Department made a presentation to my department on the basis that the accreditation for the Faculty of Engineering at the University of Manitoba was in possible danger of losing their accreditation. The University at that time did not feel that they could expand the engineering department any further. A brief and presentation was made to myself, which in turn was made to the Economic Development Committee of Cabinet, and Cabinet approved an expenditure in 1980-81 of some \$300,000; in 1981-82 of 767,700, the figure you see here; and in 1982-83, \$1 million, which comes to a total of approximately \$2 million to the Faculty of Engineering in the University.

This is very similar to what is done by the Department of Agriculture to the Agricultural Faculty. One of the reasons being the teaching and research, and industrial and computer engineering, that will be set up so that the university will be able to work more closely with industry in this province and work more closely with the development of the economics in this province. There is no question that having a university together with your technology centres and also working with the micro-electronics centres is a very definite benefit to the economic development of the province. It would have been a very serious situation if the University of Manitoba had ever lost their accreditation, the Faculty of Engineering. The faculty has given us cash flow and all of the intentions is how the money is to be spent, so it's a program of \$2 million over a three-year period to the Faculty of Engineering.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that I support any assistance that we can give to ensure the Engineering Faculty retains its accreditation and I think it's important that our university in general maintains standards, in fact, improves standards. But as the Minister describes it, I'm not clear that this is really moneys that can be considered to be related specifically to Economic Development. I'm not clear from what the Minister says. He explains that there is going to be statements of how they spend the money and explains that it's a good backup for industry and so on and technological improvement in the province, but I'm not clear whether these moneys are being spent specifically on particular projects that the department identifies, that the department assists them with, the Engineering Faculty assists them with,

or is it like a grant similar to what the Universities Grants Commission might make to the university and say, well, here is so much money, you do your thing with it. As the Minister describes it, it would seem to me that it would be more fitting that such moneys be made available to the University of Manitoba through the Grants Commission.

The university has made it very clear over the years, the students, the faculty and the administrators that they have not had sufficient funds through the Grants Commission. The funding has not kept pace with inflation up until this year. In the past years we have been cutting back in real terms the amount of funds available to the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg and Brandon, and it would seem to me that if we want to ensure accreditation standards, for example, in the Faculty of Engineering, the more logical place to do this would be in the funding by the Universities Grants Commission and that is in keeping with the intention which was laid down many many years, where the Government of Manitoba would give moneys on block to the universities not to interfere or infringe on academic freedom or the academic programs of the universities. It seems to me the way we're funding in this particular instance is to some extent well meaning as it may be, and I'm not questioning the Minister's motives or the department's motives, this is not the ideal way to fund the university. If we want to ensure a good quality engineering faculty, then that should be funded and recognized by the Grants Commission and adequate money should be made available.

It's not clear from the Minister's explanation that this is some particular type of expenditure that's going to relate to some particular program or set of programs by the department, it's simply not clear. I say that while we welcome the support for the university, this is not the way to do it.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, you have a situation in the Department of Engineering; you've got rapid changes in industrial like we've never seen before. The equipment and everything that they require to be able to keep up with the rapid changes in industry at the present time, plus the computer engineering that I mentioned earlier, was such that the Faculty of Engineering needed this assistance to be able to continue to assist and even assist much more than they have been, industry within the province. If you take a look at Stanford, or you take a look at any of the areas where you have a large industrial base, you will find that you have a very strong engineering faculty within the university that works with industry. The changes that were being made that required new equipment and some more staff to be able to do this were such that they made a presentation to my department, the Department of Economic Development, on the basis that over a three-year period if they had this assistance they would be able to, as of one time or over a three-year period, a one-time grant or assistance, they would be able to have the engineering department structured in such a way that it would become of benefit to the economic industry of the Province of Manitoba. The request was made to the department and it was considered very seriously and ultimately the Cabinet had to approve that these funds would be directed specifically to the Engineering Department. Now the

Universities Grants Commission — and I must say that I can't be technical on this just exactly how it works, the Minister of Education could probably be better on that, but the moneys that go through the Universities Grants Commission or to the universities can be sidetracked for say another faculty. We felt that the engineering faculty of the Province of Manitoba needed this particular special assistance at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I can see the concern of the Minister but by the same token I think that practically every department can feel the same thing. The Department of Health might decide that they want a chair in geratology at the University in Medicine or something. Will that mean that the Department of Health would finance that and it might be that another department, the Department of Agriculture, Mining and so on, isn't that kind of eroding the system of letting the university decide? I haven't got the answer myself at this time.

I think I know what the Minister is trying to do but — sometimes all these things start with good intentions. The first thing you know you're going to control the university and that's my concern. It might be a good thing to do at times, the same thing as the Department of Health. The government might have to do something, to say, hey, this is what we want even if it's not the first priority of something else, but there is a difficulty and it could lead to problems later on.

MR. JOHNSTON: I know what the member is saying when he says it could lead to others. We do it, and the Department of Agriculture has done it for years because Agriculture has been the feature department at the University of Manitoba on the basis that agriculture is our No. 1 economic thrust.

We have no intention of trying to control the University. I could only say that the decision to do this was done on the basis of — there was another group, the Engineering Association of Manitoba were also part of the recommendation with the University and it was studied very thoroughly. We could have done it two ways, I guess. We could have said to the Universities Grants Commission, here is this money providing it goes to the Faculty of Engineering, which would be close to doing the same thing. The money has been provided through this department.

MR. DESJARDINS: Maybe that's the way it should be done because you have the Grants Commission and they're looking at that. I don't think and I'm not saying, I want this clear, that the department shouldn't say or the Government of the Day shouldn't say, well, we want to go in that direction. I think that, you know, they represent the public and so on, but in a way you're undermining. If it comes directly to the department, you are undermining. I think, the Grants Commission and you're causing another way of — they say that if you make a lot of noise, you will get more action. You are encouraging different groups like that to go directly to the Minister concerned.

MR. JOHNSTON: This wasn't done without a lot of discussion with the University and they had no

objection to it going that way or being done that way. They were in complete agreement that the Faculty of Engineering did need this kind of extra support and quite frankly they came to the Department of Economic Development, where I must say that I had some concern — we're repeating ourselves — over their accreditation, and had some concern that if they didn't have these funds they would not be able to take their place in Manitoba with the assistance now to industry.

If it goes through the Grants Commission, as you say, with instructions — and I mentioned earlier that I'm not technically qualified on that. I guess it could have been done that way, that the complete assurance that the moneys went to the Faculty of Engineering might not have been there. This way it goes to the Faculty of Engineering. I'm not too sure when the 300-and-some-odd-thousand was passed out last year that it didn't go directly to the University specifying for the Faculty of Engineering. The cheque is payable to the University, but not through the Grants Commission.

MR. EVANS: It's one thing to provide moneys for the Faculty of Engineering to get some input to help industrial development, but when the Minister says we're afraid of the Faculty losing its accreditation and that's why we're giving the money — that, Mr. Chairman, really is tantamount to becoming very much involved in the general administration problems of the University. Surely that is a problem for the total University Board of Governors and administration to be concerned with. I'm sure they're convinced and concerned that the accreditation must be maintained, and I think, you know the road to hell is paved with good intentions. I know they were good intentions, but I'm saying this is an unfortunate way to fund our universities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 4:30 having arrived, I move the committee rise for Private Members' Hour.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): I direct the honourable members' attention to Page 9 of the Main Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Resolution No. 8, Clause 2, Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation — Administration pass.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On Friday we left off, I don't know whether the Minister has his staff coming yet. There's no one from Crop Insurance. I did have one or two more questions on the reserves that came to mind since speaking to him after the period of adjournment and that was the, as I understood the Minister he indicated that the amount of reserves that the Corporation had was adequate enough to cover all the claims that are estimated up to this point for 1980 of the possibility of \$42 million worth of claims.

I wanted to know, Mr. Chairman, since there was, I think, \$6 million worth of provincial reserves, and I think he's indicated there was \$18 or \$20 million worth of federal reserves, or a total of \$36 million in reserves, how is that reserve fund built up? In what

way does it build up every year or how do we reach that amount of reserves that we've had over the years? How is it accumulated?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: There is an annual amount paid in to the reinsurance program on an annual basis.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I am assuming that that annual amount is on a prorated basis between the province and Ottawa or does it come out from the premium income that farmers pay in. Is that how it's accumulated?

MR. DOWNEY: The deduction is made from both the percentage paid by the Federal Government and by the farmers' premiums.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, then therefore the fund is built up primarily on the basis of the premium income of farmers and, of course, the 50 percent subsidy that farmers receive on the premium income, and out of that amount a percentage . . . is it an automatic percentage that goes into the fund annually based on the premium income?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it is a variable amount depending on the coverage and the premiums.

MR. URUSKI: How is that variable amount determined? Is there a set formula that this occurs or is that sort of an actuarial guesstimate that is made by personnel at the Corporation as they view the progress of the year in terms of their prognosis of whether claims and the like — Is that the way it's determined?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it is a set formula by agreement when it was initially put in place, so it is a set formula which is a part of the agreement on the reinsurance program with the Federal Government.

MR. URUSKI: Yes. I understand that the formula has been set by a 1960, some agreement which is approximately 20 years old. Does that formula also provide for the amount of moneys that are set aside in the reserve, that agreement provides how . . . what percentage of funds goes in annually into the reserve or is that amount determined by staff of the Corporation in consultation with the federal people?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, it's not determined annually by staff, but it is by formula that's in the agreement.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Is it possible for the Minister to indicate, is it a different formula than the one in terms of the reserves of the 2 percent of coverage that the province picks up and then it's shared 75-25 between the province and Ottawa? This is how the reserves are paid out if the claims exceed, and how is the formula as to the payout into the reserve made up? If that's not available I'd like to know.

MR. DOWNEY: The formula that the member referred to is not 2 percent, it was 2.5 percent as a

matter of correction. The details of the formula I can get for the member, but I don't have the specific here. Nothing has changed over the last 20 years or since the agreement was put in place. I think it was less than 20 years, but it's been working very well.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, when we spoke on Friday about the current review that is being conducted of the Corporation's practices and the dissatisfaction in some quarters of rural Manitoba with the Crop Insurance Program — when does the Minister hope to have the recommendations and how does he intend to deal with those recommendations in terms of policy and changes. What does he foresee in terms of timing? Are there going to be changes additional to those already announced in terms of coverage and the like this year? What can farmers expect from this process?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I would expect very little change as far as the actual coverage because we have to have that in place at the beginning of the seeding period, so I would expect very little actual change as far as dollars and cents coverage as opposed to . . . I would think basically there may be some administrative type changes or that type of thing that may be implemented this year as far as procedure and operation of the Corporation is concerned. But as far as actual coverage, no I wouldn't anticipate seeing anything more than has already been announced in the schedules that have gone out to the agents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause (2).
The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister outline, although there have been publications from time to time I may have missed some of them on the Corporation, the basic changes generally speaking for this coming year?

MR. DOWNEY: Could the member repeat that again please?

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister outline the changes that there have been to coverage and to the program since the experience of last fall — the new changes for this coming year in crop insurance?

MR. DOWNEY: Basically, Mr. Chairman, the coverage for sunflowers will be increased significantly over the past year, plus there will be a change in the coverage for both utility and hard wheat. As I indicated the other day, I believe I answered that. Utility wheat will be separated from the hard spring wheat when it comes to determining the yields and the production from both crops.

Another change was, there will be higher coverage for sugarbeets and potatoes. Copies of the specifics and the changes are in a news release that was released on January the 2nd for specific details on that particular crop insurance changes.

Basically, as I indicated the other day, the amounts in general will be in favour of the farmer with higher coverage and lower yields. I notice that the Manager of the Crop Insurance Corporation did stay over, he was in to a meeting this morning. If there are any further questions that he may be able to answer, I

could have him come down to, but I wasn't aware that he was still here. So if there's any further questions of the management I can have him come into the Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to ask you questions on this particular department.

I'm also receiving a lot of criticism on Manitoba Crop Insurance and a lot of concern is expressed by producers in my area. I would like to ask the Minister, in view of the fact that he has just mentioned that there will be no basic changes insofar as the insurance coverage and so on for this year that there has to be a package in place, but he did mention that there would possibly be some administrative changes. I'm just wondering if the Minister could perhaps clarify just what he means by that and what type of administrative changes does he envisage insofar as administration is concerned? I would like to know also about the board members; I would like to know . . . I believe I missed what was said on the review, doing the review on Friday, and perhaps the Minister could just repeat what he is doing as far as the review is concerned; the makeup of the board members, the length of their terms and if there's a high turnover as far as board members are concerned?

I'm just wondering, in view of the fact that there are so many complaints coming in not only on crop insurance but on other agricultural matters as well such as plant breeders' rights and other farm problems, I'm wondering if the Minister would consider setting up a Legislative Committee, members of a Legislative Committee to go out and hear firsthand on a number of farm issues, such as Manitoba crop insurance, the plant breeders' rights, the Crow rates and a lot of other very important issues that are of concern and are getting a lot of publicity at the present time?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe the majority of the questions that were asked have been answered last Friday in this Chamber and I will try and keep it very brief and point out to the member that there were some changes, increased coverage in sunflowers and sugar beets and potatoes. I've referred to the press release that went out on January the 2nd. There was a change in the calculation of the returns from both the . . . or instead of calculating the returns of bread wheat and utility wheat they have been separated and each wheat is now covered individually.

The member asks the question of the Review Committee. It is a one-man review, it is being conducted by a one-man review. I've invited input from members opposite through their agricultural critic and farmers to sit down and document their concerns. What I said was, as far as changes that may be implemented this year as far as the crop insurance is concerned would probably be administrative, that in fact the rates and the coverages have already been announced for the coming year and it wouldn't be possible at this time to make changes. In reference to anything more I think, Mr. Chairman, would be repetitive of what I

said last week, and I think that it would be best to proceed on with the next item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes. On the questions I asked in regard to the board members. What is the makeup of the board members?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Lakeside, Minister of Natural Resources, has indicated that it is in the report. There was only one turnover and that was shortly after the last election and the numbers on the board are relatively the same, Mr. Chairman, but it is in the Annual Report, which I did table on Friday.

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

MR. SAM USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would give us some idea of what role he expects the Government of Canada to play with respect to any changes in the program for the insuring of crops in Manitoba, if any.

MR. DOWNEY: As I indicated last Friday also, Mr. Chairman, that it was a provincial-federal agreement, 50 percent of the premiums are paid by the Federal Government, 50 percent by the farmers and the administrative costs carried by the province. What I indicated at that time that any major change that would affect the Federal Government would have to be discussed with them and until that time arrives I would be unable to answer that part of it. So far I would have to say that we've had a good working relationship with the Federal Government and our Crop Insurance Corporation, that if all agreements worked as well as that I think we would have a pretty good working relationship.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would simply ask the Minister to give us some statement of intent. Is it his intent that the review of the current Crop Insurance Program be based on a premise that there would be revisions to it that would in fact involve federal participation or whether it would be exclusive of the federal interest?

MR. DOWNEY: I cannot answer that at this time, Mr. Chairman, because I don't know what the results of the review will be.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, there must have been terms of reference that were issued to the review chairman. I think it's a one-man commission as I recall it. So certainly his terms of reference would indicate what it is the Minister wants him to look for or to look at and to report on, and certainly those terms of reference would be revealing in themselves as to whether or not they would impinge on Federal Government interest or not. Perhaps you might give us an idea or description of those terms of reference then.

MR. DOWNEY: Basically, Mr. Chairman, I would suspect that, and this is only my interpretation at this time, that there wouldn't be required or there wouldn't be any major changes required that would

affect the Federal Government, but as I say that will have to be determined following the report.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, one of the criticisms of the Crop Insurance Program on the part of those participating in the program and those not participating has been and continues to be that they feel that the insurance benefits are not rewarding enough, that they are too low, and therefore if we are going to deal with that question, then it obviously does impinge on the Federal Government's interest in the whole program. Therefore it does mean, Mr. Chairman, that it would have to involve all of the provinces who are participating in the federal-provincial agreement on crop insurance. So that, in essence, this could only be resolved at a federal-provincial conference where there would be agreement to greater cost-sharing on the part of the Government of Canada if indeed the farmers, according to the findings of this commission, are willing to pay a greater portion of the premium themselves. That is, if the formula is to remain 50 percent premium paid by the producer and 50 percent paid by the Government of Canada, at least if it is found that the producer is willing to up the premium level on his part, provided the national government ups its input, then obviously this has to be a Federal Government decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 2. pass.
The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I'm not sure whether the Minister is getting information from his staff to reply to the Member for Lac du Bonnet, but I wanted to ask the Minister — he has ignored my suggestion in his reply to my comments awhile ago that a Legislative Committee be set up on agriculture to go out into the rural areas and obtain the views from the producers so that members of this Legislative Assembly from all parties would have a firsthand rapport with producers on many issues of concern to producers today. I'm wondering if the Minister would care to comment whether he supports such a Legislative Committee or whether he opposes such a Legislative Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that type of a committee has been used for certain types of reviews in the past. It was not the decision of the board or the government to proceed in that way on this particular review. We've decided to proceed with a one-man review and inviting input from members of this Assembly and from the agricultural community to put in their submissions directly to the individual conducting the review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2. pass; Resolution No. 8, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,689,100 for Agriculture, Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation — Administration, \$2,689,100 pass; Resolution No. 9, Clause 3. Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation — the Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: I touched briefly, Mr. Chairman, on the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation in the

initial opening statement. As I indicated in my opening remarks, there is of course concern within the farm community that they are able to continue to obtain funds and, of course, funds that will enable them to operate their businesses. I think it's important as well, Mr. Chairman, that the individuals who are selling their farm operations, whether they be father to son, in-family transfers, or in fact if an individual is prepared to leave a percentage or a portion of their funds that they would normally be getting from a farm sale, if in fact they wanted to leave some of those funds invested in that farm, we should as a government organization or a credit corporation give consideration to the guaranteeing of that kind of an in-house transfer of land. That, Mr. Chairman, we will be further looking at, the ability of doing that.

I may also add that since the introduction of our program in 1978, when we re-entered the direct lending field, we have seen with the rebate program over \$500,000 being rebated to young farmers in the interest rebate program. I think that it's also important to note that we have seen some increase in the numbers of comprehensive loan guarantees, something in the neighbourhood of 66 loans now guaranteed to just under \$3.5 million.

I believe it's also important to work towards increasing the amount of money which the province will lend out on a direct loan. I do not totally think that making more and lower credit is always the total answer to helping the farm community, although it is one mechanism that is available to government and one which I support and will continue to work to improve.

I think the main objective should be to continually increase the returns to farmers so that they can cope with the higher costs of interest and higher cost of energy. So we will be working in a total way to try and improve the well-being of the farm community.

I would also say that I think that basically there has been a concern that we possibly haven't lent to as many people as what some of the people in the farm community feel we should. However, I think that it would always be easy to be the lender of first resort if there were enough funds available, but I do think that there is room for the banking industry, as well as the government lending agencies, to work to provide the funds to carry on with the operations of the farmers of today.

Mr. Chairman, I think that in discussing the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation that it is as I said a valuable tool and I would welcome input from members of both sides as far as their thoughts on the whole program that is available.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In hearing the Minister's announcements or thoughts on how the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation should be operating, we've heard announcements throughout this year by this Minister indicating that he was going to reform farm credit in the Province of Manitoba. There was some big announcements indicating that this Minister was going to make some fairly wide-ranging changes in the form of agricultural credit.

There have been several articles and here is a statement that says, "Manitoba Agriculture Minister,

James Downey, has promised reforms to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation as part of the Lyon's government Throne Speech promise to support family farms." Mr. Chairman, we have yet to witness any type of change that this government is proposing other their fundamental change in terms of providing the bulk of the Corporation's loan capital to the purchasing of land. That's the point that we raised earlier on in our debate.

What we have seen, Mr. Chairman, in this last year and the Minister was warned by members on this side, not only because of the weather, but because of the high interest rates that farmers were facing, they were facing a very grave shortage of operating capital and there is very little that can be shown or the Minister can point out that there has been any change to provide short-term capital to farmers, who are in desperate financial situations.

Mr. Chairman, what we have seen throughout the years is that farm bankruptcies have been climbing and I believe that we are just seeing the tip of the iceberg in terms of what is happening in rural Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. Yet we have really very little direction from this government that has vowed to alter drastically farm credit policy, but what we have seen, Mr. Chairman, is a philosophical bend of this government to make sure that any of the previous programs that were in place are done away with if possible and one way to do it is to make sure that any and all of the land that was purchased under the former Provincial Land Lease with Option to Purchase Program now that is happening.

But you see, Mr. Chairman, the irony of it all is that if the situation worsens in rural Manitoba, what you will see is that the province after providing all this capital, putting this capital on the market, will end up taking back all that land, Mr. Chairman, but they are doing it in such a very — what one could indicate, a very surreptitious way, Mr. Chairman. They have put in a program that indicates that there is all kinds of funds available for the purchase of land, but in order to, Mr. Chairman, entice farmers to purchase that land, since they've had a relatively good deal in terms of long-term leasing arrangements, what is the next best way to have those farmers buy that land? Well, Mr. Chairman, you go and you inflate the price of land to what you think might be the market value today and then you double the lease rates, because that's really what is happening, and you make it more attractive for the farmers to borrow the money, go further into debt and purchase that land, so that you can get up on the hustings and say, see, all that land that was purchased by the former government is now being owned by farmers and they wanted to take advantage of this.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to show you what is really happening. Here's the case, Mr. Chairman, of a farmer who in 19, I believe it was 1975 sold a half section of land, part of his holdings to the Corporation for an amount of roughly \$40,000 at that time, five years ago, Mr. Chairman. That happened five years ago, and his lease rate at 5 percent was roughly, I believe, \$2,000, I have those figures here and I will give them to the Minister shortly, Mr. Chairman. The lease rate was around \$3,000, \$3,160 roughly in his last lease rate under MACC. So fine, 1980 comes along, his five-year agreement for the

renewal of the lease comes in, and of course the land is re-evaluated and the new lease rate comes into play.

Mr. Chairman, the former lease rate was at 5 percent of the purchase price that the Corporation had, which was at a subsidized rate, and this year's lease rate would be at 6 percent. Six percent of course sounds like a very reasonable figure, Mr. Chairman, and it is, but the fact of the matter is what comes into play is the new value of the land, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: It's your own policy.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says it's our own policy. Let us look, Mr. Chairman, at what land prices have escalated over the last number of years and you know, Mr. Chairman, even if land prices had escalated at 15 percent every year, which I think in a lot of areas of the province they haven't, but even if it did the new lease rate that was reflected in this individual's lease far exceeds the 15 percent mark per annum, and that is even if you compound that interest at 15 percent, if you put an amount of 15 percent onto the capital value of \$40,000 the amount would be less, would be less and far less, Mr. Chairman, than the present rate.

What has happened, Mr. Chairman, is the rate this year has virtually doubled in terms of the actual amount. So how do we arrive at what the land was evaluated at? Well, you take 6 percent of the new rate and the new rate is in excess of \$6,000 and you figure out that the land within five years at a selling price of roughly \$40,000 has now exceeded \$100,000, because to get that \$6,000 figure you have to have land that has virtually more than doubled within five years.

In an area, Mr. Chairman, of a province where land prices have escalated, albeit they've escalated throughout the entire province, but not to that extent. So, Mr. Chairman, while the Minister can sit there and say that was your policy in the agreement, what you're in effect doing is over-extending the policy in terms of the value of the asset in order to make it, because right now the gentleman says, look, even though I don't want to buy, because I believe that my capital is tied up, I would have to go into debt a greater amount, but in order for me to have my lease rates doubled I'm forced to buy, because now even if I borrow at the current rate of interest it is less expensive for me to purchase and pay the new interest rates than to pay the current lease rate of the over-inflated value of the price of land, Mr. Chairman.

The Tories indicated at the time, if you remember the Conservative Party indicated that we were overpaying for land. The land was being bought and the government was the single and sole factor of rising prices of land, because if the government would get out of the marketplace and stop purchasing land, Mr. Chairman, then land prices would drop.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the government got out of the purchasing of land in 1977, but yet this government indicates that within five years this parcel of land has more than doubled in terms of its value. It had to increase from \$40,000 to in excess of \$100,000, Mr. Chairman, —(Interjection)— over \$100,000 to get the new lease rates in five years, Mr. Chairman. That is

how they have evaluated the new asset on their MACC.

Mr. Chairman, now what they are really saying is that you must buy, Mr. Chairman, because we want to get rid of this land and in order for us to get rid of this land to tell people that everybody wants to own land is we change the leasing arrangements, we increase the value of the asset far above what the five-year average of land price increases has been and that's how we tell people of Manitoba that they really want, and to pride themselves in ownership of land. This is coercion of the worst degree, Mr. Chairman. That is really what this government is practicing. But the irony of it all is that . . . Mr. Chairman, you know when they loan the money exclusively for the purchasing of land, Mr. Chairman, what you will find is, as things get tough, the government will end up being the landlord in any event, Mr. Chairman. They will be repossessing and unless they will write everything off and let things go —(Interjection)— well, wild predictions, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Finance says wild predictions, Mr. Chairman.

The bankruptcies in the farming sector have gone up substantially in the last year, Mr. Chairman. Last year in Canada, in Manitoba, the Statistical Information Officer of the Federal Government showed last year 154 non-farm bankruptcies of roughly \$13.9 million in contrast to 90 the year before valued at some 7.1. So there's been a doubling, a virtual doubling, in terms of the non-farm bankruptcies and, Mr. Chairman, the farm bankruptcies have gone up from one in '79 to nine in 1980. That doesn't even calculate or make known of any . . . Mr. Chairman, the drought was in 1980 and that's when the bankruptcies occurred, Mr. Chairman. Let's wait till 1981, but the fact of the matter is the actual bankruptcies are nine times of that in '79. Mr. Chairman, that doesn't calculate any of the farmers who virtually sold out and closed their doors before the final padlock came, before the foreclosure notice came.

The Minister of Agriculture well knows of the instances in the hog industry where farmers and producers have had to close their doors. What happens right behind the time that they close the doors. Here's a beautiful ad in the paper, Mr. Chairman. Your opportunity to become a Manitoba hog producer. Cargill Pork Systems may be the answer for Manitobans who are sincerely interested in becoming part of a vital hog industry, Mr. Chairman. There's how the credit situation is followed up where there is either a closure, be it voluntary or the like, here's the answer to farmers, to hog producers of Manitoba. All that you have to do, Mr. Chairman, is you provide your management skills and the production facilities, the Cargill Pork Services will assume all market risks; Cargill will provide genetically superior stock, professionally formulated feeds and swine management assistance. So everything, Mr. Chairman, is well provided to the producers of Manitoba by Cargill Grain.

There is the answer of the Agriculture Minister of this province to hog producers in Manitoba. There is your answer in terms of assistance to those producers. That's how we will manage the credit system in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, what we have found in reviewing the last year's report, we have found that approximately,

by looking at this, close to 70 percent of all moneys were for land purchases that MACC had under its portfolio. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, what the figures and percentage of the amount of money and the amount of money that was made available to farmers in the year 1980. We note a substantial increase in the guaranteed loans, Mr. Chairman, from \$263,000, I believe, to now \$3.5 million, that's what the Minister indicated in the Guaranteed Loans Program when he opened his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, those three areas should tell the government something in terms of the way farmers are being squeezed in terms of their financial position and we have all kinds of promises and statements that farm credit policy will be redone. We have heard nothing from this Minister that there is going to be any changes in terms of lending approach; no changes, or at least we await some changes whether or not he's proposing in the events to at least put on the books we urged him last year. This year, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know the Minister's views with respect to the possibility of farm debt, moratorium legislation, Mr. Chairman, in the event that we strike off another bad spring and, Mr. Chairman, the prognosis certainly isn't very good in terms of this time of year, in terms of the amount of moisture and the like. Although we've had some rains last fall, the outlook certainly isn't promising.

I await the Minister's comments as to how he intends to change borrowing, the figures of the direct loans, the guaranteed loans and all the numbers of loans that have been approved in the Corporation up to this time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there may be other members of the opposition that want to comment before I respond. (Interjection)— I'll make it very brief then in case some of them do want to get involved in the debate.

I would first of all like to say, when it comes to comparing what the Land Lease Program had done for the agricultural community as opposed to our lending program, I think the figures pretty clearly state what the facts are. Under the Land Lease Program there were some 569 farmers who took advantage of the Land Lease Program for a total of 223,231 acres and in the period of 1973 to 1979 in that program the last government — till '78, I'm sorry, till the end of '78 — when that program was wound down, some \$22,637,000 was put into the farm community to assist the agricultural community.

I would think it's fair to put on the record, Mr. Chairman, direct loans, in the period of July, 1978 to March 31 of 1980, of \$32.5 million were made to well over 1,000 producers in this province; \$22 million of that used in land purchases. So what I'm basically saying is that in the period of '73 till sometime in 1978, five years, the New Democratic Party put \$22 million into 569 farmers and it took one-and-a-half years to put that same amount in to assist the farmers in the period of 1970, July of '78 to 1980. In a year-and-a-half there was 22 million went into land sales or to land purchases for young farmers, particularly young farmers. I believe 99 percent of the money went to young farmers, whereas it took five years to put \$22 million and thank God that it did, because that was a direct state farm program. So there is no question in the minds of the farmers of Manitoba what they want to do as far as

borrowing money is concerned or whether they want to enter into a state farm program. It's on the record that 569 participated for 22 million, whereas there was 32 million in total, but \$22 million went into the land purchases in a year-and-a-half. I think the record speaks for itself.

Now when the member talks about the appraised value or the leases affected by the appraised value, he is quite correct, that after a five-year period there is an assessment but that's the policy that they had in place. There's nothing new; we haven't changed that program. We haven't changed that program at all, we are assessing or appraising the land the same way as they were administering the program. We didn't change anything. Now he is criticizing us, the government, for carrying on policies, and I should be reprimanded, I really should be, for carrying on such an unfair program, but they entered into a program on a contractual basis, of which we have done very little tinkering with, in fact, none.

MR. URUSKI: That's exactly what you've done, you've tinkered with it.

MR. DOWNEY: We haven't tinkered with it at all, but maybe we should give consideration to that. If the Member for St. George is saying if he were in government he would make those changes, let him tell us what those recommendations would be instead of running down his own program saying that we are responsible for the carrying on with it.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it's also fair to note that when he starts talking about the land sales, we in fact have sold some land where in fact there has been an increased value. They haven't been forced to buy it. There has been 140-some people that have bought.

A MEMBER: How many? —(Interjection)—

MR. DOWNEY: No, there has been 100 — what is the figure here? Out of the initial 569 lessees, there have been option to purchases taken or people wanting to buy their land, of that 366 farmers. Again, evidence that farmers would sooner own their land than work under a state-farm program. I think the figures are there to prove it, in a very short period of time.

MR. ADAM: It was always there.

MR. DOWNEY: The Member for Ste. Rose says it was always there. I believe if we think back, and I wasn't a member in the House, but when the program was initially introduced there wasn't an option there for the farmer to buy his land. There was a change made, something like a year-and-a-half, and I believe that the almost extinct Liberal Party were one of those that pride themselves in forcing that change. (Interjection)— Well, it maybe was the Conservatives. It would have to be the Conservatives with that kind of a progressive suggestion. But I do think it has to be put on the record, Mr. Chairman, that I'm proud of the record of MACC since we've changed its direction. I think the figures speak for themselves when 366 out of 569 farmers have taken on the option to purchase, in most cases have used the Credit Corporation as a financial backing tool to do it.

When the members talk about increased value or of the good deals they made, there are a few on the record that weren't so good also, that in fact the land has to be — well, it hasn't been sold because we can't get what we have in it. In fact in this one particular case it's worth less than half. I think, Mr. Chairman, it's fair that the full story be put on the record. There's another point I want to make. I said that just under \$3.5 million had been guaranteed under the comprehensive loan guarantee. I think the exact figures are 3.36 to be exact, for 66 loans under that program.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is of course wishing that the facts not be known with respect to the purpose and intent of the original land lease program. He suggests that there was no provision in the contract which provided for an option to purchase at the outset of the program. That, Mr. Chairman, should be corrected. I think he can check with his administration and they will correct him. I think what he is referring to as a change that was made subsequently was that the lessees were allowed to keep the enhanced value or in other words purchase at the original price as opposed to market value. That was a change that was made subsequently; but they were always entitled to purchase. There were other changes that remain having to do with the requirements for repayments of subsidies and those policies were amended, not requiring repayment of subsidies to that particular date.

But also there was a provision that if a lessee was to opt to purchase simply to turn over the land and receive an immediate capital gain, that they also would not be entitled to do that in that the Crown would retain the capital gain unless the lessee held the land for 20 years, at which time the lessee earned all of the capital gains for the simple reason of having cultivated the soil for 20 years. It was designed to avoid abuse, Mr. Chairman. The Minister knows that. That you certainly can't recommend feeding at the public trough on the basis of people using the program to make immediate capital gains through purchase and resale immediately. That was the not the intent, that certainly would have been an abuse of the program if it had been permitted. I don't believe anyone there believes that it should have been permitted, Mr. Chairman.

It would be interesting, Mr. Chairman, to know — you know, the Minister refers to the fact that he was able to advance \$32 million in a couple of years in his loan program. Mr. Chairman, that is not a revelation that one ought to be surprised at or amazed at. I mean the corporation has been in existence for 20-odd years and it has advanced hundreds of millions of dollars in that period of time. There is no question of that. And once you go into the business of making loans for land purchases, you can understand why very quickly. Without having many applicants or many clients you can add up tens of millions of dollars given the price of land that farmers have to pay at this point in our time. So that \$ 32 million which includes the purchase of land is a minute sum, Mr. Chairman. It's a minute sum if you include land purchase agreements. It's insignificant in

terms of the Manitoba capital expended on land acquisition by farmers, Mr. Chairman.

The fact of the matter is the Minister omitted a very relevant piece of information to this debate and that has to do, Mr. Chairman, with how much the Federal Government has advanced in loans for land acquisition in Manitoba during this year, during last year, during the period of the Minister's term in office. It was for that very reason that the Provincial Government got out of financing land purchases away back in the '70s, Mr. Chairman, because we were competing with a Federal Government loan authority for clients, in essence. We saw no need for that kind of duplication. The federal loans were available for land purchases at a lower interest rate than were provincial loans available, and it just didn't make any sense for the province to have a loans program for land acquisition in tandem with a federal system that was in the business in a big way.

That's why the land lease option was indeed nothing more than that, just an option to facilitate those people that didn't receive a loan, or couldn't receive a loan, through a more generous federal loans program, that were possibly not viable by way of the traditional methods of land tenure, that they couldn't afford or they couldn't raise mortgage capital; they weren't in a position to do so. They were turned down by FCC or by a private lender and that's why they came to the land lease program because they were not in a position to borrow. Many of those people were in a position originally to borrow money for land acquisition and couldn't meet their obligations and subsequently had to turn their land back in exchange for the wiping off of the mortgage and some needed capital to continue operating and so on. There are all sorts of reasons why people went into that program. That had to be described then and today as a very small program, Mr. Chairman, and it was intended to be that, but to be an avenue for those that weren't able to fit into the traditional lending programs.

Now it would be interesting for the House, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would indicate to us, of the \$32 million that he advanced in direct loans, which 22 of it is for land, how much of it went to the 366 lessees who opted to purchase their land, or their leases? Perhaps the Minister would want to elaborate on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't have a specific breakdown on those figures but I can provide them for the member.

MR. USKIW: Well, I would ask the Minister to confirm, Mr. Chairman, that the 366 people who opted for the Purchase Program were the substantial clients or used substantially the bulk of the \$22 million that he is talking about that was used for land acquisition. Perhaps he can give us an idea as to what percentage of that total was used by that group.

MR. DOWNEY: In the neighbourhood of 19 percent, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Well then, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would clarify for us as to the numbers of

acres that were purchased by the 366 people who were on the Land Lease Program, who purchased their farms pursuant to the Minister's encouragement and at what average price per acre, the acres involved and the average price per acre, and whether it was all financed by the MACC?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the number of acres was the question?

MR. USKIW: That's one question.

MR. DOWNEY: Approximately 140,000 acres, just over 140,000 acres for an average value of \$114 an acre which was about \$11.7 million used on the land purchases.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister would then recognize that those 366 clients purchased these lands at the price that was originally paid for by the Province of Manitoba. Perhaps he would confirm that.

MR. DOWNEY: Included in that figure there were some 29 parcels that were sold by tender; 10,500 by tender, 29 . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister to confirm that the lessees purchased these lands at the price originally paid for these lands by the Crown.

MR. DOWNEY: The sale price, Mr. Chairman, was as the policy that he is, I am sure familiar with, was the purchase price plus the carrying charges, the subsidized interest rate that the province had to carry.

MR. USKIW: Yes, I wonder if the Minister would then indicate to the House whether he has an opinion as to what capital savings were accrued by the clients, that is the difference between the price that the Crown paid for the land and the carrying charges that were added thereto and the actual market value at the time of purchase. I'm sure the department has a market value on each one of those at the time of purchase. I wonder if the Minister could tell us what the true market value would have been had those lands been sold at the market value as opposed to the original purchase price.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure what he is trying to get at is that there has been a savings as far as the individual is concerned by buying and being . . . and I don't think it would be fair to speculate because we have —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, in fact those individuals had had the opportunity to buy and borrow the money. —(Interjection)— They did only later on in the program after the NDP were forced to implement such a program. But the point has to be made that they could have been allowed to, in fact, and here's another point we have to make, that they would have been allowed to not have to give back any of the capital gain if they were to turn around and re-sell it. So the point he's trying to make that the program that we were talking about was all well and good for the purchaser is not correct because he built in a pay back to the province on capital gain so he's now

trying to make the case that a farmer is a lot better off by having a Land Lease Program. That is totally incorrect.

MR. USKIW: I didn't say that at all.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, he's trying to lead to that conclusion. He wanted my opinion and he's getting it, that I do not think they were better off. I think they'd have been better off to lend the farmer the money under a loan program so that the individual could have, if he'd of felt so inclined at two, three, four or five years down, with the appreciation of land, if he wanted to sell that land he'd of been even that much better off than by entering into a Land Lease Program. Then if he wants to either use it as collateral or sell the land then in fact he's in a situation that is not as well off as if he'd been in a loan program under a direct loan system with MACC.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I see the Minister twitching and I can understand fully why because we have just illustrated for him the very fact that the lessees have had the advantage of leasing these lands for four or five years, of opting to purchase them at the original price the province paid for these lands. In the meantime the price of these lands have more than doubled in value in terms of market value, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the Minister would like us to believe that if the individual had gone out and purchased those land at market value today that he would be better off. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has a couple of economists close by and I think he should consult with them because I think if you can buy land for \$100 an acre instead of \$200 an acre you're \$100 better off.

Mr. Chairman, in the examples of the tenders that we debated at the last session, the Minister had as high as a 300 percent increase in value on properties that were sold. Yes, all of these lessees who opt to purchase are receiving those huge windfall benefits which was built into the program, Mr. Chairman, and yes the Minister is correct. He says yes, but if they sell the land the province takes the capital gain. Because if that were the case and he knows it that that would be an abuse of the program, that would not be the intent of the program for people to speculate with the use of public funds to buy land for one or two years roll it over and capitalize 100 percent on their venture. That is not the intent of the program, never was.

So yes it's true they have to be serious farmers, they have to continue their farming operations and earn their capital gain which they have realized on paper, Mr. Chairman, at 5 percent a year. Mr. Chairman, if these individuals are young people, 30 years of age, in 20 years they have the full value of that capital gain earned simply by continuing to cultivate the soil. If they choose to sell their land and they make a profit on it in the meantime to the extent that it is within a period less than 20 years, for each year less than 20 years they would have to forfeit 5 percent of the capital gain for the protection of the taxpayers of this province, Mr. Chairman, who did not intend that this be a speculative program but that this be a serious program to help those who weren't in a position to buy. The Minister keeps saying they could have bought it at the original price; they didn't have to lease it. Well, Mr. Chairman, if

they could have purchased the land they would have not been in the Lease Program.

MR. DOWNEY: They're able to buy it now, why weren't they able to buy it then?

MR. USKIW: Well that is the whole point that the Minister misses. Now, he says they are able to buy it now. Mr. Chairman, they are able to buy it now because presumably they are in a viable financial position today because they have 100 percent or more increase in equity in their land. Mr. Chairman, without putting up a dollar they have full equity in their land, that's why they can buy it, because the value of the land is two or three times as much as it was when the land was purchased and they are the benefactors of that policy. And yes, they can go to any bank, any credit organization, the FCC or the MACC, yes they will finance them on the basis of added value on land, Mr. Chairman. In fact that has been the basis of financing agriculture for a long time. As your land values go up you have a greater opportunity to borrow more against your property, to use it as collateral, that's exactly what is happening here, Mr. Chairman.

So the Minister is not in a sound position in suggesting to us here that they had that opportunity five years ago or six years ago. Mr. Chairman, those were the people that couldn't borrow money then because they had no means of repaying the loan. They were not people who were considered viable or they may have been considered viable but they chose voluntarily not to purchase, they didn't want a mortgage, that was an option they had. But by and large it was people that were not able to borrow money in the traditional way to get themselves established as people that would want to cultivate our soil here in Manitoba and produce agriculture commodities. The FCC was unable to help them; the MACC certainly shouldn't have gone into a credit program which was more expensive than the FCC program if they were not viable under the FCC program, it just didn't make any sense. So yes, these people, indeed, have benefited substantially, have been launched better than anyone that had to go out and directly purchase their property — they benefited substantially beyond over and above what anyone that had to purchase directly in the marketplace because of the program.

So, Mr. Chairman, if a person buys \$200 worth of value for \$100 that indeed has to be a bargain. And it was done without any cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba and that is the interesting point and that is the point of our argument, Mr. Chairman, we were able to use the instrument of the Crown to make it possible, knowing, Mr. Chairman, that land values continue to go up, have always gone in the upper direction and will continue to go in the upward direction. These people were given an opportunity without cost to the taxpayers to get themselves established as farmers in Manitoba. So regardless of all of the nonsense the Minister wants to throw at the program, regardless of how he wants to emasculate the program it indeed had significant, desirable results for those that participated, Mr. Chairman, extremely beneficial, much more so than any loan program has ever had in the history of this country.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I find it most amusing when we have the member opposite make

the case that the individual who now is in a position of owning a farm, owning a piece of property, when in fact if he wanted to do what he wanted to do with it, sell it, or go for a mortgage to further expand his operation, that in fact he is tied to the Crown; he is totally unable to do with what he wants or take advantage of a situation. Mr. Chairman, I think it's also important to note that we go back five years and he says that the farmer would have been better off taking a land lease program than he would have been buying the land outright. Let us use a figure of \$100 an acre five years ago. If he went into the land lease program he bought a farm at a \$100 an acre. The member said he was better off to go into the land lease program, why? Because they didn't have a lending program. It was not their philosophy or their belief that they should help the farm community. It was evidenced by the fact that they wanted to buy and own the land with a caveat for 20 years on the capital gain. Not unlike, Mr. Chairman, the famous Beef Income Assurance Program where the state was best to hang on to any profit that the farmers were going to make. Not to benefit the farmers, not to benefit the farmers at all but to benefit who? Big government, the state, the state farmer. Evident, Mr. Chairman, in the amount of people that we have seen that have, since the opportunity has been given to lend or to borrow money to buy land, that if they had bought that same land at \$100 an acre under our program, they had 4 percent of the interest up to \$50,000 refunded to them annually on an annual basis as an interest subsidy which was given to them directly to help them defer the higher interest costs. That is their money, Mr. Chairman, to do with what they want, not tied to the ongoing deal with the government.

But the point that has to be made is that they are saying that those farmers, at their particular time when they introduced the program, were better off entering into the land lease. Not only did they not have a chance to have a loan program from government . . .

MR. USKIW: They sure did.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, they didn't have a loan program, not from the Provincial Government. The Provincial Government did not have a loan program so they were directed to buying into a state farm deal or to get into a state farm lease. The other point is that the member tries to make the public say that, now, because of the that land lease program, 300-and-some of them are more financially capable or fit to buy their particular land.

MR. USKIW: Sure they are.

MR. DOWNEY: What were wrong with the NDP policies up until that point that they weren't in the condition to buy their land? Is he telling us the last three years with the Conservative policies that they are now in a better condition? That's the other thing I have to assume; that with the policies of the Conservative Government in Manitoba that those farmers are able to buy their farms and I'm pleased to hear to that. I am very pleased to hear that we have some 375 farmers now buying their land, able to do it with the Conservative Government and they are in better financial condition to do it. Plus the fact

that we have a program now that does not force people into land lease programs; that they can buy land today that three years from now, if the Member for Lac du Bonnet indicates the land prices are going to keep going up — and I don't disagree with him. But what he is not saying is that now if they buy this land today under a loan program that in three years all the benefits of that increase will accrue, not to the government, not to the state, no, not to the state, but to that individual farmer. So our policies and our programs are directed to help particularly the young farmer.

MR. USKIW: How many did you turn away to date?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, the member says, how many did we turn away? The figures that I used, that they serviced in five years some 500-and-some farmers. We have serviced, as far as the loan program in a year-and-a-half, some \$22 million in land sales of which 19 percent were land leased; but the balance of those — and I haven't got the numbers here — but quite a large number of people benefited from the direct loan program which is expanding, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: I wonder if the Minister would yield the floor to clarify something for me.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, okay.

MR. USKIW: The Minister keeps talking about \$22 million that were advanced and he talked about 11.7 million went to the original lessees but he says that only represents 19 percent of the 22 million. Well, 11 million out of 22 is 50 percent. I wonder if the Minister would clarify it for us.

MR. DOWNEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, this is land and other purposes. The total loans that were out by MACC, or have been put out by MACC, have been \$61 million of which there are 1,375 people who have participate in direct loans.

MR. USKIW: That's for the three years?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, that will be land, machinery and livestock for the three years. But the direct loan, remember the direct loan program was implemented in July of 1978, so the majority of it is since July of 1978. The point I'm trying to make is and I think it should be made very clear that the benefits of a direct loan program have been, first of all, more acceptable by the farm community; they have allowed the farm community to . . .

MR. USKIW: How do you know?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, the figures are there. The numbers of people who are participating are telling us what they are desirous of doing. The numbers of people who are taking advantage of the direct loan program are far greater than those that were desirous of taking part in the land lease program. But if you want to get into the lease policy and the buying, selling and proposals by this government, if you want to expand it, we'll debate in our Crown lands sales policy later on in the Estimates because I do think there are other examples there of the way in which farmers are showing their desire to own the

property they work and that's basically the principle that we subscribe to.

Now if the member is telling me that the land lease was the best program they could put forward and no loan program, then I accept that; I accept that. He can make all the arguments he wants but we haven't got the land lease program anymore. We have a few people who are participants in it and we are prepared to make the reassessment as necessary, to charge them the rent as necessary. We aren't enforcing, we aren't encouraging anyone to buy. If they are desirous of doing it they are free to do so, but I think it's no question, at this particular point, that evidence would show that the producers would sooner own their land than they would lease it. End of debate.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I don't think anyone wants to argue with the Minister when he suggests that most farmers wish to own their land rather than to lease their land. Notwithstanding the fact though, Mr. Chairman, we have an economic condition though in Canada — Manitoba is no exception — where more and more of the agricultural land is being leased, even in provinces where there is no government lease programs. They are being leased more and more percentagewise each year because people can't afford to buy the land because of inflated land values. So whether they like to own it or not is not the question. The question is, can they afford to own it? We find that the projections, and people in the financial community are indicating that the future to them, at least, looks like they are going to have to have a two-tiered agricultural land tenure system, some ownership and some lease, because the way the land values are going very few farmers are going to afford to continue to buy land. More and more they will have to lease additional land if they want more land. That is projected by private financial institutions. The banks are talking about the fact that it's not that important to own the land anymore, we'll finance your machinery as long as you have a system of security of tenure. That's the new language that's out there, Mr. Chairman.

But true, it isn't the government that is in the lease program, it is private individuals, it is corporations who are buying up land for the purpose of leasing it. It's foreigners who are doing it, it's all sorts of interest groups that are in the land business, Mr. Chairman. But more and more, in the United States and in Canada each year more people use more land that is leased rather than owned. That graph is going this way. So it's not whether the Minister wants to have a lease program or the Opposition wants or does not want, it is a reality of our economic situation, Mr. Chairman, and it is going to compound each year to the point where eventually we will have more land leased than owned; that's the direction it's going, that is the direction it's going. And so it's a question of whether we need a mechanism to monitor or supervise or regulate a private land lease arrangement or whether the public plays a role through its normal credit program in providing that option for those people that need more land but cannot afford to purchase some and may have a desire to purchase some but simply aren't in a position to do so.

So it's a head-in-the-sand attitude that the Minister presents to us here in debating this subject,

Mr. Chairman. He's pretending that there isn't anyone out there that is leasing land and everyone wants to own. Well, we know they want to own it, Mr. Chairman, but heavens I know people, individuals, who lease thousands of acres of land either from their neighbours. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing that prevents that from taking place today. The Minister suggests that we didn't have a loan program. I agree we didn't have a loan program because we provided an option that cost the taxpayers no money. The Minister brought in a loan program and he brags about how many loans he made on the basis of the taxpayer having to put in subsidy dollars to lower the interest rate, otherwise, he couldn't afford to do it, Mr. Chairman. That's what he is saying, we have given them dollars that they can keep. Society has put their hand in their pocket and said, here is 4 percent against your interest rate; we never want it back.

We were able to facilitate land tenure and ownership rights without having to put our hand in the taxpayer's pocket, Mr. Chairman. (Interjection)— Yes, that's what we were able to do. That's not what this Minister is doing. (Interjection)— That's right, he is costing us more money with his mode of operation and he is duplicating a service that is already available by the Federal Government under The Farm Credit Corporation Act. So that may be his choice but if he is brave as he is on the subject, if he thinks that there are no Manitobans that would prefer the lease option, then what he should do is maintain a lease option in his program. Those that want to borrow the money, he should lend them the money, and those that say they don't want a mortgage but they would rather lease some land, he should let them have that option, Mr. Chairman. But he isn't doing that, he is saying, if you want to control agricultural land through our program there is only one way you can do it and that is to take out a mortgage. If you don't qualify for a mortgage because you're not viable, you don't have enough equity, you have no down payment, etc., etc., etc., it's just too bad, you're not in this business. That's what he's saying. So he's advancing the idea of more rapid land consolidation, more rapid depopulation processes that have been going under way in all of Canada and certainly in Manitoba for decades. He is escalating that process with that kind of a policy, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here for quite a while listening to the debate going back and forth and I'm not here rising to defend the Minister of Agriculture because I think what he has just said a few moments ago illustrates in very few words exactly what we are doing on this side of House insofar as agriculture is concerned and what the NDP did when they were over here as a government. I don't want to profess to be diverging here, Mr. Chairman, but I think the Conservative Party in Ottawa made an amendment to the Constitution insofar as rights were concerned and that was that an individual should have the right to own property. I believe the Federal Government, the Liberals, were opposed to that and I also believe, Mr. Chairman, that the NDP were in agreement with the

Liberal Party, they were opposed to that. I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the NDP in this Legislature right here today are in full agreement with allowing that amendment, that an individual should have the right to own property. Mr. Chairman, I want to carry that further, that's why I started out in that connotation that when the NDP came to power in 1969, and I fully understand their philosophy, because heavens knows, I used to be on that side of the House and debating with who was then the Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, when he sat on this side of the House. Mr. Chairman, we debated the issues; they started out from '69 to '73 as a walk, that was the pace, but then when they found they were re-elected in 1973 and the Minister then of Agriculture had a Deputy Minister I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, who was right in line with them and who was making all the ammunition and he was using his Minister of Agriculture to fire the shots.

Mr. Chairman, we got into a cattle promotion program for the farmers of Manitoba, I know the Member for St. George was asking the Minister what happened to that. I can recall in those days back in 1975, since they've now entered the debate and going back there, where the then-Minister of Agriculture had to go out and pay farmers to sell his program, and he paid them 40 bucks a day to try to sell his program on the beef promotion program. And I remember, Mr. Chairman, when the farmer asked the then-Minister at a meeting, he said to the Minister, you know, Mr. Minister, you could be the biggest cattle owner in Manitoba. He says, what would you do with those cattle if you didn't have a market for them? You know, Mr. Chairman, what his answer was? You know, we could take over Canada Packers. We could take over Canada Packers, Mr. Chairman. I'll tell you that was an eye opener to the farmers in that part of the country.

Then I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, of an involvement I got into. An elderly couple, they were retired and they had a half section of land they wanted to sell because then they had become familiar with the program that the NDP wanted to get into, the land buying business, because they used the excuse, Mr. Chairman, that farmers didn't have the option or the opportunity to lease property. Mr. Chairman, I've never heard such a bunch of gobbledegook in all my life, because as long as I've been farming in my time if I wanted to rent property the property was there for me to rent; and if I wanted to buy property the property was there for me to buy as long as there was a willing buyer and a willing seller. So for the NDP to stand up in this House and say, they were still trying to defend their policies in those days, that they were buying up the land so that a farmer could lease because he never had that opportunity before is absolutely false, Mr. Chairman, and I want the record straight for that.

But I want to tell the honourable members that I got involved in one particular case where this old couple had decided to retire and a young fellow wanted to buy this land but this couple had already had an option from another chap, that he wanted to lease from them. The understanding as I recall it, and it goes back to I think about 1975, '76, but the chap that wanted to buy this land was prepared to offer that couple, I believe it was, Mr. Chairman, but

it really doesn't matter, but there was about a \$2,000 increase in the price that the government's prepared to pay. You know, Mr. Chairman, I was given to understand that the old couple, because they asked me to see them, the other party that wanted to buy the land, asked me to see this old couple and that couple informed me that the other chap who was going to lease the land after it was bought said that would have the opportunity to buy it as soon as they had sold it to the government — the government would turn around and then sell it to that person. Mr. Chairman, that was not correct.

Another matter, Mr. Chairman, I have seen where the government in those days bought up farm land, I'll give you another example, there were two parties interested in this particular land that the government owned. One party were given pretty well assurance from the department at that time that they were going to be able to lease this land from the government. So they went ahead, they purchased fertilizer, they purchased seed sufficient to sow that whole half section of land only to find out, Mr. Chairman, that they had decided to lease it to the other party. So this young farmer was out \$7,500 in costs for seed and fertilizer because the agreement, whatever it was, was not carried out.

Mr. Chairman, I can tell you the way the previous government operated in their Agriculture Department. There were more farmers that as neighbour against neighbour that the animosity was so created that it was unfortunate as far as I was concerned, that we had to have a situation like that. So they go back and they talk about what they did in 1975 and how wonderful it would be today if we still had that program that they call an option to be able to lease land instead of buying it because they can't afford it. Certainly there always has been, Mr. Chairman, and I presume there always will be farmers who cannot afford to buy land at no matter what price — it really doesn't matter. So there is an opportunity if they can't afford to buy it, they'll have land that they'll be able to lease, and that's an opportunity I say that it's a choice that they've always had and always will have.

So for the NDP, Mr. Chairman, to stand up in this House and continually repeat that they've never had an opportunity to lease land until such times as they established the program where they were buying up land and that they were going to see to it that the farmer would have land to lease. Really, Mr. Chairman, we're debating philosophy here or ideology here because, Mr. Chairman, if the NDP had gone back into power in 1977, they'd have continued to buy up farm land and the Minister of Agriculture would not only have been the biggest cattle owner in the Province of Manitoba, he'd also have been the biggest real estate owner in the Province of Manitoba. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, this is what was scaring the people of Manitoba. They were concerned as to how far, because in Manitoba we never had socialism before, and I want to add, Mr. Chairman, that this party is the first time in Manitoba's history where a government's had to take over from eight years of socialism. And there's quite a change. I don't fault them for their philosophy, Mr. Chairman, I don't fault them one bit, that's what they believe in and I hope they'll practise it and they'll carry it out and they'll fight for it. As I've said to the

Member for Inkster, I always respect him because as long as I've been in this House I respect him for what he says and for what he stands for and what he does, and he's always been honest with me. But, Mr. Chairman, his philosophy I just don't agree with and I'm prepared to fight it as long as God gives me breath to fight for the kind of things that I believe in.

Mr. Chairman, we could go on and on and debate on this subject matter and I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers are not only concerned about the high prices of land today — you know, I have not heard and when they talk about the concerns of farmers I've yet to hear anyone on that side of the House rise to the occasion and I think it is relevant, I hope, Mr. Chairman, I'll be permitted to make these few comments, that when the President of the United States, that is the former President of the United States, made an announcement in regard to an embargo on Russia for selling them grain, that announcement, Mr. Chairman, created an immediate downward trend on all prices of grains sold in not only the United States but in Canada as well.

I keep hearing questions about, well the Member for St. George was asking the Minister of Agriculture today what are you going to do for the farmers that are in a dilemma in the hog production business? You know, Mr. Chairman, I agree they've got a problem; they're not getting the money they should be getting for what it's costing them to produce a pound of pork. But I've never heard them say, and here's I think a more legitimate aspect of this whole matter, I haven't heard them ask the Minister of Agriculture what communication has he had with the Minister responsible in Ottawa in order that they may do something in the way of providing a stabilization or a recompense for the difference in what the cost of the farmers of Western Canada has been. Mr. Chairman . . .

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

MR. USKIW: I'm sure the honourable member wouldn't want to leave a falsehood on the record. Perhaps he was not in the House when that very question was asked of this Minister as to what he is intending to do about the fact that the farmers of Canada have not been compensated for the losses they have sustained as a result of the embargo, and it wasn't very long ago, Mr. Chairman. Now I'm sure the member wouldn't want to leave such a statement in the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, do I understand from the Member for Inkster that that question was posed to the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon?

MR. USKIW: Not today, not today, the other day.

MR. EINARSON: I think I've been here at every question period, Mr. Chairman, and I do not recall anyone from the NDP Party asking this question. I posed that question, Mr. Chairman, in December asking the Minister if he had any communications with even the Prime Minister or the Minister responsible for Agriculture in Canada, and I had a

response from the Minister. From the time that I posed that question, I don't know whether it's significant or not, but I've read in many western farm papers that that matter was brought to the attention through many organizations to the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I think that questions along those lines would do much more to assist the farmers whether they be wanting to purchase farm land or whether they're having problems in producing hogs at a price that they can make a dollar or livestock or whatever, but I have not heard anything come from the members opposite, Mr. Chairman. And if the Member for Lac du Bonnet is saying that they have raised that question with the Minister, if he can show it to me in the records then I'm prepared to retract my comments, but I have not yet to my knowledge or do I recall where they have had any concern for this matter. And the reason, Mr. Chairman, that I pose this question is because I feel that that it is an international problem and I don't why it is that the governments will use food as a weapon to try to solve problems on an international basis where warring countries are trying to invade another country. I think that this is something that is responsibility of all taxpayers of the nation, not just the farmers who are in the production of foodstuffs.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned when I listen to the Member for Lac du Bonnet, the Member for St. George and the echoes from the Member for Ste. Rose. Yes, it's the Member for St. George and the Member for Lac du Bonnet that seem to be carrying the ball insofar as the critics of the Department of Agriculture are concerned but the Member for Ste. Rose from his seat he sort of echoes a few comments that shoot by.

Mr. Chairman, I can recall the Member for Ste. Rose standing when he was on the government side here when things were tough and he said he had 1,000 acres and he had an awful time to support his wife — that you can find in the annals of this Legislature. So you know, Mr. Chairman, I start to try to measure as to what was the input into their policies in those days when we get comments coming from a Member for Ste. Rose such as that. But I tell you, Mr. Chairman, while I've been listening to the debate this afternoon I am going to say that I think that what the Minister of Agriculture is doing is in the best interests and is something that the farmers of this province have wanted to see happen, I think that's one of the reasons why we are on this side of the House because they were concerned.

I want to say another thing, Mr. Chairman, that is in the beef cattle promotion program that the then-Minister of Agriculture brought forward, it did not meet with the approval of the Federal Government as it did with the Government of even Saskatchewan and Alberta because he tied the farmers in for a five-year period. Mr. Chairman, that is another matter that was of real concern to the farmers.

MR. URUSKI: What's Cargill going to do with it?

MR. EINARSON: Well you know the Member for St. George he talks about Cargill and I'll tell you something, Mr. Chairman, there are a few farmers that are operating with Cargill in my part of the country and I've talked to those farmers and I've also talked to the farmers on their own.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is 4:30. I'm interrupting the proceeding for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: We are now under Private Members' Hour, Proposed Resolutions. Resolution No. 2, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is some question about whether or not this resolution is anticipatory. Rather than have that question debated I would ask the leave of the House to let this matter stand on the Order Paper until the resolution that is going to be presented by the Treasury Benches is before the House. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 3.
The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the remarks of my honourable friend for Inkster I think are valid in this resolution also but I would ask you, Sir, I want clarification, to make sure that I think the rule says that we have a chance to introduce a resolution twice. I would hope that this will not be in effect at this time, that we are waiting to see the resolution to see then if there would be any need for my resolution or if it would be in order.

MR. SPEAKER: This resolution has not been introduced as yet.

MR. DESJARDINS: Beg your pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: This resolution has not been introduced yet — as long as it stands on the Order Paper.

Resolution No. 4. The Honourable Member for Churchill. (Stand)

Resolution No. 5. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews. (Stand)

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — RECOVERY OF ONE DEFAULTED PAY PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: Then we go to Resolution No. 1, the Resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the Amendment by the Honourable Member for Churchill. At 5:30 the Honourable Member for Crescentwood had just completed his remarks. The resolution is now open.

QUESTION put on the Amendment and defeated.

QUESTION put on the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to repeat all the remarks made by my colleague, the Member for Crescentwood, on Friday in regard to this subject. However, I would like to repeat the fact that the Minister of Labour and Manpower in his concern for the matter has asked Labour Management Review

Committee under the capable chairmanship of Cam MacLean to study the situation and bring forward a possible means of overcoming the problem of recovering wages from employers who become bankrupt or insolvent. It is understood the MacLean Committee has been meeting and the Minister of Labour and Manpower expects a proposal shortly, a proposal that will have been considered by both labour and management.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move, seconded by the Member for Crescentwood;

THAT the resolution be amended by striking out all the words after the word "pay" in the 4th line of the 3rd paragraph of the Preamble and substituting therefor the following words:

AND WHEREAS the Minister of Labour and Manpower has requested that the Manitoba Labour and Management Review Committee give consideration to this matter at the earliest possible time with a view to recommending to the Minister procedures whereby employees can be offered reasonable protection from the loss of these wages;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government await the report and recommendations of the Manitoba Labour Management Review Committee.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am very much opposed to this amendment. I am opposed to it for two reasons; one, is that it is completely unnecessary. If the government wished to pass the resolution which merely asks it to consider the advisability of seeing whether there was a way of protecting an employee for unpaid wages by having them looked after as a benefit under the Workmens' Compensation. That resolution could be passed and then the Minister could do exactly what this resolution required. If he wanted to, he could say the House has passed a resolution; the resolution is concerned with non-payment of wages; the non-payment of wages it is suggested can be dealt with through the Unemployment Insurance plan; would you please look at this and tell us what you think of it? Now, Mr. Speaker, that's not what I would do but that would be open to the government to do on the basis of the motion without any amendments. Therefore, this amendment, even if it were desirable, is completely unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, I have more profound reasons for being opposed to the amendment. I am opposed to the amendment because it presupposes that the Labour Management Review Committee is the committee which has to decide on whether this type of proposal is a good proposal. For years, Mr. Speaker, the Labour Management Review Committee was unable to agree on anything except the most mundane recommendations that were made by that committee. This isn't a matter of labour management review; this isn't a labour question, this is a question in which society is involved. It is not merely the employee who doesn't get wages that suffers, we all suffer, Mr. Speaker, when an employee is unpaid or when an employer lets an employee be unpaid. But

the worst feature of this amendment is that the House has absolutely no guarantee that the matter will be dealt with. Read the last phrase, Mr. Speaker, BE IT RESOLVED that the government await the report and recommendations of the Manitoba Labour Management Review Committee. Await, Mr. Speaker, how long does it say "await"? Does it say await six months? Does it say await a year? Does it say await two years? And how do we know, Mr. Speaker, when this committee will report?

What this House needs and needs more than ever, Mr. Speaker, is a statement by the Minister that this matter is going to be dealt with. Instead we have a resolution, not that the matter be dealt with, but that the government await a report.

Mr. Speaker, there was an occasion in this House which occurred so long long that I don't even have to recall that I said it because it happened with the Weir administration. But that Minister is adopting the posture that was adopted in the poem which was written in England and had to do with the fact that some people could not get into the battle but they were part of the English community, and the poet said, "They also serve who only stand and wait", Mr. Speaker. This Minister believes that is what the posture of this government is, that they also serve who only stand and wait.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY (Fort Rouge): That was Milton.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my friend, the Member for Fort Rouge says it was Milton. When I said it was Milton when I originally quoted it, the former Member for Lakeside, Mr. Campbell, said I was wrong.

MRS. WESTBURY: I think you're right.

MR. GREEN: She thinks I'm right and that, of course, doesn't bother me. But the fact is that the Minister said they also serve and only stand and wait. What he is doing and what he promised to the defaulted wage earner in the Province of Manitoba is that he will stand and wait and he is also serving. Mr. Speaker, he has been standing and waiting, and standing and waiting, and when a resolution is put forward merely suggesting an idea that he should consider, he says I won't pass that resolution because I am standing and waiting and I'm going to put into the resolution that the posture of this government is that the Conservatives also serve who only stand and wait. How can we prove, Mr. Speaker, that he's standing and waiting because last year he had notice of an event which he said made the previous Act unworkable. I have even given some sympathy to the difficulties under the previous Act but the Minister said it was unworkable.

So what did he do? He didn't say, I'm going to make it workable or I'm going to introduce something that is workable. He said, I also serve who only stand and wait, so I'm going to remove this clause and I'm going to stand and wait. He stood and waited, Mr. Speaker, from last year to this session until a resolution appeared on the Order Paper which is not perfect, although I have yet to hear a better proposal, Mr. Speaker. And I submit that the one that has just been voted down is not a better proposal and that the motion unamended, as it stands before you, is a better proposal. The

Minister could, if he wished, refer it to this committee and that. Mr. Speaker, doesn't even have to kill it; he could then say if the committee doesn't deal with it I will do something about it. But so principled is this Minister that he will not do anything, but he puts it in resolution form. You would think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister would be a little devious, that he would say, I'm going to refer it to the employee committee, the Labour-Management Committee and if they don't deal with it I will act on it. But this Minister is more frank, he's honest. He is forthright, Mr. Speaker, and he tells us exactly where he stands, the government intends to stand and wait and the government will not do anything unless it receives a report and recommendations of the government, of the management, Manitoba Labour Management Review Committee, Mr. Speaker. From 1966 to 1969 the former Minister of Labour, the Honourable Obie Baizley took exactly the same position and at that time the Labour Management Review Committee was known as the Woods Committee. As I said last week, Mr. Speaker, it was an appropriate name because it was a euphemism for the petrified forest because it couldn't, by definition, —(Interjection)— no it couldn't, to be fair couldn't, by definition, solve the important vexing questions at that time as between management and labour such as the right to informational picketing because there was no compromise. The employees felt, quite rightly in my opinion, that they had a right to carry signs anywhere in the world that they could get to or at least anywhere in Canada — if they could get to other places that had similar bad laws that we had in Manitoba at the time they wouldn't be able to carry the signs there — to carry the same sign saying my employer is unfair to me, as was permitted to be carried throughout this country saying that people are unfair to seals and nobody got injunctions against them. Nobody could get an injunction against somebody walking with a sign anywhere saying I don't like the way they kill baby seals, because you had a right to feel sympathy for seals and carry a sign. But you couldn't carry a sign in front of an employer's premises saying this employer is unfair to worker because, although you'll protect the right to sympathize with seals, you wouldn't protect the right to sympathize with workers. The Labour Management Review Committee couldn't solve that problem, it couldn't be solved and it took a government who was willing to look at the issue and deal with it to solve the problem.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very disappointing resolution and a very revealing resolution because I think that I started my remarks on the original resolution saying that I really felt the government wanted to solve the problem; I really couldn't believe some of the things that were said about them having no interest in protecting a worker's wages and didn't feel that. Mr. Speaker, it has been said on this side of the House, and I have tried to deflect some of that because I didn't really think it was so, but I'm hoping to be convinced by members on this side of the House that you don't give a damn, because if you gave a damn you wouldn't put such a resolution. If you gave a damn somebody from that side of the House would have got up and said, not that we're going to send this to the Labour Management Review Committee, you know what they would have said, they would

have said after last year with that bitter debate in the House this matter was already referred to our department, they are already dealing with it and the question of considering the advisability of having it as a compensable benefit under The Workman's Compensation Act we agree with entirely, it doesn't bind the government to anything, we unanimously approve this resolution, bang, it's gone and it's already been worked on.

But that's not what was said, Mr. Speaker. What was said is that the old Act didn't work, we had a speaker representing the Minister's position who got up and said that the old Act was unworkable, that the court said it was inoperative and therefore we oppose this resolution. There are better ways of dealing with it. The previous resolution doesn't lock the government into dealing with it; the previous resolution, I repeat, doesn't even prevent the government from taking it, passing it, sending it to the employee-employer committee and saying, while you're considering it consider this possibility; could have done that.

But, Mr. Speaker, this resolution requires me to say, requires me and other members on this side and members on that side, to say we're going to await the recommendations of The Manitoba Labour Management Review Committee. I don't intend to say that I will wait. The people who serve who only stand and wait are over there and they will stand up and wait when they're voting for this and feel ashamed of themselves I hope because it is a shameful amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what should be shameful about trying to do something responsible and respectable in establishing a procedure in Manitoba where you can protect workers. I don't see anything shameful about that. I don't see anything shameful, Mr. Speaker, in involving some of the most knowledgeable people in industry and in labour in this province in reviewing this situation and we all agreed, those of us that wanted to really look at the previous piece of legislation that was meant as a protective vehicle for workers in this province, and we all found it wanting. Again I say those of us that wanted to read and determine the court findings in our country, we found out that it was left wanting. And we had that discussion, that debate and that series of comments that took place in the last session and I thought, and I asked for — I'm just trying to dig back in my memory — but I was sure that I had said that there shall be a procedure established in Manitoba, there shall be one that will be protective in nature for unfortunate employees who find themselves without an employer and without the funds to pay them remuneration for the work that they have fulfilled and the money that's rightfully coming to them. If I did not make that clear then I wish to make that very clear today. I don't think that this government is one that wants to stand and wait. I think we can speak with a fair amount of pride of some of the things that we've said we would do.

We had a discussion in question period today about a particular committee that's working, the Member for Churchill raised the point of when that committee was going to report. He's well aware, as

all of us in this House are, that there never had been a review of safety workplaces and conditions in the mines before in the history of the province. He's aware that there was one in Ontario. He's aware now that we implemented one and we waited because of several sets of circumstances for the committee to come through with the report. In that particular case we waited again — to the Member for Inkster I direct this — we waited again, you betcha. We're waiting now for a group of union people and industrialists to give us advice on how they want to implement the recommendations. I don't see anything wrong with that if you want to be poetic or chastise people for waiting when they're really involving people that have a great interest and have the time and have the desire to assist government in bringing in recommendations, I find nothing wrong with that.

There were those that stood and watched and waited while people were looking at the compensation system in the Province of Manitoba and that's been going on for many years, not just since we formed the government. We set up a committee to review it, again the first time it's been totally reviewed the way it is going to be and the way it is and we stood and watched and waited while that took place, Mr. Speaker, I think quite correctly so. I don't know which particular body the Member for Inkster would have preferred that I refer this to or whether he thought the department should look at it by themselves within government. I know an awful lot of people on the Cam MacLean Committee personally and have known a lot of them for years, pretty sincere, dedicated people from both industry and from labour. I asked them to look at this, you bet I did. I've stood and waited for them to look at it, you bet I have. If it will make the members opposite, or the members on my side, those are those that may not be aware, their finalized report of how to handle this and how to deal with this is very close. I have had some tentative ideas of how they're proposing to deal with it. I suspect when the system is in place and it will be brought in very soon, certainly long before this House ever adjourns. I suspect that all members on all sides will concur because I don't think that the Member for Inkster or the Member for Churchill or the Member for Kildonan or any of the rest is really hung up precisely on how it's handled. I think what they want to do, I hope all members of the House want to do, is come up with a method that will assure us in Manitoba that wages due to people are forthcoming to people regardless of the circumstances of the company. That's what I intend to do.

This committee has assured me that the recommendations are forthcoming. I have not just received the assurance and taken it easily in stride, I am aware, positively that those recommendations are coming, I'm aware, Mr. Speaker, that before this House adjourns, God willing and everything else, that we're all healthy enough to be here, that without question there will be a method established in Manitoba to assure working men and women of a method that they will receive their payments in unfortunate situations where companies cannot afford to give them to. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I have to announce that I do intend to vote against this amendment, in spite of the eloquence of the Minister in his presentation, and I do so not because of what he said but because mostly of what he left unsaid. I think that it is obvious why those on this side and those who truly wish to see this matter dealt with in the most expedient and efficient manner possible would object to this amendment. There are several reasons, the least of which is that it emasculates the original resolution which was brought forward by the Member for Inkster. It deducts it and it takes away from it any sort of positive action. Mr. Speaker, not only does it emasculate that resolution, which I have to hasten to add we had some reservations about, but intended to strengthen that resolution, at least to our way of thinking, to strengthen that resolution by way of the amendments which we provided to the House the other day which we felt supported the intent, which we felt was an honourable intent on the part of the Member for Inkster, and hopefully, that it had improved upon the wording of the resolution as it had been brought into this House.

This amendment that we're discussing now and that we have before us now destroys entirely that original resolution and replaces what was a call for action with a call for inaction. It is nothing more than a stall and that's about the politest way that I can address it; it is nothing more than a delaying device that is unnecessary, or at least should be unnecessary, and is intended to do away with any action on the part of government to deal with this very serious problem now. Beyond that it is redundant. Is the Minister telling us by his remarks and by the fact that one of his backbenchers brought forward an amendment that he needs a resolution of this House to provoke him into referring this very important matter to that committee? Does he need this House to instruct him to take that very rudimentary type of action? If he wanted to refer this matter to The Manitoba Labour Management Review Committee he could have done that a year ago. As a matter of fact he could have done it two years ago when we first addressed this issue in this House and during the estimates because, while it was passed last year, we had discussed it in the year previous. So he's had two years to refer it to that committee and if we are to believe this resolution he has not done so. If he has done so then this resolution is more of a sham than not. If he has already referred it to the committee then why is the resolution worded like this. So we can only assume that the resolution was presented with the most honourable of intentions and that it has not been referred to the committee. Once we make that assumption we can only ask the question as to why it has not been referred to the committee. You don't need the House to instruct the Minister to refer an issue like this to a committee such as that.

So he could have done it a year ago. The fact that he didn't do it a year ago, or his government didn't do it a year ago, betrays either their incompetence, which is a totally acceptable analysis, given the efforts that they have presented to us in the past, or it betrays their unwillingness to confront the issue at hand, it betrays their unwillingness to provide the protection which they stripped. And let us not forget who it was who stripped that protection from the

working people of this province. It was that government, the Lyon government, the Conservative government, who trapped in their own ideology and victims of their own dogma thought that was a proper course of action. They did it and now they're attempting to back away from a positive resolution and amendment which would have provided them with instructions as to how to deal with their previous incompetence.

So we have one of two events taking place. No. 1, either they are unwilling to deal with it or, No. 2, they are so incompetent that they need this House to provide them with the motivation and the direction to send this important matter to committee. If this referral, which I am certain they will all vote for, Mr. Speaker, is necessary today and if it is proper today, why was it not necessary and proper a year ago? That question has to be answered and they have to answer it. Why was it not a proper course of action for the Minister to undertake under his own initiative a year ago? Had the Minister done that this is what the Minister could have done today. Instead of standing before us and offering the excuses and the apologies for a year or two years, as the case may be, of inaction, he could have come to the House today with that report, because he's telling us that report will be forthcoming in all due haste, all due speed. So if he had referred it to them a year ago we surely and certainly could have been standing and discussing that report and those recommendations instead of having to listen to this resolution which emasculates the original resolution and listen to the Minister's apologies for not having taken action before.

As a matter of fact, had he wanted, I'm certain he could have come forward with legislation or at least a program, such as put forward by the Member for Inkster and clarified by ourselves, he could have come forward today with positive action that would outline what they were going to do instead of coming forward with a delaying device and a stalling technique. The Minister assures us that it is his suspicion that this report of the committee will be brought to the House in very short order. Well, then I ask why had they not taken the advantage, to at least assure those of us on this side in a more positive way, by writing a time limit into the resolution, into the amendment that they offered? They could have written into that amendment a clause to the effect that that committee would be instructed by the Minister to report back to this House by such and such a date and that matter would be brought forward to this House where it could be discussed. But, no, they didn't do that, so we have to question the assurances of the Minister that that report will be on our desk before this session is through.

I have very good cause because the Minister brought up in his own speech a few moments ago a number of reports which we had questioned him about earlier in the question period today. Mr. Speaker, we questioned him because we believe that their action or inaction in regard to those reports again betrays a lack of willingness to act or their incompetence, their inability to act. We only need to point out to you that those reports which were commissioned quite some time ago were promised to us last fall and we still don't have them on our

desks yet. And that, in fact, the one Wright committee report which dealt with safety and health conditions in Manitoba's mining industry was brought forward late last spring and the government has yet to take any action in regard to the recommendation of those reports. So given that example, that very concrete and that very immediate example, do you blame us for questioning the Minister when he provides us with hallowed and unsubstantiated assurances that we will have a report from the Labour-Management Committee on our desk before the end of this session? I don't think you can blame us. I think that would be only the logical assumption that one in our position would make.

What if that report does come forward? Would that report be treated in the same way that the report on the safety and health conditions in Manitoba's metallic mining industry was treated? Will that report be shunted aside to another committee for that committee to review the recommendations of the first committee? We don't know because there has been no action on any of those recommendations by the Minister to date; whether after that second committee report if the Minister will accept those recommendations. But we do know that the Minister in the past has ignored recommendations that have come to his desk through committee structures such as this.

It was the Workplace, Safety and Health Advisory Council that recommended to the Minister that all workplaces in the Province of Manitoba employing more than 20 persons should have a mandatory safety and health committee. It was the Minister who rejected that recommendation, it was the Minister who refused to act upon that recommendation and it was the Minister who brought in an entirely different system. So the Minister has told us by his past actions that he does not feel it necessary, and I will agree with him, I will support him in that decision that it is not necessary always to act upon the recommendations of a committee, because every Minister has to call upon himself or herself the absolute authority in regard to dealing with those recommendations. He or she can't give away power in that way or at least it has not been the practice of Ministers to give up power in that way. So the Minister, by his actions in the past, and philosophically with which we agree, has said that those recommendations that may come forward to him as a result of this referral may in fact not be followed. We have no assurance that they will be brought before this House where they can be discussed.

I would have anticipated, if they wanted to give this subject the open airing that it should have, that they would have written into that particular amendment a requirement that it come before the House before the end of this session and they could pick a date which they would feel would be appropriate. As well, having written into it, the requirement that it would come before the House for discussion so that we could proceed in discussing with it, because unless the Minister provides us with legislation then the opportunity for detailed discussion of that particular report and its recommendations will be in fact be limited.

So we have to, at least I have to, Mr. Speaker, oppose this particular amendment. I intend to vote

against this amendment. I am not enthusiastic that I will win that vote, however, I think it is important that the record be clear that we believe this particular amendment to be exactly what it appears to be, and that is a device to delay any positive action on the part of this government to provide the type of protection which was called for by the original resolution and the amendment. So they have put us in a difficult position, but they have put the people of this province, the working people of this province, in a far more difficult position. Because I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there are people who are suffering because of the lack of legislative protection today and the Minister knows about those people because they have come before the Employment Standards Branch of his department with their complaints, and because of the lack of legislated protection they find themselves losing wages.

We had a long debate, both last year and this year, about whether or not there were any third-party individuals who would innocently be affected by the legislation as it stood before. While we couldn't document any, Mr. Speaker, there were those here who felt that was of enough concern to make those sorts of changes. Yet now when we can document that people are losing money, not money lenders, not financiers, but working people are losing money because there is no legislative protection before them, that concern seems not to be there. The government seems to be not so concerned about that, yet they were very concerned last year about those third parties that they can't proven even exist and they document one specific instance of ever having been affected by the previous legislation, they were so concerned about them that they felt necessary to rush headlong into the amendments which they brought forward last year to The Payment of Wages Act and The Real Property Act which stripped workers of their protection. I only wish that they would feel so rushed in regard to providing protection for those workers now that they have stripped them of that protection that they had before.

I'm not suggesting or I'm not trying to limit their action to a legislative mechanism to bring back the original legislation so amended as to be acceptable to the courts, although that is the type of action I think is necessary. We were even willing to support this type of action which would accomplish much the same thing in a bit of a different way and yet they rejected the amendment. They obviously are going to reject the original resolution and they have tried to stall the entire process and leave the workers of this province at the mercy of forces over which they have no control until such a time as they can refer it to a committee and until such a time that Committee can make a report, until such a time as that report can be acted upon by the Minister. And we have no assurances that in fact the Minister is going to act on those recommendations and we have no insurances in fact that that recommendation or those reports will become forthcoming in the near future.

So we are disappointed, we had expected it but we are disappointed, in this particular amendment and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it does very little for the credibility of the government when they say that by this amendment, by this roundabout way, by this stalling technique, they hope to protect

anyone in this province because they won't do it. It's obvious that they do not intend to do it and it's obvious that they will use any way out of providing positive and forceful action in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to put a few remarks on the record and support the amendment that was proposed by the Honourable Member for Emerson and express my concern that the Member for Churchill has seen fit and advised the House that he is not prepared to support the amendment that was proposed. I don't know what kind of assurances that the Member for Churchill needs in matters such as this to change his mind and support the resolution. He couldn't support the proposal that was offered by the Honourable Member for Inkster for some strange reason and then he came along with his own proposal, and maybe it's one that will be considered at a later date because it's rather a vague motion as I read it. He says here that the defaulted wages for a period not exceeding two months from a government administered fund which is a strong possibility that may come out of the report of The Labour-Management Review Committee. It's a possibility but right away, Mr. Speaker, he has turned his head to one side and he says no, I'm not going to vote for it. I have no interest in anything that comes from the Members on this side of the House. He has no trust in what I say is likely the best Minister of Labour this province has ever seen or will ever see. And I think the records have already indicated and some of the better known labour people in this province will vouch for my comments that he has filled that capacity. The other Minister of Labour that is sitting right over here in his desk is one of the best Ministers of Labour we have had in this province and very able and very capable dealing with matters such as we have before us, which is a most difficult matter.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, it's not an easy problem and it's one that's not going to be solved very easily. To listen to the Honourable Member for Churchill you would think he could raise up in this Chamber and on the spur of the moment he would come up with an idea as to how we can solve this matter. I never heard him give any concrete evidence or suggestions as to how we can deal with this matter. I thought maybe he would give us the benefit of his wisdom or provide it to the Minister at least, so that we could do our best to tackle this most difficult problem. But, Mr. Speaker, no, he was negative all the way. In fact, he said that he doubted very much that the Minister has even called the Committee together yet. Now that's not the way I heard the Minister phrase it when he put into the record. He said the matter is before that Committee at the present — (Interjection)— The Member for Churchill said, as I wrote it down, he said as far as he understood it has not been referred to the Committee as yet. Now I doubt that very much, but nevertheless he likes to talk off the top of his head, which he did, and I think that he mentioned about the incompetence, of who? Of the people that's on that Committee that's reviewing this matter. I support the comments of the

Honourable Minister; those are very able people who are on that committee and they are very understanding. I suspect that when we do get the report, we will have the benefit of their wisdom at least and it will be neutral from the attitude that we have in this Chamber, where the Member for Churchill says, "I'm not going to vote for it; I'm not going to vote for it, period." So it doesn't matter what we bring in, he's not going to vote for it. I don't think he's being fair to the House, he's not being fair to himself, and he's not being fair to the people who are studying it. I don't think that a man of his ability, and the Labour critic for the New Democratic Party, should take that attitude in this Legislature when we are dealing with such a serious matter as this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly and very quickly, I will support the amendment and I wish the Minister of Labour well and I wish that Labour-Management Review Committee well and I am looking forward to their tabling reports hopefully that we can resolve this most serious problem in our province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today we had sort of a lecture from the Honourable Minister of Government Services with respect to hearing aids that we have in our desks, and unfortunately, it went over the head of the Honourable Member for Roblin because he wasn't listening to what was being said by the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Member for Churchill said the reason he wasn't going to vote for this resolution was because it was putting the question off, that the Minister had had twelve months notice and he hadn't done anything about the question and that this was just another stalling tactic, that this government in its do-nothing attitude, the only way it was proceeding was to wait for things, put them off, don't do anything about them today.

The Honourable Member for Churchill said nothing about the Labour-Management Review Committee not being able to handle this question. All he said was the Minister had been putting off this question, and that is true. —(Interjection)— That's right, people should put on their hearing aids and listen to what is being said and possibly try to understand what is being said.

The Honourable Member for Churchill also said that he was prepared to go along with the resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster, but he felt we could improve it. Nothing is perfect in this world, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that we can always amend things and make them better. But to just put them off for the sake of stalling because we don't have the intestinal fortitude to face a question, that, I believe, is not in the best interests of this House or in the best interests of the people of Manitoba. This Minister of Labour who was just lauded a moment ago, who professes to have a halo in respect to labour, was very quick to do something which was detrimental to the people of Manitoba who work and who happen to lose their wages because a company goes bankrupt. And we had a partial solution. It wasn't perfect but it was something towards helping

those people. But, no, the Minister of Labour the last session was very quick to give the financial institutions the upper hand before workers got their wages. That's what he did.

Today he comes to us and says, "Give me time; let this committee have a look at it and then we shall determine what we will do." He doesn't even put a time limit on when this committee has to report, because he doesn't want to deal with the question. He hopes it will creep away, get under the carpet and nobody will notice it. Those few people who get hurt by this, he hopes will also never come to his attention because if he had wanted to deal with it, he could have dealt with it at the last session, and he didn't.

Now, there were two proposals, first the one of the Member for Inkster — they didn't like that. We proposed an amendment; they voted that one down too. What did they bring in? Strictly a stalling tactic, nothing else, and for that I have to say to the Minister of Labour, he doesn't represent the people of Manitoba in the labour sector when he says, "We'll deal with your problems some time in the future, not today. We didn't deal with it last year properly but we did it so that the workers would suffer, not the financial institutions, who can well afford it." But when it comes to dealing with it today, which would maybe help some of the people who are involved in these dire situations, he says, "Oh, let's study it."

Mr. Speaker, I think this totally epitomizes what this government is like. They keep avoiding the problems of the people. The financial institutions, oh, that's a different situation, but when it comes to the working people, let's put it off for another day; let's hide it under the rug; let's give it to a committee and if that committee reports, let's give it to another one to review whether they did the right job or not. You know, right from Day One this is what this government has done. They had a task force, then they had another committee to review whether the task force had done its job, then it was shunted off to all the departments to make sure that each department would have a look at what the task force recommended. And what has happened? To date we are not aware of anything that is really taking place, Mr. Speaker.

So I say, this government is strictly a do-nothing government when it comes to the working people of Manitoba and I must vote against this kind of resolution.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted a moment or two to set a few things straight; first of all to say that this is a good debate that we are having on this subject and we are using the Private Member's Resolution hour in precisely the way it ought to be used. The Member for Inkster raises a question of concern to him and to all members of the House with respect to payment of wages to workers who have earned them and who then perhaps find themselves in the situation of not being able to collect them, and he was right. He was right in his original assumption that members on this side

of the House are as concerned about that problem as all members are in this House.

The honourable member who just spoke, of course, stretched matters in the usual manner when he says that a year ago we were in a hurry to put financial institutions ahead of workers' rights. Of course he is wrong on two counts: First of all, that only happened on or about July 12 — it's only about five or six months ago, to begin with, when we last sat together and passed legislation. Secondly, the other part of the assumption is of course wrong, as the Member for Inkster at least was honest enough to point out, that it isn't putting financial institutions ahead of workers' rights; it is that same worker's investment that is involved, as often as not as anybody else's in this whole question, so let's not distort it beyond all recognition.

Mr. Speaker, what I am simply suggesting, and time will prove this right, the honourable members opposite do not wish to take the Minister of Labour's statement at face value. They do not believe that he is as concerned about this matter and will indeed act expeditiously in this matter. Time will tell.

But the purpose of using the Private Member's Hour to use a Private Member's Resolution to bring the attention of this House to a problem is being correctly used in this instance. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that that purpose will be fulfilled. I do not accept the arrogance that is displayed from time to time by the Member for Inkster, that unless it is done his way, that's the only way. And his erstwhile colleagues the New Democrats fall into that same trap from time to time; you know, unless it is done their way, there cannot be any other way. I am satisfied.

I, like the Member for Roblin, happen to have some confidence in my colleague the Minister of Labour, that his way, or our way — and, Mr. Speaker, it is not the only way, it is not necessarily the only right way, but it happens to be the way it has to be because we happen to be government, gentlemen. And as the honourable member who proposed the original resolution well knows, all he could do is suggest that we consider the advisability of. I am satisfied that this government, this Minister of Labour, will do more than consider the advisability of, but will in fact act on it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am prepared to say a few words on this proposed amendment that the Member for Emerson proposed to this House.

When the Minister got up to take part in the debate, that's one of the slick ways that the Minister really has been involved in the past, even with some of the legislation that he has been involved with, someone else runs interference for him first and then he comes along — it's almost like a football game; somebody is trying to open a hole in the line for him. But sometimes that line isn't open.

The Minister said that this previous Act that dealt with the payment of wages through The Employment Standards Act was found wanting. Maybe it was. Legally it was found wanting. But I also say, Mr. Speaker, that the delay by this Minister, who was

aware of this condition at least 24 months ago, and by this government, has been found wanting, really found wanting, found wanting by the people of Manitoba, those who are affected, those, who when they go to collect their wages are told, "Sorry, the money lenders and the users of society are the ones who get first crack at it." You know, the Attorney-General, who ran the interference last year because it came in as an omnibus bill, you know that's the real catch-all, in the statute law amendments — you put everything in there and you try and fool the Opposition so they won't find certain things. Oh, yes —(Interjection)— The Attorney-General is sitting there laughing. We picked out one or two last year in that second law statutes amendment that we pointed out to the Minister of Labour. He wasn't even aware of it; wasn't even aware of some of the things that were trying to be slipped through. One of them he accepted and withdrew the thing from the legislation.

So if the Minister of Labour had been so concerned, so concerned really, the concern that he expressed today . . . and he is such a nice fella, you know, real concern . . . sure, as he said, maybe the Act was found wanting in a legal fashion. But his actions and the actions of that government in not trying to get something in place, and you know the Minister has had ample time, even since the last session, to get something rolling. Maybe I am one of these too who has problems with his hearing aid, but I listened very closely and very intently to when the Minister was speaking and I am not sure yet whether he has referred this matter to the so-called Wood's Committee, or Manitoba Labour-Management Review Committee. After all, all he is asking them is to consider something. I don't know what he is asking them to consider because, really what does this resolution say, the amendment: "Whereas the Minister has requested that the committee give consideration to this matter at the earliest possible time. . ." I don't know who prepared the amendment for the Member for Emerson; I am sure it wasn't the Member for Emerson. I am sure perhaps was someone in the Minister's office, maybe his executive aide or something like that, or maybe the Member for Springfield. I don't know who, but whoever did it, certainly, as has been pointed out here this afternoon quite amply so, quite lucidly so, that if the Minister was so concerned and found the legislation so wanting, that he would want to have a date: "Look, we are going to have a report from this committee. If you have referred it, when did you refer it?" I never heard the Member for Emerson saying when the Minister had referred this, even though he was the mover of this —(Interjection)— Oh, ye of little faith] We are the victims of experience, the experience at the hands of this government, which is a do-nothing government, do-nothing, laissez-faire, and when it comes to the polls, you are going to be out on your ear and I shall be standing on the sidelines applauding and I will be working to see that you are defeated. I will be working very hard to see that you are defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, when this subject next comes up, the honourable member will have 16 minutes.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

Monday, 9 February, 1981

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn and resume in Committee of Supply at 8:00 o'clock.

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