



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 87A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 14 JUNE, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 14 June, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Fifth Report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your Committee met on Tuesday, June 14, 1983 to consider the Financial Statements of Flyer Industries Ltd.

Mr. Hugh J. Jones, Chairman, Mr. Douglas McKay, former President and Chief Executive Officer and Mr. Barry Oliver, Acting Chief Executive Officer, provided such information as was required by members of the Committee with respect to Flyer Industries Ltd.

Your Committee examined the Financial Statements of Flyer Industries Ltd. as at December 31, 1982, and adopted the same as presented.

HON. M. B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to announce an initiative taken by our government through the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to reduce the financial burden on Manitoba farmers who have borrowed money at high interest rates.

In recent months, the Department of Agriculture has been looking at ways to reduce interest rates on MACC loans. However, the money was borrowed by the province at higher interest rates, and, anxious as we are to assist farmers, we wish also to avoid losses to the Provincial Treasury.

In the meantime, some farmers have refinanced their loans and paid them off at no penalty, and they will continue to have that privilege.

However, we are concerned that there will be a trading of clients between MACC and its federal counterpart, FCC. In other words, clients who borrowed at MACC at the higher interest rates, are now going to FCC to borrow at current rates in order to pay off their loans.

Similarly, FCC clients are coming to MACC to refinance their high interest rate loans.

The consequence is that during the tough times for farmers, capital of both the provincial and federal farm lending agencies is being used up without an expansion of the number of clients being assisted.

In addition, some farmers are in such a precarious financial situation that they can't get refinancing anywhere and are forced to pay high interest rates. So, the ones who need help most are the least likely to get it. At the same time, both MACC and FCC will be left with the so-called higher risk clients.

To deal with these problems we are introducing a program which permits MACC clients to buy down their interest rates at approximately 13 percent, using the same concept that is used in commercial mortgage financing.

It is estimated the net savings on 1,151 farm loans - these are the loans that were taken out during the period of higher interest rates - they saving will be approximately \$26 million over the remaining terms of the loans, if all elect to buy down their interest rates on current loans from MACC.

The buy down program can effect substantial savings to farmers. For example, the buy down price of \$10,500, a farmer can reduce his annual payment on a 30-year \$150,000 loan by \$5,000.00. Total savings over the term of the loan will be over \$160,000.00.

The government should be able to assist farmers through this program at no cost to the Provincial Treasury.

The buy down sums invested at current interest rates will offset the losses which result from reducing interest rates from 17 percent to 13 percent.

The buy down program, Mr. Speaker, is but one more example of the concern of this government for the well-being of agriculture - our basic industry.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to thank the Minister for making one of the few announcements that he makes, dealing with policy in the Legislature. They're normally made at press conferences prior to the sitting of the House.

The announcement today, Mr. Speaker, is an endorsement that NDP times are tough times in Manitoba. The Minister of Agriculture is today standing and telling the farm community that he is still continuing to pay high commercial interest rates or interest rates that are equal to those commercial rates of any other business, unlike the Interest Rate Relief Program or the interest policies that we had in place, which reduced the interest rate by some 4 percent under what the commercial rate would be for farmers, beginning farmers, to help them in the farm industry. So, I can see very little assistance, Mr. Speaker, in this announcement.

The buy down proposal, Mr. Speaker, will again ask the producer, that young farmer who's trying to make

a go of it under extremely difficult times, to come forward with some up-front money to, in fact, buy his way out of it, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker.

However, I will give the Minister a little bit of credit for having tried to deal with the situation, but if we remember the 1981 election promise that no one would lose their farm or home or their business because of high interest rates, they still have not lived up to that promise, Mr. Speaker, and we want to remind the people of Manitoba of that particular promise.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Beef Stabilization Program - layoffs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Economic Development.

Since the Minister of Agriculture has refused to develop and participate in a Beef Stabilization Program for beef feedlot operators in the Province of Manitoba, could the Minister of Economic Development indicate how many jobs will be lost in the beef packing industry in the Province of Manitoba as a result of that inaction and wrong decision by the Minister of Agriculture?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think the member opposite must have been examining a different plan than the one I think my honourable colleague has presented. As I understand the Beef Stabilization Program, it is an integrated program designed to encourage farmers here in the province to carry on the full scale of cattle development here so that they are, in fact, available in the province for delivery to packinghouses and that the program is designed to increase the number of jobs and the value-added that stays in the province unless the member opposite can clarify his question somewhat or perhaps my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture would care to explain once again the design and purpose of the Beef Stabilization Program. I really can't answer the question.

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

Well, since the Cabinet communication has not reached the Minister of Economic Development that the Beef Stabilization Plan deleted and left off the support program, the feedlot operators in Manitoba who finished the beef to be packed in Winnipeg packinghouses, I would ask the Minister of Economic Development if she is now confirming that she did not instruct her department to make enquiries with the beef packing industry in the Province of Manitoba to determine the impact of having the feedlot operators left out of the program, and furthermore what impact the loss of some 50,000 feeder cattle last year that went out of the province to be fed and slaughtered and processed out of the province creating jobs out of the province and not in the Province of Manitoba?

I ask the Minister did she not have her department do a study to determine the employment impact of that kind of loss in the beef feeding industry and packing industry in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, the Honourable Member for Pembina's questions and suppositions are totally inaccurate. The beef program does include the finishing of cattle, and does include the feedlot industry. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the feedlot industry was involved in a number of meetings with the Beef Commission, which were held across rural Manitoba, encouraging many of the farmers to put their cattle into finishing in the feedlots in Manitoba.

Sir, what has been requested by the feedlot operators is a support of an investment support price on the basis of dollar amount of insurance on finishing of cattle, which is far beyond the support that has been provided to the rest of the beef industry. In fact, some of the calculations that have been provided, which were indicated to us were required to stabilize the feedlot industry, were supports of \$95 a cwt, which in their analysis required premiums of almost 20 percent. Mr. Speaker, in the submission it was a 50-50 proposition which the Province of Manitoba is already putting in millions of dollars in the beef industry.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the question relating to the numbers of slaughter animals leaving the province. Mr. Speaker, that has been an annual event, a historical event. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the numbers of slaughter animals, we hope, will increase as a result of the stability in the industry. But to say that the impact on the packing industry as a result of four years of do nothing and the killing of a stabilization program by their administration did have a great impact on the loss of the packing industry in the Province of Manitoba by Swifts Corporation, Sir.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that the Minister of Agriculture has confirmed that he is not offering any assistance to the feedlot operators finishing beef in this province, could the Minister of Economic Development now kindly answer the question I posed to her some minutes ago? Did she have her department do any economic analysis as to the employment loss and the potential loss of more packing capacity and employment in the Province of Manitoba, because 50,000 beef animals left this province last year to be fed in Ontario and Alberta, to be slaughtered and packed, and employ workers in Alberta and Ontario and not Manitoba? Has she, in view of the fact that her Minister is claiming his program solves all the problems, done that analysis to provide him advice so that he might bring forward a program to include the beef feedlot industry in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, what really astounds me is that a member who can proclaim that the farmer wants the virtues of complete freedom, individuality

and free enterprise, the moment the market starts to move against him, sings out and screams out for an immediate program from the government. It's a foolish contradiction, Mr. Speaker. What we are trying to put in place — (Interjection) — We inherited this problem that had been left there by the inaction and the patchwork programs.

What my colleague has put in place is a long-term, sound program for ensuring that the full range of beef development occurs in the province, and I can assure the members opposite, as well, we are working together on the problems raised by retaining the changing scene in the packinghouse industry and doing our utmost to see (1), that there are beef and hogs available for those packinghouses; and (2), to ensure that we keep our share of that vital industry here in Manitoba.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Minister of Economic Development is astounding us in her logic in a party that treats everyone equitably that they would have deliberately left out one segment of the beef industry. That's hardly equitable treatment by the New Democratic Party. Can the Minister of Economic Development indicate whether she can assure Manitobans that there will be no further packinghouse layoffs or shut-downs in the Province of Manitoba, since her government and her Minister of Agriculture has refused to assist the beef feedlot industry?

HON. M. SMITH: You know, Mr. Speaker, the concept of equity that is being voiced on the other side of the House is that you treat everyone precisely equally, assuming that they are all in identical economic circumstances. Mr. Speaker, people are not, and a concept of equity that we support on this side is to encourage people to stand on their own feet. It's only those people who, because of the economic system or because of misfortune, find themselves incapable of managing to stand on their own feet, that we believe in giving them programs to assist them to a position where they can be self-reliant.

It astounds me, Mr. Speaker, that the concept of equity on the other side is just to give out exactly equal amounts of assistance to everyone, regardless of what the problems underlying the difficulty are.

With regard to the packing house industry there is more to that industry, as the members opposite well know, than sharing a supply of beef and hogs. There is a continental restructuring of that industry where the well-being of the Manitoban's share of the industry has to be studied with — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, it's an industry that requires a great deal of understanding. It's rapidly changing. Our goal is to retain our fair market share, and we are doing what is within our resources, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that. To give a guarantee that we can't stop that kind of change completely, Mr. Speaker, that would be irresponsible and beyond, not only our means, but those of the members opposite. But we can assure you we are doing what is within our means to preserve all phases of the industry.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that we realize the closing of Swifts was an intercontinental rationalization of the meat packing industry and not the fault of the Progressive Conservative Government

when it happened, would the Minister of Economic Development give us the assurance, given the statements, the pronouncements by the Minister of Agriculture as to the grandeur and greatness of his Beef Income Stabilization Plan, that there will be no further layoffs in the meat packing industry in the Province of Manitoba?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I really marvel at the flipping back and forth of the thinking of the member opposite. One moment he's saying, government keep out. Don't touch us. Don't interfere, while the profit is being made by the private sector. The minute there is some problem that comes about from the market or technological change or supply-demand shifts, then he's immediately saying, government step in and solve all the problems.

Now, Mr. Speaker, neither extreme position makes sense.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is your word worth anything?

HON. M. SMITH: You know, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but think that I am listening to a kindergarten class that says, you have to be black or white. Mr. Speaker, there are many shades and colours between extremes. These kind of economic problems do not admit of easy simplistic solutions. We're doing what we can, working with both private and public sector to maintain the economic integrity here in Manitoba, and we absolutely reject any notion that you must go either to complete premarket on the one hand or complete government jumping-in on any and every problem on the other.

White factory closure - implements

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism. You might say it will be interesting research as to what the Premier said when he was in Opposition and what the Minister said just now, but my question is to the Minister.

The closure of the White factory, or it went into receivership as we all know yesterday in Eastern Canada, will the Minister be doing some research with implement dealers that are involved with the White factory franchises here in Manitoba as to the effect of the employment or the unemployment that this closure in Ontario may cause?

HON. M. SMITH: I'd be happy to take that under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

Co-op Implements - reports

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd follow up with that question. Because of the obvious problems the implement business is in, because of the closure of White, is the Minister going to be in close touch with Co-op Implements in Manitoba and requesting them to give her annual reports - or very quickly - monthly reports as my colleague says, as to the position of that

company in Manitoba at the present time because of the situation the implement business is in?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, Mr. Speaker, we do get regular reports from Co-op Implements and, as you know, the total implement industry is somewhat dependent on the vitality of the agriculture sector. Although the agriculture sector has done relatively well in Manitoba in past years, I think that everyone recognizes that they are having cash flow problems. They've not been in the market for heavy purchase of farm implements. On the international scene, where there are potentially markets, many of the countries who require these implements are not in a financial position to make big purchases. Now as this industry develops over time, there is opportunity in the future, but it has to seek out what is an optimum level.

I think what probably happened was that during the upswing there was a great expansion in capacity to develop this machinery that wasn't matched on the other side by ability of customers to purchase.

Now, we will do what we can within our jurisdiction to help even out some of those ups and downs, but it just seems patently obvious to me and I think to most of the members that we cannot control the broader scene. What we can do is understand it and attempt to develop a strong strategy to help our company survive, as many as possible survive, within that context.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my further question is to the Minister. Seeing that this is confession day, confessions that the previous government wasn't responsible for everything that went wrong, I would ask the Minister if she has had representation from Co-op Implements in Manitoba for more financing if the agricultural situation in Manitoba is such that this farm implement company is in trouble?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any recent approach of that sort. I would hope that the restructuring that was done before went along with a strength in management capacity to develop strategies to deal both with upturn and downturn in the market. I think one of the great difficulties with many companies is they lived with an expanding market for so long that they thought that was going to be an attractive life. Instead, there must be a skill to plan for up and down, and then an ability to move quickly depending on how things work out. Now if, Mr. Speaker, that type of thinking is considered unrealistic or deceitful by the members opposite, then I think they're in a much worse condition than I had previously thought.

Flyer Industries Limited

MR. F. JOHNSTON: One more further question to the Minister of Economic Development, Mr. Speaker, because this is confession day and honesty day.

Today, in the committee meeting of Flyer, the Minister indicated that this government would be interested in a joint venture with Flyer and some other international company. I would say, is that a change of policy from the First Minister who criticized us whenever we thought of it before?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether or not the member opposite arrived late or whether

he is guilty of selective hearing. What I said was that we were open to all the options for Flyer, continuing to operate it publicly, entering into joint venture or sale; that what we are willing to do is to consider the well-being of the company, of the economy of Manitoba and to examine options as they come in that light. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite think that kind of open-ended problem solving and businesslike approach to the management of Flyer and the economy of Manitoba is somehow remiss or not well based, then I think they had better reflect.

Seriously, I think to be clear, where our economic approach differs from theirs is their assumption is, Mr. Speaker, that only the private sector can operate things in an efficient way. What we are saying is in some cases it makes more sense to go that route, in others it makes more sense to go joint venture, and in another it makes more sense to go public. What is important are the relevant factors relating to a particular sector or particular business.

Government policy - joint ventures

MR. F. JOHNSTON: One more further question, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister if this is her policy or the Premier's, but would she familiarize herself with the statements and policies of the Premier when he was in Opposition regarding joint ventures between government companies and private industry, because there seems to be a very great difference at the present time and the people of Manitoba really have to know what their policy is?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think what the members opposite fail to recognize is an open-ended approach to solving problems. They are so used to thinking that there is a yes, no, or black-white that they cannot hear when someone says they're going to weigh the costs and benefits. What we want is a sounder economy in Manitoba, and we're prepared to use a whole range of approaches in order to achieve that.

CPR - taxes

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the Minister of Urban Affairs concerning the free ride that the CPR has had in this province for the past 100 years. He gave them a deadline of May 1st in which to respond and I would like to ask the Minister whether he has prepared legislation to be introduced this Session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm awaiting a further meeting with the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg and the Regional Vice President for the CPR, Mr. Pike. I'd be in a better position to make comment after that meeting takes place.

Licensed Practical Nurses - morale

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health.

I would ask him whether he can confirm a statement by the Manitoba Association of Licensed Practical Nurses to the effect that if the association has been unsuccessful in meeting with the Minister to discuss the very serious problem affecting the morale of LPNs in Winnipeg and Brandon relative to the continuation of their jobs and their professional category on hospital nursing staffs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I very categorically deny that this is the case.

I might say that I met with the LPNs and other groups earlier in our stage, since we took over the government. They have been having discussions with Dr. Johnson and Manpower. They've requested a meeting with me, that's true. I had a meeting slated and it had to be cancelled while I was in the hospital. There is another meeting that is slated for next Monday.

Now, the problem with Brandon, I was never informed by them directly. I received a copy of a letter that they wrote Brandon and my honourable friend's question here in the House was actually the first time I heard anything about that. The letter, as my honourable friend will know the procedure, the copy of the letter came in automatically as it is the instruction to my staff. They were checking into that while my honourable friend asked the question. I thought it was important enough to make an official Ministerial Statement the day following or two days after. I did state at the time that I would organize a meeting and I did state the policy of the government and I stand by that. I definitely deny the situation that they've been trying to get a meeting with me and weren't able to do it.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister whether he is aware that, notwithstanding the statement that he made in this House on the subject subsequent to the original questions that I asked, that LPNs in Manitoba, particularly in Brandon and Winnipeg, are badly concerned, badly worried, and troubled at the present time because of situations that appear to be developing administratively with respect to nursing staffs in those two cities in particular, and that the morale of the LPN profession and category is suffering, notwithstanding the Minister's statement, and whether he does not think that a stronger commitment to the preservation of the category of LPN is called for at this time?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is again discussed today only because of some of the writeups that appeared in the newspaper.

If you go back to my statement of June 6th, in the conclusion this is what I stated and I quote directly from the statement, "It is the position of this government that LPNs will continue in a major role in the health

care field. I have asked the Manitoba Health Service Commission to review the role of the LPNs in health institutions and I will be meeting with the LPNs shortly to discuss this concern."

Now, as I stated today there is a meeting for 12:00 on Monday next, in my office. I add again, going back to the statement, "This particular incident at Brandon is unfortunate in that it transpired, but the outcome may be positive. The Commission will work with the Board to further clarify any innuendo, conflicting statements, and misunderstandings. The Brandon LPNs and their Association have indicated their concern is for the future, and this will be clarified by the process requested by the Brandon Board."

Then they presented a statement to me. My honourable friend has a copy of it, because that's where they stated that they had not been successful to meet with me. The meeting in fact was arranged, it was tried to be arranged immediately before receiving this, and I'm going to meet with them. They requested this meeting to present their views and I don't think it would be right to comment too much any more before I have a chance to discuss it with them.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary.

In acknowledging the Minister's statement of June 6th, I refer him to the situation today, which is June 14th, where there are concerns still being expressed, reported in the media over the weekend, and still arriving in my office in the mail. Therefore, I suggest to him that his statement has not allayed the fears of people in the profession who feel that LPNs and nursing positions are being manipulated by administrations in Brandon and Winnipeg hospitals to gradually phase out that category.

I ask him whether he does not think a much stronger statement suggesting that this government will not tolerate reduction or decline overall in LPN nursing category in Manitoba is called for at this time.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This might be the way that my honourable friend would like to operate or would operate; that's his choice. I've stated just a week or so ago that I would want to meet them. I made a very strong statement and I'm certainly not going to panic before I meet with these people and discuss the situation with them and see.

There's always two sides to a story also. The Brandon people are telling us that this is not the case. Now it's possible that they are and we'll get to the bottom of it, but I'm not going to react to a statement because there was a statement in the Press. What would it serve? I think whatever policy has to be well thought out and we'd have to make sure that we can stand behind the policy. I made a statement. I will meet with them on Monday. It's not going to be the end of the world between now and Monday and they will have a statement and a strong statement.

MACC buy downs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I've listened with a great

deal of interest to the statement that he made in the House today with respect to MACC buy downs. What I've got from that statement that the farmers that are reasonably solvent can trade back and forth between FCC and MACC because they have a net worth. The purpose of this announcement is to say that the farmers that aren't that solvent can't switch their loans over, so these farmers are therefore obliged, to use the example in this statement, to pay a \$10,500 bonus so they're in an equal position to the other farmers.

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Agriculture confirm that it's penalizing the poorer farmers to take advantage of this plan?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Don't you pay your debts? Do you get your debts free? That's ridiculous!

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, first of all, no, I do not agree that it is . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, no, I do not agree that it is penalizing a farmer and I'll give the honourable member an example of what options are available to the farmer.

In fact, if you take that \$150,000 loan at say 15 percent — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will give the honourable member an example of the \$150,000 example, an actual loan of \$150,850 at 17 percent over 30 years - the present payment is \$25,877.49 - Mr. Speaker, the annual payment on the reduction to 13 percent will be \$20,125.05, for an annual saving of over \$5,000.00. The buy down cost is \$10,454.89. Over the term of the mortgage, Sir, there is a saving of \$162,118.41.

There are three options, Mr. Speaker, in which the farmer can choose, he can make the payment as a cash payment immediately; or he can make the payment with his next payment which would include at the year-end; or he can finance that money on a three-year or five-year period. As he takes the longer period there will be a diminishing saving in that amount. But even if he takes that same payment over a five-year period, the net saving to that farmer over the 30 years is still \$158,997.75, Sir.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture, the farmer that's solvent doesn't have to take any of those three choices, does he?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should remember that farmers opted for a program which only MACC and FCC were offering. It was long-term stable borrowing, Mr. Speaker. None of the private financial institutions were offering those kinds of loans, Mr. Speaker, so that they were committed in terms of the borrowing for a long period of time. As a result of

that what has been happening is, there has been a trading of paper and it's been basically creating a workload that is really ineffective, because a year or two down the road many of those farmers would be coming back to MACC and saying, can we borrow again for 30 years now that we're through this period and we've got lower interest rates.

We are offering it and making it a blanket offer to all the farmers who are in this situation, and we are hoping as well that the Farm Credit Corporation and the Federal Government do likewise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On that point, could the Minister tell us definitively that the individual that has some equity does not have to put up money, and then can he tell us where the person who wants to buy down this program, where in fact he attains the money to do so?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should know that there will be a saving to farmers of \$26 million. The farmer has the option. The farmer who has had a 30-year mortgage has the options that I have outlined, either an immediate payment which will result in a reduction in his annual payment immediately in the case that I've outlined, of over \$5,000 in his annual payment, Sir, which will be a net reduction of \$5,000 immediately in his annual payment even on the basis of a \$10,000 cash payment, Sir.

What can be done if he does not wish to take it on an immediate payment or a first-year payment, he has the option of taking it on a three-year or five-year term which will reduce his benefits, but the benefits will still be very substantial, Sir.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Agriculture tell us why he's leading us astray here because indeed, as we understand it, there was a five-year clause at which time the interest rates were reviewed automatically? Why does he use in his example 30-year examples, and make the saving appear like it's a term over 30 years which was not available under the plan?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, he should ask his colleague, the member who was Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that the change occurred when they were in office. There was no longer the review. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, there is no longer a review. Mr. Speaker, the terms that are in here are 30-year terms in mortgages that were taken out and changes that were made when they were in office, Sir.

Prince Rupert Grain Terminal - consortiums

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture a different series of questions. It appears that a group of companies, the consortiums building the Prince Rupert grain terminal, are concerned about the future viability of the new terminal. I'm wondering if the Minister of Agriculture supports the

consortium's request of Ag Canada that the tariff for terminal handling be increased to prairie farmers so that the return on investment to the Pools and to the Cargills are part of that, can be guaranteed at 16 percent.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will take the specific question as notice. I can tell the honourable member that there were overtures made from Manitoba Pool Elevators to the province asking us whether we would not argue against or at least not be opposed to their request of their members for a levy to pay for their portion of the investment in the Prince Rupert terminal. We have indicated to the Pool, that in terms of their investment, if they wish to put it in we would not actively oppose them, but it would have to be their members' decision that would make that.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that the government has reached a conclusion or reached some determination on this particular point. I'm wondering if they then support a 20-percent return on investment for all grain companies - as indeed one Ted Turner of SaskPool says is essential for their business - if they support 20-percent returns on investment in grain handling and whether they would support it also in some other activities of grain handling, mainly by the railways.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, that question in terms of the grain companies and their farm organizations will have to be decided. I don't believe that farmers of those organizations - and it will depend on their discussions with the farmers - at least those organizations have the authority at the grassroots level to make that decision, as to whether or not they want their parent firm with that kind of return on investment; or they have the option, Sir, of lowering the elevator charges on the basis of cost of production or the basis of their actual cost and no return. They have that option, because it is a farmer-owned corporation. The Pools are farmer-owned. They have that choice, either to have a good balanced statement or a very positive balance statement, or run it at cost as a true co-operative and lower the costs to their members.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister then indicating that the government will not hold hearings for the \$2 a tonne increase that's going to be levied on those of us that ship grain to Western Canada; that he will not hold hearings and this government will not spend \$150,000 on advertising to tell us, as farmers, that we should not be spending this amount of money towards building a better system in the future, \$2 a tonne which, Sir, is equivalent to 5 cents a bushel which is the same amount the Crow rate will increase over the next two years?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I know now that the Conservative Party has changed their position; that they are now standing foursquare with the railways, Mr. Speaker, that's what is evident from the honourable member.

The honourable member in committee and the Conservative caucus in committee supported a firm

position in opposition to the changes of the Federal Government. Now he says, let us support the contention that the railway should get a 20-percent return on investment, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, there is one big difference. The fact of the matter is, if the farmers who own their elevator company wish to go along with it, they will have the say. They do not have to go along with it. They can tell their executive, by vote, that they have two choices. They either want a large return on their investment and have a good balance sheet, or they can provide that service at cost, at no increased cost. It really depends on the producers themselves because they have control of that corporation and not as it is in the Crow rate where, Mr. Speaker, the funds will be leaving the Province of Manitoba and placing a great hardship on our farmers.

Crown land allocation - appeals

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the process of appealing a Crown land allocation is one where the Minister has to approve - or in my time as the Minister had to approve - that reallocation of Crown land. Is that still the case? Does the Minister of Agriculture have to approve the reallocation of land after an appeal process?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the process, in terms of signing the appeals, the verification of the appeals that are handled by the advisory committee have not changed. They're the same as they were in the past.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Agriculture provide that document to this House and to the Opposition, so we are aware of the decisions made by the appeal board and why the decisions are made?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the decisions that are made by the appeal board are communicated to both applicants in terms of their decision. I will take that question as notice to find out whether or not there has been a practice of providing those decisions to the House. But certainly those decisions are communicated to both parties who appeal by the advisory board, because as I understand it - or there may be more than two parties appealing an original allocation - and that decision is communicated to all parties and they have the opportunity of appearing before the appeal board.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, when the Minister is checking into that, would he be prepared to review the Crown land appeal hearings that took place in The Pas on April 20th to make sure that the decision of the Crown Land Appeal Board was made on fact that was presented to them from the farmers who were appealing, not on the person who was applying or appealing the Crown allocation, not on a political affiliation with the New Democratic Party and the NDP Board that was appointed by him?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the decisions that have been made by the Crown Lands Appeal Board are their

decisions and they have been handled in that manner. Mr. Speaker, unless there is evidence that there is some decision-making and that evidence should be presented, I would want to investigate those allegations.

Deer Lodge Hospital - unions

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Member for Fort Garry asked a question for which I indicated I would get a response. I have some information for him today; this is in regard to the unions at Deer Lodge, the current certified unions.

The question had to do with whether the members of the union were in fact paying union dues, or I believe that was the intent of the question. Members of three unions are still on checkoff at Deer Lodge. Those unions are the Public Service Alliance of Canada, the Professional Institute of Public Service of Canada and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

All union dues are being deducted on a regular checkoff basis and paid to these unions. There is an application before the Labour Board for certification and that is going to be heard during the week of July 26th of this year. There are a couple of other unions who have also applied for certification of some of these workers, which the member is probably aware of, those two being the Operating Engineers and MONA. I assume that this information will suffice for the member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for that information, but then that raises the question that I put to her at the time.

Since April 1st, the Public Service Alliance of Canada has not been certified to represent those workers at Deer Lodge Hospital - the provincial takeover took effect on that date - why would the hospital be collecting union dues and turning them over to an uncertified union? Why are those dues not being held in escrow or trust for proper application in the future?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: My understanding of the agreement at the time that the province took over Deer Lodge Hospital from the Federal Government was that the unions that had been certified would carry on until new certification hearings were held and that they would, of course, have the right to apply for continuing certification.

To not have a break in the agreement, all systems were go until certification would be heard before the Labour Board, which is in July. This also allows the opportunity for other unions to request certification of certain numbers of the workers, if they choose to do so, and as I've indicated, two have indicated that they do wish some certification of some of the workers. But the unions that were there are continuing until such certification takes place.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please call the second readings on Bills 89, 90 and 91, and following the introduction of those bills it will be my intention to move Supply: Jobs Fund in the House, and Legislation in Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm just enquiring of the House Leader about the procedure that he has outlined, namely, Jobs Fund in here and Legislation outside. Legislation, of course, comes under the First Minister. I presume that the First Minister can't be in two places at one time. It had been our assumption, I suppose, not understanding that the First Minister would attend to his responsibilities in here with respect to Legislation, which in the ordinary course of events shouldn't take too long and then could move on to the Jobs Fund afterward. Is the House Leader telling us that the First Minister is not attending to his responsibilities for Legislation?

HON. R. PENNER: The First Minister is always attending to all of his responsibilities and doing so very well. Last year — (Interjection) — Well, you needn't put that phony sting in it. If you put in a phony sting, you'll get a phony response.

Mr. Speaker, last year the practice was - and we'd understood this being the practise before - that basically questions pertaining to Estimates on Legislation were answered by one or other of the Ministers on the Board of Internal Economy. We are following last year's practice.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, is the First Minister the Minister responsible for Legislation or not?

HON. R. PENNER: The government, Sir, will order its business as it sees fit within the rules and the precedents. I have answered the . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: . . . Leader of the Opposition. I have advised him, as I advised his House Leader earlier, that Legislation would be called in Committee as it was always planned that it would be called; and the Jobs Fund, here; and that there will be a Minister or Ministers in Legislation prepared to answer questions.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, we're well aware of the indifference of this House Leader to the traditions of the House or, indeed, to the traditions of the country. I am saying to him, is it not the case that under The Executive Departments Act, or whatever the proper name is, is Legislation, as an item, not assigned to the First Minister? If it's assigned to some other Minister, fine. But if it's assigned to the First Minister I suggest,

with respect, Sir, that he is the Minister who should be answering for it, unless of course he's away from the House, out of the House on other business. Nobody is trying to be glib or smart, except my honourable friend across the way, who little understands what the practices of this House have been and who would do well to keep his tongue to himself until he learns more about the House.

MR. SPEAKER: On the introduction of bills for second reading . . .

HON. S. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker, we want to find out what the practice is going to be with respect to Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: As Government House Leader, I call government business as the government caucus decides; and I have called government business. I have made it known to you, Sir, in the House. There is nothing more to be said.

HON. S. LYON: We'll see about that.

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 89 - THE LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT

HON. JERRY STORIE presented Bill 89, An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My comments will be brief.

Most of the amendments to this Act are of a housekeeping or administrative nature. The amendments to Subsection 103(4) and 103(5) are, I would suggest, the most substantive in nature. Subsection 103(4) currently provides the tenant with a general right of continued occupancy except in certain cases where the tenant is not in default of his or her obligations and had not intended to vacate. The necessity to move can be expensive and socially disrupting. The amendment that's being presented here would require the payment or forgiveness of an amount equal to two months rent as reasonable compensation to the tenant who must give possession of the rental unit to the landlord.

I should indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I have had representations from the Manitoba Landlords Association giving me some suggestions on amendments to this legislation and included in the exceptions where the tenant would be required to vacate are amendments that meet the requirements of the Manitoba Landlords' brief to myself. The amendments suggested in Subsection 103(9) and 103(11) and to Subsections 121 and 122 bring back into the Act . . .

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

Debate on Second Reading is debate on the bill, in principle, the honourable member should not refer to individual sections or clauses.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not refer to the specific sections.

Generally, the provisions which are being suggested to be brought back are those which deal with the powers of the Rentalsman to arbitrate. Those sections were deleted by amendments by members opposite at the time that the mediation arbitration provisions were dealing with rent increases were placed into the Act.

The number of other amendments are merely to clarify certain sections that had previously dealt with the arbitration mediation powers previously provided. Basically, Mr. Speaker, the amendments are of a minor nature, except the one I mentioned concerning the right of tenants where they are required to vacate under certain sections of The Landlord and Tenant Act.

Therefore, I would recommend this bill to honourable members for their consideration and adoption.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 90 - THE CATTLE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION ACT

HON. B. URUSKI presented Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Cattle Producers Association Act, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce for Second Reading Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Cattle Producers Association Act.

The purpose of the amendments is to transform the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association into a voluntary organization which is financed only by those producers who wish to do so.

Bill No. 90 is founded under the principle of freedom of choice, Mr. Speaker. This legislation supports the right of cattle producers to establish and maintain an association which meets their needs. It supports the right of individual producers to decide whether or not to finance this association, and it supports the right of individual producers to decide whether or not to disclose to the association information pertaining to the production and marketing of his cattle.

Mr. Speaker, I'm confident that those members who truly believe in the principle of freedom of choice will endorse the proposed amendments. Members will recall, Sir, when The Cattle Producers Association Act was passed in 1978, the New Democratic Party

disagreed strongly with many of the provisions of the Act including the imposition of a compulsory checkoff on all beef producers marketing cattle in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, beef producers stated clearly in 1974, in 1977, and more recently that they favour an association which is financed by voluntary contributions. We, on this of the House, respect their position on this issue. A central provision of the existing Cattle Producers Association Act is the compulsory checkoff. Sections 7 and 10 of the present Act authorize the association to impose a compulsory fee on producers marketing cattle and to increase that fee from time to time by regulation.

You will recall during the debate in 1978, Sir, the Conservatives insisted that the Act would establish a voluntary organization. They really attempted to create an illusion that the compulsory checkoff was not compulsory by repeating over and over again that it was a voluntary checkoff. Sir, by the endless repetition of a statement really does not make it fact.

Now, what is the definition of voluntary, Sir? Webster's Dictionary defines it as "proceeding from the will or from one's own choice or consent, or acting, or done, of one's own free will without valuable consideration or legal obligation." In contrast, compulsory means "mandatory or enforced." The Manitoba Cattle Producers Association checkoff, as it now stands, is not made by the choice or consent of the cattle producer. The checkoff is made mandatory by law and can be enforced by the courts. Even if a producer secures a refund, he is obligated by law to provide the association with the use of his checkoff monies for an entire year. He has no choice in the matter. He is compelled to turn over his money to the association.

At this point, Conservative logic takes some curious twists and turns. According to Conservative logic, the largely theoretical provision to obtain a refund turns a compulsory checkoff into a voluntary checkoff. However, Sir, it's not that simple.

The refund system set up by the MCPA has resulted in applications for refunds from basically two categories of producers, those who are strongly opposed to the Association in principle and will go to considerable effort to ensure they do not fund the Association; and those larger producers who are indifferent to the Association but who can secure substantial financial benefit by recovering the checkoff deduction.

Now let's look at the procedure for refunds that supposedly turns a compulsory checkoff into a voluntary checkoff. One might expect that you could telephone or write to the Association, give your name and address and producer number and your money would be sent to you. This was, in fact, the way that the proponents of the Association indicated refunds would be handled when the Act was passed in 1978, but really that's not the way it is.

First, you have to send a registered letter to the Association at its head office in Winnipeg applying for a refund. This letter has to be sent annually before June 30th of each year. If you miss the deadline, you're out of luck. You cannot get a refund of fees paid in June if you do not get around to applying until July.

When the Association receives the producer's letter, it does not issue a refund. It mails out a form to the producer. The producer not only has to complete the form, but he has to make photocopies of all his sales receipts that show where the deduction . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: Your act isn't very clean on your Beef Commission payouts. I've got one for you there too.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will have his opportunity.

The producer not only has to complete the form, he has to make photocopies of all his sales receipts that show where the deduction for the MCPA was made and send them in with the form.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not every producer has a photocopier on his home, so he's got to find some place to get his copying done. He will then get his refund, provided of course that he gets the form in the mail by July 15th. If he misses the July 15th deadline, too bad. After all, 15 days is plenty of time to exercise his free will. This procedure, Sir, just applies to the administration checkoff. That was 25 cents per head, but was increased to 50 cents per head on January 1, 1983.

Last July, on July 1, 1982, the Association imposed, by regulation, another checkoff deduction, a promotion checkoff of 50 cents per head. Now if you want to recover this deduction, you must write a second letter to the Association applying for a refund. Again the Association will mail you a form. The producer needs a second copy of his sales receipts showing where the promotion deduction was made and this must be mailed back to the Association, together with the completed form.

What happens, Sir, if a father is helping his son get started in farming? The son is still living at home but has a few cattle and sells some in his own name. Can they request two refund forms? No, Sir, they can't. The son must write his own letter and request his own form. The Association will provide forms one at a time on individual written requests only. The son must make his own application to request and receive a form.

Sir, some Conservatives, no doubt, will point to the fact that only 46 producers requested a refund of fees for the 1981-82 fiscal year. The fact that such a small number of producers received their refund may be touted by them as evidence of widespread support for the Association.

However, when you consider the complicated refund procedure I have just outlined and take into account the average number of cattle marketed by most producers, you can readily understand the real nature of the MCPA checkoff. It is in fact, Sir, a nuisance tax imposed on the majority of producers.

According to the 1981 census, Sir, there were 10,840 farmers who had less than 77 head of cattle on their farms. It's estimated that of these, 10,840 farmers marketed approximately 96,700 head in '81. That works out to an average of nine head per producer. At 25 cents per head, they've had an average of \$2.25 each deducted from their cattle sales. For the amount of money involved and the hassle to get it back, only the producers who adamantly oppose the Association will go to the trouble of obtaining a refund; and this was when the checkoff was only 25 cents a head. When it was increased to \$1 per head, they required two applications to get it back just in case a few more small producers would find the trouble worthwhile.

In fact, Sir, a simple calculation will show who does get the refunds. The 46 producers who received refunds

for 1981-82 fiscal year of the Association were refunded \$9,569, or an average of \$208 each. To obtain a \$208 refund, each producer would have had to market an average of 832 cattle, Mr. Speaker. In 1980-81, 41 producers marketed 828 cattle each and received refunds of \$207.00. Mr. Speaker, this is a far cry from the nine head each marketed by the 10,840 smallest producers.

What about the claim, Sir, that the majority of producers are in favour of compulsory checkoff to finance MCPA? I remind members that the referendum that was held in 1974 on a similar proposal — (Interjection) — it was a similar proposal, a checkoff, Sir, in 1974. I remind members that the referendum was held then and it was rejected by 57 percent of those voting. It should be noted that only 5,747 producers voted in the referendum.

You know, one can only speculate, Sir, how large the no vote would have been if all the small producers had been registered for the vote. I'm sure it would have been larger, Sir, because those campaigning in support of the proposal certainly would have had all their supporters signed up for the vote.

When the Member for Arthur was introducing The Cattle Producers Association Act in '78 he claimed, Sir, that he had approximately 4,000 letters from producers in support of the proposed Act. Sir, what did he have? He had 4,000 letters that had been solicited from the so-called Freedom Campaign in 1977 relating to the referendum on the Beef Marketing Board, Sir. Which letter was it, Mr. Speaker? Here's the letter that he had, a petition for an alternative to a Beef Marketing Board.

Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of nonsense that he perpetrated on this Legislature. In that form, Sir, what was in that form? No. 3, "A cattle producer organization to be funded by a voluntary checkoff . . ." and voluntary checkoff underlined, Sir, ". . ." and run by elected directors to do the following without government regulation." That's what was in the letter, Mr. Speaker.

Only Conservative logic, Sir, can turn such a letter calling for a voluntary checkoff without government regulation into support for a compulsory checkoff by government regulation, Sir, that's the only logic one can deduce from that. But, Mr. Speaker, many Conservatives will go on and say, marketing boards have been established without a vote and have compulsory levy powers, so why can't the MCPA? Or will they say, what about unions?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Arthur on a point of order.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would table that letter that he referred to, so that we could all see . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to table it at the finishing of my remarks, so that a copy can be made for the honourable member. He'll know what he's talking about. That's the letter that he quoted that he

said he had 4,000 copies in support of his legislation, which was nonsense. We asked him to table, Sir, those 4,000 letters. Do you think he ever did? We had to ask the department to see what was on file, Sir. That's what was found, there were no letters. It was phony, Sir, it was totally phony.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I think our Rules are very clear that if a member quotes from a letter in this House, he must table it now, and I would ask the Minister to table that letter now, Mr. Speaker.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to use the letter and I'll be pleased to table it for the honourable members, they can have a copy of it. Mr. Speaker, the honourable members can have the copy of the letter, I have no difficulty. He had 4,000 of them that he wasn't prepared to table in this House, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs to the same point.

HON. A. ADAM: On a point of order, because I object to the Member for Arthur requesting that that letter be tabled, because he had 4,000 of those letters on his desk while he was sitting right in this chair, I believe, this seat. I requested that those letters be tabled and he refused to do it, Mr. Speaker. I find it very odd that he would come in here now and ask that they be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur to the same point.

MR. J. DOWNEY: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank the Member for Ste. Rose, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, for confirming the fact that I had 4,000 of those letters, something the Minister of Agriculture just said that I didn't have.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I'm satisfied that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture will indeed table the letter referred to.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware, and as I've indicated that it was not in support of his legislation, it was in support of a voluntary checkoff, which they made compulsory, Sir.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I said, Conservatives will say marketing boards have been established without a vote and they have compulsory fees; I know the Honourable Member for Morris will appreciate the comments. And what about unions? What about union deductions?

Mr. Speaker, before I answer those questions I'd like to observe that many people who ask these questions actually oppose the establishment of marketing boards and unions, but let's deal with the issue at hand. How does a union attain the right to collect union dues? Was the United Food and Commercial Workers Union legislated into existence to bargain with the meat

packers in Canada, Sir? Of course not, they weren't. A group of employees has to start a union of their own. Nobody has to participate or contribute. But, Sir, before they can act, they must get a majority voting for them and to be certified by the Manitoba Labour Board. They then have to bargain with the employer to get a collective agreement, which can include a provision for the deduction of union dues from the wages paid and the remission of the money to the union. Even when a contract is in place, the employees can form a new union, Sir, they can form a new union and by majority vote get the first union decertified. Then the new union is certified in its place. That's what can happen to unions, Sir. Unions are permitted, Sir, by legislation, but any further comparison between unions and MCPA is like comparing clearly apples and oranges, Sir.

What about the comparison of marketing boards and the MCPA? Sir, I should point out that a number of boards, in contrast to the MCPA, have been established with the consent of the majority of producers. For example, you know, the Turkey Board, the Chicken Board, Egg Producers Board, but some Conservatives however note the exceptions. They cite, for example, the establishment of the Hog Producers Marketing Board, which was not subject to a producer vote. The comparison between the formation of the Hog Board and the MCPA, Sir, is highly questionable for a number of reasons:

1) The establishment of the Hog Board did not result in the initiation of a compulsory levy. The compulsory levy had already been put into place by a commission instituted by the Conservatives in the early 1960's.

2) There is every reason to believe that a substantial majority of hog producers favoured the establishment of a board. A substantial majority of producers marketing 60 percent of Manitobas hogs were already selling through the teletype system. So when a marketing board was put into place, nothing changed for them except for the fact a government-appointed commission was replaced by a producer-elected board.

3) The formation of the board both enhanced the economic power of producers and allowed for democratization of decision-making with respect to the marketing of hogs.

Members should be aware, Sir, that the MCPA's economic powers are almost nonexistent, because the association is precluded by law from selling or processing cattle. So the Hog Board and the MCPA are two completely different organizations with completely different objectives and with completely different histories.

Furthermore, on the subject of contrast between boards and the MCPA, one should note that there is a provision in the regulations for marketing boards whereby producers can seek to have a plan revoked and a board wound up. All it takes is a petition signed by 10 percent of the registered producers to set the process in motion. By contrast, Sir, the Cattle Producers Association Act has no provision which would allow dissatisfied producers to find out whether or not producers support the association.

There's also, Sir, a fundamental difference between the type of activities engaged in by unions and marketing boards on behalf of their members and the activities of the MCPA on behalf of cattle producers. Marketing boards and unions are formed to give power

to their members to advance their economic interests. It has been proven time and time again that individual farmers and individual workers often cannot get a fair deal from large processors or employers. And if participation in marketing plans or unions is not universal, they break down as the processors and the employers follow in what could be known as a divide and conquer policy.

The MCPA objectives are as different from the objectives of marketing boards as the day is from night. In fact, Sir, as I have stated the MCPA is prevented by the Act from exercising economic power on behalf of cattle producers, an obvious denial of freedom of choice, Sir. The MCPA's objectives are really to promote the industry, sponsor research, encourage education. In short, Sir, it is a lobby group on behalf of cattle producers. Sir, these are laudible objectives, nothing wrong with them, but they certainly are no different than those supported by other organizations in Manitoba. These are voluntary organizations, Sir, funded by voluntary contributions, not a compulsory checkoff under a special Act of this legislature.

HON. S. LYON: We'll remember this speech when we come to the election . . .

HON. B. URUSKI: Sir, it is interesting to note the experience of another producer group that is funded by a voluntary checkoff. — (Interjection) — The Honourable Member for Virden says, "Such as." The Manitoba Milk Producers Co-op Incorporated is financed by contributions, which are strictly voluntary. In order to fund the Co-op every member has signed a form authorizing a deduction from the proceeds of the sale of this milk.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Is it voluntary?

HON. B. URUSKI: Sir, the wording on the authorization - and I have a copy here - and for the honourable members who wanted a copy of the previous letter, here are some copies, Sir. I have — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, no they don't have to do it yearly, but they were forced to do that.

MR. H. GRAHAM: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: On a point of order. I believe that the Minister has said he is tabling a copy. He is supposed to table the original, and I would request him to table the original and not a copy of a letter he was quoting from.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if he wants the highlighted one, I will give him the highlighted one; it's the same copy as I have. Mr. Speaker, it would take a Conservative to come up with an idea like that, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the wording on the authorization form - and I will table this one as well - I hereby authorize

the Manitoba Milk Producers Marketing Board to deduct and remit to the Manitoba Milk Producers Co-op Incorporated, for my account, the sum of 0.20 percent of my gross milk proceeds each month. This authorization to be in effect until further notice in writing, Sir. Those are the forms that are used by the Milk Producers Co-operative. Then, Sir, there is a space for the date, producer's address and a signature and a witness's signature to the consent form.

By hard work, Sir, and commitment and service to its members, the Co-op has developed a membership of several 100 producers. This achievement is all the more commendable in view of the number of extraneous obstacles that the Co-op has had to overcome. I cite this example to illustrate that a producer or association funded by voluntary contributions can be successful provided that it is responsive to the needs of its members.

In summing up, Sir, I want to reiterate and to emphasize that the present government supports the right of producers to establish and operate organizations or associations that meet their needs. We support the right of cattle producers to maintain an association, financed by voluntary contributions. Producers however, who do not wish to fund the Association should not be forced to do so.

Accordingly, Sir, the present bill provides for the continuation of the MCPA, but it emphasizes that the Association will be operated as a voluntary organization. The Association will be able to, through its by-laws, register producers, impose fees on producers who wish to contribute to the Association, collect these fees, provide for the operation of a board of directors and so on. Furthermore, the Association will no longer be precluded from exercising its economic power through the sale, marketing or processing of cattle. In brief, Sir, the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association will be able to operate like any other voluntary organization.

Sir, I am confident that if effective service is provided to its members the Association will have no difficulty in financing its operation, unlike the honourable members opposite. As I have stated, Sir, Bill 90 is piece of legislation which supports the principles of freedom of choice. I don't know if my honourable members will recognize that. My view is that it is time to remove the heavy hand of government from the backs of cattle producers, Sir.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. B. URUSKI: Sir, it is time that we allow individual producers to exercise their freedom in deciding whether or not to support and finance the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I've listened with great interest, almost with laughable interest, to the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, because he ends up with a very laudable and worthwhile statement. He said these are the principles. I think that it's important that when you introduce any bill for Second Reading, you should deal with principles.

What I'm going to talk about today, Mr. Speaker, is purely my own viewpoint. These are my own personal views. They may not be the views of other members of this side, because we haven't had an opportunity to caucus this bill yet, but I can tell the Honourable Minister that the principles that apply in the cattle producing business in Manitoba are far more honourable than the Minister. I think that is something that is, in my opinion, vital to this whole thing.

Mr. Speaker, I recall many years ago hearing reports of a speech made by a First Minister in this province who was speaking in the Village of Angusville during an election campaign when he issued some pretty serious statements to the people of Manitoba. When he said - and I'm going to paraphrase the words because I haven't got them in front of me - any community in this province that elects a malicious, vicious or vindictive MLA cannot expect too much support from him. That was a former Premier of this province in 1973 speaking in Angusville.

Listening to the words of the Minister of Agriculture today, I couldn't help but wonder if the then Premier was referring to the present Minister of Agriculture, because everything that he has said to date in this bill indicates to me a malicious act on his part. It's vicious because it does not subscribe to his philosophy; and he has given every indication that this is a vindictive act on his part to get even with those people that refused to bow to his will in previous years. Mr. Speaker, I say that because I believe it.

I have watched this Minister act in the last two years, and I have seen the type of people that he has surrounded himself with. Certainly his actions so far have given me no indication whatsoever that this is nothing more than a malicious, vicious and vindictive act on his part to the cattle industry in this province. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because it was only half-an-hour ago that he was talking about a private deal that he had made with Manitoba Pool that he would not interfere if they would have a vote on a \$2 checkoff, and if the majority ruled it would apply to the whole works. Now he's turning around. If this is the man who believes in principle, if he believes in any principle at all, if he would allow that to happen in Manitoba Pool and then refuses to allow it to happen with the cattle producers in the Province of Manitoba, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the principle is far less than the interest.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make these few remarks right now, because I believe that this Minister has done nothing to assist the agricultural community, has done nothing to build his credibility in the agricultural community, has tried desperately to destroy the cattle industry in this province and said, if you don't subscribe to my policy, I will get you. That is the approach that he is taking.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that it's an attitude that is completely foreign to this government. I think it is an attitude that we have seen evidence of in this House. We saw it with the Government House Leader who said that you will do as I say. It doesn't matter what the principle is, you will do as I say. So it is an attitude that is becoming increasingly more prevalent in this government. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Manitoba will become more and more aware of it, that this is a dictatorial government, that this

is a vicious and vindictive government. On top of it, we have seen the actions of the First Minister; it is also an incompetent government.

So, Mr. Speaker, I regret very much the actions of the Minister of Agriculture today in bringing forward this piece of legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Roblin-Russell, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 91 - THE REAL ESTATE BROKERS ACT

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK presented Bill No. 91, An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill is designed to provide, through changes in bonding provisions of the Act, better protection to the public and a reduced administrative burden to both the industry and the Securities Commission.

The Act currently requires that salesmen, authorized officials and brokers be bonded. The amendment would provide only for a broker's bond. The requirement that salesmen and authorized officials of real estate brokers file surety bonds has proven over the years to be almost entirely redundant. This is the case because, where bond forfeiture has been called for, the practice almost invariably has been to recoup losses from the broker's bond, which is larger than that of a salesman.

At the same time it has happened that a broker's bond, which is currently about \$10,000, has been inadequate to cover all losses of the public. By eliminating the bonding of salesmen and authorized agents, and by increasing the broker's bond, it is believed that we can improve the protection to the public and reduce an administrative burden.

I therefore recommend this bill to the honourable members for their consideration and adoption.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would entertain a question.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The salesman does not have to be bonded any more and the broker is going to be bonded. Is the broker going to be responsible for the actions of the salesman in this case?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: That is my understanding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, just an announcement. I want to announce a meeting of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations for next Tuesday, June 21, 1983, to consider bills referred.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move 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, seconded by the Minister of Finance.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Jobs Fund; and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Legislation.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - LEGISLATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: The committee will please come to order. There will be no opening statement from the Minister responsible.

Would the Leader of the Opposition want to make an opening statement?

HON. S. LYON: Who is the Minister responsible, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Commissioners on the Board of Internal Economy are the Minister of Health and myself.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, under Section 5 and Section 8 of The Executive Government Organization Act, Orders-in-Council are regularly passed assigning responsibility for different legislative votes contained on Estimates of Supply for each matter. We're now dealing with Items Appropriation No. 1 through to 7, I guess it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now dealing with Item No. 4.(a)(1), 4.(a)(2) and 4.(a)(3) - Other Assembly Expenditures.

The Leader of the Official Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Who is the Minister responsible under The Executive Government Organization Act for those expenditures?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, certainly the Board of Internal Economy Commissioners are not involved

directly or have been appointed to deal with the Auditor's and Ombudsman's and Other Assembly Expenditures sections, and I'm not certain whether the Premier has designated a particular Minister for those.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that we should find out to see if we're properly constituted. If there is another Minister responsible, then the courtesy, custom and tradition is that the government would ask that there be a substitute because the responsible Minister is not available, or whatever. We don't just take whoever walks by the door. The Executive Government Organization Act makes provision, usually. I don't know what provision this government has made for its own affairs. God knows they've made very little provision for the public affairs of the province. What I'm trying to find out is, who under The Executive Government Organization Act is responsible for these votes that we are being asked to pass today? There has got to be a Minister responsible, presumably.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that over the last number of years that there has been no Minister specifically designated to handle those particular Estimates, it's been handled by the Commissioners of the Board of Internal Economy when the Premier has not been available.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm just going on my recollection, which of course can always be faulty, but it's been my understanding since I've been around here that the Premier has always had responsibility for this item. If the Premier is otherwise engaged, the Deputy Premier or somebody designated by him takes it over. It's no great problem, but let's find out who's responsible and let's not just assume that some House Leader, who is ill-informed about how Parliament works, can make a unilateral judgment and get one of his colleagues to wander in here and look after the responsibilities for which he may have no legal authority. That's the whole point of the exercise. Who has the legal authority? Who is answerable to this committee under The Executive Government Organization Act?

Now the Clerk of the Executive Council or the Legislative Council should be able to answer that very quickly. I don't expect Mr. Bryans to have that info at his fingertips, although he may.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The way the Chair understands it, the Minister of Government Services has been designated to sit in these Estimates by the Premier. I don't know if he takes responsibility for all the items or only the items about the Legislative Assembly expenditures.

HON. S. LYON: That's getting closer to the point then, Mr. Chairman. If, by that designation, we can work on the assumption that the Premier is responsible for these votes and that he has designated the Minister of Government Services to look after it, that's fine. All I am asking is: Who is the Minister responsible? Obviously, it isn't the Minister of Government Services.

If the First Minister, for reasons of his own, doesn't want to come before the committee, fine. He's designating somebody else, fine, but let's make sure

that the record is clear. We are operating a Parliament, not a unilateral bucket shop run by the Attorney-General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would seem then that the Premier had the responsibility and has delegated that responsibility in the meantime to the Minister of Government Services.

HON. S. LYON: I'm asking now, is that the case?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Certainly the Premier, in appointing myself and the Minister of Health to the Board of Internal Economy, has given us the authority and the responsibility to deal with the Estimates dealing with the Legislative Assembly and at the same time has asked us to deal with the other Estimates that are included in that section under Legislation.

HON. S. LYON: I won't worry the point anymore. It's just that, because of the now ordering of the business of the House by the House Leader, this situation need not come about. The First Minister ends up in the dilemma of having Jobs Fund and Legislation on at the same time. A suggestion was made by our House Leader that one of the items could have been on this afternoon and the other on this evening. That kind of common sense apparently didn't commend itself to the arrogance of the Attorney-General.

Let the record be clear that we're going to proceed, we're willing to proceed with the Estimates on the understanding that these are the statutory responsibility of the First Minister, who has in turn designated the Minister of Government Services. We are not proceeding and we would not treat with these Estimates on the unilateral decision of the House Leader, who doesn't know how this House operates yet. Now as long as that understanding is clear, fine, we'll go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(1) . . .

HON. S. LYON: Is it or isn't it clear, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I don't think it is proper to fault the House Leader. I think maybe there might have been lack of communication. I think it's obvious that this was at the request of the First Minister. I think it's obvious that the First Minister is responsible for Legislation, and I don't think that there is any sinister motive in going ahead in this procedure. I think it was to try to accommodate the members of the House and try to advance the work of the committee.

There is no doubt that the Minister responsible is the First Minister, but I recall in my years in Opposition that accommodation of this kind has been done. I remember Mr. McGill on a couple of occasions conducting in that way. Right now, if it's . . .

HON. S. LYON: When the First Minister was out of the province or elsewhere.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, all right. I would have to admit that maybe there could have been better

communication, but having said that I would hope that we can deal with the committee. I don't think this was something that was dreamed up by the Attorney-General or the House Leader, it's something that was decided at the request of the First Minister.

My understanding of it, I was given the information that, yes, what the Leader of the Opposition is saying was a suggestion, but as an alternative I was never made aware that they would follow this, what we're following now, reluctantly. I think it was presented to the First Minister - and I was sitting near him - that we had a choice or something after discussion with the Opposition.

If there are some questions we can't answer, we'll take them as notice and try to get the answer for the Opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Just to add to that, Mr. Chairman. It was a similar practice followed last year with the Minister of Agriculture, who was a member of the Board of Internal Economy, and who answered for the Estimates for the government for all of these sections as well. That was the practice that was established last year and the House Leader was simply following that practice this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: One year's practice by an ill-informed House Leader does not constitute a precedent. I'm satisfied from what has been said by the Chairman, by the Minister of Health, that the First Minister is responsible under The Executive Government Organization Act before these Estimates; that he is not in the Estimates because he's chosen to be in the Jobs Fund at the same time; or the House Leader has managed to confuse affairs again and get him in there when he should be able to be here; that he has designated the Minister of Government Services to answer on his behalf and we're prepared to proceed on that basis. It's not a very good way to run a peanut stand, but that's what we're accustomed to, so let's go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's go and proceed, so we can facilitate the work of the committee.

4.(a)(1), we are talking about Other Assembly Expenditures, Leader of the Official Opposition Party—pass; 4.(a)(2)—pass; 4.(a)(3) — (Interjection) — that will be Other Assembly Expenditures, Leader of the Official Opposition Party, Other Expenditures—pass; 4.(b)—pass; 4.(c)—pass; 4.(d).

The Member for Virden.

MR. H. VIRDEN: Mr. Chairman, under Other Expenditures, I see a rather significant amount of an increase here this year. Could we have a breakdown on what those expenses are?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Excuse me, I was just discussing with staff. Did you ask for a breakdown on the increase, Mr. Chairman?

MR. H. GRAHAM: No, on what the expenditures are - \$266,400.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The breakdown, \$266,400.00.

MR. H. GRAHAM: The others are all statutory?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, it includes, Mr. Chairman, a number of small items that would add up to the total amount: fringe benefits and other costs of professional fees; other fees - membership fees; real estate rentals; office furniture and equipment; printing and stationery supplies; xeroxing; telephone and postage; furnishings and furniture; computer usage; automobiles; mileage; advertising; publications; travel, and so on; and conferences, of course, which is the major one this year because of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference that is being hosted by Manitoba this year.

MR. H. GRAHAM: On the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, how much money is there allocated to that?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, \$65,000 has been budgeted for that this year.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Was there any money budgeted for that in last year's Estimates?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that last year there was a total of \$15,000 budgeted for that conference, for advanced planning.

MR. H. GRAHAM: So there's a total of \$80,000 for the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference. Is that correct?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, that would be the money available over the two-year period for the expenses for hosting that conference.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister consider that to be a sufficient amount to cover the cost of hosting that conference?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, certainly there's been a tradition to spend rather large amounts of money in the past years - an increasing amount - on that particular conference, a very important and major conference. However, the Planning Committee this year has been able, it is my understanding, to work quite comfortably within these guidelines by utilizing some innovative ways of accommodating people in travelling to and from the airports, and so on; co-operation from departments, and so on; and also, by spending less emphasis on excursions to any great distance outside the city.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I know what other conferences have cost in other years, and I believe if we look back, you'll see that over the last four or five years, the various provinces that have hosted this, have spent well in excess of \$100,000, in some cases over \$200,000.00. I was just wondering if Manitoba was going to be hosting it in the same degree that other provinces are now accustomed to, or are we going to

be appearing to be a rather severely restrained convention?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, as a member of the committee that discussed that, I guess that it is obvious that we're going through a period where we have to look at restraints. That's done in many of the provinces. There was a province, I guess, of Nova Scotia which was supposed to hold the meeting of Ministers that I was supposed to attend and then they cancelled that because they couldn't because of the cost. I think it is a responsibility to show an example. There is no doubt that it won't be as elaborate as it has been, but I think that there is a movement in most of the provinces, if not all the provinces, in cutting down.

The meetings that I've travelled to the last two years or so I've certainly noticed that and, as I said, there are a couple of provinces that have cancelled meetings because they felt they couldn't afford it. We're cutting down on travelling in my department and most of the departments, and I think it's a sign of the times.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I just wanted to add to that. I think one of the important elements of the conference this year is the fact that Folklorama is taking place in Winnipeg at the same time and gives an opportunity for visiting delegates to take in a great deal of information on our culture and what Manitoba is all about, certainly through the visitations at Folklorama. So that is one aspect of it that has contributed to a lower cost involvement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Earlier the Minister had indicated that there was some involvement from various departments of government. Could we have an indication of how much participation to this important conference will be supplied from other departments of government?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Speaking from the aspect of the Department of Government Services, and I think that would be the main department involved in terms of travel arrangements, in terms of supplying vehicles and drivers to assist people, delegates who are arriving in Winnipeg from the airport, and also in certain travel arrangements to get from one point to another during the course of the conference, we are assisting and co-operating through Government Services with that - we will be, I should say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(d) - the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Could the Minister put a dollar figure on the amount that his particular department will be contributing or a rough estimate?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I'm not able to do that at this time. It's a matter of making

vehicles available when they're needed. Certainly the vehicles are there at any rate and could be utilized for that purpose, so it's not like we're incurring greater costs to have those vehicles available.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Will the province be hosting a dinner at that conference?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe we are. However, I'm not involved on the organizing committee and I believe that the province is hosting a dinner, but I'm not certain of that. I could certainly get that information out from the minutes of some of the meetings that have been held.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Would the funding for that come under the Executive Council under the Premier's Office, or what area would that come from?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would have to get that information for the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(d)—pass; 4.(e) Hansard—pass; 4.(e)(1)—pass; 4.(e)(2)—pass; 4.(f)—pass.

Resolution No. 1: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,386,100 for Legislation for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984.

The Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave that item, I have a question with respect to statutory allowances. I can ask it either under that item, 2.7 million at the end, or I can ask it here. Actually, if I ask it now, perhaps Mr. Bryans or one of the staff can get the information.

Pursuant to Section 64, Subsection 2, the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly is entitled to an indemnity of \$50 for each day he attends at his office when the House is not in Session. I wonder if we could have a breakdown as to how many claims the Speaker has made for those per diems since the Speaker took office.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I don't have the information for as long as he's been in office. Was that the question? Or just for the last year?

HON. S. LYON: Last year would be a good starting place.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe it was in the neighbourhood of 140 days. It would be \$7,000, approximately.

HON. S. LYON: That would be for what period, Mr. Chairman?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The fiscal year, 1982-83.

HON. S. LYON: So from April 1st, 1982 until March 31st, 1983, per diems were paid for 140 days. Can we have some indication? I know my recollection is that the House was sitting for at least four months of that period. By quick arithmetic, it would indicate that the Speaker must have made application for a per diem

payment for practically every other working day of the year, whether he was in the office or not. Is that the case?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I certainly wouldn't agree with the premise that the Speaker was making claims when he wasn't in the office. I would say that if we had a Session of approximately 100 days and his claim for 140 days, that would leave about 125 days of the year that were not covered. Of course, that would have to include holidays and weekends and so on. So the honourable members can draw their own conclusions as to whether he claimed every possible day that he was able to, when in office - I really cannot speculate on that.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Chairman, again in a ballpark way, we presume that the Speaker would not be claiming for Saturdays, Sundays or holidays, and in an ordinary fiscal year there would be a minimum of 52 weeks, there would be a minimum of 104 days taken up by Saturdays and Sundays, to say nothing of holidays, which would be on top of that; so that would account for about 120-odd days there.

That being the case, it would appear that the Speaker claimed for practically every working day of per diem allowance, practically every working day of the working week, for those weeks when the House was not in Session. Would that be an accurate assumption?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: My understanding, of course, is that he would claim for the days that he's in working, and it could involve weekends and certain times, as well, and I think the Honourable Member for Virden would be aware of perhaps sometimes that he would have had experience in that regard, and also the Honourable Member for Concordia, who's had the experience, as well, and would know that very often there are official functions that the Speaker would be involved with on weekends, as well. So I don't know that it would be accurate to include, or to take off all weekends on that.

However, as I said, I cannot speculate on which days the Speaker - I don't go with the Speaker to work every day and I'm certainly not aware of his general routine - I understand that he claims the \$50 per diem every day that he comes into work, in his duties as Speaker, between . . .

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Chairman, we don't want to deal with guesses or anything of that nature either. Could we have produced before the Committee the claims made by the Speaker for per diem allowances, so that we'll all know what we're talking about and we'll be able to make a judgment then on whether the figure is within the voted - well, it's not the voted estimate - the statutory estimate that is provided, as I see it, the Speaker's per diem allowance is \$5,000.00.

You tell us that in the last fiscal year he received \$7,000, so obviously he received \$2,000 more than was anticipated in the statutory amount, which would appear to be unusual, because recalling the terms of Speaker from the Member for Virden, the Member for Concordia - I don't think there was ever an excess amount claimed by previous speakers under this Section 64(2) - and

I'm not claiming that the present Speaker has been excessive - except that the figures would seem to indicate that the amount of \$7,000 is certainly beyond that contemplated in the statutory appropriation under this item.

Can we then, Mr. Chairman, just make a quick addition. The Speaker's expenses - well, first of all, the Speaker's salary is \$12,000.00?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's correct.

HON. S. LYON: Then his indemnity as a member is the same as all of us. It would be in the area of . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: \$31,416.00.

HON. S. LYON: \$31,416.00. And then his expense allowances are \$3,000.00. Now, I'm not sure whether those are on payment on voucher, or whether they're . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: On voucher, Mr. Chairman.

HON. S. LYON: All right. Can we have from Mr. Bryans, or from the staff, what the Speaker's expenses amounted to in that same fiscal year?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: \$3,000 a Session, isn't it?

HON. S. LYON: Yes, a max. of \$3,000, it's supposed to be.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the amount out of the \$3,000 allocation that was spent by the Speaker on voucher was \$1,283.86.

HON. S. LYON: Thank you.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: And that was for a reception.

HON. S. LYON: Yes, that would be vouched for expenses. All right, well leaving that item aside, would my arithmetic be correct then, that if the Speaker received \$12,000 salary; he received an indemnity as an MLA for \$31,416; he received \$7,000 in per diem allowances; then I take it he would also receive \$1,500 for . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's part of the \$31,000.00.

HON. S. LYON: Is that part of the \$31,000.00? So the research amount is paid to him directly?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Right.

HON. S. LYON: Yes, and that's part of the \$31,416.00?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Not the research. Just the constituency allowance, the indemnity and expense allowance.

HON. S. LYON: And \$1,000 for research?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: \$1,500 is constituency expenses and \$1,000, I believe, is research.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's included.

HON. S. LYON: \$1,000 is research?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: \$1,000 for research.

HON. S. LYON: So, the Speaker's gross salary then would be \$51,416 for the last fiscal year?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'd like to change jobs.

HON. S. LYON: Is that the case?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that as a new member, actually, of the Board of Internal Economy - I've only been named recently and attended one meeting - that was a concern that we expressed. This was discussed with the Speaker, and that is probably the reason why you have an Act in front of you and it suggests that it'll be a set fee, except for a per diem maximum, a set fee. Also of course, that would be increasing from 6 to 12. That's done only this year, the 6 to 12 of his extra remuneration, so he would put 12 - well, that part isn't being introduced but it'll be discussed during the bill, but the members of the board had the same concern and that was discussed. We'll try to rectify that.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I take it the Minister of Health is confirming the figure that I was trying to add up here; that there was a total amount paid to Mr. Speaker, of \$51,416, that is by way of allowances exclusive of expenses, which are not properly accounted for there, that would be by way of gross salary, or allowances paid to him including the \$1,000 research allowance, which every member is entitled to.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. Is the Leader of the Opposition using the figure as additional indemnities of \$12,000.00?

HON. S. LYON: Yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh, well, it should be \$6,000.00.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, could I just . . . He actually received, Mr. Chairman, if I could just clarify - \$11,766, instead of the \$12,000 because it was changed during the year.

HON. S. LYON: That's because of the way the payments go, I suppose.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes.

HON. S. LYON: But in the fiscal year that would be \$11,766, or whatever, but based on the \$12,000, so we're not being unkind if we use the \$12,000 as a rounded out figure. How would that compare, Mr. Chairman, with the salary and MLA's indemnity and other ordinary allowances that are permitted to members of the Cabinet?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health. Please use the microphone, so he can record.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The indemnity is \$19,944, that was for 1982; the expense allowance - \$9,972; constituency allowance \$1,500 - that was included in what the Speaker we get. Now the research thing, and I would imagine in both parties, there are only two parties now, that would go directly, except the independent member of the House and the Speaker, it's paid directly to him. Then he'll have the 12,000 . . .

A MEMBER: No, the Cabinet Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh, the Cabinet Minister.

MR. A. ANSTETT: It would be the 31.4 plus \$20,500.00.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, then this year, Mr. Chairman . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: 31.4 plus what?

MR. A. ANSTETT: 20,500.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've got to keep the record straight of the proceedings. Nobody's recognizing the tape if everybody speaks at the same time.
The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, the only difference between a regular MLA and a Cabinet Minister in terms of additional remuneration over the \$31,416, I think the figure was, is the \$20,500 that was payable last year and has been reduced to \$19.5 this year. So the figure will be approximately \$52,000 for a Cabinet Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: It's \$19.6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: So then the effect really of the situation about which we're speaking is that the Speaker, even though the Legislative Assembly rejected the notion that the Speaker should be paid at the same rate as a Cabinet Minister - that was rejected in legislation last year - even though the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba rejected that notion by virtue primarily of the utilization of per diem allowances, the Speaker, in fact, received almost the equivalent of what a Cabinet Minister would have received. Is that right, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: A little bit less. The Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I don't know whether the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is saying that there was anything rejected by the Legislature last year. There may have been a bill that was not voted on or passed last year, but I don't believe that the concept was necessarily rejected or was even proposed last year, it was just discussed. I don't know that it was ever rejected or approved.

However, I would agree that the final figure that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has stated is very similar to what a Cabinet Minister and Leader of the Opposition would have received.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can clarify one point. The Leader of the Opposition makes reference to the Legislative Assembly not accepting. The Assembly did pass a statutory salary to the Speaker of \$12,000, which is an increase from the previous \$6,000.00. But, I can confirm what the Leader of the Opposition, I believe, was referring to and that was discussions were held amongst members of both sides to give consideration to recognizing the position of the Speaker as that equivalent to a Cabinet Minister, either with or without portfolio, and the salary that would be attendant thereto. Those discussions resulted in a salary change of \$6,000, which was implicit recognition that members who were involved in the discussions, although not necessarily the Assembly formally, rejected the suggestion that the Speaker should have that equivalent salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: I thank the Member for Springfield for that clarification. It wasn't in the statute certainly in my recollection, in accordance with his it was in discussion. The idea was advanced and then the idea was dropped and the House, I think, unanimously, went ahead with the idea of \$12,000.00.

Does the Speaker, Mr. Chairman, have a government car as well, or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: No, he does not.

HON. S. LYON: Does he have the use of one on a part-time basis?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that he has not used a government vehicle for any purposes; that is my understanding.

HON. S. LYON: Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health indicated that there is a restriction in the new amendments to The Legislative Act, a restriction on the per diem allowance payable to Mr. Speaker of - what is it - \$3,000 a year?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: \$3,500, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will be \$3,500 maximum.

HON. S. LYON: \$3,500 maximum would be permitted. Is that the . . . ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield will clarify.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, the proposal in Bill 55, before the House at the present time, will fix an

intersessional allowance for the Speaker of \$3,500.00, period. There is no minimum or maximum, and it will abolish the per diem, so that there will not be a claim required by Mr. Speaker as to how many days he has worked. In effect, it'll recognize the fact that he does have intersessional obligations and he will be paid that. So, in effect, his salary will rise from \$12,000 to \$15,500 and his right to claim a per diem will be removed.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could ask the members of the Board of Internal Economy, through you, was it ever intended that the per diem allowance provided under Section 64(2) would be used in this extensive way by any Speaker to really, in effect, provide an increase in salary, which would bring him up to the equivalent of a Cabinet Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe that various Speakers have drawn on that per diem at various levels over the time. It certainly has varied on the information that I have from the previous two Speakers, as well as the Speaker at this time, and so it has varied, I guess, with the degree of involvement that the Speaker has felt was required in carrying out his duties.

I couldn't comment though as to whether it was ever intended that it would be used to the extent that it has been in the past year, because certainly that figure has been in place for some years and that per diem has been in place. What the thinking was in terms of the number of days that it should be used, certainly I can't comment on, but I would assume that it was put in place to be used by the Speaker in as a responsible way as required.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall we proceed to Item 5(a)?
The Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Just on that point - well then I can take it, Mr. Chairman, by implication from what the Minister of Health has said, that it is the considered opinion of the government now that by placing a limit of \$3,500 on this intersessional allowance that they certainly consider that the amount drawn last year, \$7,000, was excessive.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we believe the intersessional allowance of \$3,500 is fair.

MR. A. ANSTETT: You can draw your own conclusions beyond that.

HON. S. LYON: It's very hard, Mr. Chairman, to draw a conclusion then from the statement. The Minister of Health said - I'm sure he doesn't mind - he said, across the table, yes, that it was considered excessive and I think we're in agreement with that statement.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I think that's exactly it. This was discussed by the Board and the Commission. The thing is, especially with the increase of \$12,000, it was felt that it was too much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall we proceed to 5.(a) and 5.(b)?

HON. S. LYON: Pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)—pass; 5.(b)—pass.

HON. S. LYON: Just one question to the Provincial Auditor. He's here. The question can be asked of him, Mr. Chairman, in the Public Accounts, but if we could have an indication. I know that the Provincial Auditor makes his requests through Treasury Board in the ordinary course for staff. Could the Minister indicate if the Provincial Auditor is satisfied that he can do all of the jobs that we in the Legislature lay on him and his staff with this vote?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that the Provincial Auditor feels that he has no trouble meeting the obligations with the present staff.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: And he can't claim \$50 a day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We passed the items 5.(a) and 5.(b).
Resolution No. 2: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,316,900 for Legislation for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceeding, 6.(a) and 6.(b), Ombudsman, Salaries and Other Expenditures. 6.(a)—pass; 6.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 3: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$235,200 for Legislation for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

7.(a), 7.(b) Electoral Office. 7.(a)—pass; 7.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 4: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$235,300 for Legislation for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

There is another item that we have to pass and this is the Main Estimates of Expenditure on Page 133 in your book.

HON. S. LYON: There's another item in Labour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know if we have to do it in this committee, or in the other committee.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I think that our House Leader has some understanding in any case that this could be dealt with in the other committee. We've only got the Jobs Fund plus this item, as I understand it. So if we rise, we're through in here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

SUPPLY - JOBS FUND

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: We are considering the Estimates of the Jobs Fund. Does the Premier have an introductory statement to make?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'll be dealing with an introductory statement pertaining to the nature and the structure of the Jobs Fund, and the Minister

of Finance will be offering some words pertaining to the financial aspects of the Jobs Fund.

The Jobs Fund was established as a means of not only responding to the urgent needs of unemployed people in the Province of Manitoba, those desiring work, in order to deal with the bitter consequences of the unemployment situation that has confronted all of Canada including the Province of Manitoba over the last number of years, but to make a contribution on the part of the Provincial Government and the provincial community as a whole working through their Provincial Government in order to better deal with the development of initiatives to provide employment.

A close relationship has been established, Mr. Chairman, with the construction industry in the province. The construction industry appeared before the Jobs Fund Board within the past few weeks and urged us in what I feel to be a very realistic sense to accelerate capital works projects during these particular times, to refurbish the infrastructure of the province so that infrastructure of the province could be refurbished during times of high unemployment and create employment in the important task of creating long-term benefits to the province.

Mr. Chairman, at the same time we make no apologies in respect to funding and enriching various short-term projects in the province. The Manitoba Employment Action Program, for example; the provincial contribution that has been made to the NEED Program; the highly successful Careerstart Program that has been extremely successful is one of those kinds of short-term projects initiated and effected by this government through the Jobs Fund Committee. These are undoubtedly temporary expedients but at the same time, during times such as these, they are necessary expedients. I am pleased to indicate that the Jobs Fund Committee will continue to finance such expedients. I am pleased to say that we will fund these kinds of activities.

There will be a Northern Employment Program, possibly by the Jobs Fund, and such efforts will be continued as long as they are required to provide Manitobans with some protection from the worst ravages of unemployment.

We recognize, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot eliminate unemployment in our midst. We are an island unto ourselves, and we can but reduce the extent of the ravages of unemployment within our provincial community through the operations of the Jobs Fund.

Also, the kinds of activities represent - there is a second phase, a second stage in respect to the projects of the Jobs Fund initiative, those activities which have stimulated the construction industry in Manitoba; those that will benefit suppliers of materials and other products; those that will ensure spinoff benefits insofar as either suppliers and businesses are concerned within the provincial community.

This morning I had the pleasant opportunity, along with the Minister responsible for Education, to attend at the University of Manitoba and to make an important announcement pertaining to the Earth Sciences Building, to move ahead the construction of the Earth Sciences Building, a project that will cost some \$11.4 million, but \$3.5 million allocated for the Earth Sciences Building during this fiscal year from the Jobs Fund Program.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt indeed in the minds of anyone that natural resources are an important

base insofar as the provincial economy is concerned, and the development and exploration of our mineral resource is important. The contribution by those that are engaged in that kind of economic activity is essential to the future well-being of the economic and social health of the Province of Manitoba. Therefore, this was a most appropriate time to move forward that kind of project insofar as timing was concerned to ensure that the most significant work done in respect to the construction of the Earth Sciences Building would take place during this fiscal year, the following fiscal year, during times of high unemployment in order to assist the construction industry in the Province of Manitoba, assist in respect to the creation of employment in Manitoba.

There are many other examples that honourable members, I'm sure, would appreciate hearing about. For example, the expansion of the Auto Diesel Shop at the Red River Community College that was announced by the Minister responsible for Labour and the Minister responsible for Education some weeks ago was another very important addition in respect to this, and the continuing commitment on the part of this government towards the excellent facilities at the Red River Community College.

The renovation of former shop; additions to the school at Cranberry Portage - the Honourable Member for Flin Flon would be quite familiar with the need that existed in that respect; Crane River; the addition to the expansion of the Food Products Centre at Portage la Prairie that I'm sure, if the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie was present, would be applauding as an important contribution not only to the provincial community but an important contribution insofar as Portage la Prairie is concerned.

The work in respect to the announcement pertaining to the Manitoba Fire College in Brandon, an essential announcement pertaining to the southwestern region of the Province of Manitoba, an essential announcement pertaining not only to the creation of jobs in respect to employment in Brandon, but the fact that the Fire Training College would generate other forms of economic activity in the City of Brandon; that there will be trainees that will indeed find their way to the Fire Training College in Brandon to participate in the training and in the courses in Brandon; that will be able to make a contribution towards the Brandon business community of a lasting nature. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, not only will there be the short-term jobs that will be involved, but there will be long-term jobs as a consequence of the Fire Training College in Brandon, Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, there have been already announcements made in a short period of time since this thrust was announced by the Provincial Government of some \$131 million from provincial funds towards job creation initiatives in the Province of Manitoba; \$131 million already announced.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, members I'm sure will be delighted to know that there's an additional \$81 million that has been extra; \$81 million that has been levered from the private sector and from other levels of government by way of additional contributions towards the creation of jobs in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, that indeed is the target, the objective, that we ought all to be striving towards: the creation

of jobs; the building of the infrastructure of the Province of Manitoba in the short term, in the long term; the co-operative effort of all three levels of government, the federal, provincial and the municipal level of government; and the contribution of labour and of business.

I want to say, in case there be any doubt by any member in this House, that we've had excellent and positive contribution from business, from labour and other levels of government. I would not like this opportunity to go missed, Mr. Chairman, in order to express my appreciation to the other levels of government, to the business community and the labour community for their co-operative attitude and their positive attitude in working with this government towards the creation of jobs, long-term infrastructure, in the Province of Manitoba in order to generate employment during these difficult times in Manitoba. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Chairman, I hear some bleating from across the way. I don't know why honourable members would be so grumpy in respect to what indeed is an important initiative, what indeed is a fine demonstration of co-operation. I would have anticipated that honourable members across the way would be demonstrating, if not enthusiastic response, that we could have at least expected on the part of honourable members across the way some pleasure that Manitobans were prepared to work together shoulder to shoulder in this most difficult task to combat unemployment in the Province of Manitoba and there had been some degree of success by Manitobans so co-operating. I would have thought rather than a negative attitude on the part of honourable members across the way there would have been some positive response on the part of honourable members across the way, if not unduly enthusiastic, which would be too much to expect from honourable members across the way. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to permit this opportunity to remain unanswered by the Member for Sturgeon Creek. He shouts from his seat, that is not the view or that is not the opinion of Mr. Martin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'd be very willing to put it on the record, standing in my place at the present time, that Mr. Martin's letter said there was no co-operation between departments regarding economic development in that government.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would not wish that comment to go unanswered because it would reflect upon Mr. Martin's judgment and that would not be fair to Mr. Martin, who is not in this Chamber, to respond to those kind of frivolous charges by the Member for Sturgeon Creek. Mr. Chairman, if I recall correctly - and let this be on the record - Mr. Martin has indicated that the previous government was completely useless insofar as dealing with the problems of unemployment in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, I would refer — (Interjection) — I am really astonished that rather than us starting on a positive note, rather than us wishing to discuss the contribution that all groups

within society can make to combat unemployment at this point, that what all that we hear from honourable members across the way is cynicism, anger. I would have thought at least coming from their convention this weekend they would have been full of new vision and new hope for the creation of a new Canada and a new Manitoba, not the old cynicism, not the old hate, not the old sour grapes, but a new vision. All we see across the way is the continued vacuum of any leadership in that respect.

But referring back to Mr. Martin, the Free Press, June 3, 1983 - if the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek would like to make a note of this - MFL President Martin says the fund is working reasonably well to this point. It carries on to state, the fund is creating a considerable amount of socially useful and labour intensive jobs, says Martin. That's what is most important. The labour movement doesn't want simple make-work projects. The MFL chief agrees with Dolin that the funds administrative setup opens up, simplifies the process for groups offering job creation proposals, while giving the government a complete overview of determining priorities. Administratively, says Martin, it's a lot cleaner. As well, Martin says the process benefits both labour and business because of the equal membership on the Funds Advisory Committee.

I could on, if the honourable member doubts what I'm saying, to make reference to the favourable comments on the part of the Chamber of Commerce, on the part of the heavy construction industry in the Province of Manitoba, that have also endorsed the measures that are undertaken.

For example, Mr. Greasley, who is the head of the construction industry in the Province of Manitoba, states that — (Interjection) — if the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek would like to listen for a few moments he might learn - the government's administrative setup to handle industry input has some good potential. He's impressed by the attitudes reflected at the association's meeting in recent weeks with the Cabinet's Jobs Fund Board and support staff. The government appears to be very serious about job creation. It's significant, said Mr. Greasley, that the Funds Board Chairman is the Premier, not the Labour Minister, as what usually would be the case for an employment program. This indicates they know in Manitoba that there is a job creation problem.

Carrying on, Mr. Chairman, insofar as the various criteria that are exercised in order for the Job Fund criteria, we've gone about our business in a quiet and an effective way. We have developed a number of important criteria. I would like to outline those criteria for honourable members across the way: (1) In respect to any project is the job potential, the number of jobs that will be created by the initiation of any project; (2) the start-up date, how soon can the project be started? For example, this morning, with the Earth Sciences Building, and a lot of work had already taken place in respect to architectural work, so that a start-up date should take place in September of this year, a major project, a lot of advance work already done, start-up date can take place well ahead of the oncoming winter. The start-up date is very important.

The importance of long-term assets. I think there is a proper cynicism on the part of many Manitobans and Canadians about some job creation programs that do

not appear to leave behind long-term assets to contribute to the economic well-being of a provincial or a federal commitment. We have attempted as well as we can, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that those funds that are expended in the main, general, will contribute in some form or other to the betterment of the long-term assets in Manitoba.

Thirdly, a recognition that there are various regional needs in the province; that there are some parts of the Province of Manitoba where the unemployment rate is very, very high. Therefore, one has to ensure that there is a proper reflection of that whether it be in rural communities, whether it be in the Northern parts of the province or whether it be in the City of Winnipeg.

Fourthly, to preserve skills and talents to ensure that the talents and skills of humankind are not permitted to go to waste, but indeed those skills be continued and be enhanced, particularly in areas that suffer from considerable amounts of disadvantage within our community.

Also of course, Mr. Chairman, is the question of the leverage factor. Will the project initiate additional investment on the part of Federal Government, Municipal Government or the private sector? Any project that will leverage additional funds, matching funds, contributions, whether it be the short-term Careerstart kind of program that the private sector matches and contributes toward, or the NEED Program, or other kinds of programs; whether it be those programs of long-term that can draw additional private, municipal and federal funds. That is important.

So, Mr. Chairman, when we talk indeed about a \$200 million Jobs Fund - this is the point I was attempting to make a few moments ago - that Fund can grow to a larger Fund through the additional contributions by municipal, federal and private-sector groups as well as labour groups in our community and certainly the Manitoba Government Employees Association contribution was an example of the kind of contribution that has been made by the labour community, our own employees within the public service.

Mr. Chairman, the thrust, the central theme of the Jobs Fund is working together, business, labour, government to improve and to work upon both short-term and long-term assets for the people of Manitoba. The Jobs Fund is not an initiative undertaken by the Province of Manitoba acting alone. Government believes, as Manitobans believe, that job creation cannot be tackled by only one segment or one narrow part of the community.

Official representatives of Manitoba business, of Manitoba labour are involved in the detailed task of providing advice and assistance to the Jobs Fund not just insofar as the present Jobs Fund by giving us important input as far as continuing process, looking ahead to next year and the year afterwards. We appreciate the contribution from both business and labour in that respect.

Jobs don't happen. This government believes that major decisions must be influenced by both the Manitoba business community and by the Manitoba labour community. For this purpose, the government is taking its responsibility seriously. Our responsibility is to co-ordinate job creation efforts, to seek advice where that advice can be effective in assisting us with our task, and to permit us to act best where indeed action is needed.

We might have bandied words around with the opposition over the past few weeks, but we have chosen instead to reply in a more effective and in a more responsible manner by establishing and by using in a responsible manner a concentrated sum of money to set against the employment problems experienced by Manitobans and the economic difficulties that are faced by so many of our industries.

I am proud of our efforts, and I want to pledge to Manitobans that we will continue to strive to use all the resources and the influence of government in order to produce worthwhile employment opportunities in the private sector, the labour sector, to work with the representatives of trade and industrial organizations. We're going to continue. We're going to increase that kind of dialogue that we've established in order to ensure that we continue on in seeking effective means of working together to ensure a better future for Manitobans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The First Minister wonders why we on this side of the House haven't acclaimed this Jobs Fund thrust as being something that is worthy of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance on a point of order.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the First Minister, when he rose to speak stated to the committee that he wished to have the introductory remarks split between himself and me in order that I could deal with the financial aspects of the Fund. As I understand it, for instance, a very similar procedure was followed in the introduction of the Interest Rate Relief Program where the lead Ministers were allowed to provide an introductory statement, and I would ask that I be allowed the courtesy of the same approach.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain to the same point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I guess if the First Minister isn't familiar enough with the details of the Fund which he's in charge of and he has to have someone else explain the details, so be it.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thought it might be helpful to the committee in reviewing the Jobs Fund Estimates if I were to make a brief explanatory statement on the financing of the Jobs Fund.

First, as I announced in the Budget on February 24th and has been explained several times since, funding for the Jobs Fund comes from a number of sources. The Main Estimates provided \$82.2 million in budgetary authority made up of \$25.7 million for Current operating expenditure, \$46.5 million for expenditures related to Capital assets and \$10 million from the MGEA contribution.

The Capital Supply Estimates provide a further \$117.8 million in non-budgetary authority including \$83 million in new authority and \$34.8 million in authority carried forward from the '82-83 fiscal year.

In the Budget, I stated that the \$200 million Jobs Fund total was roughly double the amounts allocated for job creation efforts in '82-83. I used the word "roughly" in that comparison, because there are significant differences between this year's programming and last year's not only in terms of magnitude, but also in terms of program design.

In addition, as I noted in the House some time ago, I wanted to take account fairly of the amount of Capital authority being carried forward from '82-83. At the time the Budget was being prepared, our figures indicated that the total authority available for employment programming in '82-83 was in the range of \$75 million to \$80 million including \$50 million in authority for the Homes in Manitoba Program. That total, of course, is less than half the \$200 million in total Jobs Fund authority and roughly half the \$165 million in Jobs Fund authority after the 34.8 million in carryover authority is deducted. Again, though I should say that the 1982-83 and 1983-84 totals aren't exactly comparable because of the differences in program composition or mix, in fact, in some cases programs included in the 1982-83 total I just mentioned are being financed through other authority than the Jobs Fund in 1983-84.

I want to turn now to the question of how much of the Jobs Fund is new. Shortly after the Budget some members of the Opposition suggested that, in fact, virtually none of the authority was new. Now, it appears they agree some are new, but according to them, it is a relatively small total. Neither suggestion is correct.

The Opposition's initial argument apparently was based on the view that some sort of redefinition of budgetary capital expenditures had produced an artificial increase. However, that argument was abandoned quite quickly when it was demonstrated to be inaccurate. The Opposition's second and more recent argument is based apparently on two general assumptions, neither of which holds up very well under scrutiny.

The first assumption seems to be that non-budgetary capital is for some reason not significant and should be dismissed or ignored, possibly because it does not enter into the budgetary deficit calculation. The second assumption seems to be that the composition or mix of the budgetary capital total, that is, the program content and particularly the employment program content has remained largely unchanged between 1982-83 and 1983-84, so that a relatively small overall increase means only a small increase for job creation. As I said neither assumption holds up.

The facts are that non-budgetary capital expenditures can have a significant job creation impact and will in the case of the Jobs Fund, and that the program mix within the budgetary capital total has changed significantly since 1982-83. Obviously, we have placed far more emphasis on the employment creation impact of capital expenditures this year, creating and preserving jobs being our top priority.

I would like to make the basic point, that strictly speaking the new money in the Jobs Fund is \$165 million. That is the total which requires voted authority from this Legislature this year - 1983. Without that authority there could be no Jobs Fund. So that is one definition of "new" and surely that is a valid one. You have to vote \$165 million of this \$200 million in order for us to have a Jobs Fund.

Another definition of "new" is the one which I have used since Budget night, when indicating that roughly twice the authority was available this year through the Jobs Fund that was available last year for employment creation.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier has told us just now that more than \$80 million has been levered with the first \$130 million that we have spent. We have now allocated specifically more than \$130 million of the \$200 million and with that \$130 million we have brought more than \$80 million in from the Federal Government, from the City of Winnipeg, from the private sector, etc. That is a tremendous success, I suggest to you. It really has an impact on what we have been able to achieve in terms of employment creation in this province. That is why, when we look at our employment statistics, Manitoba this month over the same month last year has 5,000 people more working, when in Canada, overall there are 12,000 less people working in Canada than a year ago this very same month. Our work force is growing, we are providing more jobs and this Jobs Fund is just starting to take effect and has been starting to take effect over the last month or so.

I can inform honourable members that the Jobs Fund has to date created 288,129 work weeks. That is an actual figure. It might be translated into 5,540 jobs of one year's duration; 11,081 of six month's duration; or 14,406 jobs of 20 weeks duration which, incidentally, is the way the Federal Government calculates jobs created when they talk about the number of jobs they create and other provincial governments indeed, some of the Conservative provinces are saying, yes, if you have 20 weeks of employment that's a job. On that basis, we have created 14,000 jobs, but as I said, such figures can be misleading.

What we can say is 288,129 work weeks have been created and that is not misleading, especially, and I'm sure it is especially interesting to those Manitobans who have already acquired employment as a result of announcements made to date and there will be many Manitobans who will be working in the future as a result of announcements made to date.

I might add that 157,458 weeks of the 288,129 work weeks are of a construction nature and there will be, as members opposite know, many spinoff benefits from that kind of activity. So I would urge members opposite to just think about that when they reflect on what they have been saying about the effects of this Jobs Fund. This has been a tremendous asset to the people of Manitoba. It has already created a large number of jobs and it will create more jobs in the future.

When the Jobs Fund has been allocated fully, it will be possible to provide a breakdown showing 1983-84 programming alongside 1982-83 totals where appropriate and where there was anything like it in 1982-83 and we will undertake to do so.

A further approach to the question of new versus old money is to review the Jobs Fund programs which have been announced to date and to determine what proportion of the funds for those programs is new or additional to what was provided last year. To date about 131.4 million in Jobs Fund programming has been announced of which 71.7 million is for budgetary programs and 59.7 million is for non-budgetary expenditures.

Here is how these totals break down into categories. On the budgetary side, 57.1 million or 80 percent of

the 71.7 million total is for programming which is new and expanded while the balance is for continuing expenditures; on the non-budgetary side, 24.9 million or about 42 percent of the 59.7 million total announced to date is for new and expanded programming while the balance 34.8 million, the carryover authority announced in the Budget, is for continuing programming.

Overall, the totals and percentages are: new and expanded, \$82 million or 62 percent of the Jobs Fund total program announced to date. That is of the 131.4 million, 82 million is new and expanded funding - more than 60 percent, and as I indicated earlier, we had all along indicated that it would be at least half. There was continuing programming therefore of 49.4 million or 38 percent of the total to date. Let's remember that along with that continued and new programming, because of the way in which this program was assembled, we have brought \$80 million in private sector and municipal and federal funding into the mix as well.

I should say that "continuing" means, the capital carried forward from 1982-83, plus amounts equivalent to what was voted or spent on the programs in 1982-83, whichever is greater. It is not certain that the same ratio of new and expanded expenditures to continuing expenditures, that is, a little over three to two, will apply to the nearly \$70 million in the Fund, for which program details have not yet been finalized, but the overall proportions we believe will be similar.

In any case, the basic point I want to make is simply this. The bulk of the Jobs Fund expenditures are new by whatever reasonable and fair definition of new is used. There have also been questions about the new taxation measures which will help finance the Jobs Fund, such as whether or not they were really required. The Committee of Supply is not the place to debate revenue measures, but I will state simply that if the government had proceeded with the Jobs Fund without making taxation adjustments, and without changing other programs, then the deficit obviously would have been larger. Looked at another way, if there were no Jobs Fund and no tax adjustments, the deficit would have remained at almost exactly the same total as estimated in the Budget.

Some members may argue that other programs could have been cut to free up funds for job creation. To an extent that was done, but there's a limit to how much overall growth can be held down and, of course, our projected revenue growth was down as well and was not sufficient to cover even limited regular program growth without an increase in the deficit.

The main point I would make here is simply that the Jobs Fund programming is, to a large degree, discretionary. We did not have to proceed. We were not locked in. We felt it was clearly in the best interests of the economy of this province to do so and we felt it was most appropriate to finance the budgetary portion of the Jobs Fund through those measures which we announced at Budget time.

As I said on Budget night, we believe and we think the majority of Manitobans will agree, that those who are fortunate enough to have reasonable levels of income will be willing to make some sacrifice to help those who have not; and to assist in protecting and developing our economy, Manitobans have always done

so in difficult times in the past. That is what makes our province such a strong community and an example for the rest of Canada, of how the principle of shared responsibility can and will work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, if one only listened to what this government said and what these Ministers say, one could easily become impressed that perhaps they were doing something. It's only when one looks more deeply and makes a comparison between what they say they're doing and what they're actually doing, that you really begin to find out what a charade this Jobs Fund is.

Now, whether it's a comparison of their political promises of 1981 to the reality, or whether it's the impression that they have tried to leave with respect to this Jobs Fund, as compared to the reality. I've listened to the Minister of Finance and his explanations and I gather the Minister of Finance has been learning, as the weeks go by, about where the money is and how he's changed definitions and conjured up tens of millions of dollars out of changed definitions, and his explanation of it becomes extremely interesting as a consequence of it.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the government hasn't done anything through the Jobs Fund, which they could not have done without going through this PR job of appearing to put together a \$200 million fund. — (Interjection) — The First Minister says he couldn't have provided the co-ordination without it. Well, Mr. Chairman, all he need have done was to create an advisory committee if he wished, a subcommittee of Cabinet, whatever, and said, we're going to co-ordinate our efforts. I'm surprised that they would admit, Mr. Chairman, that his efforts weren't co-ordinated last year. He speaks now about leverage and purchasing policies as though that's something that was just discovered by his government.

A MEMBER: What did you guys do?

MR. B. RANSOM: Governments have been attempting to use their expenditures in a way that would get money coming in from one sector or another, to compliment it. That's been going on for a long time. Purchasing policies have been directed through a great period of time.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the First Minister is very sensitive. I realize that the First Minister, and his Minister in charge of baffle-gab are very sensitive about this, because they have such a dismal record. They can say one thing, but one only need look at what's happened. There are 52,000 unemployed people in Manitoba today, and I believe there was something like 29,000 when they took over. We can turn around the harsh economic circumstances of the past four years. Well, there are now 52,000. There were 52,000 last month, and as far as I have gone back in the records, which for several years - and I'm sure that one could go back even further - they could not find another case where the numbers of unemployed didn't decrease between April and May. What we have from this government is an absolutely unprecedented level of unemployment and they are

attempting to give the impression of doing something. Now, they could simply have decided to direct their spending towards capital, if that's what they wish to do; if they want to be more capital intensive, they could simply have increased it. But no, they had to try and make it appear as though the capital they were using was going to do something extra.

For example, the \$34.8 million that the Minister of Housing has since had allocated to his housing program, is the first piece of misrepresentation, is that the government tried to make that appear as though it was something new. Well, last year this House passed a Capital Supply Bill and it had money in it to cover MHRC requirements, the Homes in Manitoba Program. The First Minister, I believe, announced it something like 11 times last fall. He announced the \$50 million program on many many occasions - \$50 million program.

Now, of course, they didn't spend the full \$50 million amount last year, so they announce it this year as going into the Jobs Fund. Mr. Chairman, there was no other place that that money could go, because this House approved it for a specific purpose. It could not be spent in any other way. The government had already said that it was going to be spent on the Housing Program, and they then try and shift it into a \$200 million Jobs Fund. Well, there's 34.8 that shouldn't have been there at all. It was absolutely and totally misrepresenting what the government had the authority to do. There was no way that they could redirect that money to any other purpose. All they could have done was broken their promise that they made last fall to spend \$50 million on the Homes in Manitoba Program. — (Interjection) — Oh, I see. The Minister of Finance says that he didn't promise to spend \$50 million.

The fact that they announced it about 18 times last fall, apparently doesn't mean that they intended to carry out their announcement. That's something like the promises they made in the election, Mr. Chairman, the promises they made that they didn't intend to carry out. Well, people should bear that comment in mind then from the Minister of Finance. They should recognize that just because they announced it, it didn't mean that they intended to carry it out.

What they have done with the Jobs Fund is to largely take money from one pocket and put it into another. That's the musical chairs part of this, is that the Minister of Finance in his Budget said that he had to increase taxes in order to fund the Jobs Fund. I believe he said in his Budget. On Page 25 he said, "that financing for the Jobs Fund includes 72.2 million in budgetary authority made possible by the tax measures I just outlined."

That is a misrepresentation, Mr. Chairman. It simply isn't true because what the Minister did was take money out of one department and put it into the Jobs Fund and then tell the people that even though they had that same level of spending last year that it was necessary to increase taxes this year in order to cover it.

The First Minister today talks about Cranberry Portage and Crane River and an expansion of the diesel mechanics of building or space at the Red River Community College, but when one looks through Page 2 of the Estimates, you see that there has been a reduction of approximately \$6 million in the Department of Education. Well, what did the Department of

Education do with that money that they had last year? Did they by any chance build schools? Did they by any chance make any additions to the community colleges? — (Interjection) — I bet you they did too, Mr. Chairman. I have a feeling that that's exactly the same type of expenditures that they were doing this year.

There's money gone from the Department of Health. No, pardon me, the Department of Health is one of those that has a slight increase. There's money gone from the Department of Highways. What did they do with the money that they had in highways last year? Did they build assets? Did they by any chance build assets that the First Minister talks about? I have an idea that maybe they did and when they built those assets, Mr. Chairman, I think maybe they were employing people. I think that extra \$20 million that they spent on highway construction last year probably resulted in people being out there driving paving machines, and driving crawler tractors, and earth moving machines, and trucks. I daresay there were people supplying fuel to them, Mr. Chairman, and they were buying food in the local communities to sustain their work force and that it was having an effect on the economy of the province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister has taken that \$20 million out and he's filtered it through his Fraud Fund and somehow gives the impression that we're doing something different with it.

Mr. Chairman, we take the Department of Natural Resources. There's a reduction of over \$6 million in capital there. Well, when we asked the Minister of Natural Resources what he was doing, what was he doing then with the extra staff he had, because surely if he had all these engineers to handle an \$18 million capital program last year and he cut it down to \$11 million this year, he must have been overstaffed. Oh, no, no, the Minister of Natural Resources said, not really. He said he's not overstaffed, because some of these projects are being done through the Jobs Fund. So they're simply doing the same kind of projects through the Jobs Fund that they could have done through the department before.

I see where they have prevailed upon their friend Mr. Greasley for the Executive Vice President of the Winnipeg Construction Association. They have prevailed upon the — (Interjection) — Yes indeed, Mr. Chairman, I heard the explanation of the Minister of Finance and quite frankly the Minister of Finance's explanation doesn't add up, it simply doesn't wash, Mr. Chairman.

There's a media release dated the 10th of June put out by the Winnipeg Construction Association where they have prevailed upon Mr. Greasley to designate those projects that have been put through the Jobs Fund. He says, "This year at the request of the Province of Manitoba, those projects that are presented through the Jobs Fund program have been identified on the printed results."

So there it's quite evident, Mr. Chairman, that they weren't really interested in the actual programs that they were putting in place. What they wanted the Winnipeg Construction Association to do was to go along with their game and make sure that they identified those projects that came through the Jobs Fund. At the end of it you have such things as dike upgrading, Ste Rose. Well, Mr. Chairman, that type of project has been delivered through the Department of Natural Resources for a great period of time.

I would like the First Minister, the Minister of Natural Resources, someone who will take the responsibility over there before we're done with the discussion of the Jobs Fund to stand up and declare categorically that the dike upgrading for instance at Ste. Rose is not the kind of project which would normally be delivered through the Department of Natural Resources and that indeed that very project has been in the planning stages now for two or three years, at least. Well, I don't really care what the Finance Minister told me, Mr. Chairman. What I'm interested in is the fact. I want the First Minister himself then to tell me that the dike upgrading at Ste. Rose, that it is a new initiative, that it isn't something that has planned for years through the Department of Natural Resources and that the entire program will be delivered by exactly the same people who would deliver it through the Department of Natural Resources.

Where did the \$6 million go? Where's the \$6 million or \$8 million that's gone from the Department of Natural Resources? What were they doing with that last year, Mr. Chairman? We're going to have some answers from the Ministers. Up until now they've been able to skirt around it. Whether it was the Minister of Labour who wouldn't answer questions about Careerstart. There is absolutely nothing, Mr. Chairman, which the government couldn't have done with Careerstart without the Jobs Fund. All they needed to do, Mr. Chairman, was simply vote some additional money to the Careerstart Program, which last year was called the Career Internship Program. What they do is change the name of it, take the funds out of the Department of Labour, put them into the Jobs Fund, then take the funds back from the Jobs Fund, give them back to the Minister of Labour to run the Careerstart Program, put an additional \$6 million in and say, aren't we great.

Mr. Chairman, — (Interjection) — Yes, absolutely, Mr. Chairman, absolutely. There's an additional \$6 million because the employment situation in this province is so dismal. There's 52,000 unemployed. They needed to put additional money into Careerstart and they could simply have done it by walking into the Cabinet room and passing a Special Warrant and they could have given the Minister of Labour \$6 million to devote towards her Careerstart Program. They could have done it in about 10 minutes, 5 minutes maybe in Cabinet, Mr. Chairman, but they chose not to do that. They chose to try and make it appear, through the Jobs Fund, as though there was something new happening here which would not otherwise have been happening. Mr. Chairman, that simply isn't the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. The committee will reconvene at 8:00 p.m. tonight.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour.

The first item on the agenda for Tuesday's Private Members' Hour is the Adjourned Debate on Second Readings of Public Bills, Bill No. 41, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Concordia. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West, Bill No. 56, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Springfield. (Stand)

RES. NO. 8 - APOLOGY TO THE U.S. FOR MEMBERS' PARTICIPATION IN DEMONSTRATION

MR. SPEAKER: Private members' resolutions, Resolution No. 8. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain has 14 minutes remaining.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's so long since we last debated this resolution that I think it is probably advisable to go back and recap some of the circumstances that surrounded the unfortunate events which took place at the U.S. Consulate when two Cabinet Ministers from the NDP Government became involved in an anti-American demonstration at which the American flag was burned.

Mr. Speaker, we were told following this incident that it had been brought to the attention of the NDP caucus that the demonstration was to take place and that the Minister of Economic Development had been asked by the First Minister to represent the caucus at the demonstration. That was something that was reported on two occasions by the Winnipeg Free Press, quoting the Minister of Economic Development. Subsequently, the First Minister denied that, saying that his Minister of Economic Development and his Minister of Natural Resources had shown bad judgment and naivety by appearing at the demonstration.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we had the unfortunate situation where two Ministers of the Crown, accompanied by a number of government backbenchers, participated in this anti-American demonstration. The involvement of those Ministers in that demonstration was something which could not be separated from their role as Ministers of a government, as people representing all Manitobans.

The individual MLAs who participated largely represent themselves and their own constituents, and that is something which they have to take up with their constituents; they have to be accountable to their constituents for that action. But the action of two government Ministers is entirely another matter, because whether we like it or not those Ministers represent all of us. They represent all Manitobans.

For the Ministers to believe that they could change that; that they could somehow make it otherwise; that they could be outside of their role as Ministers of the government while they were there participating in that anti-American demonstration indeed shows naivety, as the First Minister said, and it showed bad judgment as well, the fact that they were there at all.

What it did, what it caused, Mr. Speaker, was a great outrage on the part of a great many Manitobans as well as many of our American friends that members of the government should be participating in this kind of demonstration. Because of that outrage on the part of both Manitobans and Americans, we are as a province, very likely to suffer as a consequence of that action because we have such a close relationship with our American friends that anything that happens, anything that shapes their thinking or our thinking, changes the relationships that exist between our two governments. No matter how large or how small the effect might be, there is an effect.

What happened in this case unfortunately, is that we were involved in an issue, the Garrison Diversion issue,

which has been extremely topical now for a number of years and is of great importance to Manitobans as well as to our friends in the United States. But Canada and Manitoba have been putting forward a position, attempting to protect the interests of Manitobans. In putting forward that position, they have moved away, within the last year or two, year and a half while this government has been in power, from simply relying on the international treaties that were in place and have moved more into the realm of lobbying and of trying to influence legislators in the United States.

Well, the normal influences that people have on legislators in the United States, of course, don't apply to Canadians because we don't vote down there. So those elected people in the United States weren't listening to our lobbyists for the same reason that they would listen to lobbyists from the United States. We were dependent to a great extent upon the good will that the American legislators would extend towards Canadians and Manitobans going down there to put our case before them.

We then have a situation where the Minister of Natural Resources, the Minister who had been charged with the responsibility of representing Manitoba's interests, participating in this anti-American demonstration before the United States Consulate - on the property even of the United States Consulate - and thereby jeopardizing the position that Manitoba has held on a bipartisan basis towards the issue of the Garrison Diversion. That is just one of the very concrete issues that has been affected by the action of the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Economic Development.

There are others, of course, whether it's tourism or whether it's simply the general attitude that Americans now hold towards Manitobans, and unfortunately it's even had effect beyond that. I am sure my colleague for Emerson will deal with a problem which arose some months ago concerning the issue of people going from Manitoba into the United States to do custom combining. The very weak position that the Government of Manitoba was in, in trying to make any sort of representation on behalf of those people, because they were embroiled in the consequences of their naivete, bad judgment and their general anti-Americanism, so they, as a government, were not able to represent the interests of Manitobans in the way that they should have been able to represent it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that action on the part of the Government Ministers and the backbenchers, as well, simply demonstrates a general feeling of anti-Americanism which runs through the members opposite. I don't say that it's a view that's shared by every one of the member's opposite, but it is certainly a general theme that runs through the speeches that the members opposite make and through the resolutions that the members opposite present to this House.

Now, it's one thing for them to say, as I've heard the Minister of Natural Resources stand up in the halls of the very Capitol building in Washington and profess his great love for our American friends, and then to see him come back and participate in this kind of demonstration, Mr. Speaker, simply raises serious doubts about the credibility of the Minister. But that same feeling that was demonstrated by their participation in this demonstration at the Consulate runs through a number of the resolutions that the

members put forward, whether it's debating Reaganomics, or whether it's debating the Cruise Missile, or the Peace Role that they would like to see Canada play.

Now, that is an unfortunate thing I think for the welfare of Manitoba that the government should have that attitude, but that isn't something we can change, Mr. Speaker, that if the government wishes to present that sort of view, then they can do that and they will bear the consequences of it as a party. But to have this official demonstration by the two Ministers has simply gone beyond the bounds of proper conduct of government, and I'm sure that there are members opposite who would agree with that position. I am sure that there are some members, there must be some members opposite, Mr. Speaker, who would recognize the bounds of common decency that should guide the behaviour of a provincial government towards its national government and towards the national governments of other countries as well.

I am sure that they will not be able to stand up and speak their piece on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, although I suppose we live in hope that some member opposite might recognize the principles that are involved here and stand up and say, yes, I think that those two Ministers did wrong and that I agree with our First Minister that they showed naivete and bad judgment in participating in it, and that really, if I had my way, I would extend an apology towards the United States. That, of course, Mr. Speaker, would have been the very simple and decent thing for the government to do.

Once they came to the realization of what had happened . . .

HON. S. LYON: They were caught.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . that they had, as my Leader says, been caught, and I acknowledge that I am absolutely certain that the two Ministers and the backbenchers, when they went to that demonstration, did not know that there was going to be American flag burned at that demonstration, but there was. And they are part of it and, because they were there, they now have to bear the consequences and having realized what happened, Mr. Speaker, what they should have done — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Springfield wants to know, as my Leader has said frequently, "If you fly with the crows, you're going to get shot for one," and that's what's going to happen and the member can see what's happened.

When the First Minister realized that he should not have sent his Minister of Economic Development there, and that there was a potentially damaging issue here from a political point of view for his own government and from the point of view of the international relations of Canada and the United States, and of Manitoba to the United States, he should have immediately said that was the wrong thing to do, we made a mistake and we apologize for it. That would have been the end of the issue; the issue would have been over right then, Mr. Speaker.

Instead, this First Minister, who leads that group on the other side, dragged it on for days and days, and weeks and weeks, until he backed himself into a corner that it was absolutely impossible to extricate himself

from. Then, having got in that position, they then want to blame us. They want to blame us for talking about it. They wanted to go and participate in the demonstration and show all their left-wing friends that they were prepared to demonstrate against the United States, but when they got caught at it they don't want anybody to talk about it. They blame us for making this a public issue, Mr. Speaker, when what they should have done was recognize what they had done and apologized.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would have expected more reasoned words from someone who would be running for the leadership of the Conservative Party than those I just heard. The Member for Turtle Mountain generally has a reputation for reasonableness, even tone. The even tone was there, but the reason wasn't.

Mr. Speaker, of course, the origin for this debate lies in a demonstration which was a demonstration against U.S. intervention in the country of Nicaragua. It's a demonstration at which members of this government were present, but with their typical leaps of logic, the members of the Opposition have decided that demonstration against an action is equated with demonstration against a nation and a whole country. It's interesting that these people make the leap and they say that we are anti-American, when I find it . . .

HON. S. LYON: What are you?

MR. P. EYLER: Well, I'll get to that later. Anyway, that's not what I want to deal with at the beginning. If the Leader of the Opposition could keep his patience for a few minutes, I'd like to deal with this affair in its proper context, and that includes both the traditions of Canada and the outlook of the present members of the Opposition.

I think, first of all, I'd like to deal with the approach that the members of the Opposition take to politics, especially their approach to American politics. I find it a lot like the Playboy Magazine approach to women. Playboy Magazine goes out and they find a basically good-looking woman and they take pictures of her that emphasize all of her best points, very good-looking pictures, and then they take an air brush and they clean off all of the flaws, get rid of the pimples, the moles, the warts and then you have an idol. You have somebody that you can put up on the pedestal and you can worship. If we take the Playboy Magazine woman as the ideal woman, we're always going to be searching for that ideal, and we're never going to be satisfied with reality.

I think that has a great parallel with the approach of the Opposition when they talk about America. You know, the Conservatives say that they have a great love for America, but if you let one or two or three people of American origin move into this House, you have instant animosity. The Leader of the Opposition says that the members on this side of the House don't have the proper background to govern. The Member for La Verendrye is forced to withdraw a slur against

the American origins of the Minister of Labour. The list of comments made off the record is endless.

There is clearly a great gulf between what the Opposition says about America and what the Opposition says about Americans. And what's behind this paradox, Mr. Speaker, before anyone says I'm accusing them of racism let me say that it's not racism, it's a problem of political perception. The members of the Opposition have a certain set of political perceptions which I could only characterize as American nationalism. The members of the Opposition are American nationalists themselves. They aren't Canadian, they are American nationalists.

K.R. Minogue wrote an excellent little book called "Nationalism," — (Interjection) — and I'll tell the Leader of the Opposition out in the hall if he wants to listen about my life story, but here I'm talking about things that are important. Nationalism is defined by Minogue as "a certain intellectualization of the idea of the nation concerned." Nationalism, in other words, appears to be a love for an abstraction of the nation, and that abstraction may have none but the most tenuous connection with the concrete national life. Clemenceau loving France and rather disliking Frenchmen expresses the paradox of this nationalism.

So, what we have, Mr. Speaker, is an Opposition which has an impression of the United States, but it's only a partial impression. They've allied themselves philosophically with one particular stream of American political and economical thought, and they have proceeded to define the whole country in terms of that single stream of thought, and when Americans don't conform to their perception of what Americans should be, they react with vicious rhetoric.

Minogue again says, "Nationalists are liable to violent alternations of love in contemplating the ideal virtues and hate when they contemplate the actual behaviour of their compatriots." "Hate" becomes the key word. Anyone who disagrees with a nationalist's perceptions becomes an object of hatred and he in turn is accused of hating the nation. Consider what the Member for Pembina said. — (Interjection) — The Member for Flin Flon said, look at the Member for Pembina. Let's look at what the Member for Pembina said: "I just can't conceive of the circumstances of a person growing up in a nation being fed and clothed by the wealth of that nation, being educated by the wealth of that nation, being given freedom in a democracy of that nation in which they were born to develop the kind of hatred that some of the expatriot American MLAs of this House have for the United States. I can't conceive of the hatred they hold for the country in which they were born, raised and educated."

There we have the Member for Pembina. Clearly he equates dissent with hatred. In their idea of the United States, there is no room for dissent. You either love America or you hate America.

There are different sets of values, Mr. Speaker. K.R. Minogue continues, "What we find, in fact, is involvement in a fantasy and those involved in a fantasy are liable to violent and unpredictable rage if the world fails to fit their dreams." That's what has happened here. The Members of the Opposition are living in a fantasy world. There may be some Americans present in this House who do not conform with their conception of what Americans should be and they react with rage.

One of the problems of the perceptions of the Opposition is that they have never had any direct experience with the United States. They are unaware of the full range of national life. Unlike some of the members on this side, they have never lived in the United States. They've only had infrequent, vicarious visits and an excursion to the Republican National Convention is not going to give them the exposure they need to the full range of American's values. As residents of Manitoba, these people live on the fringes of American life. They're peering in, but they don't have a very good view.

Minogue notes a little bit further, "It is a common observation that many nationalist leaders come from the periphery of their countries. One is indeed tempted to regard modern nationalism as a recourse of those who feel spiritually exiled from their communities, the outsiders, the alienated, the excluded." — (Interjection) — They know who I'm referring to, yes.

Ever since the election in 1981, the Conservatives have subjected this side of the House to increasing verbal violence, and it's the responsibility of the members on this side not to get caught up in that violence but to understand it for what it is, the rantings of an increasingly alienated minority who spend more and more of their time in a fantasy world.

The Leader of the Opposition concluded his tirade in the Great Flag Debate by saying that the whole issue was one of loyalty - but loyalty to what? - to the United States, or to American nationalism? How far do you carry that loyalty?

Remember what the Member for Minnedosa told us in this House when he was discussing "If You Love This Planet," a film he hadn't even seen. The Member for Minnedosa said, "If the President of the United States doesn't like that film, I don't like the film." Now, that's loyalty, uncritical loyalty, unthinking loyalty and it's irresponsible loyalty.

On this side of the House, we assess for ourselves the policies of the United States. — (Interjection) — We prefer to develop our own opinions. And in this, in forming our own opinions, we are more representative of Canadian traditions than the current members of the Opposition.

I'd like to give you a little parallel from Canadian history.

HON. S. LYON: What in God's name do you know about Canadian traditions?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. P. EYLER: I got to him the day I was elected. The day Harold Piercy lost his bid.

I wonder how many members of this House have ever heard of George Brown. He was a prominent Canadian from the pre-Confederation period. He founded the Toronto Globe in 1844, which was the predecessor of today's Globe and Mail, and he was an outspoken critic of the institution of slavery in the United States. In his newspaper he wrote, "It is not easy to understand how a government with 15 states, rejoicing in their cherished institutions of slavery, can be actively and perpetually engaged on the side of freedom. It is difficult to believe that the government

will be perpetually on the side of freedom when the very preservation of that unholy bond to the union is based on the principle that in vast tracts of their country the human mind is placed under Russian restraint.”

If you look in the Provincial Library, you'll find a book of other speeches by George Brown. Under the heading of "Anti-Slavery Demonstration in Toronto," there's a speech, and the words appear, "When you have mingled with the thing itself, when you have encountered the atrocities of the system, when you have seen three millions of human beings held as chattels by their Christian countrymen, when you have seen the free institutions, the free press and the free pulpit of American life linked in the unrighteous task of upholding the traffic, when you have realized the manacle, the lash, the slothound, you think no more of rhetoric. The mind stands appalled at the monstrous inequity."

Now, those are words that aren't calculated to gain George Brown the friendship of the United States, and a speech like that raised concerns in Canada and speeches like that, that he made throughout his career, continually raised concerns not only because he was the editor of the Toronto Globe, but also because he was an influential and respected member of the Ontario Legislature. Not only was he a member of the Legislature; he was a diplomat. He was a diplomat who was engaged in negotiations with the United States.

So the Canadian tradition is not necessarily to sit back and take whatever the United States wants to say and then not object to what they do elsewhere in the world. When Ontario wanted to discuss trade revisions to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, the Premier wrote to George Brown, "We have considered that the first movement to be made is to select a competent individual who would be entrusted to deal with the subject of Washington and who, by his position, could approach all parties at that capital. I need scarcely tell you that one and all of my colleagues point to you as possessing all the qualifications required for that highly important mission." George Brown, an outspoken critic of American institutions and a successful diplomat in the United States, but not a contradiction in terms.

Now, there are those who are going to say that the slavery issue is irrelevant. Indeed, in retrospect, it would be an easy issue to settle in terms of morality or ethical terms, but to the people of the 19th century slavery was no less complex an issue to unravel than the issue of American involvement in Nicaragua is to the people of today. In both cases, the case for complexity lies more in economics than in morality.

When slavery was abolished, a large number of people lost vast amounts of money. Their property rights were subordinated to human rights. We must not forget that property rights is the real issue which is involved in American diplomacy in Central America, Latin America today. The Nicaraguan crisis didn't pop out of nowhere overnight. There is over a century of traditions which have been building up; the problem has been building up and it has now reached a crisis.

It began in the 1850s when Commodore Vanderbilt built a road across Nicaragua from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. The Nicaraguan Government thought this was a great idea; bring in foreign investment, develop the country. They had a great deal; 10 percent of the profits would be given to the Nicaraguan Government. The problem was that Commodore

Vanderbilt refused to pay that 10 percent to the Nicaraguan Government.

Meanwhile back in New York, he lost control of his road to another group of New York bankers who took over, and they refused to pay to the Nicaraguan Government. But rather than pay, they overthrew the government and they installed an American adventurer, William Walker, to be the leader of Nicaragua. For two years, an American was in control of the Nicaraguan Government. Commodore Vanderbilt, in order to get his road back, engineered a counter-revolution and threw out the American and put in his own puppet. So they got off to a great start.

It didn't take long after that before the land barons moved in, the United Fruit Company, or the United States and Nicaragua Company. The United States and Nicaragua Company was given a grant of 10 million acres in northern Nicaragua with exclusive rights to the agriculture, the forests, the railroad rights, the telephone rights, the telegraph rights, exclusive rights to 10 million acres. In Manitoba, that would be a piece of land extending from Portage la Prairie to the Saskatchewan border and from the American boundary to Riding Mountain, 10 million acres. It was all tied up by American corporations who were involved in mahogany foresting, in banana production, in orange plantations, and the whole economy of the country became a branch plant which was run entirely for the benefit of the United States.

In 1911, when the Government of Nicaragua was on the verge of bankruptcy and couldn't pay its foreign debt, the United States organized a cartel of bankers to move in, and the bankers took over the revenues of the Department of Customs and they paid off the loan. When Nicaraguans protested, the United States sent in the marines. From 1912 until 1933, the Country of Nicaragua was occupied by American forces. When they left, they set up a puppet, Somoza. The Somoza family ruled for the next 40 years, and that is the genesis of the present crisis.

You can hardly disagree with their point of view when you see what the United States has done in a century-and-a-half in Nicaragua. Property rights, not human rights, take precedence in American foreign policy. The protection of American property rights is still the pre-eminent factor in U.S. foreign policy throughout Latin America. To protect the American investments in Chile, the U.S. engineered a revolution to replace a democratically-elected government with a military dictatorship. Now the U.S. is working to overthrow the government in Nicaragua.

We respect the government and the people of the United States, but we do not endorse every action. They have a lot to contribute to the world, but they are not flawless. No single government or nation is perfect and that is why we reserve the right to be critical of their actions, but not necessarily anti-American. Canada and the United States have shared this continent for well over a century despite our differences of opinions, and perhaps it's because of our differences of opinions that we are two nations and not one.

This resolution reaffirms our friendship for the people of the United States the way we amended it, and that friendship stands regardless of which political party is in control in the United States. But we do not pledge blind loyalty to a narrow stream of American thought and defend that thought as the essence of America.

We are the elected leaders in Manitoba. It is our responsibility to formulate our own opinions. I can't agree with the Member for Kirkfield Park when she says that it's not up to her to make up her mind about something. We must think for ourselves and not follow unthinkingly, like the Member for Minnedosa, the opinions and actions of American leaders.

In closing, I would like to once again refer to George Brown. George Brown put it so well when he said, "We are in the habit of calling the people of the United States the Americans, but we too are Americans. On us, as well as on them, lies the duty of preserving the honour of the continent. On us, as on them, rests the noble trust of shielding free institutions from the reproach of modern tyrants."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to express some regret and shame, I guess, and a lot of annoyance that we even have the need for this resolution in this House. As a member who has been representing 100 miles of the American border for the second time now, I want to talk in a more personal level than possibly some of the others have done, that we don't have that much connection with the Americans.

Regarding the remarks of the Member for River East, and maybe some of the other members there, I would have to say it's the usual rhetoric and tunnel vision that has been expressed; and at the end, I'd like to indicate to them the hypocrisy and stupidity of some of their statements.

The effect that it has had at the local level - and I don't think anybody's really got involved that much, or checked into what has happened at the local level with neighbours. What bothers me much more, and I won't talk at the diplomatic level and the higher level, as our Leader has done, as the Member for Turtle Mountain has done, the effect it will possible have on Garrison, and some of the other relationships at a higher level, I want to talk about the effect it has had at the local level.

What bothers me so dramatically is why this government, or why the Premier would not extend an apology to the Americans for the incident. I think it was well put by the Member for Turtle Mountain. Mr. Speaker, I could have found 15 different ways, as a Premier, to extend an apology without embarrassing his Ministers, necessarily; but what it indicated to me is the lack of leadership they have in the government over there. I think the Premier is not strong enough to handle his kind of Cabinet, or the government for that matter and, as a result of that, is why we have the problem - they dug in. He could have so easily extended an apology because, as indicated by the Member for Turtle Mountain, I don't think they realized the flag was going to get burned, but the fact is it was burned. It would have been very easy to just indicate to our neighbours to the south an error had happened; it could have been done in various ways, it would not have created any embarrassment, but that is not what they wanted to do.

As a result, what has happened? I want to indicate a few of the incidents that have occurred since that

flag burning incident happened. One of them is that a dealer in Dominion City, who does a fair amount of his machine business in the States, a week after this happened two of his major combine deals, to the tune of \$125,000 each, cancelled with a note on there, "That's for burning the flag." Many of these issues happen, these are people that were dealing with neighbours across the border, have never had problems with them, and the reaction that happened because of it.

What have we done, Mr. Speaker, since the flag burning incident? In the southeast, I think all along the southern border with the Americans, we have tried to make peace on our own, because the government refuses to apologize. Communities have sent out peace merchants on their own; we had a delegation that went from Dominion City to the various towns in the States. I was asked to attend; at the time I could not attend, however what I did, I sent along pins and flags and apologies, as a member of this Legislature, to our neighbours to the south. I think it would have been, if possibly time would have allowed it and we had not been a Session, I think it would have been well if all members of the Legislature would have been out there in the various towns, creating goodwill. I'm talking at the local level because, if members of the government feel that the people did not feel slighted, they should have travelled in the States. They should have travelled shortly after that in the States and got the finger sign from some of the people and these were our neighbours. That is why I say it was a very emotional impact on the Americans, and these people stand here in the House and say, it was nothing, they're our friends. Well, that's not how you treat friends.

They are our friends, Mr. Speaker. We have hospital services that are being provided by the Americans; we have dental services being provided by the Americans; we have all kinds of business that is being done with the Americans; we have intermarriages with our American friends across the border - all along the southeast border. There has always been a good relationship and it is strained, and has been strained because of this dumb incident, and the fact that a government and a Leader don't have the guts to apologize.

As I indicated, we've been doing a fair amount of that on our own, but the impact is still there. And then we have our Minister of Natural Resources, and the Minister of Tourism and Industry, going out and promoting tourism into this country.

A MEMBER: Unbelievable.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I will just find it very interesting to see what the impact will be on the tourist industry within the next year, because it has a bearing. I'm an outdoorsman, I like to hunt and fish and I do that with many of my American counterparts and when you meet them it is there; it is there, subtly sometimes, sometimes not so subtly. On the odd occasion, when you have a snort with them, it doesn't become subtle at all, they are very concerned about this. Of course, Mr. Speaker, not indicating that I had the snort because I've been

I also want to make a little reference, just a few points I want to bring out here. The case of the

harvesters going across the line - a dramatic effect. Three major dealerships had their companies on the line because it sold combines to Canadian operators on a year-to-year basis. They'd buy the combines; they'd take them across, do the harvesting route; come back here, finish up harvesting here; trade it in again on a new unit. We're talking of half a million bucks, in some cases. These are the people that, all of a sudden, out of the blue, indicated that they could not go across and, whether we like it or not, it is these little things. The situation was finally resolved, by the help of some people like Jake Epp and people in Ottawa, but it is these little things. They were resolved because our people went out there and tried to establish good relationships again.

But the fact that these things surface and will continue to surface because, with Manitoba and with Canadians generally, because of the stupid actions; and then the Minister of Natural Resources gets up in this House and does the greatest job of saying, we are friends, we are the closest of friends. We wouldn't do anything to the Americans, but we have the right to express our views. I'll deal with that in a minute.

We've had peace marches lately, we've had all kinds of activities going on regarding the Cruise missile, and we sit here, as Canadians, under the umbrella of protection by the Americans. We have a great land that many people, if the borders were ever opened up, we'd be inundated with people from all over the world that would want to come and live here. We live here, we have our protection, to some degree, in terms of how many immigrants can come in at a time, but, Mr. Speaker, we have virtually no protection against the nations of this world if they would ever want to attack our country. We have very little that we can offer in that respect. But there isn't a nation in the world that will tackle Canada as long as we have our big neighbour to the south, the Americans there. Whether we like it or not, we live under their umbrella of protection and we never expressed that gratitude to them.

Mr. Speaker, I do not deny the fact that if the members of the government felt strongly about raising a point, a difference of opinion with what the Americans were doing - I don't agree with everything they're doing. I've had my differences of opinion with them on the Roseau River Diversion. I don't deny anybody that right, but then, when the Minister of Natural Resources gets up and says, friends, they're our friends. Well, when I have friends in my home community, or here in the Legislature, or neighbours, and I don't agree with them, Mr. Speaker, I don't go and demonstrate on their lawn.

A MEMBER: You kick their dog.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I don't go and kick their dog, as is stated. What I do, Mr. Speaker, I go and have discussion with them. I go and discuss it with them, and that is the point that bothers me most, and that is where the hypocrisy comes in of members opposite. They say, we're friends, and then they go and demonstrate on their friends lawn, on his property. Well, I would be frightfully annoyed if the Member for Assiniboia came and demonstrated on my lawn because, if we had a difference of opinion, and we do from time to time, all he has to do is come into my

house and discuss it, all he has to do is come and discuss it; or, Mr. Speaker, I'll go and discuss it with him.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it brings out interesting thoughts. You see this is where we're hairlining in, again. Member's say it was on the sidewalk, it wasn't on the property. Well, if I was going to demonstrate in front of my neighbor's house, or in front of my friend's house on the sidewalk, it would be even worse yet. Now what we're doing, what the members opposite are doing, pulling little lines, and they've been doing that since the start of this debate. You know, they've been trying to camouflage the whole issue and the seriousness of it. This is something that my area - you know, we kid up and down once in a while about who's going to win the next election in Emerson - well I'll tell you something, the government cemented my position; they did.

Mr. Speaker, seriously, very seriously, I would ask the government people that they do extend an apology in a very tactful way; nobody has to be embarrassed. What has happened now, you've dug in your heels, you've created a worse situation, it would have been so simple and the relationship among the people along the southeast border with Americans, at the local level, at government level, at the diplomatic level, would have all been resolved, to some degree. The fact that they can't do it, they can't bring themselves to do it, shows the weakness of the Premier, it shows the weakness of the government, and it shows - I don't know how to even explain that, Mr. Speaker, because there's certain words that we can't use.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, with those remarks I wanted to put it on the record, as a very, very concerned MLA that has neighbors and is representing the area involved most with a stupid action like that. I would, once again, just ask the government, please reconsider your position. It takes - how does that expression go about making a mistake - it takes a bigger man to admit one, and if you admit it, do it, the situation is resolved. That would show courage on your part. That is what I say you have not got; you have not got courage to admit a mistake and that is what's going to ultimately, as soon as we can get you to call an election, is going to wipe out that party.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I've always been, every since this farcical resolution has been brought in by the members opposite, I have, to say the very least, that it is an embarrassment to have a resolution such as this put forward. It is an embarrassment to the Legislature; it is an embarrassment to the people of Manitoba to have politicians stoop to the level that we have of the Tory caucus in this House, the levels that they stoop to to try and implicate, Mr. Speaker, events that never happened.

Mr. Speaker, what we have is a classic attempt at Tory misinformation. I don't know if they're following the footsteps of Goebbels, or who their patron saint is, and especially for the member here from Arthur who, once again, repeats about people burning flags when he knows darn well, as the Member for Turtle

Mountain finally admitted today, that the people when going to a demonstration, and a legitimate demonstration, knew nothing of any such thing taking place. But they, classic Goebbels, they take an event, Mr. Speaker, they take a peripheral incident, not attached to that event at all, and then they try to turn the whole story around, reinvent the happenings of something that they never even witnessed, were not there, did not have any idea of what the demonstration was about. Their own quotes are clear evidence that they had not understanding of what the demonstration was about, Mr. Speaker, but they try and twist that around, they try to do that to disgrace the government.

They try to do that to create a left-right division in Manitoba; to try and create, Mr. Speaker, some image in Manitoba of a communist threat, is the only words that come to my mind, of a sort of rhetoric that we hear constantly from the members opposite, and it's not just from the Leader of the Opposition, not at all is it just from the Leader of the Opposition. We had the same sorts of comments coming from the Member for Fort Garry and from almost anyone on that side who rises to speak, Mr. Speaker. It's almost as if Sterling has been cloned in 22 other seats over there, and that we have a Legislature now, and the members of an Opposition of a Legislature, who are so incredibly narrow in their perspective that they won't read behind an issue. They refuse to look behind issues to try and find out why demonstrations took place; what sort of thing drives people to going out and making a public demonstration; they do not like demonstrations.

The only demonstration that caucus, I think, has ever supported, to any degree, in this province was a demonstration against Autopac, and I have my severe doubts, Mr. Speaker, if they were not clearly or very actively involved in the participation toward the organization of that demonstration. But it would not the least surprise me if they were, and that's the last demonstration probably they took because it was a demonstration against the government, because it was a demonstration against the efforts of a democratic institution, and democratically elected government, in moving toward cutting out, basically, the rip-off that one has, and one had at those stages, in the automobile insurance industry in Manitoba.

But this is, not to move off onto other directions, Mr. Speaker, their idea of free citizens. They say to us, whether it's a peace demonstration, it's a demonstration against a friendly nation who is involved in covert operations and spending tens of millions of dollars backing up those covert operations against, Mr. Speaker, against legislation that has passed, even within that country. If I can find it here amongst my notes I would like to read to the members opposite the words of the Bowman Amendment which came forward last year in the U.S. House of Representatives. This was almost a conciliatory amendment, as well; it was passed in December 31st of 1982, which forbids the Administration to use funds for, and I quote, "military equipment, military training or advice, or other support for military activities, to any group or individual, not part of a country's armed forces, for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of Nicaragua, or providing a military exchange between Nicaragua and Honduras." What do we see in Honduras? We see the largest training operation, of the U.S. Government using

other nationals, in the whole world based in Nicaragua trying to train people. First off it was joining with the ex-Somosa guardsman, people who rape women, burn children, burn whole families in their houses are still participating in those sorts of activities in other countries around there whom the Government of the United States is still supporting. In particular, in Guatemala where they are routinely going into villages and trying to destroy the morale of the people in those villages of anyone who does not believe in what the government and what Ronnie Reagan wants them to do. And we say that we, Mr. Speaker, as citizens in a democratic country who feel a form of friendship with the United States, feel a closeness of an undefended border, feel a closeness of family links across the border. In my own family, on the Scott side in particular, probably three-quarters of the descendants of original settlers who came over here in, I believe, 1824, are living in the USA right now. So, let's not have some of you people talking as if you are the only ones in this House that have any kind of relatives in the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, when you have a country that is engaged in covert operations, trying to overthrow another government, trying to prop up governments that are already there that are on the verge of toppling, and here I mean, in particular, the government of El Salvador, which would have toppled years and years ago without U.S. interference. In Honduras, the government no doubt would topple as well if it wasn't for U.S. interference and U.S. propping up of another corrupt government there. In Guatemala, it's probably the most classic example and the classic case in the past few years of the form of government, the kind of atrocities that that government commits and the sort of blind obligation that the U.S. feels towards maintaining that.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address, just in the final couple of minutes of today, of the sentiment that the Tories of this House, and the Tories in many stages of this province try to get across the message that anything that you do in criticizing the United States isn't because your taking a Canadian position, it's because you're anti-American. This whole facade of people being anti-American, Mr. Speaker, I've had it up to my eyeballs with all this garbage of people being anti-American. There is no such thing as a Canadian, from their mentality, from their point of view. If a Canadian stands up and speaks against any other nation, and in particular, speaks against the United States, they are automatically anti-American, not speaking against the American public, but speaking against an administration which, in its own laws, is disobeying the laws.

It's disobeying the law that was passed last December 21st in the United States, and you have a number of U.S. Congressmen, of Michael Barnes speaking out against it and wants the money cut off. Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who feels that the CIA in their covert operations against Nicaragua based in Honduras have not been consulting adequately with the Congressional Intelligence Oversight Committee, of which he is a part.

If any Canadian joins the voices of the U.S. congressman and the U.S. senators and the millions of U.S. citizens who are speaking against the U.S. involvement in another undeclared war, afraid that they will get into another circumstance like they walked into

with eyes half-closed in Vietnam, that when another friendly nation and members of that friendly nation, be they parliamentarians or not, speak out against that, that there's something basically wrong with it.

In other words, the basis of an awful lot of the Conservative policy is that if you are not a continentalist, you are anti-American, that you cannot have viewpoints, that you cannot express your viewpoints in a free and democratic way in this country without being anti-American. It is so much garbage, Mr. Speaker, so much absolute bunk, that it shows how the narrow little path that the members opposite are taking themselves and unfortunately, their party which has not associated itself with that kind of opinions in the past, but unfortunately the past couple of years with the new right taking over in the party, it seems that they are becoming more and more susceptible. As members of a so-called Progressive Conservative Party to following holus-bolus, the policies of another country; not having the guts to stand up, Mr. Speaker, and express what their own policies are as Canadians, but just following in dead step - and they are dead steps - behind their American neighbors, no matter what direction they wish to take.

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

The time being 5:30, when this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have 10 minutes remaining.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, on the understanding that the House will resume in Committee of Supply only in the Chamber to deal with the Jobs Fund, I would move, seconded by the Member for Brandon West, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: It has been the custom of the House to be meeting in two committees when there are two items left to complete and two different Ministers responsible for them. Perhaps some Minister on the government side who can look after the affairs of the government could deal with that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield to the same point.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, when we finished Legislation, which I understood was the last matter referred to the Committee of Supply meeting in the Committee Room, it was suggested by the Leader of the Opposition in the other committee at 4:30 this afternoon that we could finish up the Local Government Grants as part of the consideration of items that was going to continue in the Chamber and it would be necessary only to meet in one committee tonight. I was proceeding on the assumption that the Opposition House Leader and his Leader do confer on occasion, and I took the Opposition Leader's word as gospel.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for Springfield complete his motion?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Brandon West, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until until 2 p.m. tomorrow afternoon, on the understanding that members will reconvene in committee this evening.