

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 17 June, 1986.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we proceed to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 45 students from Grade 9 from the Westgate Mennonite Collegiate. The students are under the direction of Mr. J. Pankratz, Mr. Bachmeier and Mr. Wiens, and under the direction of Miss Wiebe. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

We have 60 students from Grade 9 from the Lockport Junior High School. The students are under the direction of Mrs. Rachael Elinger. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

We have 17 students from Grade 9 from the Birch River School. The students are under the direction of Mr. Bruce Johnston, and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

On behalf of all the members, I would like to welcome you all to the Legislature this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Canadian Indemnity Company - relocation

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Premier.

I understand that he has been informed today of the decision of the Canadian Indemnity Company to move its head office functions from Winnipeg to Toronto, and given that this is a company that has operated for 91 years in Winnipeg and that this decision will result in 19 people being offered relocation in Toronto and another 41 employees being terminated, has the Premier instructed his Minister of Economic Security and Employment Services to become involved in assisting and retraining and redeploying these people to find new employment in Manitoba?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I met with the representatives of Canadian Indemnity this morning at approximately 11 o'clock in which they advised of the intention to move the head office as a result of a merger

that had taken place with Dominion. They also indicated at the same time that they were putting together a package that would provide for assistance insofar as those employees who would be adversely affected, Madam Speaker, in respect to the changes that would take place.

Madam Speaker, of course the province will be prepared to look into any and all means in a way by which we can facilitate the loss of employment, employment problems within training, etc. The existing programs of government, once requested by the company or once the company is ready as a result of the completion of their putting together their package, to ask for cooperation.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, given that this is the third insurance company to move its head office from Winnipeg during the term of this government, this government's administration, I wonder if the Premier has initiated or would he initiate studies by his government to look into the taxation and other policies under Manitoba's administration to see whether we can stop the outflow of jobs to other jurisdictions as a result of head offices being moved.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I'm not going to engage in the kind of stunts that the Leader of the Opposition might wish to engage in because I could refer to Swift and the Winnipeg Tribune and ask why there weren't inquiries undertaken then.

The president of the Canadian Indemnity Co. advised me this morning by way of a letter that in no way should this action be construed as a negative comment upon the Manitoba business environment.

We intend to remain very active in the province. Our motivation is based solely on corporate decisions which seek to protect the company's position in the — (Interjection) — market.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable the First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the president did indicate that the action was a result of a merger which took place when Dominion acquired the assets of Canadian Indemnity which brought about the need for rationalization of the company's operations in Toronto because of the acquisition of Canadian Indemnity by the larger Dominion company holdings.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I accept what the Premier is saying as being perhaps a sincere intent on the part of the president of the company, but this the third insurance company to move its head office.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, Madam Speaker. My question to the Premier is: would he undertake studies to try

and ensure that we understand what effect the taxation and other policies of his government have on the people of Manitoba so that in future the rationalization will take place . . . ?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. A question should not repeat in substance a question that's already been answered or to which an answer has been refused.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question to the Premier is: will he find out why such rationalizations don't take place in Winnipeg's favour so that companies centralize their operations in Winnipeg in future?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, it would be, I think, very important without a study. Madam Speaker, we know that the total capital investment in the Province of Manitoba grew by 12.3 percent during the period 1982-1986, five times the Canadian average, Madam Speaker. We also know that in 1986 the projected capital investment in the Province of Manitoba will grow by 8.9 percent, which is twice the projected rate for Canada as a whole.

Madam Speaker, there is growth, private capital-wise, in the Province of Manitoba. It is based upon actual, cold figures, and not political rhetoric from Conservative politicians, Madam Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Premier, then, would be willing to explain to the 41 people who are losing their jobs how great it is in Manitoba.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I regret that the Leader of the Opposition would like to reflect adversely upon the word of the president of Indemnity . . .

MR. G. FILMON: I'm not . . .

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, if we moved from the kindergarten session across the way into the real politics of this Legislature, I would complete my response.

Madam Speaker, as I indicated, it's unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition reflects upon a statement by President Waugh to the effect that the decision in no way related to the business environment in the Province of Manitoba, but was entirely — (Interjection) — The Member for Arthur has asked me do I swallow that? I accept the word of the president of Canadian Indemnity. If the Member for Arthur does not, I do, Madam Speaker. It relates to the fact that there is a rationalization as a result of the acquisition by Dominion of Canadian Indemnity.

Manitoba Hydro - Dominion Bridge contract

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Acting Minister of Energy and Mines, responsible for Manitoba Hydro.

There's a news release that has been issued by the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, Mr. Eliesen, that speaks

of an award of a contract to Dominion Bridge for intake gates at Limestone. My question to the Acting Minister is: what were the prices on the lower bids that are referred to that were not acceptable under this tender?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-op Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I believe it is a positive announcement and one which all members of this House should support in respect to the awarding of that contract that will mean improved business for that particular company. It will mean improved economic circumstances for the economy as a whole and, of course, will mean improved circumstances for the workers and the employees of that company.

I think it shows very well that our policies in respect to the construction of Limestone through Manitoba Hydro are working to the benefit of Manitoba, are providing the types of benefits that we'd all like to see for workers, employees, families and companies, and in fact are achieving the goals which I know, if not members of the Opposition share, all Manitobans share in that regard.

In respect to his specific question, I would like to take that as notice, not having the information available to me, only knowing that this announcement is one that is very positive . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I remind honourable members that answers to questions should be brief, deal with the matters raised, and should not provoke debate.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I need no lecture from the Minister about employment in Manitoba. That was what my first question was about — the 41 jobs that are being lost. My question to the Minister, in addition to the knowledge of what prices were bid by the lower bids that were not accepted is: were there any North American bids that were lower than the one that was accepted on behalf of Dominion Bridge?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Well, again, I need no lecture from the Leader of the Opposition as to how he always tends to dwell on the negative and job loss, and when we have jobs that are being gained in this province because of policies of this government he wants to ignore it.

As far as the specific question is concerned, I'd indicated to him that I will take those questions as notice and that information which is normally provided on tenders such as this sort will be provided in due course.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the Minister takes a long time to tell us that he doesn't know any answers to any questions. But I have one third one that he can take as notice as well since he doesn't have the answers to any questions. Did they have any experience below

the tenders that were rejected? Did they have any experience in erecting and building gates in other jurisdictions other than North America?

HON. J. COWAN: . . . certainly we'll be pleased to provide the type of information that is normally provided about tenders of this sort. I will take that question as notice along with the others and will respond to the Leader of the Opposition in due course.

Manitoba Hydro - gag orders on officials

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, a question to the First Minister.

Would the First Minister consider asking the chairman of Manitoba Hydro to rescind the recently imposed gag or muzzle order on officials of Manitoba Hydro so that Manitobans in general and the media, not excluded, can ask the kind of questions that we ought to be asking now, particularly where billions of dollars are involved, where the tendering system is being circumvented, and I'm sure many Manitobans want to have certain questions asked?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I thought the committee hearings that were just completed in which there was the fullest of information provided in the committee — I may be wrong but I thought that to be the case — so I find mystifying the — (Interjection) — question posed . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I would hope that honourable members would be as quiet to hear the answers as they are to hear the question.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I find it mystifying because my information is that the President of Manitoba Hydro provided — (Interjection) — the . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . fullest of information before the committee.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, my specific supplementary question is the gag order was imposed a few days ago after the public hearings with Manitoba Hydro. I'm simply asking the First Minister whether he will consider asking his chairman of Manitoba Hydro to rescind that order so we can ask questions of importance at this time?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I still fail to know what the member is speaking of. The Minister responds in this Chamber in respect to matters pertaining to Manitoba Hydro — or the Acting Minister — the

president of Manitoba Hydro, because there can only be one spokesman. You can't have 15,000 spokespersons who respond to questions that relate to Manitoba Hydro as well if inquiries are made.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, a final — (Interjection) — supplementary.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside would like to ask a final supplementary. Could he please have quiet?

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you. Madam Speaker, my final supplementary question to the First Minister.

If I ask Bill Morham of the CBC to call the appropriate officer at Manitoba Hydro about recent contracts awarded, will he get an answer from the appropriate official, or will he be told that, no, Mr. Marc Eliesen has said nobody at Hydro can speak about any of these subject matters? That's the gag order that I'm asking to be rescinded.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, knowing the reputation of Mr. Morham of the CBC, he would know enough to go to the person who is accountable and is responsible. That is the president of Manitoba Hydro, and not go to someone who he might not obtain accurate or complete information from.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Lakeshore Metis Cooperative Ltd.- interest free loan

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert has the floor.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Co-op Development.

The Co-op Loan and Guarantee Board Report for 1984-85 indicates an interest-free loan of \$70,000 was made to the Lakeshore Metis Land Improvement Co-op Ltd. Would the Minister indicate whether there are any other interest-free loans given by the board, and whether the Minister approved of this loan in any way, shape or form?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-op Development.

HON. J. COWAN: There are no other interest-free loans currently given by the Loans and Loans Guarantee Board, but it is a policy which I think can work to the benefit of cooperatives attempting to start out under adverse circumstances.

I know the members opposite want to see new cooperatives develop in this province. The Lakeshore Metis Cooperative was one that is providing an example,

hopefully, for other cooperators who would like to make better use of agricultural land through the development of cooperation and cooperative models.

So I, yes, did approve that. That is one that is approved directly by the Minister because of the amount. It's standard practice for the Minister to approve loans over a certain amount. I did approve that one, and I would give this indication; that if there are other cooperatives that come forward that in fact have an innovative approach and require that sort of assistance through interest-free loans or through other financial assistance that we can provide, I would be willing and would most likely do exactly the same thing to ensure that we develop and continue to develop the cooperative movement in this province in the way in which we have over the past couple of years.

MR. G. MERCIER: I would ask the Minister if the payments on this loan are up to date or are in arrears, and whether he would table in the House all audits, financial statements or monitoring that has been done with respect to this loan by the department?

HON. J. COWAN: I can't indicate at the present time as to the status of the payments, but I would be prepared to table those documents, including the audit, which are normally tabled around loans of this nature and answer specific questions if the members opposite have them, certainly.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, would the Minister inform the House whether the president and director of Lakeshore Metis Land Improvement Co-op Ltd., one Garry Anderson, is the same Garry Anderson who was the NDP candidate in the Ste. Rose election during the last election, and what Mr. Anderson's salary is?

HON. J. COWAN: I'm sorry, I missed the last sentence, which was drowned out by the oohs and aahs of the members opposite.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, the last part of the question related to the amount of salary Mr. Anderson takes from the co-op.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, in fact, Mr. Anderson is a member of that co-op, as are members of the Opposition members of co-op, as am I a member of several co-ops, as are many civically-minded individuals, who believe in cooperation, members of co-ops. I believe that they should have the same right to assistance that is provided normally to co-ops that any other individual and cooperator in this society should have.

As to whether or not Mr. Anderson is paid a salary by the co-op, I do not know that. I can certainly find out that information and, again, that information which is normally provided in respect to the affairs of cooperatives in this House will be provided in that instance. But I do not believe that once political affiliations, whether they be Conservative, Liberal, NDP, or otherwise, should be a factor in determining whether they get a loan or assistance or whether or not they don't get a loan or assistance.

I am proud to be able to provide loans to work with the department, to work with the Loans and Loans

Guarantee Board, to ensure that all cooperators, regardless of their political stripe, have an opportunity to promote the cooperative motto in this province in the work towards building a stronger future through cooperation for us all.

Lakeshore Metis Cooperative Ltd.- Special Audit

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, a final question to the Minister of Finance.

Would the Minister of Finance undertake or request a special audit of all financial activities related to this loan and financial transactions that have taken place since the granting of this loan by the Lakeshore Metis Land Improvement Co-op Ltd., in this grant of \$70,000.00?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

I believe that there are normal audits done of the operations of that board, and made with respect to all loans made by that board, and I'm not aware of any concerns being raised by those who are doing that audit with respect to any irregularities.

Executive Council - Myers, Tim, appointment of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the First Minister.

Could the First Minister indicate whether the Timothy Myers, who, in 1985, contributed \$500 to the New Democratic Party, be the one and the same Timothy O. Myers who was recently appointed as media specialist II to the Executive Council with a salary of \$41,703.00?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes, Madam Speaker.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, a supplementary to the First Minister. Since, according to the Order-in-Council, Mr. Myers will be replacing Mr. Garth Cramer, and given that last year Mr. Garth Cramer donated \$1,273.75, will Mr. Myers' tithing to the party be increased to that same figure?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. That question is not within the administrative competence of the government.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Sorry, Madam Speaker, I didn't hear your comment.

MADAM SPEAKER: I reminded the member that he is to ask questions that are within the administrative competence of the government. Donations to a political

party are not within the administrative competence of the government.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, I, of course, have to abide by your ruling, but matters within the competence of this government . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind the honourable member that I am interpreting the Rules of the House, not my rules, your rules, sir. Do you have a question?

Executive Council - flow-chart of staffing

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

Madam Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would be so kind as to provide the House a flow-chart of the staffing that now currently is serving Executive Council in his office, including special assistants, executive assistants, media specialists, communication specialists, and all of the myriad of staff that he has. Would he provide that information to the House?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, during Estimates, and let me assure the honourable member that I wouldn't want a media specialist working for me in what is a political-appointed position that was a contributor to the Conservative Party.

Bissett Recreation Site - float planes

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs.

In 1982, a planning study, and eventually a signed by-law, took place in Bissett indicating a certain area should be designated as a recreation site. Would the Minister explain why he has just recently granted permission for float planes to land in this recreation site?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I thank the Member for River Heights for that question.

It appears that there was a firm from Selkirk wanting to use that site as a place to land their planes. There is a need for that classification of aircraft in that area, and there are no plans in place at this time by the Community of Bissett to develop their recreation site. At this time, there are aircraft landing spots and also a boat landing spot which are utilizing that area. So really there is a danger to the people who would be utilizing it if it was allowed for a recreational site. So until such time as the plans are in place for development of a recreational site, then I've authorized the aircraft to use it as a landing site for the aircraft.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A supplementary to the same Minister.

Would the Minister please explain why he overruled the council who ruled against allowing float planes, in that they would infringe upon the swimming area and be a hazard for children?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, after rounds of consultations with the community council, there was a difference of opinion within the community, and they came to the Minister for a decision and that's the decision I made, after taking into consideration all the factors.

Wild Rice Permits

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker, to the Minister of Natural Resources.

The constitutionality of several departmental programs has been called into question in the last year, and since it appears that civil servants may be prevented from justifying government policy, would the Minister please inform the House of the rationale for giving Native people priority in the allocation of wild rice permits?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, those matters are before the courts, the matters that the Member for Emerson refers to, specifically the question of wild rice, and I think it would be inappropriate of me to make reference to that while it is being considered by the courts.

Migratory Bird Treaty

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I have a new question for the Minister of Natural Resources.

A Manitoba Court of Appeal ruling decided that a policy made by Executive Branch of Government, which gives a particular group dispensation from obedience to laws, is an illegal policy. The Canadian Native Law Report also clearly states that the Migratory Birds Convention Act of Canada applies to Treaty Indians. Would the Minister please explain why his department is preparing to discriminate against non-Native offenders of the Migratory Bird Treaty?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I am not aware of any attempts on our part to discriminate, but if the member would allow me to take that as notice, I will check within the department to see if there is any evidence of that.

Natural Resources - suggested senior staff replacement

MR. A. DRIEDGER: A question to the same Minister, Madam Speaker.

Given that we have three or four examples in the last year where illegal policies have been developed, would the Minister please look at his senior staff and

look at the possibility of maybe replacing some of his staff so that we have proper programs being developed that are not going to be impinging on the rights of Manitobans?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I would like to say to the House that I totally reject the premise of the Member for Emerson that the matters are illegal. Those policies are being considered by the courts, and when the courts rule, if there is indication that any member of the departmental staff has been involved in some legal impropriety, I will deal with it at that time. But I think it is a gross misrepresentation, again by the Member for Emerson, to suggest that departmental staff are dealing with it incorrectly.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I would like to ask the same Minister then if he would consider and check some of the memos that have been passing from his directorate to the regional managers regarding these kinds of things?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, that comment is so vague that I would have difficulty, but I would be pleased to check into any matter that he would table. Please do. Please do. I would ask that they be tabled.

Manitoba Indian Affairs - funding cutbacks

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs. A recent audit . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. S. ASHTON: I believe I have the floor, Madam Speaker.

A recent audit of the Manitoba Indian Affairs Branch has uncovered serious cutbacks and underfunding of reserves in Manitoba.

My question to the Minister of Native Affairs is as to whether he has been in contact with Manitoba Indian Bands and the Federal Government in regard to this very serious matter of funding cuts?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Native Affairs.

HON. E. HARPER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I have been in touch with a few chiefs, and also I did talk to David Crombie and I mentioned to him about the audit. He mentioned that he is having serious problems in Manitoba in respect to the audit that was done. This confrontation took place in passing on a different matter, I believe it was on Thursday. He indicated to me, he had a serious problem in respect to the special audit that was conducted.

I may say that I give credit to the Brotherhood of Indian Nations that have made presentations to the

standing committee on Indian Affairs, and it has brought out some light that there were cutbacks made to the Indian programs that were instructed by the Minister of Indian Affairs, himself, that there would be no cutbacks of existing programs. What we have found out is that they were cutbacks at the direction of the Minister, himself; and also the audit indicated that the facts that were presented to Parliament were misleading. I think the Minister of Indian Affairs has a serious problem in terms of the departmental staff or the management of staff that are presenting the facts to that department in Parliament, which is a serious breach. I know I would say that the Minister of Indian Affairs get a handle on his department.

MR. S. ASHTON: Just on a brief supplementary, Madam Speaker.

In view of the fact that the Department of Indian Affairs has announced its intention of cutting back its staffing by 50 percent and moving that to the . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. A supplementary does not need a preamble. Does the honourable member have a supplementary?

MR. S. ASHTON: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask whether the Minister will review the plans of the Indian Affairs Department to cut back its staff and 50 percent transfer to the reserves to ensure that . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please. A question must be within the administrative competence of a Minister. Does the honourable member have a supplementary?

MR. S. ASHTON: Madam Speaker, I have addressed a question to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs, and this certainly relates to the concerns of Native people and that is, to whether they will get the full benefits of the planned transfer.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. That question is out of order.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

The Honourable Member for Thompson on a point of order.

MR. S. ASHTON: Could I have the opportunity to rephrase the question, please?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member can briefly rephrase a supplementary if it's within order and in the administrative competence of the Minister.

MR. S. ASHTON: Madam Speaker, I'm asking the Minister of Native Affairs whether he will be in touch with the Federal Minister of Indian Affairs and Manitoban Indian Bands to ensure that they receive the full benefits of the transfer of Indian Affairs staff to Native Bands in Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. That question is a repetition of your original question.

A.E. McKenzie Company Ltd.- tabling of Annual Report

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Minister responsible for A.E. McKenzie Company Limited.

In view of the fact that on Thursday the Standing Committee on Economic Development will be considering the Annual Report of A.E. McKenzie Company Limited, when will the annual report be made available to members of this House?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I understand that report will be tabled tomorrow in the House.

Payroll tax

HON. E. KOSTYRA: While I'm on my feet, Madam Speaker, I'd like to respond to a question that I took as notice or was taken as notice by my Acting Minister on May 22, questions from the Member for Morris regarding — the specific question was related to — were there any conditions under which the Minister of members of the staff of the Department of Finance have discretion with respect to, as he referred to it, the payroll tax.

The situation is that there is no discretion by the Department of Finance or the Minister of Finance with respect to exercising any discretion with respect to the health and post-secondary education tax levy.

There was however, Madam Speaker, in the 1982 Budget Address the following statement: This is a quote from the Budget on Page 102: "The province will also safeguard against the potential negative effects of this levy on businesses experiencing significant financial difficulty by rebating the costs of the levy for all businesses eligible for assistance under the Manitoba Interest Rate Relief Program." That was done under the Interest Rate Relief Program for those eligible applicants qualifying for a rebate of the actual amount of the levy. That was done through the respective programs and through the Departments of Agriculture and Business Development and Tourism.

The member also asked for a list of those companies, and I can table copies of that for the member.

Education funding formula

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, I have a new question to be directed to the Minister of Education.

I would like to take this opportunity, Madam Speaker, to thank the Minister of Education for meeting with Manitoba's low-cost school divisions this morning. The reports that I've heard are that the Minister gave the representatives there a good hearing.

Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that earlier in this Session the Minister of Education made the statement that the school divisions are being dealt with fairly — and in particular he singled out the Brandon School Division — and after his meeting this morning with representatives of low-cost school divisions in this

province, does the Minister now recognize that there is a problem requiring his attention?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I appreciate the thanks for meeting with low-cost school divisions; it isn't necessary. I see that as part of my role as Minister, and I'm more than happy to meet with them or any other group who have concerns with respect to educational matters.

I should indicate I hope that the individuals who attended that session of many school divisions from across, particularly, Southwestern Manitoba were not left with the impression that there is any simple means for redressing concerns that they raised.

Madam Speaker, I hope that I left the representatives of those divisions with the clear understanding that the government support to education programs cannot deal with all of the perceived problems that are out there. The fact of the matter is that an increase to one school division, unless we're prepared to grant a much more significant portion of provincial spending to education, means a reduction in other areas.

I do recognize that there they have a legitimate concern. I indicated that it wasn't going to be easy to address that concern. That doesn't mean that we aren't obliged to review at any time when a concern is addressed, and I undertook to take a second look and to review the implications of the support program.

I also undertook to review any implications changes would have for other school divisions and I note that, while there were 11 or 12 or 13 school divisions in attendance at the meeting, there were some 45 who were not at the meeting, including special revenue district divisions who, by and large — (interjection) — pardon? I was talking about special districts. Madam Speaker, there are two sides to the issue.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West with a supplementary.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, while recognizing that there is a legitimate concern, the Minister has not gone that one step further to say that he would be . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a supplementary?

MR. J. McCRAE: Yes, I do, Madam Speaker, if you'll allow me to put it.

MADAM SPEAKER: With no preamble?

MR. J. McCRAE: Will the Minister bring in a funding regime that treats all divisions fairly, and that everyone understands and can be explained to municipal councils and ratepayers, so that long-range planning can be undertaken?

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I believe that it is the intention of the government to treat all school divisions in a fair manner. I point out to the member opposite, as I did to those in the meeting, that fair is often in the eyes of the beholder.

Dutch Elm Disease Program

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Natural Resources.

With the serious cutbacks in provincial assistance over the last few years, the City of Winnipeg has had to limit its Dutch Elm Disease Control Program.

Will the Minister advise the House if they're going to be providing any increased assistance for this very valuable program in 1986?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, at our last meeting with the official delegation, the Minister of Natural Resources and myself agreed to meet with the councillor responsible and the Mayor. I should say that, in addition to the \$350,000 in grants to the City of Winnipeg for Dutch Elm Disease, the province in its capital grants to the City of Winnipeg approved a grant of some over \$250,000 for reforestation.

So the answer to your question is, yes, we are increasing the support for the Dutch Elm Disease Program in the area of reforestation as part of our \$90 million, six-year capital grant to the City of Winnipeg.

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, if I may, I think the Minister is mixing apples and oranges.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. J. ERNST: Yes, I do, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, as Dutch Elm Disease is manifesting itself in greater numbers of trees that ever before, endangering one of Winnipeg's greatest natural assets

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question, a supplementary with no preamble? May I remind the honourable member question period is not a time for debate? Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. J. ERNST: Yes, Madam Speaker, I do have a question. I was about to ask it as part of that sentence, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Ask it.

MR. J. ERNST: Would the Minister advise the House if they have any other plans to stop the spread of this disease in Winnipeg?

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, the member opposite asked whether we had improved the level of support for Dutch Elm Disease, and it's not apples and oranges.

On the one hand, we're providing the \$350,000 for prevention, and an increase of over \$250,000 for reforestation. So when the trees decay, at least there are new trees in there for the City of Winnipeg. In

addition to that, Madam Speaker, we have stated that we will meet with the councillor responsible for potential other programs in 1986-87.

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

The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Before we go to Orders of the Day, I request respectfully the leave of the House that we return to the item relating to the presenting of reports from Standing and Special Committees, so that I may present the progress of last night's Committee of Supply. (Agreed)

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES (Cont'd)

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, respectfully reports progress and asks leave to meet again.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: I'd just like to announce a change in the Economic Development Committee. We have the Member for Thompson substituting for the Member for Flin Flon; the Member for Inkster substituting for the Member for Osborne; the Member for Lac du Bonnet substituting for the Member for Dauphin.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, first on a matter of . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. If the honourable members would like to come to order, we can proceed with Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West, on a point of order?

MR. J. McRAE: I think you'll find that if you feel there's disorder in this House, you may find that the reason for it goes back to something that happened yesterday in this House. We're sharing space in this room . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. McRAE: Madam Speaker, would you allow me to make my point?

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a point of order?

MR. J. McRAE: I have a point of order. Madam Speaker, you just rose to ask that order be restored to this House. There's a much better chance of order being restored if a member of this House who has maligned every member on this side . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I have taken that point of order under consideration. We will discuss it at the time I bring it back to the House. We are now on Orders of the Day.

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, on a matter of House business first, it is my understanding that the Economic Development Committee finished its review of CEDF, Moose Lake Loggers, and Channel Area Loggers this morning and on this Thursday, will be considering A.E. McKenzie Seeds, the report of.

On Tuesday and Thursday next, through agreement with the Opposition House Leader, the committee will be considering the report of Flyer, so members of that committee can so note.

Having said that, Madam Speaker, I would move that Madam 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, Estimates for Agriculture taking place in the Chamber; Estimates for Highways and Transportation taking place in the Committee Room, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

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 Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture, and the Honourable Member for Kildonan in the Chair for the Department of Highways and Transportation.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin: Committee, come to order. We are dealing on Page 97, Resolution No. 95, 6. Driver Vehicle and Licensing. The Minister has a statement he'd like to make.

The Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, yesterday when we completed the discussions at 10 o'clock, we had just passed the members a summary of financial implications of the revised agreement with MPIC for cost-sharing, and I

think it is relatively self-explanatory. But I did want to correct one impression left on the record, that it may have given the impression that the Special Warrant for \$2,128,200 was passed November 7, 1985. It was authorized — that Special Warrant — by Cabinet minute, as I stated yesterday, November 7, 1985. However, the Special Warrant itself was not passed until February 7, 1986.

I think this is important information for the Member for Pembina who had reflected that this wasn't shown in the quarterly statement at the end of December. It wouldn't have been, obviously, because it had not been passed until February 7, and it's important that the member — before he starts chastising the government for misplacing the way it reports information — that he would be aware the implications were not quite the same as he left them on the record yesterday, and how I left them on the record, by not correcting the statement as to the exact date of the Special Warrant. So it was February 7, 1986.

I should mention, as well, that discussion of Special Warrants is covered under Public Accounts in detail, and I think the Member for Pembina was aware, and that was also referred to yesterday. We were talking about the matter of whether Special Warrants should be included in the budget, and I said finance is responsible for the structure, format, and so on, but Public Accounts is the appropriate place to discuss Special Warrants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, I just have one or two questions left in this department. Last year we questioned the Minister on a newspaper article — it appeared about the time we were getting into Estimates — about one of his former aides being appointed as administrative officer with the Licence Suspension Appeal Board. I guess I can keep that until we get under boards and committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would be more appropriate.

MR. D. BLAKE: The next item might be . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Thanks for giving notice anyways.

MR. D. BLAKE: . . . a little better for that. Seeing as I brought it up, maybe the Minister of Urban Affairs might be here because he stated this thing as a "blatant political appointment," Manitoba Government Employees' Association President Gary Doer said . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: He wasn't the Minister then.

MR. D. BLAKE: We'll get into that and we'll find out if that gentleman is still around.

HON. H. PLOHMAN: I was as annoyed as you were, Dave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(a)(1) - the Member from Turtle Mountain.

MR. D. ROCAN: Yes, what are the criteria for an Autopac per person getting an Autopac agency? I have

a small town right now and a fellow who is trying to get ahold of an Autopac agency.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously, that would be dealt with under the Crown corporation MPIC. As far as a driver licensing agent, when MPIC does approve an Autopac person or company as an agent, we, as a matter of course, also issue approval for a driver licensing and registration agency so that person or company will then be able to transact all of the business that is related to insurance and registration licensing and so on.

MR. D. ROCAN: In other words, he would have to come and address the Minister on this, or who would he go talk to to try and get this application through?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, as I indicated . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. I thought that the question would be more appropriately asked under Crown Investments than under Crown corporation MPIC who could give you the details on what the procedures are.

The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. D. ROCAN: Yes, okay. I wonder if the Minister could tell us the reason why all of a sudden now we've got these cheaper looking licence plates that they're not reflectorized and the red "Friendly Manitoba" is gone, the whole thing is all black now. Are we saving much money here or what?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, I just wanted to complete the information. I, as Minister, do send a letter of appointment for Autopac agents, but I am not involved in the approval process. That is done by MPIC, so that was correct. So there was some involvement, Mr. Chairman; I just wanted to clarify that.

Insofar as the licence plates, the change was made this year to move from reflectorized licence plates to painted licence plates as is the case in a number of major jurisdictions — Ontario, I think, being one of the major ones. It never did shift to the reflectorized licence plate.

The saving is \$120,000 per year in years where we just have the replacement of plates that are damaged and new plates issued for new vehicles and so on. If there was a major change, a complete change of the plates, which takes place every 10 years or 7 to 10 years, there would be a substantially greater saving of perhaps upwards of \$1 million in the saving of costs of licence plates, but for this year and every year \$120,000 is saved. We think that is a legitimate cost-saving measure by the government.

MR. D. ROCAN: Due to the fact that we're saving \$120,000 already, and the Minister indicated here the other day that a personalized licence plate will go from \$50-75 and we're raising it over and over and you've got a cheaper looking plate. Are we not getting what we're paying for on this type of deal? If we're paying \$50, I would think it's more than appropriate just for this black-looking licence plate instead of this \$75.00.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I don't think there was ever any indication that you would get exactly what you're paying

for. Obviously, if you want the privilege of having a personalized licence plate, you have to pay something for that. It's not the actual cost of the licence plate. It actually contributes revenue towards other programs and towards other revenues of government. Last year it was \$50; it's now going to \$75.00. In Saskatchewan, it's \$100.00. In Alberta it's \$150 for personalized licence plates. So, you're not getting it two colours I guess, insofar as your money's worth, but you are getting a personalized licence plate. I've indicated that it doesn't cost that much to produce it. It is contributing towards general revenues.

MR. D. ROCAN: Can the Minister tell us how much revenue is brought in from these personalized licence plates?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: There's about 8,000 of those times \$100, this next year, if it stays the same; \$75 times 8,000, one time only. They wouldn't have to get it every year, so it would vary from year to year. How many of them are renewed every year — I mean new ones? Eight thousand is an irrelevant figure.

I'm advised there's about 1,200 new applications per year at \$75 each.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Well, we can start moving through it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(a)(1)—pass; 6.(a)(2)—pass; 6.(b)(1)—pass; 6.(b)(2)—pass; 6.(c)(1)—pass; 6.(c)(2)—pass; 6.(d)—pass.

Resolution 95: Resolved that an amount not exceeding \$12,554,900 for Highways and Transportation, Driver and Vehicle Licensing, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

We are now on Item 7, Boards and Committees, Page 98, Resolution No. 97.

The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: I wonder if the Minister could just bring us up to date on deregulation. There is a White Paper, if he could inform the committee just where that stands at the present time and what position we're in.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether the member is referring to intra-provincial trucking and revisions that were contained in the White Paper that the province issued last year before the amendments were put in place, or whether he's talking about the freedom to move that the Federal Government put in and that has major implications on the province as well.

MR. D. BLAKE: The provincial position, first of all, and then maybe we can touch on the other.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well the provincial position for trucking within the province has been that we should move in a very cautious and responsible way to change the regulatory system that had been in place for intra-provincial trucking for some 50 years. As a result of that study, the task force that went out and consulted, and then the reports that were tabled, and more

consultations, and then a White Paper issued, we passed a number of amendments to The Highway Traffic Act last year. Most of these have been proclaimed, particularly those dealing with enforcement, fee increases, or fines that could be levied by the Transport Board.

We are also considering at the present time the enacting of the maximum rate proposal that was put forward in our legislation last year. That has not, at the present time, been enacted, or proclaimed, I should say, because we want to do further consultations as to exactly how it would take place, as we promised during last year's consultations. But it does provide for maximum rates being set by the board for intra-provincial trucking and provisions for minimum rates if there's predatory pricing that may be taking place.

We also haven't put in place the owner-operator provisions pending further discussions and consultations with labour and with the industry on whether there should be a ratio, or what kind of formula should be in place.

In addition to that, we have proclaimed the sections dealing with the farm trucks and making it legal to haul for neighbours for compensation, but not at profit, in other words, to help your neighbour out. So that reflected the representations that were made at the hearings last year. I hope that it's a workable solution. We haven't had an awful lot of complaints in the first year on that.

So, in addition to that, the board has undertaken a number of changes that were contained in the White Paper revising their rules of procedure to expedite the hearing process. They have really brought down the backlog there. I guess, because of the uncertainty a bit in the regulatory environment at the present time, not as many are applying, or not as many are intervening in the hearings. So the hearings have cleared up quite a bit and they're really very short now — a month to six weeks backlog as opposed to nine months a little over a year ago. There has been a significant benefit there for trucking companies, or prospective trucking companies, trying to get into the business. They do not have to wait as long as they had to previously.

They've also put in place procedures that will enable pre-hearings, or a study of the evidence first, before a hearing is granted, to determine whether a hearing is necessary, and to eliminate frivolous interventions, where this was the case many times in the past; so that seems to be working.

We are, as well, one of the first provinces to expand the list of designated commodities, which are really deregulated commodities. There was a rather substantial increase, as of March 15th, I believe it took effect, in the number of commodities that could be transported without having to have PSV authority. So that has, I think, freed-up the system a lot.

In addition to that, we're looking at the potential of regionalizing authorities, so that there's more competition in a region. A lot of trucking companies are opposed to it because they see that others will be able to compete with them. It hasn't been acted on, but it was put out there to get some views and some thinking of, not only the trucking industry itself, but also shippers to get some feedback. There may be some further progress made on that in the future, but the idea was there that there would be provisions for

a number of PSV authorities in an area to compete with each other in servicing the small communities in a region, rather than having to go all the way to Winnipeg with things and then brought out to another community that's only a few miles away. It's very costly, inefficient and it doesn't make sense. So that is an area that may have to be moved on in the future.

So I think that a number of the changes that the Transport Board has made have really freed-up the system and made it more accessible and responsive, without deregulating. We still retain the public need and convenience tests, which involves proving that it is not in the public interest to allow another trucking firm into the business formally.

That is something that is being proposed to be changed at the federal level, particularly, with the "freedom to move" proposals, which are really saying that, for extra-provincial trucking, we should go to a shared onus or reverse onus process, where it is up to the intervener to prove, to a certain extent, that it would harm the public interest if that person was granted an authority. That makes it much different than the person who is applying to have the full onus of proof that it would be in the public interests for him to be indeed serving those communities.

So that is a switch in the onus, and that is proposed by the Federal Government to be in place January 1, 1988, for a period of three years. We would like to see that five years and we've made that known, very clearly, because we believe that there should be a transitional period before moving and, if moving, to a fitness test only, which is what the Federal Government is thinking about now and which the shipping industries definitely want, because they think it's going to lower their costs.

Now we are concerned about the implications on the trucking industry and particularly if those rules are applied, not only for Canadian firms with each other, but also insofar as American firms coming into Canada and perhaps taking over a lot of the lucrative runs and perhaps buying up trucking firms here and moving out their headquarters. And Winnipeg, of course, having 9 of Canada's 15 largest trucking firms, we have a lot at stake in that whole issue.

So we want to move cautiously and we're saying to the Federal Government, give it five years under this reverse onus, still have a hearing process, so you can have some checks and balances into who gets into the trucking business; and during that five year period do an exhaustive analysis of the impact and evaluation, assess and determine who the losers in the system are, ensure that you have your safety code in place, ensure adequate enforcement, ensure that the Federal Government is paying for some of that enforcement because after all it's their jurisdiction — trucking, transportation — that they've delegated to the provinces in trucking. We are currently paying for the enforcement ourselves.

We are introducing this year, as members have seen, the new Commercial Vehicle Testing Program for safety reasons so that commercial vehicles will have to be tested for their equipment for each year. We're saying that there has to be a safety code that will also include hours of work legislation, so that drivers will not be forced to be on the road for hours and hours just to try to make a go of it, especially owner-operators.

So with all those things there's a lot of change there and we think that there should be this transitional period

of reverse onus for five years; no automatic sunseting of that provision; have the studies, the evaluations which we are committed to doing through CCMTA and then make an assessment as to whether to move to fitness only. At the same time, there can be negotiations going on with the U.S. Government to gain some recognition from them, that Manitoba and Canadian truckers may need some protection under this system, a bilateral trade in trucking agreement, which doesn't exist at the present time. We're saying that's necessary. There has to be that recognition by the Americans.

I think we have a consistent, uniform approach in Manitoba from the trucking industry, from labour, but we do not have the shippers, at least the big shippers, coming on side on this. They're anxious to go full tilt and we're saying no, don't fall into the same pitfalls necessarily that the U.S. did. We're not a mere image of the U.S., let's take some time to assess and move slowly but still move forward. That's kind of where it's all at.

I understand now that by June 25 or so, the Federal Government will be tabling, Mazankowski will be tabling the new national Transportation Act revisions in the Federal Parliament. We've had input along the way, consultations, and we want to commend them for that; however, we're still not completely satisfied from Manitoba's point of view that there will be enough safeguards built in to those new revisions to ensure that we're protected here in Manitoba.

Alberta, Saskatchewan, and B.C. really have quite a different situation than we do here in Manitoba, although Saskatchewan is coming very closely into the same position we are. But they don't have the amount of presence of trucking headquarters that we have in Winnipeg, so we have more at stake.

MR. D. BLAKE: Well, I'm glad the Minister brought up the backlog. That was going to be my next question.

Just on a point of interest, are the Americans now levying a charge for Canadian truckers crossing the border?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: We understand that charge is to take effect July 6. The Customs Office recently has notified firms. We've come across a copy of the correspondence. I don't know that we've been sent any directly as a government, but it would indicate that there will be a \$5 charge for each trip for anyone entering the U.S., including American carriers. So it is not a discriminatory tariff, but it will be an additional cost for trucking into the U.S. of \$5 per truckload or \$100 for an annual permit with no limitations.

So that is something that we're assessing right now and determining whether there's a reciprocal kind of charge assessed by the Federal Government in any way, shape or form at the present time, whether there should be. But that's something that took place without consultation and will increase the costs of trucking by \$100 per year, and is something that is just dropped on us.

MR. D. BLAKE: On the trucking franchise, one of the things that's affecting my area and, I'm sure, other areas, the larger trucking firms have moved in in some areas and have just made it so difficult for the smaller

local trucker that, after spending \$10,000 or \$20,000 on lawyers fighting the big boys, so to speak, they've just given up and sold out.

The evidence is there already, that the service is not as personalized and as good as it was with the local trucker. We're having meat shipments arrive without the benefit of reefer trucks, 24 hours a truck, not accepting it, meat's going back. The service is not what it was. So that's something that we have to be very mindful of, I think, when they're granting licences or enlarging franchises, because the giants don't really worry about the little shopkeeper who may be taking a very small quantity.

I wanted to mention too the temporary permits being granted for wide loads or special loads. I've talked to the Minister before on granting permits for wider loads without the necessity of two escort vehicles. That's presenting quite a hardship to one operator in my area, who brings in a bin from the west. They can travel Saskatchewan and Alberta but, when he hits the Manitoba border, he has to have two escort vehicles to come an extra 80 to 100 miles into Manitoba. He's been applying for permits, and they haven't been granted. It's a 16-foot load and 15 feet is the maximum.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: First of all, I just wanted to make a comment on the small rural truckers. That's exactly why we want to retain the right of the province to regulate according to provincial policies to protect the small and captive shippers in the rural areas of the province. I think that principle has been accepted at the federal level for intra-provincial trucking undertakings. But if we were to move to a fitness only, of course the thing would be thrown wide open, and anybody would be in there.

So there's that balance, and there's that move to go towards throwing it wide open. But the whole idea of this regional kind of proposal was to allow for some hub-and-spoke type of delivery services being set up in areas that would be rationalized, make more sense than the current system that we have which, as you say, has resulted in some of the smaller truckers just selling out to the big guys, Gardewine or whatever it might be, just servicing the whole area. So the idea of that regional trucking service or project or proposal was to provide for greater opportunity for those small truckers in the areas, to give them greater access to additional markets.

Insofar as these permits for these wide loads, we had made some special provisions and changes after meeting with a company from — what was it, Winkler? — Altona. They had met with us, and they have some special dollies that they have with a number of additional wheels. I don't know if it's 12 wheels across. Because they then, when they go off the edge of the pavement, there wouldn't be this abrupt movement of this wide load, it was felt that they could get by with one escort vehicle.

However, in the case of the bins, it was quite a different situation in terms of the equipment they were using. I looked at that very carefully and wanted to see if we could be a little more lenient there, and I would like to look at it further to see whether there are some other options. But that's why it is maintained, the regulation was maintained that two escort vehicles would be required.

We did make it a little looser for the mobile homes, 16-footers, because of the kind of equipment they were using, and it was also consistent with what Saskatchewan and Alberta, I think, were doing in that area, a special kind of dolly that was available. But people moving those bins had trailers or low beds or high beds, whatever the case may be, that did not have the wheels that were continuous across and, therefore, it would be abrupt movement having to swing out over the pavement edge and things like that. So it was felt that it wasn't as safe.

MR. D. BLAKE: I had a couple more, Mr. Chairman. They just escaped me for a minute. I'm getting mixed up with the construction program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on 7.(a), Motor Transport Board.

MR. D. BLAKE: We can cover the waterfront here maybe and get it passed.

I just have a question on cabs. We can wait till we get down there a little bit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll deal with this section by section. We're on Motor Transport Board.

The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned in his remarks to questions from my colleague that he believes there should be changes in the hours of operation, that drivers should be permitted to run presumably for a week. Could the Minister indicate what this proposal to the Federal Government would be in that regard?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I have proposed that there be hours of work legislation. We have not stated how long those precisely should be, and how much time there should be in rest periods and so on and how many total hours in a week. That's something that we're working out. Perhaps we have some additional information.

So we didn't give the precise details, where we said this is the way it should be. What we did say though is that there should be an enforceable hours of work legislation in place across Canada that is uniform, and it should be enforced. So the CCMTA Committee has been requested to bring in a report for the September meeting of the Council of Transport Ministers on this issue, that we then can assess and make revisions to and then hopefully it would be accepted by all of the Ministers from across Canada.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Minister is saying that all he wants is some legislation but he doesn't have any idea what the legislation should be.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That's the Member for Pembina's words. We haven't worked out a definitive position into whether it should be 10 hours a day, or so many hours a week, or what it should be.

The fact is that we want to undertake further discussions with staff and also await the CCMT report, which is being put forward. They will have to consider

the workability of any provisions that are put in place, the enforceability of them. We are open on that, as yet. However, realize that there is a need to have enforceable regulations, for safety reasons.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, those aren't my words. Those are the Minister's words, twice repeated now. He wants legislation and he doesn't know what he wants in the legislation. He hasn't made a suggestion as to hours; it's still under review. Can the Minister indicate why he's come to the conclusion that this is needed, if he hasn't got any of what he wants to change it to?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The Member for Pembina is quite welcome to offer suggestions if he has such a keen mind that has all of this figured out and knows exactly what the best system would be. It is obviously a very complicated area that has led to a safety code being established in the United States after quite some time, but not one that has been solved in Canada.

We're saying that because there will be a tendency to cut costs, and I think this is something that the Member for Pembina should have no trouble agreeing with and recognizing, as has been true in the airline industry where there's been a rash of accidents, the tendency is, under deregulation. I agree with those who write with that message, certainly, and there's a lot of articles in trucking magazines, in transportation magazines now that would outline that concern, that safety will tend to be sacrificed under a deregulated environment, because there's only so many places you can cut costs under an extremely competitive system.

That's why we feel it's absolutely necessary to have basic requirements for equipment, inspection, to ensure that it is kept up in a safe manner, brakes and lights and everything else. We also feel it's important that those people working in the industry have certain guidelines governing how many hours they can be working and under what conditions, so that there's some protection there to keep them from being unduly exploited to the extent that it may be unsafe to have them on the roads.

These are all kinds of things that I feel personally are very important when moving to a deregulated environment in the trucking industry, as well as in all of the transportation areas.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister can't have it both ways, then. If he thinks it's very important and if he thinks it's a safety issue, if he thinks it's an issue of exploitation of workers, if he believes in all those things, then I find it hard to understand or comprehend why he can't tell us this afternoon what his proposal for change would be, given all the concerns that he's mentioned.

I think what we see here, Mr. Chairman, if I can be so blunt, is that he is a Minister being led around by some opinions voiced by various union leaders who have always requested this. It's in their interest to have stricter controls, more drivers and fewer hours, and it discriminates against independent operators — there's no question about that — if you bring in those kinds of legislation.

Then, of course, the independent operators are private-enterprise exemplified and that's something this

Minister and his government don't particularly believe in.

I can understand the Minister coming up with a position supporting this kind of legislation. What I can't understand is why he doesn't have any idea of what he would propose because it's only when he comes up with those kinds of ideas that the Manitoba Trucking Association, and those involved in the industry, can tell him whether he's right or wrong. As long as he hides behind this alleged need for this kind of legislation from a safety standpoint, from an employee exploitation standpoint, and all of the usual shibboleths tossed up by the labour unions.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: A bunch of garbage.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Minister says garbage. That was his answer five minutes ago, that he just now called garbage, Mr. Chairman. This Minister is a very confused young man. Mr. Chairman, if he believes in those kinds of areas, then surely he should be coming to this committee with a position, not simply saying, you know, all of the shibboleths from the union movement are right and yet he doesn't offer any original thought as to what he believes should be the new changed system.

Then, I presume, if it is changed by the Federal Government, he leaves himself wide open by not having told us what he believes in and what he thinks is correct and proper. That would leave him wide open to criticize any move the Federal Government would undertake, which is the position this government wants to be in consistently; no original thoughts of their own, no solutions to the problem of their own, but rather simply a fallback position where they can then always decry any move made by another jurisdiction in the Federal Government.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Pembina should be ashamed of himself to suggest that it's only labour that would be concerned about safety. It is something that all those companies involved, all interests involved in the transportation sector, are concerned about. It is something that all governments across Canada have indicated a concern about. That is why, not just because the Manitoba Government has asked for it — that is precisely why the CCMTA has been instructed to bring back a report on how best to implement this, to the next meeting of the Council of Transportation Ministers.

It is a federal responsibility, one that they want to consult with the provinces on, and we think that is a very constructive way to proceed in such a very complicated area. It's an area that deserves a lot of consideration by people working in the areas themselves. It involves consultation with groups and individuals and a lot of discussion, debate. There's no simplistic solution to it.

What the Member for Pembina is asking me to do is give some individual or private thoughts on the record so that perhaps, if that isn't the final position, he can later say, in the same way that he said I want to criticize, he can turn around and criticize me and say, well, you didn't get what you wanted and you're obviously way out to lunch.

The point is, it is not something that should be dealt . . . I think it's irresponsible to start going into general

areas, forays of thought on what is the right decision here. It's something that should be discussed and consultation should take place and it's federal jurisdiction. We will have input into that; We are having input. We will await the federal report and then we'll make recommendations on the basis of what is presented by the CCMTA Committee. I can tell the honourable member that he could ask any of his colleagues in the Conservative Party, who are in government in other jurisdictions, for their specific position and proposals on this issue, including his federal counterpart, the Federal Minister, and they will not have specific proposals at this time. They are awaiting the report of the experts who are involved and who have been asked to come up with the alternatives so that we can consider them. We will do that in good time and certainly, I believe, solve this issue, solve this problem, to the satisfaction of the majority of interest and for the protection of the public in Canada.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that's a very interesting non-statement the Minister just made because, you know, the Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators, Manitoba has representation on it. They theoretically are making this outline proposal for the Federal Government, for the Minister of Highways and Transportation safety across Canada. Manitoba's representation is on that organization and this Minister just told us they're going there without a position. That's the whole point that I'm making to the man, he doesn't have a position on the issue. If he wanted to be a leader he could be, but he isn't.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister another question. I corresponded with this Minister for a couple of years now on a holiday combination of a three-quarter ton truck, fifth-wheel hitch on a fifth-wheel holiday trailer, and a boat and motor trailer behind that, so you actually have three vehicles. Could the Minister indicate what the current driving status of that combination is?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we are just beginning with the formulation of the report, who are the CCMTA on the previous matter, and I'm going to be getting a report very soon from our representatives on that committee, for the Member for Pembina's information.

In addition, he has raised a matter of the fifth-wheel trailer combinations. I have had a lot discussions with the department, been made aware, of course, that Saskatchewan and Ontario have provision for this, although that does not take away from the fact that department officials did feel it was somewhat of an unsafe practice, or could be construed as such under certain conditions.

I have talked to a number of people who have made representation the same as has been made by the Member for Pembina, individuals throughout Manitoba. There have been a number who have written or called me on this and asked why this difference existed between Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Ontario. So we intend to address that issue in the upcoming legislation that will be tabled in the House for second reading very shortly.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I take from that, the legislation will see us uniform with Saskatchewan and Ontario then?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That's the intent of the legislation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: On that same item, Mr. Chairman, it's not legal now to have, say, a crew cab with a fifth wheel on it and a boat and motor behind that, it's not legal?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That's right, not legal in Manitoba. How many years have you been using it?

MR. D. BLAKE: I'd better not pursue that question any further, Mr. Chairman. I guess I've never been stopped yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(a).

MR. D. BLAKE: On board hearings under the Highway Traffic Board . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it 7.(a)—pass, or are we still on 7.(a)?

MR. D. BLAKE: Well, if you want to do it line by line, I'm finished on Motor Transport Board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we should. In this case, they're reasonably discreet.

MR. D. BLAKE: Perhaps my colleagues have a question on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(a)—pass; 7.(a)(1)—pass; 7.(a)(2)—pass.

7.(b) Highway Traffic Board — the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: On the board hearings, I'm getting the odd trucker in my area who's maybe trying to benefit, get the benefit of a backhaul and had one or two infractions about hauling illegal loads that had been called before the board. With the strained financial situation in the agricultural community these days, I trust the board will be listening to some of these appeals with a sympathetic ear, and then I guess the same type, they may be applying for a PSV if they can't get away with hauling it the way they have been doing, but there seems to be quite a few occasions where they could haul a return load and make their trucking a little more economical.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I believe the member is talking about farmers with F-plated trucks?

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The provisions there are the same as always, that they can haul for their neighbours. However, if they want to make money at it, in other words, get into the trucking business, and not only recover their out-of-pocket costs in helping their neighbour, then they have to get a PSV licence which does cost more money. But because of the designated commodities, now the expansion of the list, there are

all kinds of opportunities for them to get that backhaul as the member mentioned.

The fact is though that, if they have a backhaul for themselves, there is no problem; if they are charging someone else for hauling it back, above and beyond the costs of transporting it, then of course they are in a situation . . .

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, this is where I think the difficulty comes in. They are hauling a legitimate load out and an offer comes up to make a buck on the way back and they can't justify it as hauling it for their neighbour. If people apply for a PSVR, are they reasonably easy to pick up, or is there a pretty severe limit on how many get them?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I don't believe there is a limit — and correct me if I'm wrong — on this area for PSV licences. It's specific PSV authorities to do certain movements within certain areas that require a hearing. As far as the licences, they just have to make application, and I believe there may be a test of fit, willing and able — some questions to answer about whether they are financially able to carry out the service.

MR. D. BLAKE: We have a lot of grain that goes out to, say, Alberta, places like that, and they may have difficulty with a PSV licence interfering with some other franchise. So it may not be that easy for them to get a PSV licence, I suppose.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: No, it's easier than it used to be and, as a matter of fact, we're dealing with the licence, as opposed to the authority. It's not interfering as long as they are hauling designated commodities. The designated commodities were accepted by all three western provinces during joint hearings. So, if they're hauling any of those goods now, which is quite an expanded list — I don't have it right here, but I could read off a whole pile of different commodities now that are known as designated commodities — for which you do not need a specific PSV authority which is again the hard one to get. I think the member is referring to that one. He says there may be some difficulty about infringing on somebody else's franchise. This is not the case. If you're dealing with the PSV licence — (Interjection) — that's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: Yes, I read where the Chairman of the Manitoba Traffic Safety Committee said it hopes to introduce new legislation which will reduce motorcycle casualties. I take it, that means yourself as Minister, would be introducing that legislation.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, first of all I just want to clarify — the Transport Board was passed and we were just answering questions on the Transport Board. But anyway now we're on the Traffic Board, this is not the Highway Safety . . .

MR. G. ROCH: Oh, I'm sorry, I thought it came under the Traffic Board . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: No, it's not the same as the Highway Safety Committee which is not an official

committee that is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Highways, particularly. That committee reports to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. But I might add this person who did make the comments apparently was misquoted on that and I have not received a clarification as to what he exactly said.

I think he was referring to amendments and changes that had been made in previous years, as opposed to upcoming changes to legislation that involve motorcycles, because there are no plans currently, as we have discussed in detail. There are currently studies being undertaken, statistics being compiled, and we're certainly not considering at this time introducing changes until we have a chance to assess what's taken place in the past.

MR. G. ROCH: This was misquoted then.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes. A complete misquote is what would be accurate.

MR. G. ROCH: For clarification then, if it's a misquote, then there's no point in pursuing it, but if such legislation were to be introduced, it would be from your department or from the Minister responsible for MPIC.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, if there were changes in The Highway Traffic Act, obviously that comes under the Minister's responsibility for Highways and Transportation, and it is under The Highway Traffic Act that the safety legislation was previously passed.

MR. G. ROCH: This committee itself is a committee for reporting to the Minister responsible for MPIC.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, and it's an advisory committee only. It does not have any statutory authority. It is made up of members from police departments and from the safety council, the medical profession, legal, Highways Department, driver licensing, City of Winnipeg, MPIC. All of these come together to discuss ways of making our highways safer and making recommendations to the Ministers.

MR. G. ROCH: Basically the only power you have is to make recommendations on highway safety.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That's right, on highway safety.

MR. G. ROCH: Okay, I have another question which I believe falls under the Highway Traffic Board. It's in regard to speed zones. I just wonder why, in certain areas, there is quite a variance in the limited number of miles where you'll go from 70 kilometres, to 90 kilometres, back to 70, 50, 70, back to 90. I'm referring especially in an area on provincial roads 213 and 212 from 206 to Cooks Creek. There's no villages there or anything and some of the residents are wondering why there's not more consistency. There may be a good reason for it, I don't know.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would have to have the details of that specific situation, then get a report as to why the speed limits are as they are there.

If the municipalities wish to have them changed, they could send in a resolution to the Traffic Board, and this would then be considered for a change. So there's a method of making changes in those speed limits, if it's confusing to motorists.

MR. G. ROCH: So the proper channels then for those people might be to go through their local council to make a request? I could understand in the area of Cooks Creek itself, which is a very small community, to have it 50 kilometres; but there seems to be a wide variance around there.

Okay, I'll advise the people to go to their local council. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, and just to clarify, the local councils will obviously tell them that they haven't authority to make the change itself per se, but the council can't if it's a provincial road, but they can pass a resolution sending it to the Traffic Board, asking for this to be changed.

MR. G. ROCH: Right, I am aware of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(b)(1)—the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: While we're on that, we were discussing the 100 kilometre versus 90. I don't know whether we covered that or left it for this section before.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I think we did cover it, Mr. Chairman. I outlined the proposal, the number of kilometres that the department was recommending and that over a period of time these would be increased through hearings of the Traffic Board.

MR. D. BLAKE: Are those hearings upcoming?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, there's been a number that have taken place already, Mr. Chairman. There's been changes since last year — since this was made — on Highway 5 to the Saskatchewan border, from Dauphin. There's been a number on the list on Highway 83 up near Swan River, so it's ongoing.

MR. D. BLAKE: I realize that. I'm thinking of No. 10 with the tourist season coming on. There's a pretty heavy flow of traffic there and it's pretty confusing coming off 16, which is 100, and turning north and you're back on 80, or 90 rather.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: We've asked as a result of the initial questions the other day for an updated report on the status of where we're at on implementation of that. There are a number that we've just listed.

Highway 12 was also one that was added, so the numbers have been increased to 100 kilometres, and I think I mentioned the other day as well that it would have to meet certain specifications in terms of shoulder width.

But we should have a report available within a week or two to provide additional information on the status of that and I can do that to the member individually or in the House, in answer to questions.

MR. D. BLAKE: On Highway 83, from where it joins the Yellowhead at Russell, it's 90 kilometres to Swan

River and then from there on, it's 100; and coming the other way it's a little confusing to people. They come off a 100 kilometre stretch through to 90 and then 5 down, it's still 100.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(b)(1)—pass; 7.(b)(2)—pass.

7.(c) License Suspension Appeal Board—the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, maybe here the Minister could tell me now where Mr. Shewchuk is now working. Is he still with the License Suspension Appeal Board, or is that a term contract?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, there was a competition held, I believe some six months ago as we had indicated last year after the individual was moved on a term basis, temporary — Ken Shewchuk — there was a competition held at the License Suspension Appeal Board and another individual was selected as the candidate and is now working in that position. I don't know where Mr. Shewchuk is working right now. I'm not sure. We are not sure.

MR. D. BLAKE: I wonder if the Minister could give us the makeup of the License Suspension Appeal Board now and what is their workload with the new regulations?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I'm sorry, I missed part of that question.

MR. D. BLAKE: I just wanted the makeup of the License Suspension Appeal Board and what is the workload like now with the new regulations, where there's no work permits issued for three months?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I don't know that they've felt a dramatic change yet. I see that the License Suspension Appeal Board Chairman is sitting in the back and his secretary, so they may want to come up and whisper in somebody's ear as to whether they've seen a big difference as a result of the federal legislation on drinking and driving in December. It was enacted last December, so we've only got a certain few number of months to go by it, but, overall, the number of cases was up from 4,044 in '84-85, the number of applications processed in '84-85 from 4,044 to 4,293 this past year. So there was a slight increase up to the March 31 fiscal year as compared to the previous year.

From April to June this year, compared to last year, I'm informed that we're down about 250 applications. Say, if that's half the year, that's about 2,000, so you're looking at 10 percent.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, I realize the federal legislation and I'm not trying to take away from the seriousness of the offence, but I am wondering if there is any — what's the word I'm looking for — any move to make a provision in there for — and I'm thinking of a hired man, say on a farm operating farm machinery — should he be suspended for three months with no driving privilege at all? He's unable to operate the farm machinery and he's really of no value to that employer. So does he throw himself on the welfare system? I'm

wondering if there is any move to provide some type of limited working permit for, say machinery, if it's his livelihood.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is precisely the point that we made on a number of occasions to the Federal Government when they passed this legislation, and they ignored it. The fact is that we have a system that is responsive in the province and recognizes the need for licences for work purposes through the License Suspension Appeal Board, but under the new act there's a prohibition from driving for three months where the License Suspension Appeal Board can have no impact.

We have made that case to Mr. Crosbie, but through the Attorney General; we have also made that case through Mr. Mazankowski through Transportation. I raised it at the last meeting of the Council of Ministers in Vancouver, specifically that issue. He said that he would pass it along to Mr. Crosbie, but we have not seen any reflection of that situation here in Manitoba.

Not all provinces are the same; I don't believe all of them have License Suspension Appeal Boards that work the similar way that ours does, but I agree that there's really a double penalty or more for those certain people and for others there isn't. So it isn't consistent, and I felt that there should be that flexibility even though, as the member has stated, it is a very serious offence but in terms of livelihood it's important.

I think that the member should attempt to make that kind of representation to his colleagues in Ottawa — I say that very seriously — to make that as strongly and as often as he can.

MR. D. BLAKE: It's creating some severe hardships in one or two cases that have been brought to my attention. I said, well, there is really nothing that can be done about it but possibly they'll maybe become a little more sympathetic to the work conditions that some people are under. I'm thinking of a long-range trucker. Mind you, he shouldn't be in that condition to start with but, as you say, it's a considerable penalty. He would be earning his living under a considerable handicap even with the probationary period. The workload is no different because it just staves it off for three months, I guess, so they still come to the Appeal Board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(c)(1)—pass; 7.(c)(2)—pass.

7.(d) Taxicab Board — the Member from Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, I am just looking at some of the reports, Mr. Chairman, of the complaints that come in on taxicabs and the city being not in good condition, dirty and uncourteous drivers and things of that nature.

I wonder if the Minister might tell us what his experience has been, if he's had those comments or complaints.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, I've been made aware, Mr. Chairman, of these concerns and I know that the Taxicab Board is very concerned about them. I think they feel that perhaps it has been a little bit exaggerated, at least not that it's not a real problem at times but that it's kind of a broad-brush treatment of the taxicab

industry in the City of Winnipeg, and it has given perhaps the taxicab industry a bad name, smeared them a bit with this. It's made it very difficult, unfair in a way is how they feel, not that it isn't unfounded though under certain circumstances.

So they have been taking steps to meet with owners and individuals to impress the importance in meeting with the community of the Chamber of Commerce. There was a committee set up and made up of a number of interested citizens that has also been providing representation on this issue to ensure that hotel associations are involved and Chambers of Commerce. We have received letters from I think a couple of groups, perhaps a hotel in the city and I believe an individual, not an awful lot of complaints but it did find its way into the media. It is something that the Taxicab Board has addressed and I believe that they are taking steps.

I'm not certain whether they have done anything in terms of any training or information. I am informed there are new examinations that will be coming forward to be ready for September that will emphasize this whole area of keeping the cabs in a presentable condition for the public and the impact that this has on the public and tourists and so on.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, under this board, the handi-van, or the vehicles used to transport the handicapped, is now under the Taxi Board — June 30?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Strictly speaking, they are not under the jurisdiction. The regulation is to take effect under the jurisdiction of the Taxicab Board on June 30 of this year; in other words, two weeks.

MR. D. BLAKE: And this decision was made in full consultation with the League for the Physically Handicapped and all other interested parties. The Taxicab Board and everybody has agreed with one exception, I suppose. So these regulations are going to be satisfactory and fair to the handicapped?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, I think they're going to be fairer than the unregulated system that was there before.

It's interesting. We talk about regulation and deregulation, and here is a case where we're moving into regulating where in so many aspects of the transportation industry they're moving the other way; but there were no safeguards in terms of standards for safety, standards for fares, on level of service, this was all over the map, and it was felt that users of the system, as well, should have somewhere to go to place their complaints and concerns that they may have. So we feel that it is a constructive move; it certainly hasn't been easy. It was to be done a year ago but was put off because we felt it was very important to have proper consultation with the industry who initially didn't want it, but then it came around to feeling that it might be a good thing for them as well and the users of the system being represented by their organizations, such as the League and the Canadian Paraplegic Association, seniors' groups and others.

There's been general agreement now on the kinds of fares that should be assessed, additional fares for special services on the safety requirements, some

recognition that these have to be perhaps phased in over a period of time, that it was not economically possible for some of the cab companies to afford, the handicapped, mobility disadvantaged taxi companies, to afford the kinds of provisions and equipment; so it was an effort to look at all of these considerations and then move towards a better system, a safer system and one that was economical for the users of the system.

We haven't got to the stage where the social services departments are plugged into it in such a way that there are offering it as a social service, as I think Theresa Ducharme would like to see. We're continuing to meet with her and then seeing whether it's possible, under other departments over a period of time, to making this even more accessible to those who can't afford it. It's not something that's really an ensured service.

MR. D. BLAKE: The only subsidization would be through someone on social service assistance. With the assistance allowance they're getting, they would provide their own transportation out of that. There's no other

HON. J. PLOHMAN: There's some transportation allowances, I believe, under the social services but no special provisions for the use of special requirements under this, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(d)(1)—pass; 7.(d)(2)—pass.

Resolution 96: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,189,600 for Highways and Transportation — Boards and Committees, for the fiscal year ending the 31st of March, 1987—pass.

We are now on Resolution 97, Expenditures Related to Capital, Page 99.

MR. D. BLAKE: This is where everybody wants questions now.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the member, he may have a number of questions himself but it may be possible to work through (b), (c), and (d) or something. If there's a number of people who aren't here . . .

MR. D. BLAKE: I think they'll be jumping in so if we just maybe do it all and then pass the whole thing. We'll be jumping around quite a bit on it.

Mr. Chairman, I had a call just today and I haven't had a chance to look at the map even yet. Highway 206 has been reconstructed in the — I guess it's the highway leading to Landmark — there's a newly built road or reconstructed road in there. I wonder what property was acquired there.

I haven't had a look at the operation, but apparently there's about 10 houses in there and the way the road has been curved in, it comes very, very close to some of the houses. In fact, I think one of them is about 40 feet now off the road and there's some concern with heavy truck traffic maybe shaking the house pretty badly. I just wondered why they would come so close to that particular property without maybe expropriating it and relocating it.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I don't know who the individual is. We haven't had any special . . .

MR. D. BLAKE: It's a Roland Nault I think that owns it. There's one house that's extremely close, Roland Nault.

A MEMBER: How's that spelt?

MR. D. BLAKE: N-a-u-l-t. It's Nault to us Anglos but it's Nault to the Francophones.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The spelling is N-E-A-U-L-T? The first name is Roland Neault, so we'll look into that.

I can just tell you generally though, the members, that was a very tight squeeze in there and his residence is on both sides I'm informed. There's curves to cut over to an intersection on one end and relocation on the other end and an effort, of course, to be as flexible as possible in terms of the taking of the right-of-way to not dislocate people any more than had to be done.

Of course, they would have received visitations, discussions and negotiated and I don't recall receiving any special complaints or saying they weren't being fairly treated or requesting that there be another look at what we're doing there, as to how much land is being required. They would have had an opportunity to put forward perhaps a request that they wanted the residents to be relocated or to be bought out or whatever. These things can be discussed. Now, whether he raised those, I don't know, at the time.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, that's my immediate reaction. If it's that close to the property, obviously, it should have been expropriated and relocated in some way. There's always two sides to the story, when you're not familiar with the area.

The Member for Springside may be a little more familiar with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: I'm just wondering what was the original reason, the original rationale behind because this is new construction that we're talking about. There's a few feet between where 206 goes into Landmark and 206 went to No. 1, actually were separated. What was the original reason for building this?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: We could get the planning minutes, the considerations, the alternatives that were looked at over a period of time to try and solve the problems of the intersections there. The idea was to try to yield one intersection instead of two. Therefore, relocation was deemed to be the best way to join up 206 with No. 1, with 207; so, they were looked at a number of alternatives of how to do it, and there was consultation, I believe, in the area with the municipalities and with the MLA at that time, the department locally and the department central office, and eventually decided that was the best route.

MR. G. ROCH: You say there was consultation with the residents of the area at that time?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I mentioned the municipal officials. I didn't mention the residents themselves as to what the plan should be. They would have been obviously

consulted after the expropriation process began, consulted with regard to the amount of remuneration they should get for their land. I don't know that they were consulted before as to whether it was best to do that or the other.

MR. G. ROCH: What's going to happen with that portion of the road which was 206 from where the new 206 will join to 207? Will it remain as a municipal road? Will it be abandoned?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: There are a lot of planning objectives. A major one was the amount of traffic that was using 207 at No. 1 Highway, going through Lorette and down south to Landmark or other places. They were using 207, instead of using No. 1. The idea here was to improve that intersection with No. 1 so that there would be more use, and improve the intersection of No. 206 with 207 where it intersected so that there would be more use of 206 right through to No. 1, and take some of the traffic pressure off 207 and the speed restrictions that were through Lorette and the intersection of 207 with No. 1. That was one of the reasons why that was changed, so that there wouldn't be that jog if people didn't feel like using it and, therefore, would stay away from that road.

MR. G. ROCH: If I understand you correctly, the objective was to encourage people to go down No. 1, straight down 206 to Landmark or wherever they're going, with the idea of, instead of making a little jog, go straight through.

I would take it then from you said, that's going to be all hardtop then.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: It's planned for hardtop, Mr. Chairman.

MR. G. ROCH: Why is everything sitting idle right now? There's no work proceeding on it right at this moment unless they've started, you know, in the last couple days.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Let me find out, Mr. Chairman, what is in the program this year. The member maybe already knows what's in the program with regard to this section of road but, if it's in the program to finish and carry over, they will finish it. Nobody's told them to not finish it.

MR. G. ROCH: No, but I'm just wondering, at this time of the year, why it's not proceeding.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, if conditions warrant, the grading would be completed and, depending on the schedule of the contractor who had some work to do there yet, he may have other commitments and hadn't gotten out to this section. I'm not sure. The member would obviously be more aware of whether it's wet there or whether there were any difficulties in getting started there earlier.

The program allows for that completion, and then additional gravel and calcium treatment, dust treatment for this coming year. It's never the practice to put the pavement on right away, so obviously it wouldn't be considered until next year or the year after.

MR. G. ROCH: So if I understand correctly, that will be completed this summer?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes.

MR. G. ROCH: Everything but the black-topping. I had another question related to that project and it may be not to do with this question, but there have been some local merchants who have had some problems with one of the sub-contractors with unpaid bills. Do they have any recourse through the department? Do they have to go to the general contractor, or what kind of recourse would they have?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: There is a holdback provision and, if any of the sub-contractors indicate to the department that they haven't got their money after a period of some 30 days or . . .

MR. G. ROCH: Oh no, no. Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, what I said was that one of the sub-contractors has got some outstanding bills to local merchants. I'm just wondering do they have any . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: We don't have direct involvement with the sub-contractors at the present time, and there wouldn't be any recourse. The contractor is paid this money. He pays the sub-contractors, and it's too far down the line for the department to be holding, because we don't have a contract with the sub-contractors per se. We have a contract with the contractor. He is responsible for paying out the money to his sub-contractors who are responsible for paying their bills. So on that basis, the current system does not allow for the department to hold back anything from the sub-contractor.

MR. G. ROCH: So their only recourse would be just, I guess, civil or other proceedings against the sub-contractor.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Small claims or whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: There's a road, I'm not just too sure — what's being done in the Stead area, would it be 304? What construction is going on up in that area? I had a call from someone who said there's a road being built there, and he's not too sure where it's going. It doesn't seem to go anywhere. I thought that one had been built through the former Minister's land at Selkirk, but apparently there's another one that's going nowhere.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, this one is obviously a case where we had to look at some relocation of 304 through Stead, where there were a lot of problems with the grade there through the peat area, smoke and burning areas in the past, and also very dangerous narrow grade shoulders. It was felt, rather than upgrading it on its present location and jogging through up close to Powerview there, that it was better instead to take it right across to Highway 59, from one of the junctions further north and go straight west, across

through the Belair Provincial Forest, instead of around the bottom of it. So what we've done is started the construction from Highway 59. The first seven miles was let in last year's program. It hasn't been completed. We will consider letting the second contractor join it up from where it hits the railway track there, throughout the provincial forest, the CN line, right across to where 304 is currently east, right straight east, at the jog.

MR. D. BLAKE: From the first jog, up from the 304?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, there's Stead. There's a jog that goes east and there's a jog up.

MR. D. BLAKE: Straight across from there?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes.

MR. D. BLAKE: Right south to 59?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Right. So it's straight west from there. It's relocation of that section and it is currently under way. Because the whole section was not contracted in one contract, it will seem to people, who may want to be curious and decide to go down there and take a look, that it goes to nowhere, because at the present time it does go nowhere. It's currently being constructed and the second portion has not been let. We intend to do that, perhaps, in the pre-tender program, or next year's program, so that it will be completed.

There's some property to acquire as well there. The member can understand that through the forest, no private property had to be obtained, and that's why construction started on that end.

MR. D. BLAKE: It will just go through a couple miles north of Stead, then?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, a few miles north of Stead. The intention, then, is to make a new connection into Stead from the north, straight down.

MR. D. BLAKE: That's pretty well all provincial park?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, right on the boundary there.

MR. D. BLAKE: That may take a lot of the traffic out of that Stead area. It might not disturb the birds as much in the fall, Mr. Deputy Minister; it may be helpful.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That's what's behind this.

MR. D. BLAKE: That's a couple of them out of the way. The Newdale access, could you tell me what's happening? That was in the plan and I don't know whether there's anything happening there, that access off 16 to the Village of Newdale. It's a pretty dangerous cutoff there and there was, I believe, in the proposal, plans to do something on that.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: It certainly rings a bell.

MR. D. BLAKE: I don't know whether it was in the proposed . . . yes, Newdale access, in the projects

Tuesday, 17 June, 1986

previously programmed. I just wondered what was happening on it.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, there are intersection improvements. It's in there; it's in the carry-over. The intention is to complete that this year, providing there's no problems . . .

MR. D. BLAKE: You're just going to put a little curve in there to come back out onto the highway at a better angle?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That's supposed to be approved. I don't what the date is for tendering. It's in the program and I think the intention was that it will be done this year. It was a carry-over from last year. So if there are no problems with acquisition — I hope there wouldn't be, otherwise it shouldn't be in here for improvements if there was still acquisition to do. It doesn't indicate that. I can't tell you why it was not done last year but the fact is, there's about \$140 million worth of projects that are approved, 1.6 times the amount of expenditure, so in any given year, all projects that are programmed cannot be done and some of them are carried over.

It may be done this summer, then. I don't know what the projected tendering date is at the present and no one has that information right now.

MR. D. BLAKE: The Stonewall cutoff — would it be 67?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes.

MR. D. BLAKE: There's some concrete work being done. Would that be the junction of the Stonewall cutoff there on the No. 7? I just wondered what's being done there. Is there concrete work being poured on that intersection? There's an irate citizen out there who has called the Premier and everybody else. Apparently there's two days work and it's taken 10 or 14 days to complete. He's worrying about the staff not working hard enough on it.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Could I have clarification? The member mentioned 67. Is he talking about the junction of the Perimeter with 6, or?

MR. D. BLAKE: No, it would be the junction of the Fort Garry Road, where it comes across the bog, as they call it, and joins up with No. 7. I assume that that's the junction he was referring to. It would be the junction of No. 7 and 67.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I don't know whether it's some patching, or whatever, at Highway 67 and No. 7 from the east is what the member is saying he thinks it is?

MR. D. BLAKE: It's got to be on 7 because he's talking about the danger of the truck traffic. They're down to one lane and then they're doing the other lane and it's dragged on for an abnormal length of time. That's his complaint, that it should have been done in a couple of days, to allow the truck traffic through. But apparently it dragged on quite a bit.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: If that's on the four-land section in the vicinity of 67 and 7, we'll find out what's going on.

MR. D. BLAKE: That seems to be, from what he described to me, as the place for it.

I don't want to get into this one maybe until afterwards, because it might take a little while. I want to go into the Plessis Road thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. D. ROCAN: I wonder if the Minister can tell us if anything is being done on the 244 between No. 2 and the Town of Notre Dame.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The question was what, Mr. Chairman?

MR. D. ROCAN: Is there anything going to be done? South on 2.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I didn't get the intersection.

MR. D. ROCAN: The road, at 244 but south of 2, to the Town of Notre Dame.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: 244 south of 2 to Notre Dame. What's the number of that road? 244.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the program at the present time. Maybe the member would like to enlighten us as to the importance of doing something there, but there is nothing in that area at the present time.

MR. D. ROCAN: It's just that this road here is in deplorable shape. It's just that, you know, the potholes, the road has deteriorated, you don't even want to drive there with your car any more, it's that badly shot up.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, we have, Mr. Chairman, that noted on 244, and we'll take a look at whether we should be beginning a program of upgrading on that road, but it is not currently planned. There may be some revisions or some initial plans from the district on that, but we'd have to check with them first as to what they are proposing.

MR. D. ROCAN: On the 242, from the Town of Somerset to the junction of 245 — and, as the Minister already knows, on the 245, from Notre Dame going west, it's blacktopped already, but it goes to nowhere. Is there anything in the plans of connecting up to the 242, blacktopping the 242?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, from 245 to 23, that section of 242?

I'll just check the program, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the budget obviously doesn't indicate that we can. When we come back, we can have some additional information as to what the plans are on that section of road.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, we interrupt the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and return at 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: This section of the Committee of Supply has been considering the budget

Tuesday, 17 June, 1986

Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. We are in Item No. 4.(d)(2) Soils and Crops Branch, Other Expenditures.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wish to provide for honourable members — during our discussion last night, we spoke about the cost of agricultural chemicals, as faced by farmers, and I wish to table for the honourable members — a copy of our brief paper on the cost of agricultural chemicals that was presented to the Ministerial Conference in St. Johns, Newfoundland in July of 1985 so that honourable members would be aware of it.

As well, I want to provide some information for the honourable members on lupins and lathyrus, Mr. Chairman. Manitoba Agriculture has selected two lines of sweet lupins that have good promise for commercial production in certain areas of the province.

The lupin is an annual legume, high-protein feed crop which can be produced on sandy soil, because it has good tolerance to drought. The lupin has the following important features. The seed has a protein content varying between 30 percent and 45 percent. This is considerably higher than the faba bean, grass pea and field pea. The crop holds good potential as a source of protein for feeding to monogastric animals, particularly swine and poultry. The lupin is very drought-tolerant, allowing for production on light soils in areas of the province where annual legume crops, such as, faba beans cannot be successfully grown.

The crop requires 115 to 125 days to reach maturity, but has good frost tolerance in the seedling stage, allowing for early planting. The lupin readily forms good nodulation when inoculated with a specific inoculant. Lupin production can be handled with the same equipment used in cereal grain production, therefore requiring no special equipment. The current seed supplies of the two strains of lupins are quite small, and two years of seed increase will be necessary before large field production demonstrations can be initiated. Some laboratory tests with feeding of rats have been conducted at the University of Manitoba. Additional feeding trials will be undertaken by the livestock group.

Information regarding the lathyrus sativus, which is commonly known as the grass pea, Agriculture Canada Research Station at Morden has developed a low-alkaloid strain of the grass pea. The development of this strain holds good promise for the introduction of a new annual legume crop in Manitoba.

The grass pea has the following important features. The seed has a protein content of 26 percent to 28 percent, 2 percent higher than field peas. It's approximate maturity is 100 to 110 days. It grows to the height of about 60 centimetres, two to two-and-a-half feet tall. It is very drought-tolerant, and equals field peas in frost tolerance. Its nitrogen-fixing capability appears to be higher than field peas.

The low-alkaloid varieties of the grass pea are expected to be suitable for human, as well as animal consumption. It is anticipated that the low-alkaloid variety developed at the Morden station will be licensed in 1987. This will mean that only small investigational

plots can be grown in 1986 to establish suitable cultural practices. Simultaneously, seed supplies can be increased.

When supplies are adequate, larger field-scale demonstration sites can be established to demonstrate the production of this new annual legume crop. Tests for grass peas as human food and feeding trials for annual animal feed in the form of forage and grain will also be required.

Mr. Chairman, as well, I have asked staff and they're being sent down to provide copies for my honourable friends of the . . . They can be photostated right now so that for the next section, the Farm and Rural Development Division, we'll have an overview presented to the honourable members of that division of the major areas under this division. If the Page could take this copy and make about half-a-dozen copies for members, then they'll have it when we reach the next section.

Mr. Chairman, I think, rather than put all this additional information about demonstrations and summary of all the horticulture demonstrations by Manitoba Agriculture and the University of Manitoba and the Morden Research Station, we have a varying list. I would table this so it would be copied, and copies can be distributed to honourable members for their records. I won't put it into the record. It will be there for them. We can present it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I'd like to thank the Minister for providing that additional information for us. I assume that, as we go on into Policy and Economics, he could perhaps table some additional information at that point, the fact being that many of us on this side who are new to this House and new to this process in asking questions, without having background information, sometimes I'm sure we prolong the Session more than is possibly necessary in the eyes of some people probing to find certain answers that might be provided to us. If the Minister could give us additional information up front our questions could be a lot more concise and perhaps a lot more productive.

An example, I guess, of where I would ask under Other Expenditures, we're still on Line 2, is this where the Minister's prepared to answer questions on the Value-Added Crops Agreement, or would he sooner have that carried forward to the Federal-Provincial Agreement section?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the same Assistant Deputy Minister will be back for that one. It is actually at the end, under the Item 7., Federal-Provincial Agreements, but we've been into it and out of it. I leave it to my honourable friends, if they want to have the questions now or they want to leave it till we reach that item, I leave it to them.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Under the Soils and Crops Branch, under the staff breakdown — if I could ask the Minister's indulgence for a moment, I realize that probably this question could have been asked under Salaries. All the information that I seek here is a little bit more breakdown on the 54 members of staff that are involved there. Under Other Expenditures, I assume

that no salary is involved there, but I've asked the Minister's indulgence if he could give us a little further breakdown on that staff complement.

HON. B. URUSKI: The member is speaking about the Soils and Crops Branch.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Yes.

HON. B. URUSKI: Okay, in the way that we have it presented in our own budgets, and I can give him generally the funding that is related in each area. We've got it broken down as a combination of Salary and Other Expenditures, totalling the \$3.4 million. That's how we have it related in our own presentation, in our own detailed notes.

So I have given the honourable member from the records, the staffing, I'll go through the whole thing, and I will give him the breakdown in each area, even though there is . . .

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Perhaps this is the type of information that it might be more productive for all of us if the breakdown of the staff complement were information that could be tabled ahead of time and then we could avoid going into this line of questioning. I wonder if the Minister would consider that.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm not rejecting it at all. The only thing is, I'm prepared to give the honourable member what I have in my own notes in terms of the record. I would have no more information available at this time other than unless we went into a much more detailed presentation of what is other expenditures, what does it relate to. We have not historically gone into that detail in terms of presentation.

We've had to always go back if there were some specific questions in a specific area, saying, I want to know how much travelling or whatever this branch did, we would have to go back and get it because we do not, in terms of our own Estimates, get into that detail.

There is a process, and perhaps I should explain to the honourable members that by about July of this year a process of starting to project Estimates for the next fiscal year begins and the budgets that are presently in each are allocated to each branch. Those branch managers start to determine what kind of budgetary requests they are prepared to put in. That whole request covers off that branches, all its incidental expenses. In other words, if there is paper, there is telephone, there is vehicles, all those expenditures related to that branch would be in this global budget that we would have. So that, for example, in Soils and Crops, the \$3,400,000 would be the entire staff, the projected salary increases, any budgetary requirements for vehicles, telephones, office supplies and travelling that that branch may do. They are given a global budget to operate under, and unless there are checks and balances in terms of where the executive, in fact, after setting the policy in the direction in consultation with the Minister, deems that there needs to be a change in direction or added discretion, then the requests come back to the executive.

But, generally speaking, once that budget is approved in a global sense, travel is approved by the executive

in terms of out-of-province travel; those kinds of requests do come into the executive and approved. But all that money that is in this is allocated for all those expenditures.

MR. E. CONNERY: I would just like to ask the Minister, when we were here, we've been talking about the input costs. Will the Minister monitor the price or value cost of nitrogen fertilizer? I don't know if the Minister is aware that Trans-Canada Pipelines will be changing somewhat to where they can become a common carrier of natural gas and that individuals, large users, can then go out and bargain for large volumes of natural gas.

Simplot fertilizers at Brandon would be one who could go to Alberta and purchase a large volume of natural gas and get it transported through Trans-Canada Pipelines and that should really lower the cost of nitrogen fertilizer.

We want to make sure that these savings are passed on to the farmer at this time. I don't know what mechanism the Minister might have, but I think if we could try to relate between the cost of gas to the fertilizer companies and the cost of fertilizer to the farmer.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we have and continue to monitor retail pricing of fertilizers to the farm community to see whether there may be some large variations in terms of prices being paid by farmers, and in response to complaints and/or allegations about, for example, fertilizer that is Canadian goes south of the border and comes back allegedly at a lower price than it went over there. We've had those kinds of allegations in the past, and we have done monitoring and sample pricing on both sides of the border as well to try and confirm or at least determine whether in fact those allegations are accurate and see what happens.

The issue that the honourable member raises, I'll have to investigate that further just to see what actually is occurring in that area. I'm not aware of any more information than the honourable member has and the implications that it may have for us. But we do and will continue to monitor pricing and respond to concerns that may be raised in various parts of the province as to the retailing of fertilizer to farmers.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: This is a general question and perhaps if the Minister wants to answer it in another section, that'll be his prerogative.

In terms of establishing budgets within the various departments and because I'm also interested in Government Services, I wonder if he could explain what the relationship, or if in fact there is one, with Government Services regarding cars, materials of that nature.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, staff may correct me if I'm wrong, in terms of office equipment, there is a central purchasing bureau of Government Services which all departments apply for the purchase and leasing of equipment and office equipment from that bureau, but we would budget those amounts within our own budget for that whole area. When it comes to vehicles, there is a charge-back provision. Government Services has the budget for the purchase of vehicles

for the entire government fleet. Each department has its allocation of vehicles and then there is a charge-back provision. That's built in to the various branch budgets within our own departments in terms of the vehicles.

When it comes to office space, it's the same as vehicles. Government Services does the leasing, they do the comparable leasing arrangement and they actually do the payments for space. I don't believe that there is anything built in our own budgets for actual rental in these budgets. But for vehicles, transportation, telephone and all the utilities that we'd be normally liable for and office expenditures, equipment, education material, whatever each branch would have, that would be built in, but not for the cost of office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to direct a general question to the Minister, one dealing with an area that the Minister has no responsibility for and hopefully you'll allow me to pose the question anyway. It is to do with the carry-over, or the possible carry-over of lower grades of wheat on Manitoba farms into a new crop year at which time of course the initial price will be significantly lower. Although I fully realize that it's a Canadian Wheat Board responsibility, I would ask the Minister whether anybody in his department is monitoring the extent to which lower quality grades of wheat, particularly, will be carried over into the new crop year; and to what extent is he liaising with the Canadian Wheat Board to continue to impress upon them the gravity of the income loss associated with carrying over any grades into the new crop? — bearing in mind, as I indicated earlier, that it is a federal responsibility.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I believe the honourable member is aware that just this week, or the previous week, the Canadian Wheat Board issued its monthly or quarterly newsletter to all producers, indicating that all producers should attempt to meet the extent of the quota openings prior to July, if at all possible, to make sure that as much of the grain that is in store on the farm is in fact moved out.

The Wheat Board I believe is very cognizant of that fact and is attempting to accommodate, as quickly as possible, so that there is no — what I would call — “jam-up” at the end of the crop year, at the end of July, and they're trying to urge and encourage farmers to make sure — to the extent of the availability of quota — that those crops are in fact moved off the farm and put into the system.

I have not personally in the last number of weeks had any direct communication with the Wheat Board but our staff is in a fairly regular communication with them. But I want to say that I personally have not put that concern on them.

Unless there is some specific area in addition to this, we maybe should be examining this further just to see whether or not there is the likelihood of major amounts of utility wheat — I'm assuming lower-grade wheat being left on the farm — and I want to check that out and if need be, we will make representations to the Wheat Board. But I want to tell my honourable friend

that in the last several weeks I have not made any direct representations on this one specific area.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'll accept the Minister's word that his staff — or some members of his staff at least — are in constant communication with the board, because I see this issue which I address at this time, is one being very major and one that could represent a significant income loss to a large number of producers, having in their possession either No. 3 wheat or feed wheat.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask another question. It's general in nature; it's dealing with grain, but it's dealing with the possibility of a strike, a grain handlers' strike again, at the Lakehead. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture whether his department, or the Department of Labour within his government, is watching this situation — and more so than watching it — are they prepared to jump into the fray in support of the Western Canadian farmer or the Manitoba farmer and see that an orderly and a quick resolution to the dispute surrounding wages be brought into place?

Again, I realize fully that this is not a responsibility of the Manitoba Government, but I think at this time it's incumbent upon our Provincial Government and the Minister of Agriculture to be prepared to take a position and I would ask whether he is prepared to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is both hypothetical, as well as outside the provincial responsibility, but I leave it to the Minister to answer it.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I believe this matter was raised in this House several weeks ago — or last week — and I indicated we will and are prepared to raise our concerns with the Federal Minister. I believe the conciliation services are now being used in the dispute that has occurred at the Lakehead. I'm not aware that there has been any final report or determination at this point in time, but we certainly — putting it bluntly — sit on pins and needles when there is any possibility of a disruption in service, whether it be in the area of the shipping of grain or, in fact, in the area of processing of livestock.

During these points in time, when there may be a possible dispute or there is an actual dispute, I can assure the honourable friend that both staff in labour and our own department virtually are on pins and needles in trying to ensure that collective bargaining continues and a resolution occurs as quickly as possible in the most amicable way that it can.

What we don't want to happen is what's happening, for example, in Alberta, in terms of the vicious dispute that has occurred with Fletchers at Red Deer and, of course, which is now continuing on with Gainers in Edmonton. That is to the detriment of everyone in society in terms of what is going on there and, quite frankly, our approach which we have taken over the years is to try and facilitate cooperative open bargaining, and is really the approach, in terms of our position, that we have taken. In fact Manitobans can be rather proud of having one of the fewest — if not the fewest — work stoppages of any province in this nation, in terms of the cooperative approach that we've used.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, with your indulgence — I hope you don't rule me out of order — I just want to make a final comment and a request.

I guess, first of all I would request that the Government of Manitoba very quickly come to the support of the Manitoba farmer and the grain companies that are now dealing with the labour union in Thunder Bay, the leader of which indicated a few months ago that their workers should not expect an increase in salary, and yet it appears that the membership therein have decided that they should strike for higher wages.

Unless the members opposite have some ideological hang-up, I can't see how anybody can justify today an increase in salary, handling the product of a large rural community, who indeed are taking 15 or 25 percent decrease in their income over the last two years. So my appeal to the Minister is simply this: the members opposite quickly realize that they fall in line and support the farmer of Manitoba with respect to this labour dispute and I won't belabour it, Mr. Chairman.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, before I come to the defence of anyone, I believe that free and open collective bargaining does not require anyone to come to the defence of one party or another. I think the honourable member is aware — and I'll just put the other side of the case in terms of — and I understand where farmers are coming from. But let it just be on the record that this is the first year that there's been a freeze on tariffs of the grain companies. Grain companies have received tariff increases year-in and year-out.

MR. C. MANNES: They haven't taken them always.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member says, "They haven't taken them always." I don't know whether they have or they haven't. They have been granted increases in tariffs.

I believe the best way to facilitate this matter to its resolution is for those two parties to work it out at the bargaining table, not to have the heavy hand of government saying, "I'm in support of one or I'm in support of another"; but just to say, let the bargaining process work and facilitate that bargaining process in a cooperative way, knowing that, and if the workers strike they are on their own. They do not have this public support behind them, and that will be settled very quickly, I can assure the honourable member. But there is no labour dispute will be settled quickly when one of those parties knows that he has the full support of government saying we're backing you to the hilt and to heck with everyone else in the system. That will not foster good labour relations, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. E. CONNERY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister, he said earlier — we were talking about research then — that he didn't want Manitoba to reinvent the wheel. I agree with that; there is a lot of technology out there to be used.

In light of the fact that the university grant has only gone up \$25,000 since 1982, would the Minister be a little easier on allowing outside-of-Canada travel for

those research people to go to areas to pick up and to learn the newest in research?

I'll be very specific. In our vegetable specialist, we've had a great deal of difficulty to getting him to accompany growers on a trip into the production areas of, say California the one time, that travel is very restricted, and this is a tremendous opportunity to pick up the very latest in technology in the horticultural area.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification for my honourable friend, our staff per se in our department are not directly involved in research. Our staff would, of course, be involved in getting and disseminating information on innovative technology and basically technology transfer. Our research in this country, basic research, is generally conducted by Agriculture Canada and that has been their historic responsibility. Our liaison is to provide some funding through the university through an annual grant. It's been an historic relationship between this department and the University of Manitoba.

We do, of course, as I indicated the night before, supplement that as part of our ongoing commitment to the research area through the university, through the Agri-Food Agreement that we're here, but each request that comes in is reviewed by the executive in terms of the extent of travel.

As the member knows, we have, over the last number of years, reduced and tried to tighten up on the amount of out-of-province travel. It's still a fairly significant budget for our department, in the range of \$90,000 for the entire department that is there. Decisions may sometimes seem arbitrary when requests come in about travel and, unfortunately, we make those difficult decisions, some of which in terms of what we feel are of higher priority are allowed, and some of which we feel in terms of our financial position are not allowed.

I want to share with my honourable friend that there's no doubt that someone sitting in the field saying well, damn it, here's the one annual meeting somewhere, wherever it may be, outside of Manitoba, and I can't go to it. Although we are able to receive a technical document and the recommendations that come from that meeting, and put them to use, there is some value for those people attending, but we have generally tried to balance that off in terms of having the highest priority as determined by the executive. That isn't an easy situation, I can assure my honourable friends.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I guess one of the problems that I have in going through the Estimates is the general nature of the Estimates. Obviously, in the Ste. Rose area forage crops are extremely important as they are, and probably even more so, in the Minister's home riding.

I wonder if he could inform us as to the number of people and the resources that are available regarding the improvement of forage crop production in this province. For example, I see that there's a grassland specialist and a chief of grassland section. Can he tell us what the staff complement is in that area and what their responsibilities are?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, centrally, we have two technical specialists in this branch. This is the

central arm of the department, central branch of the department. Then we have, of course, regional staff in each region dealing with the specialty areas of forages and the like; and when you get into the whole area of demonstrations and working with special groups and the contracts under Agri-Food, there would be some term staff and technical staff provided for in those agreements. So there is no sort of one area of direct — there is the line responsibility, but they're also involved in each region so that our specialists in the region would be involved in the entire region that they serve whether it's northwest or central or interlake or Eastman or southwest. There would be specialists in those areas as well as the central branch, and the central branch has two technical people with some term staff in terms of stenographical. There would be a pooling of stenographical support as I indicated before.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: The production of forage crops and forage crop seed production, can the Minister expand on what the involvement of the department is in supporting seed production in the province?

HON. B. URUSKI: Forage seed?

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Forage seed, yes, specifically.

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to indicate to my honourable friend — and I'll give him an example just to go back on the monies — in our budget, for example, in terms of central administration and work, we had just over \$126,000 in the whole area of forage production investigations. However, in that whole branch, as the members know, there's over \$3 million. If, in terms of work activity there may have to be some shift during the year, there is flexibility within that branch in order to say all right we see that we can't do much work in this area, and we have some projects or work developing in another area of soils and crops; we can highlight that and move money around within the branch, within that \$3 million figure. That is normal.

We would need special Cabinet authority if we were to take money from, I would say the whole division of agricultural development and marketing, and put it into say central administration or crop insurance. We could not do it as a department, but within our own department we can make use of the funding that's allocated to that branch. There are wheat districts grants in there, there are publications, there is land planning, there is a whole host of areas in that branch as I indicated the other night.

Forage extension, there is a very strong extension program to the livestock industry by our department. In 1985, this program involved over 150 demonstration and evaluation trials throughout the province. These trials covered most aspects of forage production and utilization, including species and variety trials to show the regional adaptability and yield potential of the various forage grasses and legumes; sod seeding trials to demonstrate and evaluate forage establishment techniques as alternatives to complete renovations; trials to compare relative yields and forage quality of annual crops grown for forage; trials to evaluate the effect of commercially available herbicides in a wide

range of forage crops; demonstrations of commercially available forage preservatives and anhydrous ammonia for preventing spoilage in hay; trials to demonstrate the yield and quality improvements that can be obtained through soil testing and fertilization; trials to evaluate and demonstrate the soil salinity tolerance of various forage crops; trials to evaluate the effect of placing fertilizer in direct contact with alfalfa during the seeding operation, and grazing trials to demonstrate economic production of beef from tame and native pastures.

In addition to the ongoing departmental program, \$1 million over the next five years has been allocated under the Agri-Food Agreement for forage production technology transfer. Under this program, demonstrations will be conducted on improving native and woodland pasture, improving tame hay and pasture production, improved forage handling systems and forage marketing alternatives. Information from these programs and other sources is transmitted to Manitoba's forage producers through field days, tours, extension meetings, seminars, media releases, and one-to-one consultations.

As well, Mr. Chairman, we do have what is known as the Canadian Forage Seed Project. The project was established to multiply and distribute foundation seed of the older Canadian public forage varieties. In 1985, the province distributed 2,070 kilograms of foundation forage seed to 77 seed growers. The grower pays full purchase price for the seed and the only cost to the province is for administering the project.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: My question would be regarding probably what would be called communication or it would be linked, undoubtedly, to the Extension Department; but my question is, in each of the areas — we have the Animal Industry Branch, the Veterinary Services, Soils and Crops, and then we go over to Technical Services — does each area have an allocation that is used for, example, demonstrations and field days, that is specific to their area, and a fund under which they could draw to have public meetings? Do those fall under separate categories or does each section of this branch have an allocated fund that they can draw from, or does this come from central administration funds in the Department of Agriculture?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the funding for meetings and information, generally the majority of the costs of that kind of extension work would be borne by the regions within their regional budgets. Centrally, there would be some money, not a great deal of money, for some extension work and, I guess, information dissemination; but the bulk of it would be on a regional basis.

There is a budget within the Agri-Food Agreement in which all the results and the annualized results that would be tabulated and provided to as many, first of all, members of those associations participating in those trials, as well as communicating through local media and provincial media in the form of press releases and the like. There is a budget for that kind of information dissemination in the Agri-Food Agreement, as well as for demonstration days and those kinds of activities.

Over the five-year period, in the Agri-Food Agreement, there is \$2.4 million that's allocated for the

process of evaluation, analysis, implementation and public information of all the demonstrations under the Agri-Food Agreement.

I'll give the honourable member the breakdown in terms of the total federal-provincial agreement. Program 1 is \$10.5 million, Agriculture Canada, and \$5.35 Manitoba Agriculture for crop research and extension, livestock research and extension, utilization marketing and value added.

In Program 2, which is soil management, research, planning analysis and district organization, soil conservation management, water conservation management, \$8.5 million, Ag Canada; \$2.7 million Manitoba Agriculture; \$5.5 million, Manitoba Natural Resources.

Program 3 is farm management, extension, education, farm management decision-making aids, farm management analytical research. Ag Canada, \$2 million; Manitoba Agriculture, \$1.35.

Program 4, as I indicated, an analysis, evaluation, implementation and public information, \$2 million, Ag Canada; \$400,000, Provincial Government.

Total federal expenditure of \$23 million; \$9.8 million, Manitoba Agriculture; \$5.5 million, Manitoba Natural Resources, for a total of \$38.3 million, the total of the federal agreement over the next five years.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Pardon me if I don't understand the explanation completely. Some of those monies that are related towards communications aspects of that agreement, are they re-allocated, for example, some of them regionally and some of the funds into departments? How are those funds allocated or slotted as to the direction in which they will be used?

This sort of ties into a question that perhaps I could ask at this time and give the Minister some idea of where I'm coming from. For example, in the agricultural development and marketing division, which we are still discussing part of, what is the direction that's given down through the — what is the decision-making body that approves the thrust of the department? Would the department heads make recommendations? How is the thrust of the department established?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to share with my honourable friend that just today the executive and myself met for a number of hours to basically overview, in a very general way, what I would say, our *raison d'être* of the department and its service to the family farms of this province, and to see whether we could provide a better method and improve on methods of sharing in the development of policy and direction within the whole department.

I gave my honourable friend my style and my approach. Ultimately, I am responsible for decisions that we take. I may not be privy to all the decisions that we make administratively and the like, but I am responsible. The approach that I have taken in terms of the development of policy and program direction is to try and utilize as much expertise at the field level as one can, given the circumstances and the timing.

Not always has it been as successful as I would have liked it to be, but we have attempted to build what I would call the team approach in the department in the delivery of services, but also in terms of getting as

good a handle on from our own staff as to in consultation with farm groups, the advisory groups and others as to what is really happening out there in various regions on specific issues and bring that up as well as work that approach with our executive and our central people in the development of policies and programs for the department. That's the general approach that I've taken. One would have to take one specific issue and say "How did you handle this issue in policy development?"

Generally we've tried to use the consultative and the team approach within the department. On some issues it worked better than others, depending on the nature of the issue and when it comes up and the time needed to respond to that issue.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: The question that I'm trying to come around to, I guess, is that several times the Minister has referred to the meeting of the executive, as he did just in this answer. I hope you'll excuse me if I appear naive, but could he explain who is involved in this advisory executive or who makes up the group that he refers to as his executive?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the executive group is my Deputy and four Assistant Deputies, the Assistant Deputy of Administration. When we dealt with Administration and Finance, you remember Greg Lacomy was here. Now we're into Agricultural Development and Marketing, which is Tom Pringle. The next division will be Cliff Cranston, who's watching the proceedings from up there. The Policy and Economics Division is Craig Lee. Those are the executive of the department, as well the general managers of the Crown corporations, the general manager of Crop Insurance and the general manager of Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. Those would be the members of the executive that would be involved in the day-to-day decisions and administrative procedures the department would follow.

On any specific policy issues, we would call on other staff, whether it be directors or, in fact — to give the honourable member an example, we did a review of Crown lands policy a number of years ago. In that review, we had members of the executive present, and it was done right in the Crown lands offices. We had all members of staff, or not all the staff but a good representative number of staff, both centrally of Crown lands and field, to go through the policies as they had been administered over the last number of years.

Of course, basically staff would raise issues where they found problems to see whether or not there should be changes in policy. There was considered some areas needed further refinement, but staff then of course would put some options together for consideration of the executive and myself and the advisory committee for implementation. That would be one example of how we have reviewed policy and procedures on an ongoing basis and where I directly have been involved as well.

Insofar as what we've been discussing about in terms of the Agri-Food Agreement, the requests for funding and project development would come from producers organizations. I'll give my honourable friend, for example, the Lawrence Cattlemen Cooperative Forage Improvement Project, three years total funding, \$20,000

into Rorketon-Toutes Aides District which is in his own constituency.

Generally, the target was to establish tame forage on Class 4 and 5 soils in the Rorketon-Toutes Aides District, specific development within the Lawrence Cattlemen Cooperative, the increase in establishment of tame forage acreage and quality of existent tame forage fields, and to demonstrate economically viable methods of establishing tame forage on Class 4 and 5 till soils and improvement of existing tame forage fields.

The budget that was allocated there would provide for those demonstrations. Within that budget, there would be some provision for the dissemination of the technical data that the committee would have collected in liaison with our ag rep out of the Ste. Rose office. So they would have some money in that budget for publications, for technical information that they wish to put in the paper or disseminate information to their participants in the cooperative. Hopefully, that information would go beyond only the members of the cooperative and into the area. So they would have some funding within that total project for information and dissemination.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I guess that leads to a question that follows along on that same topic. The programs that the Minister mentioned, would they by and large be producer-initiated? Was that what I understood him to say, or would they in fact be programs whereby the department would have chosen areas that they felt should have increased access to this modern technology and information, and went out and actively promoted this program in those areas? Which direction is the flow there?

HON. B. URUSKI: There are a number of types of projects that we would have funded under this agreement. There would have been agreements with individual producer groups. There are agreements with producer associations, in particular commodity groups, and there would be agreements dealing with, for example, conservation districts that are already established within the province.

I'd like to advise my honourable friend that, prior to the agreement being implemented, there was what I would consider a fairly major, extensive consultation and planning process for the implementation of this agreement right across this province, involving I would say probably hundreds or in the neighbourhood of hundreds of groups in the Province of Manitoba in all facets of agriculture. Their views and their ideas were solicited in terms of possible projects under this agreement.

For those projects which were approved, there probably was another half dozen or a dozen projects which were applied for which the federal-provincial committee of staff did not agree with. The final approving authority is a joint committee of federal and provincial officials in terms of the teams that were established pursuant to this agreement. But the initial process of, I would say, grass-roots feedback was a fairly extensive consultation process with a whole host of requests which were then considered by the committee and prioritized by the committee.

As well as groups in the various commodities, we didn't as well make all the tough decisions. We threw some of the tough ones to them as well to say, all right, if there are 20 requests and maybe we have enough money to fund five, how about some priorities from you? Will you at least sit down and say, all right, if you had this much money, which ones would you do first? What would be your priority? That's the kind of process that we were engaged in prior to the finalization of the actual projects being implemented.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I would simply ask one more question along that related area. I was trying to determine if the department felt that the initiative in getting these programs started was theirs. Did the department through the ag reps, was this where the interest was initiated? How was the information and the interest created in the areas in order to — part of my question is: were certain areas delineated by the department which, I would think, would be quite in order? Were they delineated by the department as areas that needed this type of communication?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the whole process was, I would say, one of major participation by all groups. Just for information, we were coming off and are coming off the previous Agro-Man Agreement, of which there were a whole host of projects that were carried on by community groups. There were areas within those projects that practical research should have been continued on in some specific areas. Those groups were involved in the process.

I would say, in terms of the global sense, it was top down but, in terms of the specifics of the recommendations, it was really from bottom up. So while we negotiated the overall agreement in terms of the global amounts of money, we worked with interest groups in trying to prioritize and determine what projects would in fact come out in this specific area.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I would just like to compliment the department on the Grassland Projects. I think they have been very worthwhile and have done a good job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(d)(2)—pass.

4.(d)(3)(a) Northern Development Agreement — Provincial Salaries; 4.(d)(3)(b) Other Expenditures — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: The salary referred to here is that . . .

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, all inclusive of the staffing and salary that I gave the honourable member at the beginning of Soils and Crops Branch includes this amount of money as well. It's all within them.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I was wondering, could he tell us, is this one staff person.

HON. B. URUSKI: 1.5, I'm advised, Mr. Chairman.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Obviously, for the number of dollars here, it's quite small compared to other sections, but I wondered if the Minister could give us some

understanding of what the Northern Development Agreement - Provincial refers to.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, this expenditure and this program is really the Northern Gardening Project that the department is involved in, and it's designed to develop skills and provide technical support in the production of horticulture and other crops specifically adapted to northern conditions and to improve the availability and utilization of vegetable products in northern communities, basically self-help, a promotion type of program to develop gardens and the production of root crops and cold crops in Northern Manitoba.

The services are provided in total or in part to 30 Northern communities, and the activities include the promotion of crop production through the cooperative vegetable garden demonstrations in 15 communities, youth gardening activities in 15 communities in cooperation with Frontier School Division, demonstration of production under plastic tunnels in 19 communities, production workshops at the community level, investigations and demonstrations regarding commercial production of barley, forage, vegetable and greenhouse crops; and secondly, land breaking and tillage services. We provide the roam disc for commercial land breaking, provide initial land-breaking services for home gardens, a total of 72 plots in 1985, and we do supply small rototillers to 14 communities for servicing home gardens. That is part of the delivery of this program.

MR. E. CONNERY: Is this the total provincial budget for this program, Mr. Chairman?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think we may receive some of the money that we got in here, but this is the total amount of money the Department of Agriculture spends in this area.

MR. E. CONNERY: Is this the total for the government?

HON. B. URUSKI: There would be some indirect assistance in terms of the setting up of 4-H groups, because there is a 4-H thrust in Northern Manitoba, so some of the 4-H groups and possibly some of the funding. Now when he says, all the money, are you talking about specifically for gardens?

MR. E. CONNERY: Yes.

HON. B. URUSKI: Okay.

I believe that is all the funding that there is in terms of the actual garden plots that are provided. We do the provision of services in Northern Manitoba. That's the amount of money that we have allocated. We have no further funds.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: The relationship with Frontier School Division that's referred to here a minute ago, would that be a case of where funds would be transferred to people within the division to promote the program or would personnel from the department actually be involved at that point?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we really cooperate with Frontier School Division whose staff attempt in

the various school areas in the communities where the schools are in to organize community gardens and get some, basically motivation, and desire in the community to proceed along those lines. We, of course, would provide the technical information and some of the equipment in order to follow up on that development that's done by local people. In many of these, it would be staff of Frontier School Division or teachers in the community.

It tied in fairly closely to the Frontier School Division and nutrition program in terms of vegetables and the like in terms of their teaching program and we would tie into the actual production.

MR. E. CONNERY: Have you done an analysis of the success of the program? It's not a horrendous amount of money, but are there vegetables being grown, consumed, stored and so forth?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the one thing I should tell my honourable friends, that we have not gone north and attempted to force feed and basically say, "We'll show you how to do it." We're there to respond to community desires and the program has, in fact, been taken up fairly substantially and grown over the last number of years in terms of the number of communities there.

In fact, production is occurring on an annual basis and I would think that probably a number of communities who are now even on their own or individuals within communities who have their own gardens, we basically start the process going and hopefully it will take off in the community. We do provide some of the tillage services that may be ongoing. But I believe that once it's established for a number of years it will, in fact, continue with minimal support from government.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Under Other Expenditures, and this will likely be my last question in this area, Mr. Minister, is this an area where, for example, travel would be charged back to the department?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, yes, I'm sure a major portion of this budget would be travel for the person in Northern Manitoba. That would probably take up the bulk and some of the operating, like gasoline and repairs for the equipment and those kinds of things. But the bulk of it, no doubt, would be travel expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(d)(3)(a)—pass; 4.(d)(3)(b)—pass.

4.(e)(1) Training Services and Training Branch: Salaries — the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in this branch, we have a total staff complement of 45, and I'll break it down in this way that I have it here: Branch Administration - 9.24 staff years; Agricultural Engineering - 7 staff; Entomology Extension - 3; Apiary General - 2; Apiary Inspections - 1.36; Farm Machinery Board - 2.10; Farm Management - 4; 4-H and Youth Specialist - 2.3; Agriculture Manpower Services - 1; Ag Extension Centre of Administration - 2; Ag Extension Centre Facilities - 9.26; and 1 person in Home Economics.

Tuesday, 17 June, 1986

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(e)(1) — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Could I ask the Minister on that last staff person. Did I hear him correctly; 1 in Home Economics?

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This one person would be our central support in the financial area. That position was one that was seconded to the Department of Health because all our home ecs are in the regions. They would not show up in any of these budgets. They would be in the regional budget that is coming up next. This was strictly central staff. All of the 17 positions that we have in the department are located in the Farm and Rural Development Division because they're spread out throughout the regions.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Under staff complement, we're talking about the Ag Extension Centre in Brandon. I picked up that there were 2 in Administration and 9. Can he expand on what those other positions might be? Is that service people or is that technical people that are referred to there?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that those staff would be the, I guess what one would call the Maintenance Staff, the Operating Engineer and the Cooks in that facility. It would be service to people.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: So then, it would be my understanding, that mainly there are two people who are in charge and operate that school, and any courses that are brought in, the instructors come in with them at that time? Is that the procedure?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the majority of instructors' fees — and of course, instructors would be either from the department or outside of government that would come in — there may be some small amount within their budgets for some instruction fees, but the majority of costs for instruction would come from other budgets. For example, Livestock may want to, or Forage. Those areas would bring in speakers. That would be out of their own budgets. And, of course, covered off to some extent. I guess, in many of them they're basically very close to being self-sustaining by course fees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to go back to the one home economist who has been seconded to Health. Is that what you said, Mr. Minister, and does that mean that Agriculture is paying for this individual, but the individual is actually working out of Health?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we have, in fact, been paying for that position, but the position that we have here, in fact, is a vacant position. In the whole review that is being undertaken, we'll be making a decision as to how the entire services to rural and urban women will be carried on. That decision will be made likely within the next two weeks.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I'd just like to correct the last few words. Surely home economists serve more than rural women.

HON. B. URUSKI: I said both rural and urban. I did say that.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: But surely they serve more than women.

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they serve the families of rural Manitoba and urban Manitoba.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you. I appreciate that correction.

I'd like to ask a more general question here. The Technical Services and Training Branch, while it has a slight increase for salaries but nothing, quite frankly, out of line with just regular and normal salary increases, is overall down a budget of 4.6 percent, with the largest amount, of course, coming in agricultural societies. Can you explain the rationale when the budget process was done that, in fact, resulted in this being given a 4.6 percent decrease?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in terms of the entire branch, the staff complement, in fact, there was a slight, slight increase in the staff complement, not of an entire person year. Being that there may be some, either change in staff or new staff, the actual budget for staff went down by \$20,000, I believe, in my own figures that I have here. I don't know whether that is reflected in the final figures in the book, but in terms of our own staff request, we went down.

Where there was a fairly major difference was in the budget for the Austin Museum. The Austin Museum operating budget is now being handled by the Minister of Heritage and Cultural Affairs. That budget was removed from this department. It's \$123.6 thousand. It is now, in my mind, in its rightful place, being with the whole area of museums and culture and heritage within the province. It's been taken out of our branch and funded out of another department.

So the decrease is not an actual decrease, it is the shift of funding from one department to another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Expanding on the home economic question and the staff in the Home Economics Department, there seems to be a fair bit of discussion and a fair bit of information supposedly flowing from the government at this point.

There's a good possibility that Home Economics resource people will go back into the Department of Agriculture. One of the reasons that I have is that there is some scepticism that that will in fact happen, is because of the Estimates and the way that they're made up at this point.

If the resource people came back into the Department of Agriculture, would this be the section under which their salaries would be funded?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, chances are that would happen. This would likely be the area that they might, but I don't want to prejudge what the final outcome will be. That decision, as I indicated to the Member from River Heights, will likely be made in the next couple of weeks.

Tuesday, 17 June, 1986

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I recognize that my question is hypothetical. The problem, however, is that if it were to be transferred to this department, would that mean that the funding would also be transferred?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, just for my honourable friend's information, this is where they were prior to, I believe, 1973 or 1974 in this area. I certainly would assume that when you bring people over, if you bring them over, that the required funding would change with the number of personnel in the branch.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Perhaps my next question will require some research, although it may be readily available, given that this is so topical this Spring. When the Home Economics resource personnel were transferred over did, in fact, at least two of them continue to be funded under the Department of Agriculture after they were transferred over to the Department of Health?

HON. B. URUSKI: I'm assuming that the honourable member is speaking of the central group.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Uh huh.

HON. B. URUSKI: No, they would not have been.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Okay. I'm not clear on what the Minister was referring to after he mentioned the members of his staff that are in entomology. There was a staff of two in the next item and it sounded like . . . I'm sorry?

HON. B. URUSKI: Bees. Apiary inspection and general. The inspections would be primarily staff that we would use on an ongoing basis to do the fumigating of hives, the service that we provide to the apiarists around the province, in the ongoing prevention of disease. Basically the whole apiary section is 3.362, and 1.36. I gave him the actual breakdown of each area.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I am now going to do what I accused the Minister of doing, I would like to jump back one step again to the home economists' staff.

The home economists of the province have been delivering some health care information as well. Is there a joint funding with the Department of Health where these programs have overlapped? Can the Minister or can his staff anticipate continued cooperation in this area?

If I could expand on my statement. For example, in prenatal classes, the home economists have been delivering nutritional courses, which is helping out the extension work of the Department of Health. Is there any financial sharing between the departments in that area, or what are the ramifications, given the possible changes?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I believe there's 11 staff in health dealing in the areas of nutrition and family work; also home ecs both in Northern Manitoba and in urban centres as well as the 17 staff that we have on a regional basis.

The central coordinating group would be the resource group that would provide the resource information and

material to whatever services the home ecs would be delivering in the various communities that they would be serving, whether it's nutrition, whether it's prenatal, whether it's farm counselling and farm management, whether it's stress, whatever, financial management, those whole host of services.

In terms of the possibility of the development of resource material, we said, "Only you can manage your money," was developed by, I would think, probably the resources of the centre but also the expertise of the field staff. It's only because there are individuals who are centrally located, it doesn't mean that they have all the answers to all the various areas. They would still call on field staff to assist them in the preparation of this material and that would be the way that ongoing programming and development of resource material would be undertaken by the department.

There would be occasions, of course, that we might even hire on a per diem basis some expertise outside of government to assist, and that has occurred in the past on some specific projects.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: My concern in this area was that if the home economists under the Department of Agriculture were to continue to provide these services without the central backup, where would the resource come from? Obviously, at the present time they are still able to put forward the programs, given the information that they've built up over the years, but they will rapidly become out of touch if there is not a central directorate that they can approach.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that's precisely the reason for, I would say, the rethinking of the decision that was originally made. I think honourable members would appreciate that in the whole Estimates process in terms of decisions, probably Cabinet ends up likely making a decision every 10 or 15 seconds in terms of the whole process. There are times, and this is one of them, that we really should have rethought the whole process, and we did.

We recognized that it was not the right decision and we believe there should be a central coordinating body in terms of the provision of information and we're dealing with that presently. That decision will be implemented, as I said, I hope within the next couple of weeks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I have a question to the Minister. At the training workshop that was held, I think it was around the 3rd of June, where the four home economists in the directorate weren't allow to go.

I wonder if the Minister could tell us what kind of training was given to the rural home economists, when the Minister had indicated that it was only going to be dealing with health.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I don't even want to pretend to speak for the Department of Health in those decisions. I think the honourable member should raise them with the Minister.

In terms of our own staff, we have ongoing updates and reviews in terms of education throughout the year

and that's on an ongoing basis throughout our regions and them as a group. We do not segregate in terms of our own delivery of services, home ec from the ag rep, and from the specialist. We have tried to integrate the delivery of services in our department as a total service to the farm family, whether it be in livestock, whether it be in counselling, whether it be financial management.

We have taken the thrust in our own department that farm financial management and stress are the key roles of the delivery of services, both whether it be to the family, through the home ec, and really it's trying to get a team approach and a network approach at getting at the family because not always — I want to share that with my honourable friend — will the man of the house admit that they are in financial difficulty, but the spouse or the children have no hesitation in speaking out and speaking up on the very problems of stress and the problems that they're having in the family. And it will be many times that it will be the home ecs or the public health nurse, or other groups in the community, that will recognize and spot difficulties that a family is going through and be able to do the kind of liaison work with the family. That's the kind of integrated role that we've tried in this department in terms of dealing with farm families and the assistance that we provide.

But as far as the upgrading and education in our own department in terms of the financial area, we do that on an ongoing basis and the staff, of course, the reverse comes in, in terms of ideas from the field level into the centre, and say, hey, there are some good ideas, maybe we should start focussing a change in the thrust that we're doing. It's a two-way street as far as our department is concerned.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I understand what the Minister is referring to. I guess my question is, did the staff that are dealing with the Agriculture Department attend that workshop? Also, when they were looking at the restructuring of the directorate and possibly bringing it into the Department of Agriculture, what then will happen to the areas in the city and urban areas that will be severely affected if this directorate doesn't continue?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, first of all, there is no directorate. There hasn't been one for about — I guess the title of "directorate" hasn't been around for about eight or nine years, or 10 years — but in terms of the provision of Central Services, whether it be in agriculture or in health, wherever the decision is made to house the central coordinating group, that service will continue to be provided and that's basically the work that is being undertaken now, and that's the analysis that has been undertaken.

Basically, there will be a decision on how best to manage the resources and deliver the services that have been there and will continue to be there from now on. That'll be the review that's undertaken.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: When I listen to the Minister talking about Central Services and that they are rethinking a position that probably shouldn't have happened, a decision that shouldn't have happened,

when something has been so successful as these Central Services seem to have been, the only reason I can imagine that the government is even looking at reconsidering the issue is because it was a successful service and that the field staff complained bitterly because they know where all the services are going to have to come from.

They're going to have to think up the courses; they're going to have to do it if they don't get the support service. I guess what I'm saying to the Minister is, instead of thinking about it so much and doing a lot of reshuffling to make it look like you've done something, why don't you just reinstitute the four home economists, the two staff, if needed for the area, shift it from Health into Agriculture and just let them get on with the job?

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Under 4-H the staff was 2.3, if my scribbled notes are correct. Can the Minister expand on that staff? — (Interjection) — Was that 2.3 that the Minister said was listed at 4-H specialists?

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my honourable friend from Kirkfield Park that I believe that we should not just say that we're satisfied with everything that's been in place for whenever. I think we should constantly review and challenge people. Maybe the approach that was taken was not the right approach. I will be the first to admit it, but I don't think we should just say, well, it's been great and let's continue on and merrily we roll along, as the member suggests. I hope she's not suggesting that, but that's certainly the impression that she gave me.

I'm suggesting that there are changing needs in terms of the rural community and urban community in terms of the services to the families. Our whole thrust has changed in the last number of years in terms of delivery of services. We have now concentrated on a continuous basis dealing with families in crises and farm management areas, financial management areas, both not only on the production side but also on the family side, so that goals and decisions can be made in an informed way and that our staff can, in fact, assist families in making those kinds of decisions when times are as difficult as they're at.

It is a challenging process and it is a time when we're calling on staff to do more than they've done with less, and the honourable member knows very well that's the case. Quite frankly, I appreciate the comments that she's made, but you know her colleagues as well, many of whom sit on that front bench, have said your deficit is running too high, but on the other hand, when someone says, let's see if we can do more for less, don't cut the service because you're hurting Manitobans. Everyone would not like to have their services cut when it affects me, but do it to someone else and if that someone else is out of my area, that's tough. That's really the argument that's being put forward and, quite frankly, you can't have it both ways.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: While I'm listening to the Minister talk about we can't have it both ways, and then I see today it was brought up about a new media specialist for the Premier and here you're talking about cutting back on family services — (Interjection) — Wait a

minute. It may not be a new position but it certainly is going to be replaced. There's no cutback there.

We're talking about services and when you consider the trouble, the problems that the farm communities are facing, to be cutting back in any area there seems ludicrous. I can hardly believe that I really heard the Minister of Agriculture saying that there are places to cut, but certainly in times of need and times of trouble, this isn't one of them. I hope that maybe he spoke a little too long on that.

MR. E. CONNERY: We have suggested on this side, Mr. Minister, many cuts that you could make. I got in trouble because I suggested that the Minister of Culture and Heritage had increased her executive salaries by \$41,000. That would go to hiring the home economist that we need. What about the PR people you're continually putting on? What about the \$6-10 million that you are spending of public money to promote your own party and you've been doing it for a long time? In Business Development and Tourism two years ago, you added \$80,000 to the Communications sector. You still didn't pull it out. Those are definite cuts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Relevance.

MR. E. CONNERY: We've told you some and they're on record, now listen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are considering an item in the Department of Agriculture.
The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member should start getting serious in terms of what he is speaking about. When he talks about \$6-10 million, let him be very specific of what he is talking about, because he doesn't know what he's talking about. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, where are we spending \$6-10 million? Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . our own communications . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everybody will have a chance.

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . in our department has gone down from what there was in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, it's time for Private Members' Hour. I am therefore interrupting the proceedings of the committee and we will return at 8:00 p.m.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Debate on Second Reading on Public Bill No. 6 — the Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Stand, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Stand.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

RES. NO. 8 — INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF PEACE

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution — the Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: I move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Labour that

WHEREAS it is recognized that international peace is a desirable goal shared by all peoples; and

WHEREAS conflict exists in numerous regions of the world affecting many countries which only serves to underscore the need for enhancing measures which promote peace; and

WHEREAS there is particular concern about the danger of nuclear warfare arising out of continuing world tension and the continuation of the nuclear arms race; and

WHEREAS people from all walks of life, representing all sections of society demonstrating increasing concern for the need to work for peace by participating in peace activities; and

WHEREAS Manitoba's Legislative Assembly expressed its commitment to world peace by passing unanimously a Resolution declaring Manitoba a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone; and

WHEREAS the United Nations has declared 1986 International Year of Peace;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba declare its full support for the United Nations' declaration; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request the Government of Canada to declare its full support for the United Nations' declaration; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Madam Speaker be requested to ensure that the United Nations be made aware of this Resolution and the support of the Manitoba Legislature for the United Nations' declaration.

MOTION presented.

MR. S. ASHTON: Madam Speaker, this resolution deals with a very important issue for all of us. It deals specifically with the endorsement of the International Year of Peace which has been declared by the United Nations for the year 1986; but, more generally, I think it deals with the whole question of peace and nuclear disarmament; questions, I think, Madam Speaker, that we all should reflect on as members of this Legislature and as citizens because there in fact can probably be no issue that is of greater importance than peace because the very survival of those we love, the very survival of our society is dependent on the maintenance of that peace.

Madam Speaker, what we're talking about is trying to develop a global movement towards greater sanity in times when sanity is difficult. We see difficulties throughout the world, Madam Speaker. We see conflicts in many areas of the world. We see the growing threat of a nuclear arms race, Madam Speaker, a threat that goes to the very continuation of our existence. We also

see what could be done if things were different, if we were to contribute some, Madam Speaker, and hopefully all of that tremendous effort, that tremendous expenditures of funds that presently goes to the nuclear arms race and to other armaments, and contribute that to useful human purposes.

Madam Speaker, the Estimates have indicated that approximately \$800 billion a year is spent on armaments in the world — \$800 billion a year. Just to put it in perspective, let's compare some of those expenditures with some of the expenditures on human needs across the world today.

Madam Speaker, world military expenditures averaged \$19,300 per soldier compared to public education expenditures of \$380 per school-age child. In the global population there are 556 soldiers and 85 physicians for 100,000 people. Madam Speaker, the public budgets — the United States and the EEC — provide \$45 per capita for military research and \$11 for health research, and world expenditures of \$108 per capita for military forces compare with expenditures of 6 cents per capita for international peacekeeping.

Madam Speaker, those are staggering statistics. They indicate just how far out of line our priorities have gone. They indicate how much effort is being put into armaments and how much more could be put into human needs if we were to only change direction. You know, none other than Olof Palme, the late Prime Minister of Sweden, I think perhaps summed up some of those trade offs, some of those other needs that could be developed, Madam Speaker, and I'd like to quote one section of what he said.

He said, and I quote, "The present level of world military spending is 20 times the total amount spent on development aid to poor countries. One-half of 1 percent of the \$500 billion would pay for enough farm equipment to eliminate world hunger. One tank would build 1,000 classrooms for 30,000 children in developing countries. One jet fighter would build 40,000 pharmacies. In the U.S., every billion dollars spent on military hardware would create 51,000 more jobs if it were spent on goods and services for the civilians in the sector."

Those words, which were stated in 1981, I think, Madam Speaker, sum up just how out of line our priorities are. The real question, I guess, for those of us who are concerned about what is happening in terms of conflict in the world, of the continuation of the arms race, the real question is: what can we do about it? What can we do here in Canada? Should we sit back and sit by passively while these developments affect our very future? I say no, Madam Speaker.

I think there are constructive steps that can be taken by our Federal Government. We should, I think, in the United Nations, be pushing for a comprehensive test ban to impede the further development of nuclear weapons. There should be an agreement, Madam Speaker, in my opinion, to stop the flight testing of all new strategic delivery vehicles such as the Cruise Missile, an agreement to prohibit all production of fissionable material for weapons purposes, and an agreement to limit and then progressively reduce military spending on new strategic nuclear weapon systems.

I think we can take action too as a nation, Madam Speaker. I think we should be joining the growing global

campaign for a nuclear freeze, Madam Speaker. We should be stressing the need for a pledge by all nations never to be the first to use nuclear weapons. I think, as a country, we should be looking at our own efforts in terms of disarmament, and I think we should adopt the pledge that will devote one-tenth of 1 percent of our defence budget to disarmament efforts because this was a proposal made, Madam Speaker, by the Secretary-General of the United Nations at the First Special Session on Disarmament.

These are some steps, Madam Speaker, that can be taken by our Federal Government. There are other steps we can take, Madam Speaker. We've certainly seen that here in the Province of Manitoba as a Legislature. We adopted a resolution declaring Manitoba a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. We have joined a growing number of jurisdictions, whether they be provinces or states, whether they be towns or villages, who have said that they are Nuclear Weapons Free Zones.

And, as citizens, I think, we can participate in peace activities. I think we saw this weekend throughout Manitoba that many people are concerned about peace and disarmament. I would urge all members of this Legislature and citizens generally to be involved, not just once a year but on an ongoing basis, because I think the momentum that we've seen in the last few years of individual citizens, Madam Speaker, declaring that they are concerned and making that statement, whether it be in Winnipeg with the Peace March or in Thompson where we had our first peace march on Saturday, the first peace march in the history of our community, whether it be in The Pas or Brandon or the many other communities where peace activities have taken place, I think we can make a statement.

I know there will be some who will say that perhaps I'm idealistic for moving this resolution, for suggesting that we should participate in peace activities, for suggesting that somehow we can make a difference. Well perhaps they're right, Madam Speaker, but I don't see any other way in which we can attempt to shape the course of our own destiny than to have that idealism. Madam Speaker, to be idealistic about an issue such as peace, I think, is nothing more in fact than the expression of the human spirit itself. We desire a society that is better, where there is no conflict.

I think the bottom line is clear. It's not a selfish statement. You know, certainly as I stand here today to move this resolution, I look forward as an individual to many years ahead, many years of peace in Canada and peace, hopefully, throughout the world. Certainly, Madam Speaker, I'm sure all members of this House do, but there's something more serious, I think, than our own personal concerns, concerns for our own personal futures. That is our concern for those who we love, Madam Speaker.

I look at the situation in my own family of two children of age three and one year old, Madam Speaker. You know, as much as I hope to have many years ahead, I consider myself pretty lucky when I look at people my own age in other areas of the world who've seen conflict, Madam Speaker, many people who have never had the opportunity to live as long as I have. When I look at the uncertainty in the world today, I can't help but be concerned about my children's future and the future of other children, that they at least have the opportunity to live the 30 years that I have had in peace and many more years as well.

I think that's the bottom line of what we saw this weekend in the peace marches. People were saying in their own way that they were concerned about themselves and their loved ones, and they wanted to make a statement about that, Madam Speaker.

So that's what we're talking about when we're talking about this resolution today. It's more than a question of endorsing the International Year of Peace, although that certainly is part of it. It's more than considering various concrete actions that can be taken here in our own province and in Canada to further the causes of peace and nuclear disarmament. It's more than that, Madam Speaker.

I think it's an opportunity for us as members of the Legislature to make a personal statement. Let's set by example for others in society that it is, Madam Speaker, useful for us, as Manitobans and as Canadians, to make a statement on this issue.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, as I said, there will be those who will say it's idealism to even talk of peace and disarmament in this world today. Certainly at times, there are reasons for discouragement when one looks at the extent of the nuclear arms race and the escalation that's taken place in recent years. Certainly there is cause for alarm at the number of conflicts that are taking place in the world today, Madam Speaker, but I sincerely believe that, if we can develop the peace movement that we have seen develop in Canada spontaneously in the last half-dozen or so years, I believe if we can develop that into a global movement in which all people will be making the same statement, we can influence our destiny.

We can influence those, Madam Speaker, who have the power to put a cap on the arms race, who have the power to roll it back. We can influence them to negotiate, Madam Speaker, negotiations which unfortunately are not taking place. I think we can influence things to the point where perhaps we can shift away from this madness. Perhaps we can shift towards greater attention to human needs, Madam Speaker. I think it can be done, but it can only be done if we make that statement.

I would urge today, as we as members of the Legislature have the opportunity to reflect on this important issue, that we take the lead, in keeping with what we did last year with the nuclear weapons-free zone that we take the lead, make the statement today that we are concerned about peace, and that we do want peace and disarmament, Madam Speaker.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm pleased to participate in this resolution and indicate at the outset that the resolution has the wholehearted support of Her Majesty's Official Opposition. It is certainly recognized by us, as the resolution states, that international peace is a desirable goal. Madam Speaker, we are more than aware or at least as much aware as anybody else that all people in this world desire that goal of international peace.

Madam Speaker, we are also aware of course, as the resolution notes, that the United Nations has

declared 1986 as the International Year of Peace. Madam Speaker, Canada of course as a member state of that peace organization, having signed that on behalf of all of us, I suppose if one wanted to quibble, one could suggest that this resolution, therefore, was redundant, but I'm not quibbling because I agree with the Mover that this indeed is a most important subject and indicate to the Mover and to the House our wholehearted support for the resolution.

I would have personally felt that the resolution could have been enhanced if a few words like "freedom," "liberty," "respect for basic human rights" were somewhere included in the resolution. But they aren't, Madam Speaker, and I want to simply indicate that doesn't concern me that much. It's simply concerns that I note, and we will not be offering any amendment to the resolution as presented by the Mover, and will indeed be supporting it.

Madam Speaker, having said that, we of course continue to live in a less than perfect world, and the last speaker and the resolution itself in the second WHEREAS notes that conflicts are happening at this very moment that we are debating this resolution. In this very year of International Peace as declared by the United Nations Organization, there are serious conflicts going on in the world. Far too many of our brothers and sisters, fellow human beings around the globe, are suffering the horrors of war.

They come readily to mind. The one that perhaps doesn't receive sufficient attention is the terrible conflict that's going on between the two nations of Iraq and Iran. One of the most devastating features of that conflict is, from the news coverage that we do get, the number of young people, the very young people who are being drawn into that vicious conflict that is going on in that part of the world.

In Lebanon, the Middle East generally, we really cannot say we have peace. South Africa, one can hardly talk about peace in certain portions of that continent, Central America, southeast Asia, Afghanistan.

Let me pause for a moment with respect to Afghanistan, and not to single out any particular area of conflict, but with respect to the resolution before us. As I read the intent or at least a portion of the intent of the resolution, it is geared somewhat to the concern that all of us share about the role of the superpowers, the United States and that of Russia, inasmuch that they are the principal movers in the arms race and such the principal proponents from whom the threat of nuclear disaster could emanate. It is in that conflict of Afghanistan, that for the past five years over 100,000 troops of a foreign country have been trying to subjugate a relatively small third world country and to impose a regime that obviously is not of the liking of a significant number of its inhabitants.

That, Madam Speaker, is a conflict that I believe has largely passed us by in our concerns when we talk about peace, but one that surely deserves the attention of all of us just as much as the world attention was focused when another superpower was engaged in what could have been called a civil strife, a civil war, in southeast Asia a decade ago. Recall, Madam Speaker, that during that decade, our livingrooms via the TV were constantly filled with the horrors of that war.

Well, Madam Speaker, I only mention this that while we can all agree, and I believe we will agree and we

will demonstrate that when this resolution comes to a vote, that peace, as this resolution states, is indeed a universally sought-after goal.

You know, Madam Speaker, we should not be totally disheartened with the conditions of the world. In a major way, we have affected the peace in many areas that saw conflict before. The major powers have not been at war. Europe has not been at war. We, in North America, have not been at war, involved in war, since the last World War. I certainly am prepared to acknowledge that organizations such as the United Nations, which is no stronger or weaker than the weaknesses and strengths that member states bring to it, but nonetheless, that organization has contributed a great deal to the maintenance of that peace on a major scale. For that reason, I think the initiative taken by the United Nations organization supported by Canada, as a member state, is deserving of the full support that this Assembly can give it.

But you know, Madam Speaker, as much as we talk about the desirability of peace, peace, nonetheless, remains a relative term. There are times when causes, conditions, sometimes become more important than the maintenance of peace.

Madam Speaker, this House has, just in the last few days, taken certain action in recognition of the tensions, of the conflicts that are currently going on in South Africa. I have alluded earlier to the conflict that is going on in Afghanistan and, Madam Speaker, I believe that you can refer to what is going on in South Africa as a country that's on the brink of civil war. We genuinely hope that that will not occur. But if it does occur, Madam Speaker, would there be anybody in this Chamber who would chastise responsible leaders, church leaders, who are currently being incarcerated and who, in fact, are dying for the cause of freedom and for liberty for the majority of the people of South Africa? We, Madam Speaker, certainly would not be passing any resolution chastising them for breaking the peace because, we, Madam Speaker, have an empathy for what is going on in South Africa, those of us who enjoy freedom and liberty.

Madam Speaker, it could be said that Europe enjoyed peace during the years 1940 and 1944. I'm speaking of mainland Europe. But would any one of us for a moment hold that peace with any high regard? Madam Speaker, it was the people of Europe who waited for another march, and they waited for the footsteps of those marchers, and those marchers came; but they came with guns, they came with planes and they came with bombs to liberate Europe from a peace that they did not want. Canada certainly played its role and participated in that liberation.

To single out a particular country that still remembers and remembers every year, the country of Holland, where Canadian troops, in particular, had a role to play. Now, Madam Speaker, in 1941, 1942, Holland was at peace. Belgium was at peace. France was at peace. But peace, Madam Speaker, without the words that I mentioned, without the word "freedom," without the words "individual liberty" and certainly without the rights, those basic human rights that we tend to take so for granted in this country. Those rights that are now being sought by the vast majority of people in South Africa.

So, Madam Speaker, I feel very strongly about the fact that our present generation who rightfully — and

one could not in any way argue with their legitimate concerns about peace. Technology has moved us a horrendous step forward in mankind's ability to create war and to create destruction. But, Madam Speaker, I would think it would be entirely appropriate to ask the same 8,000 marchers or more, who marched last Saturday, to march on Remembrance Day, so we all remember that it is for the reason that others died and contributed to the peace that we now talk about whether it is in resolution form or on our placards as we march down Memorial Boulevard or Portage Avenue.

You know, Madam Speaker, we, in our group, and in other groups, in our leisure moments enjoy a little sing song from time to time. A song we often like to sing "Battle Hymn of the Republic" contains a particular line that I sometimes think is trivialized, but for me is always taken very seriously. It makes references to My Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ's mission on earth when he was here, when the line says: As He died to make men holy, let us live to make men free. Well, Madam Speaker, I take that line very seriously whenever I hear it. I believe that is our biggest calling. That is my personal calling. That is my reason for being in this Chamber, to do, to work and to keep men free, thank God, in this country of Canada. I do not have to fight because others have fought for me, Madam Speaker.

But certainly my greatest responsibility, our greatest responsibility ought to be the maintenance of those freedoms and of those liberties in this country, just as I have some understanding for the Desmond Tutu's and others who are attempting to bring about some of those qualities, some of those rights, some of those freedoms to the majority of people of South Africa.

Madam Speaker, today, people are dying in South Africa so those who live might be free. And, as I said earlier, if that conflict should get more serious, nobody will be suggesting in this House a resolution should be passed to stop the conflict.

Nobody is suggesting that the Americans were wrong, Madam Speaker, that a century ago they fought one of the most vicious wars ever known to mankind in which more soldiers, more people lost their lives than in the two succeeding world wars on the American part.

Why did they die and what was the conflict over? Freedom and basic human rights, recognition of the dignity of man, no matter what the colour of his skin.

Madam Speaker, not to detract for a moment from the resolution, but we do ourselves no service when we speak of peace in isolation of those very things that make peace worthwhile and make life worthwhile on this planet Earth.

I regret that 8,000 marchers could not be marching on the streets of Moscow last Saturday. I regret that the dissident movement, the peace movement is virtually all incarcerated in so many countries of the world that have not maintained, have not been vigilant enough to secure the freedom for their people that we have and that we enjoy in the Western democracies, with all our faults and with all our shortcomings.

So, Madam Speaker, in supporting this resolution my purpose was to put firmly on the record our concern that peace is a commodity highly prized and most desirable. But peace can become an euphemism, a meaningless phrase, a meaningless bit of sloganeering, if you don't attach individual liberty, if you don't attach freedom and basic human rights to it.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. J. MALOWAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I am pleased to, for the second time this Session, follow the Honourable Member for Lakeside and once again, he has given a very eloquent address and I'm glad to see him on-side this time in the debate. I hope he follows through and does support this resolution, when passed.

Madam Speaker, the present stalemates in arms of reduction talks and continued superpower policies which result in continued buildup of nuclear weapons, underscores the need for active support for peace activism. In order to maintain a stable and long-lasting world peace there must be a constant vigil on the part of people all over the world.

Manitoba took the lead last year with its Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Resolution, and this resolution sends a message to all that we, in Manitoba, reject the premise that military buildups assist in sustaining peace.

This resolution, the Member for Thompson's resolution, further states Manitoba's position and reaffirms that the people of Manitoba are committed to peace.

It's mind-boggling to recount the number of nuclear weapons presently available by all sides. The destructive power of these weapons is widely known. We, in fact, can destroy the entire world many times over.

An often misperspective is the drain of resources the arms buildup presents. We often hear claims that the militarization of the economy has a stimulus effect because they create high-tech jobs and create employment in manufacturing industries. In reality, however, it is very much to the contrary.

Military spending, in general, and spending on nuclear arms in particular, is a silent partner in the inflationary spiral. Although arms development and production produces spendable income, it produces no usable products available to the civilian market. It draws off capital needed for civilian investment. We have people starving. We have people living in poverty and we are producing weapons and it makes no sense at all.

Military spending is totally misplaced. According to available figures from Project Plowshares, and I believe the Member for Thompson dealt with this issue, world military expenditures averaged \$19,300 per soldier. Public education, on the other hand, expenditures totalled \$380 per school-aged child. Quite a difference.

In the global population there are 556 soldiers and 85 physicians per 100,000 people. European and American budgets provide \$45 per capita for military research and only \$11 per capita for health research.

Furthermore, military spending costs jobs; it really doesn't create them. According to a United Nations study, modern nuclear weapons are technology intensive and not labour intensive. The result is that most jobs created are for the few highly-skilled engineers and scientists, not regular workers. Also, such a drain in science deprives civilian industries of needed scientists to work on civilian discoveries.

You heard the Member for Thompson quote the late Olof Palme's statements in this regard and I needn't

repeat it. But it's very clear that the whole world system on all sides is upside down. The militarization is, in fact, growing when we are trying to wind it down.

Rather than perpetrating the drain of resources on military activity, they should be rechannelled. Rather than continuing research and production of weapons, workers and scientists should be transferred to areas such as development, production, and installation of new, cleaner and safer energy technologies, such as solar systems.

These trained people could work in areas to enhance our environment, our natural and social services, our housing and urban development, and transportation systems. All these endeavours are much more productive and socially more useful. Thus, rather than supporting research and development activities which promote war, we should use our political will to promote peace and social development.

This resolution calls for support of the United Nations declaration that 1986 be the International Year of Peace. Even though it's been some 40 years since the world has been engaged actively in a world war, there are numerous conflicts and military interventions throughout the world. The Member for Lakeside alluded to a couple of areas.

Military activities are ongoing in the Middle East, Southeast Asia, Latin America, and Africa. Whether these be declared wars or not, they represent collectively a threat to world peace. The involvement of the superpowers, either overtly or covertly, intensifies the instability and further threatens world security.

Now some may argue that a resolution in support of peace passed by this Legislature, will not in itself bring about sustained world peace, and that may well be. But someone has to take a stand and it's us, we people in this Legislature, by debating this resolution and passing it, who are doing a little bit to help out. A journey begins with the first step and we have to march, we have to sign petitions, and we have to engage in other activities that are helping to at least stop the arms race.

We're sending a message that Manitobans do not support the arms race. We're sending a message that Manitobans don't support the drain of available research into military activities. We're sending a message that through the combined efforts of governments and citizens throughout the world, we can re-order our priorities. Peace and activities which promote peace, ought to be our priority. That is the message in this resolution.

Thank you very much.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: I relish the opportunity that is afforded us to put on the record our concerns about the need for a greater and a more understanding and loving, peaceful society.

Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside quite rightly alluded to a number of historical facts and indicated his concern that in a peaceful world, we must emphasize the need for civil liberty, human rights, freedom of expression. With all of that, no one can disagree.

But, Madam Speaker, I am concerned to reflect on history as well. We've seen, in the lifetime of modern civilization, enormous numbers of people who have gone to an early death for causes which were rather nebulous. We've seen a vast destruction of human life, resources, and we can't specifically measure the gain to society.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside referred to the great — I shouldn't use the term great — that horrible Civil War that occurred in the United States of America, and quite rightly alluded to the devastation that occurred in that terrible war, but the focus wasn't just on freedom, the freedom of black people in America; the concern was political power and the rights of the South as against the North in respect to material and economic prosperity and independence in respect to the development of their jurisdictions.

While the people in the United States saw that great loss of human life and that terrible destruction, it didn't mean that after the Civil War black people were free in America. Martin Luther King, Jr. and many others in the United States testified to the relative lack of freedom that black people had in the United States for many, many years following the Civil War.

Sure, we can look around the world and see areas that are at peace, but when men, women and children are dying of hunger, when men, women and children cannot read or write, when they have no clothing on their backs, no shelter, they may have freedom in one sense; but do they have true freedom where they can express their personality and live in dignity as should be the aspiration of every living soul on this planet?

The answer certainly is no, Madam Speaker. And why should that be? It appears that it is because we, who have the opportunity to develop systems and programs, have failed in doing that, to liberate our brothers and sisters throughout the world from those enslavements. To think that so many millions of people, but for the grace of God we be, live from day to day in the terror and fear of malnutrition, sickness, starvation, illiteracy, while we, in this sophisticated computer technology era, continue to fund \$800 billion on armaments to destroy.

The irony of modern civilization, Madam Speaker, is completely frustrating that with all of the ability we have, we divert so much to systems that are not designed to enhance and uplift but to destroy. We do live in a mad world. Mad, I say purposely, because at the present time that is the system by which we live — mutual-assured destruction — a fantastic array of weaponry and explosive power on either side of the philosophical fence that divides countries in the world, 20 times-over sufficient power to destroy us all. But now people in this world — prominent people — are talking about well, we'd be able to survive a nuclear onslaught; this kind of tough, Rambo-like attitude that well, we can go in and we can overcome.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside said that since the two great wars, North America has been spared major involvement. How quickly we forget the young men of Canada — young men and women — and of the United States whose lives were wasted in Korea, and so many Americans in Vietnam. For what cause, for what lasting benefit to the world? We were told that this communism that was developing in China, that had developed in the Soviet Union, that had existence in France and in Italy and elsewhere, was going to sweep

over the world, that all of the little countries in the Far East would fall like dominoes when that great philosophic, economic power of communism took over.

For decades the United States of America did not deem to recognize that that great country of China existed, but through a little thing, an exchange of ping-pong players, finally some discourse was developed, some opening for understanding, and finally there was a breaking down of that barrier and today anyone in Canada or the United States will tell you that despite the fact that the People's Republic of China says it's a communist nation, that that is a land of opportunity because they are prepared to look at new ways to help their people. The ideologies have changed.

Surely, Madam Speaker, that is what we need in the world today. I'm not talking about more ping-pong, but more willingness to talk and exchange and appreciate the differences that exist in the world rather than the idea of isolationism or blind opposition. We have to say to ourselves, Madam Speaker: why do people fight one another? As the Honourable Member for Lakeside talked about the horror of the onslaught, the terrible waste of human life, the tragedy that existed between Iraq and Iran, why is it? It's hard for us to understand.

I suggest that most, if not all, of the terrible wars that have been experienced in our civilization have at their roots intolerance, bigotry and ignorance, Madam Speaker, an inability of people to accept that there is another point of view that may have legitimacy.

Madam Speaker, we live in an era where we have tremendous potential for good. As the Honourable Member for Thompson indicated, just think of the utilization of that enormous wealth that we are pouring out for arms, and think of it diverted to the uplifting of people throughout the world. What a fantastic world this would be.

So when this resolution speaks about the International Year of Peace, each one of us should consider, yes, it is possible that individuals speaking up in society, that Legislatures speaking up in this world can count — and I know honourable members can look in the pages of history for individuals who stood out and spoke up and took a path that others hadn't taken, and they were successful in bringing enormous numbers of people great joy and happiness and lasting economic benefit.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside referred to Jesus of Nazareth. Earlier, I had referred to Martin Luther King. One could look throughout history at Mahatma Gandhi. One could look southerly to the United States and, as I have recently in some of my speeches I've made in this Chamber, and reflected on some of the words of people like Dwight Eisenhower, whose concern when he was leaving the presidency was for his beloved United States, and his concern about the growing dominance of power of the military industrial complex in the United States that had started to influence and dominate the decision-making in the United States.

There are vested interests in society, Madam Speaker, not just in the United States, but in Canada, in France, in Israel, in England that are involved in the production of arms, and there's a lot of money to be made in that industry. It's an age-old industry. Madam Speaker, these people want to see a continuation of tension throughout the world, because they can sell arms. They can sell

devices for destruction. What we as a society have to do is say, look, our priorities have to be for peace. Let's start channelling our resources to uplift people and not destroy human life.

So the opportunity is ours as individuals to stand up and be counted, and urge that there be sanity in this troubled world, that there be an end to intolerance and hate, and the development of love and understanding, human compassion. Then we can all hope to see a peaceful world one day.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, thank you for this opportunity.

This is a subject which I cannot resist to share my thoughts, because of the importance of the basic questions that the Member for Lakeside asks and the Minister of Labour asks. The Minister of Labour asks, why do people fight one another. I'd like to address that question, Madam Speaker.

I think the answer is obvious. People fight one another because of the scarcity of the things that they treasure in life, scarcity of material things, resources and other values that people consider important in life. Because of the inherent tendency in human nature to claim for one's self these things, there is conflict between individuals and between groups in our society.

People, therefore, struggle for power and all that power will bring like wealth, honour, glory, recognition. They will involve not only themselves but even innocent people, because in the name of nationalism many thousands and millions of lives have been spoiled, and they themselves without knowing why they are shooting their fellowmen.

When we begin to invent weapons beyond our arms, we increase the scope of human misery. People used to fight with their hands, and obviously you can only reach your enemy when he is near. When we invented the bow and the arrow, you extend the effect of your aggression beyond the reach of your arm. When we invented firearms and the gun, we can bring that a further distance. The worst has come now when we have invented the intercontinental ballistic missile and the strategic delivery vehicle system, the multiple independent target double re-entry vehicle system. Then we have come full circle. We are endangering humanity itself. So it is a time now for meditation as to how far

we have gone in our struggle, in our desire to accumulate for ourselves the things that power brings.

I'd like to answer the next question. How can we stop this madness or this struggle among human beings? There is an example that the world has seen, and it's in my home country in the Philippines. There was all the indicia of a bloody struggle but, when people have learned that cooperation is better than competition, when people have appreciated the fact that dialogue is better than confrontation, then there is a miracle that happens. Instead of seeing a bloody revolution, we have seen the transformation of a society from a potentially death-like struggle into one of peaceful transition to a new democratic regime.

It is like the phoenix after it is born into the ashes, it rises again from its ashes to show to the world that democracy can be achieved other than by means of the forces of war. Democracy can still be possible if we have learned how to communicate with one another, if we develop goodwill, tolerance for one another, if we have understanding, sincerity and truth in our hearts when we find and seek out those methods to have some solution to our conflicts and to our struggle.

If we want more peace in the world, then we should start with ourselves. We should fill our hearts with brotherhood, spirit of brotherhood, spirit of goodwill, spirit of tolerance with one another, spirit of truth and sincerity and understanding. We should begin right here in the very Chamber where people are watching us and people in this province are hearing us that we should be more tolerant of one another. When we have forgotten common modesty and honesty with one another, then we begin to endanger the world, not only ourselves.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Madam Speaker, I wanted to speak on this particular resolution but, in view of the time, there may be a desire to call it 5:30. It is pretty well that time now anyway.

MADAM SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, the resolution will stand in the name of the Honourable Minister of the Environment.

I am leaving the Chair with the understanding that the House will reconvene at 8:00 p.m. in the Committee of Supply.