



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-6048

VOL. XXXI No. 24 - 10:00 a.m., FRIDAY, 11 MARCH, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 11 March, 1983.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to inform the House today of major changes in our system of deciding capital expenditures for school divisions.

Before getting into the "meat" of my remarks, I wish to thank representatives of the major educational organizations; the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, the Manitoba Teachers' Society, the Association of School Superintendents and the Association of School Business Officials. Each has had a consultative role in arriving at this new system. Each has pressed for changes in the past.

First, I wish to inform you, Mr. Speaker, of our intent to gather information from across the province, in cooperation with school divisions, through two surveys. The first survey will be an inventory of school facilities in the province as they exist today. I am told that such a survey has never been undertaken. It will be a major tool in our planning to have an overall, province-wide view of the condition of our various facilities.

The second part of the survey will document the needs which school divisions have projected for the next five years. This part of the survey will include, not only proposals for new buildings, but proposals for major renovations as well.

When all this material is compiled, Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to further consult, not only with representatives of the educational community, but with parents as well, to determine a set of priorities.

Requests from school divisions to the Public Schools Finance Board will be considered in relationship to these priority guidelines.

I want to assure this House and the divisions that this new system will not lock them in to only those projects which they can identify at this time. We recognize the fact that conditions and needs change. Divisions will be free to bring new projects forward for our consideration at any time.

In addition, the information that we gather through the surveys will be of use to school divisions since it will be stored by computer and updated from time to time. Divisions may use our data in their own capital needs planning. They will also be able to work more closely with neighbouring divisions in planning joint use of facilities. This could be extremely cost-effective during this time of declining enrolments.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are changing the system in a way which will strengthen the abilities of school

divisions to maintain their facilities at a high level. Rather than have the Public Schools Finance Board review all minor capital expenditures for divisions we will give grants directly to divisions for minor capital expenditures and allow them to decide how to best spend the money. To give direction, we will supply the divisions with a master list of suitable minor capital projects which these grants can be used towards; but again, let me emphasize our willingness to be flexible. Divisions will be permitted to save unspent portions of these grants from year to year to put towards planned maintenance or renovation projects.

This spring it is our intention to provide the divisions with about \$3 million in minor capital grants. This is an amount similar to what would normally be provided from the Public Schools Finance Board and does not represent an additional expenditure to government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

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

We thank the Minister for giving us that announcement. At first glance there doesn't appear to be a great deal in terms of new initiative but certainly if the survey which she has undertaken to go forth with is of use, if it's of help, then certainly we would support that endeavor.

It strikes me that some of the initiatives that the Minister has announced sound a bit like block funding, a move that members opposite were quite critical of under circumstances in the past, so perhaps they have seen the light, or perhaps they have taken a different view on that type of approach, and we're certainly anxious to see the results of it. There's no doubt that over the past while, due to changing population demographics, due to shifts in population, we've seen many unusual circumstances take place within the public school system, whereby we are closing down functionally useful buildings at the same time as we're building completely new edifices for the same purpose in different areas. So certainly rationalization and looking at the manner of dealing with these things in future is something that must be done by any government in power, because it's going to be an even greater necessity in the future to deal with these things.

There has been criticism in the past, as the Minister well knows, of the planning and decision-making, particularly when the decision-making has had some political overtones to it, or some ministerial intervention, and so I would hope that this particular initiative will produce something that will avoid that kind of thing in future.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the

gallery. We have 50 students of Grade 11 standing from the Churchill High School under the direction of Mr. Sabeski. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

There are also 23 students of Grade 5 standing from St. Alphonsus School. The students are under the direction of Ms. Dziedzic. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Constitutional Conference re Native people

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. Next week he will be attending a Constitutional Conference with respect to Native people and their role in the constitutional process of Canada.

During the past several days we have seen, in the papers, reports by a number of Chiefs of Indian Bands in Manitoba as well as some indications, if not from Manitoba certainly from elsewhere, that people of Metis extraction are boycotting the conference in question. My question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, is could the First Minister tell us how many representatives of Native people will be part of the Manitoba delegation meeting in Ottawa next week; in other words, what proportion of the Native population of Manitoba will be represented at that meeting? Will it be 50 percent, 80 percent, 20 percent, or what?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition wishes precise information, I can obtain that and communicate to him the names and organizations that will be participating in the Manitoba delegation. It will certainly represent a large majority of the Indian and Metis people in the Province of Manitoba.

I believe there are eight, nine bands that have disassociated themselves from the Assembly of First Nations' position that will not be participating in any way, shape, or form in the conference. Outside of that, the Indian people in the province will be represented by the Assembly of First Nations and, of course, those that will be participating in our own delegation. Insofar as the Metis is concerned, there will be participation in the Manitoba group of Metis representation. I could get to the Leader of the Opposition more precise detail as to the makeup of the delegation.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the First Minister for that offer, and I am sure that at the meeting itself the names of the chiefs, and so on, will become apparent. I assure him, I'm not so much interested in the precise figure as I am to find out if he is satisfied, as he has indicated here this morning, that the majority of the Native people of Manitoba will be represented at the meeting, participating as active representatives on behalf of their band members, and if he is giving that assurance, that really answers my question.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in fact, I have more detailed information. The Manitoba Assembly of Chiefs Constitutional Committee - five seats will be rotated amongst chiefs that will be representing the Indian people of the Province of Manitoba, with the exception of the eight bands that have declared their disagreement with provincial involvement in the conference. Also, there will be seats conditionally reserved for Manitoba Metis Federation delegates, and I have the list of some four Metis Federation delegates, which includes their president and other - their chairman of their constitutional committee, Mr. Guiboche.

Adoption Moratorium

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable First Minister, and I would preface it, Sir, by saying that once again I am directing the question to him, because the Minister of Community Services is not available apparently to answer questions in question period this week. I would ask the First Minister whether he has any response to my question yesterday, having to do with the claims made by Betty Schwartz, the Executive Director of the Winnipeg Children's Aid Society, that a number of children in the adoption stream now require psychiatric treatment because of the emotional impact on them of the delay imposed on their adoptions through the moratorium imposed by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, all that I can say to the Member for Fort Garry - I don't have as much information as you would like - but I have spoken to the department. Mr. Evans is in Brandon and will be returning Monday to deal with this question in more detail.

There has not been any previous quantitative report or complaint of that nature from Betty Schwartz of the Children's Aid Society, according to the information that I have received; and certainly I point out to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that has to be balanced against the report that was issued yesterday by the Canadian Planning Council that, indeed, the present process that exists in so many parts of Canada of children being adopted in a cross-cultural way from Indian to non-Indian homes, causes serious psychological damage, mental damage, insofar as those children are concerned in many, many cases.

My information is that there has not been specific filing of grievances along those lines from the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg with the department.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I accept the Minister's assessment of the process up to this point in time insofar as this question is concerned, but I would ask him whether he would not consider that his Minister of Community Services should consider that the claims made by the Executive Director of the Winnipeg Children's Aid Society, a person of high repute and standing in this field, bear on a matter of urgent and

critical human importance, and that they should be investigated immediately; and, that if the Minister of Community Services is not in Winnipeg, if he is in Brandon, he should be on the telephone in communication from Brandon with the First Minister in order to answer questions in this House about a matter of urgent, human importance heading into a weekend.

Would the First Minister not agree with that, Mr. Speaker?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, what does puzzle me, from the information which I have received personally, is that there has been no grievances of that nature brought to the attention of the department by one, Betty Schwartz of the Winnipeg Children's Aid Society. If the honourable member is referring to some comments that Mrs. Schwartz made on the open-line program yesterday, then certainly they will be investigated. But if they are of the nature that the member has made reference to, and if they are of the nature as described, I would have thought that Mrs. Schwartz would have brought those grievances, those complaints, to the department not just days ago, but weeks and months ago.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Mrs. Schwartz said essentially the same thing in a profile interview with the Winnipeg Sun some three months ago - it appeared some time in December - and then repeated them on an open-line show yesterday, and in view of the fact that there have been several complaints by agencies in the community that they have not been able to sit down face-to-face with the Minister of Community Services on questions of this nature, would the First Minister . . . — (Interjection) —

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I know the Honourable Member for Fort Garry does not like to accept the fact that a short preamble is allowed to the first question. — (Interjection) — Well, if the honourable members believe in law and order and rule-making, then surely they should want to uphold the rules of this House. The rules are clear, Mr. Speaker, a short preamble to the first question. There is no preamble allowed to supplementary questions. Now, the honourable member made a fairly lengthy preamble to his first question. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: He is asking supplementary questions and prefacing them with long preambles. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked the questions in the proper way. There is something that should be learned by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry in placing questions. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to repeat the rule to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, continue to repeat the rule until he finally understands it and accepts it.

HON. S. LYON: I'm going to check Hansard. If you say I'm right, I must be wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry to the same point of order.

MR. L. SHERMAN: To the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Acting or Deputy Government House Leader ignores the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister in responding to my question introduced a different aspect into the subject nature under discussion. The First Minister suggested to the House that there had been no complaints of this nature related to the issue that I raised that had been filed with the Department of Community Services or the Minister of Community Services that that difficulty had not been brought to the Minister's attention. I'm speaking to the point of order raised by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Speaker. His point of order was that there are no preambles permitted on supplementary questions. My response to that point of order, Sir, is that the supplementary question really had to do with a new subject matter, with a new item that had been brought into the discussion by the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister to the same point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the charges that had been levelled are of a nature that warrant investigation. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am responding to the question that the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I think we have not yet dealt with the point of order. If no one else wishes to speak to it, may I draw the attention of members again to Citation 359(2), which says the question must be brief. A preamble need not exceed one carefully drawn sentence. A long preamble on a long question takes an unfair share of time and provokes the same sort of reply. A supplementary question should need no preamble. I don't see too much breach of that except for the length of a few questions that have come up in this House.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd Adoption Moratorium Cont'd

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister, following along the questions from my colleague, the Member for Fort Garry. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that both he and I have been pressing the Minister of Community Services to act in the best interest of these children since the day the moratorium was announced; and in view of the fact that on June 10 in the Winnipeg Free Press, Colette Goerwell, CAS Director of Children's Services talked about the number of babies who had to be placed in foster homes because there was not one Native home on the registry; on June 11 in the Winnipeg Sun, Chris Buchel of the CAS

Adoption Department said we're forgetting about the child; on December 12th in the Winnipeg Sun, Betty Schwartz, the Executive Director of Children's Aid Society and I questioned the Minister at that time, said how long is the government prepared to wait? It's now almost a year and these children will never . . .

POINT OF ORDER

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

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the point of order I raised is that the honourable member heard the Speaker read Rule No. 395. Very clearly, the preamble to the question must be brief. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition set a good example in the questions he put to the First Minister and it's not often, Mr. Speaker, that I draw attention to that. But surely the aspirants to take his position should learn something from at least the manner in which he puts questions in this House. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry was not giving a brief preamble to a question, he was making an extensive speech and then was going to tag on a question at the end - clearly out of order, Mr. Speaker, and I want you to advise the honourable member accordingly. — (Interjection) —

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

In addition to the previous citation that I read to members, I would direct their attention to Citation 362 which says, "The reading of telegrams, letters or extracts from newspapers as an opening to an oral question is an abuse of the rules of the House. I know that members have made short quotations from newspapers in the past, but it's clearly something that should not be abused by members and I would ask the honourable member not to make lengthy preambles to questions.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

Adoption Moratorium Cont'd

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in the light of all of the concerns that have been expressed over the past year, and in light of the reiteration of these concerns today and yesterday by Mrs. Betty Schwartz, would the First Minister, in the best interest of these children, summon his Minister from Brandon today to investigate this matter immediately and ensure that these children are well cared for?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is an issue, as we indicated right from the very beginning, when Judge Kimelman was charged with the responsibility of investigating the question of Native adoption, is a

complex one. I need not remind members across the way that there have been allegations that have been made and have been repeated by the Native community and by others in the community including the report yesterday by, I believe it was, the Canadian Planning Council that many young Native children are psychologically and mentally affected by the cross cultural adoption situation that exists. According to that report yesterday in other parts of the country, a crippling and mental crippling often takes place on a life-time basis. There are other charges that we are hearing by way of the media from Betty Schwartz about the mental difficulties that this creates for Native children whose adoption process has been held up.

So, Mr. Speaker, you can ascertain that it is a complex issue. It is for that reason that Judge Kimelman was charged with the responsibility - look forward to his report.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment that the Minister of Community Services is not one to close his door on any group wishing to meet with him. His door is an open door to all groups within Manitoba and there need be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, in respect to that, whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the seriousness of the allegations, I've requested the department to investigate the complaints. Their response to me upon putting it to the departments yesterday is that they were somewhat surprised because they had not received quantitative complaints from the person who was making these complaints by way of the open-line program. So that, Mr. Speaker, rather than us jumping to what may be hasty and irresponsible conclusions within this Chamber, I think (a) we should wait the investigation of the department; (b) we should ascertain what Judge Kimelman, who has been working and is well respected within the community, ought to be given his opportunity to bring forth his recommendations on this very very complex matter that requires special expertise to ensure that there is proper determination made in regard to the issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a different question, not a supplementary. I was going to rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and ask you whether you didn't think that the Government House Leader was bullying the Member for Fort Garry, earlier.

In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister assured us again yesterday that a decision on the moratorium would be made as soon as Judge Kimelman brought in his report, I would ask the First Minister whether he can advise the House at this juncture, after some 10 months of investigation and after having an additional assignment loaded upon Judge Kimelman's shoulders with another review requested of him just the other day, when may we expect the report on out-of-province adoptions?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for Fort Garry for that question because it is important that we receive the report from Judge Kimelman. The reason that there has been nine months

pass by, though, does indicate the complexity of the issue that is confronting Judge Kimelman. Obviously, if it was an easy and simple answer to this complex issue, Judge Kimelman would not have taken 10 months up to this point in preparing his conclusions. Mr. Speaker, I trust and expect that report will be made shortly so that government will be aware of the recommendations that are made. I, in fact, yesterday asked that the department attempt to ascertain when we might receive the report.

A MEMBER: It's the children that are important.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable First Minister for that information, but I would also then like to ask him why Judge Kimelman would have been assigned another review, another investigation, if the complexity of this issue is as profound and as deep as the First Minister suggests. I agree that it's a very complex issue. Why then was another review loaded onto Judge Kimelman's shoulders?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it is a matter of time pertaining to Judge Kimelman. It's a question of obtaining all the necessary information from all the different authorities and all the different individuals and groups that are interested and concerned about the issue that is involved.

MR. L. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, so that we may sleep safely and comfortably in our beds this weekend, and those who are concerned for these children might do so. May we expect, on Monday or at the earliest possible opportunity next week, a report to this House from the Minister of Community Services, the Minister responsible, or failing him, from the First Minister as to the investigation into the serious claims and allegations made by Betty Schwartz.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I thought I had already indicated that the Minister will be responding to these questions. Indeed, I took most of the questions as notice on behalf of the Minister.

Job Creation Projects re unemployed

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the number of claimants year over year in the Parkland Division for unemployment insurance claims has risen by well over 60 percent, can the Minister of Labour indicate what specific job creation projects the Parkland region of this province can expect her to announce now to help alleviate the unemployment problem in the Parkland region?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: We are quite aware that there are pockets of unemployment in this province that are higher than in other areas. We intend, through our job creation efforts, to target the areas with the highest

unemployment with projects specific for those areas, and those will be announced in those areas in due course.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Parkland region is by no means the area in which the highest number of claimants are presently on unemployment insurance but, Mr. Speaker, how much longer, I ask the Minister, are Manitobans who are unemployed and expecting relief from this government with its much touted effort on job creation, how much longer must those unemployed Manitobans wait upon this government and this Minister to provide them with some specific projects as promised, as committed? How much longer must they wait on the unemployment rolls, Mr. Speaker?

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that was a question, but I want to assure the member that this area of job creation has obviously been set by us as our highest priority this year. We have the mechanisms under way and we will be announcing projects in due course. We will obviously not announce all of the projects on the same day, because we must carefully look at the target populations, the target regions of the province, and the projects that are being proposed. We will announce them as they are approved and as they meet the needs that are perceived by the population of this province, one which has just been identified by the member.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the First Minister.

I believe the First Minister indicated this week that the Job Creation Committee was meeting. Can we expect an announcement of a specific project from that meeting, from the First Minister in the failure of his Minister of Labour to do so, just one project?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, our Minister of Labour is a very industrious person and she doesn't fail to do that which is expected of her. Mr. Speaker, there will be an announcement before the day is out.

Bill No. 12 - distribution

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, last December, the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources introduced a bill, I believe Bill No. 12, regarding water management. The bill has yet to be distributed. I am wondering, could he indicate to me and to the House when he intends to distribute that bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, it should be soon. My department is checking the printing, making sure that everything is in order. As soon as that process is complete, and it's a fairly substantial bill, it will be distributed.

Job Creation Projects re unemployed

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Labour, following up on the similar questioning from my colleague for Pembina.

In view of the fact that the latest Labour Force Survey shows an increase of 92.6 percent in unemployed insurance claims in Northern Manitoba between January, 1982, and January of 1983, will the Minister tell us what specific job creation programs are being put in place for the people of the North, relative to this government's much touted job creation program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, if the member wants a listing of this, of current job creation programs, we can certainly give them. I have been criticized in this House for reading out such statistics, so I would be happy to provide him with the information if he wishes.

There are a number of programs that were put in place this past year, the Northern Employment Program. There were several under my auspices and some under the Minister of Northern Affairs' auspices. They were out of our 1982-83 expenditures. We will be continuing a number of these programs. We will be having new incentives in the north. We realize that the north is obviously our area of highest unemployment - it always has been. We intend to do something about that though.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the Minister of Labour. She indicated that several job creation projects have been introduced during the last year. The figures show that there's some 92 percent more unemployment now than there was a year ago. What specific jobs are being put in place that will reduce this figure?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think we have already clarified that starting today we will be making announcements about new initiatives. There were a number of items mentioned in the Budget Address. Some of these initiatives will be targeted into the various areas of the province where the highest unemployment exists, the north is one of those. You will be hearing announcements.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, given the information that the Minister of Labour has just advised the House about an impending announcement, can we have her assurance, Sir, that this House will have the courtesy of hearing the announcement before the press?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, we intend to make these announcements to those people who are most involved, the people who are concerned with that particular target area. We hope to be going around the province making these announcements, in the north and Parklands region, and various other parts of the province.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, can I ask the First Minister if he would not perhaps prevail upon the Minister of Labour and advise her of some of the traditions of the House, when the House is in Session, that announcements of importance should be made in this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the general announcement pertaining to the Job Creation Fund and the criteria to be established was made in this House, as indeed it was proper to do. That announcement was made here. Mr. Speaker, I must say to the Leader of the Opposition, I know of no practice, by which every specific allocation from that fund would be first announced in this Chamber. There are obviously interested groups that will benefit, as a result of the allocation of those funds, and those announcements will be made to those groups, Mr. Speaker.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the First Minister that details are not announcements that need be made in the House, but the Minister of Labour was indicating to us, Sir, that what she was to announce, in response to the question from the Member for Swan River, was of importance. My question to the First Minister is, if it's of sufficient importance to preview it in the Legislature, surely the Legislature is entitled to hear it.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I recall all previous precedent announcements pertaining to allocation from Jobs Fund are made to the interested parties. Certainly that was always the case with the Provincial Employment Program, when sums of money were allocated to a community group, or to another group, each and every single announcement regarding an individual group was not made first in the Chamber. The same with Main Street Manitoba; the same, I believe, with different programs that the Manitoba Enterprise Program and other programs, pertaining to grants that were made, in each individual case, were not made in the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the general guidelines of the Job Creation Program have been announced in this House, the criteria that is to be established, but Mr. Speaker, we're not going to get up each and every time, of what will probably be scores and scores of times — (Interjection) — to announce first in this Chamber, we are providing "X" program to help "Y" community.

Wild Rice - legislation

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. Could the Minister indicate whether he is anticipating tabling

legislation regarding the wild rice industry in Manitoba in this Session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, could the Minister indicate who is the director that is responsible for the wild rice industry in Manitoba at this time and who will be working with the drafting of the legislation?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, Legislative legal counsel, the Attorney-General's Department, of course, involved in the drafting of the legislation; staff of the Department of Natural Resources are involved, in advising as to the makeup of the legislation. I wouldn't want to honour or slight anyone in the department. There are a number of people working on that proposal.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Does he have a director who is responsible for the wild rice industry in Manitoba at the present time?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, we have a number of people in the department, of course, who monitor the progress of the industry.

A MEMBER: Who's in charge? Who's the director?

HON. A. MACKLING: The responsibility stops with the Minister, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Minister, of course, is advised on it.

We have one person in the department designated to have overall responsibility with initiatives there and that's Mr. Mike Thorvaldson. I don't know whether I could call him a director, because if I call him a director, it may cost the public a little bit more money. I don't know what his proper title is, but he is one of the people within the department, that has been given lead responsibility in respect to the development of this legislation. One of them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: On a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and I don't really care where the responsibility stops, it is where it starts, and if people are concerned about the upcoming industry this year, who would they be contacting?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, those persons who are interested in the development of The Wild Rice Act, obviously will contact the Minister of the department, and I want to know what their views are, and I've been hearing the views of a great many people who are interested in this industry in Manitoba.

MACC - interest rates

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other day the Member for Emerson raised a question

concerning interest rates and files of clients, dealing with MACC.

I'd like to advise him, in general terms, the interest rates have been revised and the specific matters that are referred to, are now presently in legal hands and it should be a short period of time. But knowing when papers get into lawyer's hands, it does take some time to finalize the preparation of those documents for the interest rates that have been revised by MACC.

Single mothers' employment program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: To the Minister of Community Services, or the Acting Minister, or the First Minister, in view of the fact that the Minister of Community Services has cut funding for what was a worthwhile and very successful program to employ single mothers; my question is, is this an example of this government's reprioritization?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, probably I should inform the honourable member that her nature of questioning, in relation to this, would be much more fruitfully dealt with during Estimates review. Dealing with a particular program and asking whether or not it demonstrated some approach or other is suitable fodder for discussion during the Estimates review.

Manitoba Youth Employment Program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Labour. I would ask her, in light of the record high unemployment among young people in this province, and in light of the bleak outlook for jobs for university students as well as school students, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House when she will be announcing the Manitoba Youth Employment Program.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Or do you have one?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, we will be making that announcement very shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, since many of the employers and many students will be looking for jobs very shortly, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether or not the criteria with regard to that program will be expanded, so that employers who are employing more than 10 people will also be eligible for this program.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of employment projects targeting young people. All of those will be announced in due course and the criteria will of course be announced with them.

Gasoline Consumption - Province of Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister in charge of Mines. I wonder if he could tell the House whether or not the gasoline consumption in the Province of Manitoba dropped something between the percentage points of 9 to 10 percent last year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice. I know there has been a drop in gasoline consumption between '79-81, but I'll check out the specifics because that's been a trend right across the country and frankly is a trend in North America as a whole.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether or not he or his department has done any projections as to the drop in consumption this year.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my department monitors these matters and I'll check with them to see where they are at in terms of their projections.

Deer population - winter forage

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago the Honourable Member for Minnedosa asked me questions, in respect to the condition of deer, arising out of the ice storms that occurred. My department advises that no special contingency plan has been put into place to the extent that deer have been incommoded. It is believed that our ongoing program of deer feeding in certain localities will offset any adverse effects of the storm.

In general, the snow cover has been light this year, so that habitat is readily accessible. However, the Wildlife Branch does experience difficulty in making certain the counts of animals. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that there has been any catastrophe occur in respect to deer in the province as a result of the storm.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank the Minister for that answer. I wonder if he would just keep monitoring the situation, and if there is any change that he would keep us informed.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Single mothers' employment program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Kirkfield apparently asked a question based upon an incorrect assumption, and I think in fairness to her that I should rectify that incorrect assumption as soon as possible. The program that the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park is referring to was not cut out; she'll be pleased I'm sure to hear that. It has been receiving provincial funding of some \$125,000 and the same was allocated for the present fiscal year. The program has been so successful, that supply of money has indeed run out, and future funding therefore will be something that we'll obviously be having to consider because of the success of the program.

Legislation Analyst, Highways - qualifications

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Highways and Transportation. Could the Minister indicate whether the position of Legislation Analyst, transportation of dangerous goods, is a Civil Service position?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe that's a term contract if I'm not mistaken. I'd have to check that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then, Mr. Speaker, it's fair to assume that position was not bulletined, so that qualifications for the individual were not compared to other applicants for the job.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think what I should do is take that as notice. I'm not certain as to the method that was used to fill that position.

CAE - assistance re job creation

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on March 3rd, I asked the Minister of Economic Development a question regarding the department's development or work with CAE to see if there was a possibility of them remaining open and employing people in Manitoba. Her reply at that time was that she was meeting with the aerospace industry that afternoon. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister can report anything to the House after having

had that meeting with the aerospace industry that the efforts of the government and the industry will be able to save the jobs at CAE in the Province of Manitoba.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I sincerely hope the Minister's wrist is not too painful, and I hope that it gets well very very clearly, very fast. I would also say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm sure the Minister was much happier it was her right arm than her left, because I know the ability she has with her left arm.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Is that a preamble or a postamble?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the message of concern and goodwill from the member opposite. I must report that I've learned the folly of leading with my right.

In response to the member's question, we did meet with representatives of the aerospace industry, and as the honourable member knows the possibility really of reviving CAE and enabling them to stay was really not in the books. They have been struggling for some time. However, they had been in good communication with other members of the industry and there did seem to be a few opportunities emerging whereby units of activity from CAE could be transplanted to other industries.

There was some interest in use at least of one of the buildings and the communications between the industry to try and place some of the other employees seem to be open and operating. Unfortunately, the entire group of employees cannot be dealt with in this way, and we regret that, but I think the industry is doing what it can at this point in time to help the employees along in what is admittedly a very difficult time for them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for question period has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY ADJOURNED DEBATE - CROW RATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, will you call the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation found on Page 5.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, who has 13 minutes remaining.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, colleagues, I was concerned last evening when I spoke and, admittedly, I indicated my annoyance about what I had perceived to be an apathy on the part of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in this Chamber to deal with the question so vital to the interests of western agriculture.

I am given to understand that the Honourable Member for Arthur did make a contribution and, of course, I'm always grateful that there will be some

interest in this question on the part of members opposite; but I want to reflect briefly on the tenor of the remarks of the Honourable Member for Arthur.

You know, Mr. Speaker, what he proposed was that there should be some further study and some further monitoring of the developments that were being proposed. Well, Mr. Speaker, with all respect to the Honourable Member for Arthur, and I presume he has the support of other members opposite, what is really being proposed is that a committee be struck to study and monitor the assault on western agriculture that is proposed in this massive revision of transportation in Western Canada. A monitoring process, Mr. Speaker, and that I regret very much.

There is some suggestion that some member opposite will be moving an amendment. Well, of course, we're always interested to know what their true feelings are and I would have hoped that someone, if they had decided to move an amendment on this question, would have made their views clear earlier.

It is the intention of members on this side of the House to deal with this question as a matter of priority, and we will reflect that in the speeches we make on this side of the House. We are not prepared to see this matter lie still on the order paper. We are not prepared to have honourable members of the opposition continue to want to postpone a decision on this issue in this House and so we will press on.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see honourable members of the opposition accept with us responsibility in respect to this question. I would like to see agreement on their part that this resolution be dealt with early, not put off, no procrastination; deal with the resolution early and get out with our Standing Committee on Agriculture and listen to the farmers of Manitoba on this question.

Mr. Speaker, when we listen to the farmers of Manitoba on this question, I hope that honourable members will listen to members of Manitoba Pool Elevators. You know, Mr. Speaker, for some time I have perceived that Manitoba Pool Elevators hasn't been on the political left or on the economic left in Western Canada, but that organization, which has been somewhat conservative in its thinking - and maybe I'm indulging in gross understatement - has come out very strongly in criticism of these revisions.

I hope that there are some honourable members who farm lands in their constituency that belong to Manitoba Pool Elevators. I happen to belong to Manitoba Pool Elevators, Mr. Speaker, and I received their letter. It's an undated letter, but it's a submission to all members of the Pool. I hope that there is the odd farmer-member opposite who is a member of Manitoba Pool Elevator. Perhaps the Honourable Member for Morris might belong; I don't know. I hope he does. If they don't belong, then they wouldn't have received this document from the Manitoba Pool Elevators and I think, Mr. Speaker, that it's interesting to hear what the Pool has to say.

Listen, Mr. Speaker, as to what the Pool has to say; it's very significant. It says, "Pressure to change grain freight rates has been building for a number of years prior to this announcement." They are referring to the Pepin deal. "The primary sources of that pressure were the railways, the Federal Government, and other industries using rail transport for products such as potash, coal, sulphur and lumber." Mr. Speaker, they

go on in this document and expose what I think is the subterfuge that is being exercised by proponents of the Crow. They are trying to minimize the effect of the cost increases on Western Canadian agriculture, but this leaflet that the Pool puts out shows how, with the application of the formula that is proposed, Western Canadian farmers won't be paying 3 percent. They will, in all likelihood, be paying 15 percent and, in some instances, 51 percent increases within a short time.

Now, the mathematics are a little difficult and I don't know whether I can paraphrase for honourable members the picture that is revealed in this document, but how this comes about, Mr. Speaker, is that the 3 percent cost increases that the farmers have to bear are not 3 percent of the farmers' costs of the shipment, but 3 percent of the total costs of the shipment. Let me explain. As the leaflet indicates, the producer now pays \$5 per tonne. The shortfall - the government commitment is \$20 per tonne for the total shipment cost of \$25 per tonne. When the costs rise 3 percent, then the cost increase is 3 percent of \$25 per tonne; not 3 percent of the \$5 per tonne the producer pays, but 3 percent of the total shipment cost per tonne. That produces a 75 cent per tonne increase; but who pays the 75 cents? The producer; not the government. So the producer then, his increase is not 3 percent of \$5 or 15 cents. He pays \$5 per tonne plus the 75 cent increase or a total of \$5.75 per tonne. That's a 15 percent increase, Mr. Speaker; that's not a 3 percent increase. That's not 6 and 5. That is what the honourable members over there are supporting, 6 and 5. They love the position of the Federal Government. This is no 6 and 5, but it gets worse, Mr. Speaker, and this document reveals it.

MR. H. ENNS: I've got the whole picture now, Al.

HON. A. MACKLING: I hope you have. I hope the Honourable Member for Lakeside has, Mr. Speaker, because it gets worse. The support level that this Pepin formula provides for is 31.1 million tonnes. Well, you think, oh, that's a great amount. That is based on the 1981-82 figures. That's what we shipped in 1981-82; 1982-83, we're already concluding - well, we will conclude as of July 1st, that grain year, 33.4 million tonnes. We are already in excess of that floor that the Federal Government has set. What effect does that have, Mr. Speaker? What effect does exceeding the floor of 31.1 mean?

MR. H. ENNS: 31.1 what? Bushels or tonnes?

HON. A. MACKLING: 31.1 million tonnes, that's the level. — (Interjection) — Well, the Honourable Member for Lakeside has been missing a great deal lately, Mr. Speaker, and he better start finding things pretty quickly.

Mr. Speaker, the effect of that ceiling is that, immediately, western Canadian farmers are going to be picking up the total cost increases of limits that are already exceeded and the effect of that - and I won't go through the arithmetic here because the honourable members have difficulty finding things. The effect of that increase - if there's a 10 percent increase over 31.1, that's merely 3.1 million tonnes increase and we have now increased 2.3 million tonnes right now; we

just have to go a little further. That 10 percent increase, combined with the increase that I have already referred to, will increase the farmers' cost to 51.4 percent. How do you like that, Mr. Speaker, for an increase?

And you know, Mr. Speaker, the nonsense that's involved in this. Do you know what the producer payment is going to be based on? Is it going to be based on shipment of grain? No, it's going to be based on the acres that a producer has, nothing to do with the shipment of grain that he actually makes. It's the amount of acres he owns. The honourable members over there haven't said anything about that. Where are they on this question?

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the last few moments that I have, and I know that I have received a message from you that I have but a few moments, I want to say to members opposite, get on side in connection with this question. Because while we have political differences, we have to, as a matter of responsible government and responsible opposition, combine our collective wills to fight an injustice. We have demonstrated we're able to do that on issues.

I want to confirm that honourable members opposite have worked effectively with us in respect to questions like Garrison. They can do that again, Mr. Speaker. They can assist this government; they can assist the people of this province to fight for justice in respect to rail transportation in Western Canada. They can do it by agreeing to the resolution that's on the Order Paper, a resolution which was adopted unanimously in the Province of Saskatchewan where they have a government that is a Conservative Government, an opposition which is an NDP Government, but they decided that issue transcends political nicety and we must have a combined voice to protect western agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, it is not too much to ask the members opposite, on this issue, one that is paramount to the interests of all of our constituencies, to get on side. You say, all of our constituencies? Yes, because agriculture still is a vital influence in every community throughout Manitoba, not just the small communities. The City of Winnipeg has a vast stake in the agriculture industry as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge members opposite; I implore members opposite to get on side in respect to this resolution. If you try to put an amendment to emasculate the committee going out and talking with farm folk, getting the kind of groundswell that we want to fight this injustice, then you will be doing wrong, Mr. Speaker. I urge that all members opposite agree to the passage of this resolution quickly and get on with the task of fighting and protecting the farmers of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again we are being urged by the government, as we were last year, to give speedy passage to a resolution on the Crow rate. Once again, at the urging of the Cabinet Minister that introduced this resolution, he wanted to forget about the historical perspective and he wanted to deal with the issue at heart. Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways and Transportation has been stabbed by his fellow

Cabinet colleagues, his fellow travellers, who have put this issue clearly in the political realm in some of their speeches last night and again this morning. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that's not my intention in this resolution. I intend to comply with the Minister of Highways' urgent request to debate this issue as an important issue as it exists today.

There are some troubling things that members of the opposition have to deal with, with this resolution. We do have a confusion on the part of the government as to what their position is. This resolution, I need not tell any member, is direct from Saskatchewan. This is not really the resolution of the Crow rate that the New Democratic Party of Manitoba wishes to see take place. The real resolution, in their eyes, was passed and voted on at their convention over the weekend.

So really, what are we being asked to vote on in the House when we discuss this resolution? We are not really voting on the true position of the New Democratic Government of this province; we are not even voting on a resolution that their members agree with because the Minister of Agriculture last night said, there are parts of this resolution that he does not agree with and he doesn't like.

The resolution - and the members are very concerned that we want to amend it. Mr. Speaker, I assure you, we are going to amend this resolution and we are going to amend it to take into consideration some of the valid concerns that have been mentioned by the government in their own resolution that they can't agree with, and we are going to also deal with some of the very valid concerns that are in the farm community.

Mr. Speaker, what the government should have done was provided us, in this resolution, with some new ideas, but obviously they chose not to. They chose the identical resolution from Saskatchewan. That, by itself, has some problems because, when you compare the type of agriculture in the two provinces, clearly there are differences, and clearly the interests of Manitoba farmers do vary from interests of Saskatchewan farmers. It may well be that the resolution passed in Saskatchewan legitimately reflects concerns of Saskatchewan farmers. I do not believe they necessarily legitimately represent the concerns of Manitoba farmers, and if the message, as the Minister of Highways and Transportation has said, that we want to get to the Federal Government, is that we disapprove of the present Pepin proposal then, yes, let's pass such a resolution. Let's register our disagreement in the Province of Manitoba, but let's make sure that the protest, the disagreement that we register, properly reflects Manitoba farmer concerns, not Saskatchewan farmer concerns, because there are differences.

Mr. Speaker, as a small example, I will name you four differences. First of all, Manitobans are closer to the port, so our transportation costs, regardless of what happens, will always be lower than Saskatchewan farmers.

Secondly, we have increased production per acre. The principle of higher production per acre is firmly established in Manitoba. Our yields are higher; we move more grain per acre.

We have specialty crops. Saskatchewan has a great deal of vested interest in the six statutory grains, wheat being the prime one. We in Manitoba, as I don't need to tell the Minister of Agriculture, have a number of

special crops: buckwheat, sunflowers, flax, beans, peas, corn, all of which represent a much greater portion of our production in Manitoba and have different transportation needs and different concerns. That's not reflected in this resolution from Saskatchewan.

And fourthly, Mr. Speaker, the degree of processing in Manitoba of agricultural products is higher in this province than it is in Saskatchewan. A greater percentage of our oilseed production is crushed in this province; a greater percentage of our bean, pea and legume special crops are processed in this province. The cannery at Morden takes practically all of the white, the navy bean production in this province most years. That is in a stark contrast to Saskatchewan and this resolution doesn't reflect that.

We have the proposal that the government is currently dealing with of a further agricultural processing plant in the province. It happens to be in my constituency between Crystal City and Pilot Mound of the potential to have flax seed crushing there, further processing of our products in Manitoba to ship processed products, not raw seed. Those factors are not reflected in this resolution.

So what does the passing of this resolution give us in its present form? Well, it gives us the Minister of Highway's stated objection to the Pepin proposal but, Mr. Speaker, the danger in passing it, as it written, is that it does not reflect what the farm community wants to have reflected and voiced as the concern of Manitoba to Pepin against his proposal. That's what our amendments will deal with, Mr. Speaker, and I trust that members opposite, who have told us how greatly concerned they are about rural Manitoba and farmers, will agree to the amendments that we are going to put in that will be applicable to the circumstance in Manitoba, not Saskatchewan.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask - the question has to be asked - what are the real concerns of the Crow rate proposal in Manitoba? I basically identify four concerns that are related to the proposed change in the Crow rate.

The first one, and I have absolutely no argument with the government on this one, is that there is an artificial ceiling put on the number of tonnes of grain shipped, which will be subject to the Crow rate subsidization. The 31.1 million tonnes upper limit of Crow rate benefit paid by the Federal Government is not acceptable. It's not acceptable by myself, by members of our party, and by farmers in Manitoba.

Secondly, there is a great deal of division and concern over the method of the Crow payment, whether it be to the railroads on one hand, or whether it be to the producers on the other hand. That is a real area of concern and has to have further discussion.

The third one, is in the area of performance guarantees by the railroad. I am not certain, and I don't think any member opposite can be certain, as to whether there is adequate protection for assurance of service by the railroads in the Pepin proposal. That's a valid concern in rural Manitoba.

The fourth concern is clearly that Pepin chose not to use the Gilson figure of participation of only 4.5 percent upper limit from 1985 and '86 on increased shipping costs. He has changed it to 6 percent, which puts a further onus of loading of cost on Manitoba farmers and that is of concern, Mr. Speaker, indeed.

The fifth concern that is always mentioned in rural Manitoba in any discussion of grain transportation involving the Crow rate, any change in the Crow rate, is the very unsettling question in rural Manitoba of how to resolve labour management disputes in the grain handling system. That is of probably more concern to farmers in rural Manitoba than the fact that they may pay 20 cents a bushel more to ship the grain, because when labour management disputes stop the flow of grain as they have in the past, it is not 20 cents a bushel that farmers are losing, it is the entire \$4.25 of initial payment that they are losing when that bushel of wheat does not flow because of labour management disruption in the system. If you poll Manitoba farmers, they will identify that as an equally important issue to the changing of the Crow rate.

Those are the five concerns, Mr. Speaker, that I believe Manitoba farmers legitimately have and we must address.

Now, I agree on three basic principles in the changing of the Crow rate. First of all, the Crow benefit must be paid by the Federal Government not on an artificial limit of 31.1 tonnes of shipment from Western Canada, but on all tons of grain shipped, regardless of how high that value of tonnage goes in the future. It must be tied to future tonnage, not to an artificial limit.

Secondly, the Federal Government has an obligation, a historic obligation, to assure that rolling stock is in place, to make sure that our grain products will move; and thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has an obligation to assure Manitobans that their branch lines are upgraded to accept 100-tonne hopper cars at all delivery points.

Now, to some regard, all of those points have been dealt with in the Pepin proposal, but I want to give members opposite the reason for my stating those positions as absolute prerequisites for any change to the Crow rate.

My beliefs on those three principles are historic, and I will take members back to approximately 1925, when the present Crow statutory rate was enshrined in legislation. At that stage of the game, Mr. Speaker, the rail system would service all delivery points. The rate would provide a reasonable return and indeed a profit to the railroads at those times, and all communities had access to the most modern equipment that was available during that time. Boxcars happen to move grain. All lines could receive the maximum size boxcar and therefore in 1925, when the rate was enshrined, the system worked. It served all people; it served all points and all farmers. But, Mr. Speaker, over the history of the Crow rate, where it has been frozen and costs have gone up, the system has deteriorated. There is no question. Rolling stock is not presently adequate. That is in contrast to the adequate situation of 1925. Branch lines — (Interjection) — Would the Minister of Natural Resources kindly keep his mouth quiet and listen, he might learn something.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, in 1925, the branch lines would take all of the traffic that was available in the system, but that all changed as costs got out of line.

Now, that's why I say that the Federal Government has the obligation that in renewing an agreement on the Crow Rate today, they must assure:

1. That a Crow benefit is given to all tonnes shipped, hence scrap the 31.1 limit;

2. They must assure there is adequate rolling stock to meet the needs of grain shipment in Western Canada as it was 1925; and

3. All branch lines must be able to carry the maximum tonnage hopper cars as they could in 1925. All lines could carry the maximum size car. That's why I say those three obligations by the Federal Government are historic and must be met in any resolution of the Crow.

So, Mr. Speaker, these factors have led us to a situation where the Federal Government now wants to change . . .

HON. B. URUSKI: Nothing but a handout.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Agriculture has already given us his wisdom on this issue, and I wonder if he might allow me to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, it comes to a basic position that if we're going to see a resolution of the Crow, those three main issues must be resolved by the Federal Government because when they enshrined the statutory rate around 1925, those three obligations were indeed there. We can ask no less of them today if they propose to change the Crow rate.

Now, let's deal with the major concerns. Rail line abandonment is one that's often voiced by many people in Manitoba including the opposition. Well, there have been varying efforts on preventing rail line abandonment and I want to tell you some of the efforts that we undertook in four years and the assurances that we received in having a number of lines placed into the permanent system. The Morris to Hartney line was, the Rossburn subdivision was and one other line, and for the moment I cannot give you the name of it. But, those lines were scheduled for abandonment and there was very little effort going on in the early '70s to prevent their abandonment but a concerted came forward and we did have those lines placed in the permanent rail network guaranteed to 2,000.

The reason I was so adamant, Mr. Speaker, on the retention of the Morris to Hartney line is demonstrated in the geography of southern Manitoba. Should you remove the Morris to Hartney line which goes from Morris to Hartney, Manitoba, you abandon all of southern Manitoba, south of No. 1 Highway to one railroad, namely the Canadian Pacific Railway with the exception of a line that runs from Winnipeg to Graysville which is CNR.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that would have been an unacceptable position, because the railroads need competition with one another in movement of grain. If there was no competition due to the abandonment of the Morris to Hartney line, southern Manitoba farmers would have suffered. Now, that line is being upgraded to hopper car standards and it will provide competition.

Now, secondly, Mr. Speaker, we always hear the argument of where the performance guarantees, how can we be assured that the railroads are going to perform, even if they are given a compensatory rate

for hauling grain. Mr. Speaker, no one can definitively say, yes, they will or no, they won't. But one thing I will assure you, Mr. Speaker, is that should the statutory rate change and should the railroads receive a compensatory rate for hauling grain, any railroad who did not face competition in a region would certainly not concentrate its efforts on moving grain from that region, it would concentrate its efforts in regions where they were open to competition between the two railroads. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that is the justification for the Morris to Hartney rail line. When and if the statutory rate is abandoned for one compensatory, southern Manitoba farmers because of efforts we undertook to assure that the Morris to Hartney line would be upgraded and in the basic network is there, it will assure southern Manitoba farmers of competition between the railroads and service.

Mr. Speaker, the competition between the railroads is important. Corn moves out of Carman by rail and by truck, but rail movement of corn out of Carman is hotly competed for between C.N. and C.P. It's a compensatory traffic and when they can see that they are going to have an opportunity to make a dollar in moving that car of grain, cars are readily available. There is competition; the system works when there is competition. That's what the objective of any change in resolution of the Crow is, to make this system an incentive system and when competition is there because of an incentive system, we will see grain move in this country.

I offer members opposite one small example which came about in the fall of 1977, I believe, or '78. It was a wet fall, the sunflower crop in southern Manitoba was out in the field because of the wet fall. When you miss the boat in Thunder Bay with sunflowers you carry them all winter with no cash flow and no movement, because when the lakehead freezes up you cannot move those sunflowers. And here is what happened in that fall: Canadian Pacific Railroad put on a 40 car hopper unit train and they ran that hopper train between the Cargill terminal at Elm Creek and Glenboro and, Mr. Speaker, we hear all kinds of talk about turnaround and service and what guarantees do we have, well, that fall with that 40-car unit train they were returning those cars to Elm Creek and to Glenboro in less than 72 hours round trip to Thunder Bay, and that compares, Mr. Speaker, to a normal car cycle in the prairies of anywhere from 14 to 24 days. They were doing it in less than three days because there was incentive in the system. The rate they were moving those sunflowers at was a compensatory rate. There was profit in it and the service went from a minimum of a 14-day car turnaround to one of less than three. I think that should be something all people considering whether the railroads can perform should consider seriously.

Now the Pools and other grain organizations and indeed other individuals have expressed concern about the concept of variable rates. They see variable rates as a means of abandoning a number of smaller delivery points in the country and massing the grain delivery along the main line to the detriment of the delivery opportunity of people not on the main line or close to it, of farmers not on the main line or close to it.

Well, I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to freight rates being distance-related, no argument with that at all.

We have always said that, Mr. Speaker, but I'll offer members opposite a little food for thought. If you have distance-related freight rates, should you not allow the railroad the opportunity that given certain operating efficiencies along the line that they could charge less than that distance-related freight rate which is fixed in statute? Should we offer that incentive? I don't know, I think maybe members opposite could.

Now, when you offer these incentive rates, members opposite will put their ideological blinders on, Mr. Speaker, and they will say that automatically translates into inland terminals, Cargill Grain and massive delivery to one point in one area. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that is not true. That is absolutely not true.

I want to once again refer to my own branch line, the Morris to Hartney line. It is a line of about 155 miles. It goes through some of the best grain producing country in south central Manitoba. It has some 18 delivery points with some 25 separate elevator companies represented on those grain delivery points.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you have a distance related rate and you operate the car allocation system the same as it is now, you are going to find that the railroads will charge the maximum allowable rate along that line, okay? But let's say that you allow the railroads to offer an incentive rate and you have an agreement, and I've talked this over with elevator managers to see if it's a viable proposition and they agree with me that it is - bear in mind you've got 25 elevator companies on that line - what is to stop the grain companies from getting together with the Canadian Wheat Board and setting up in a given shipping week; let's say shipping week No. 37. Two weeks in advance of that, the Wheat Board says to the grain companies - all 25 of them that are on that Morris to Hartney line - two weeks from now, we want you to have sufficient No. 1 feed barley in your elevators to load four cars each, okay? Nothing but No. 1 feed barley. The elevator managers with that two weeks' notice will make sure that their farmers are ready to deliver or have delivered that grain to the elevator; so when the train comes out, it drops four cars per elevator on 25 points on 150 miles of rail line.

HON. A. MACKLING: They are doing that now . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources doesn't know what he's talking about because they are not doing that. If he'd check his facts, they are not doing that. If he would listen, he might learn something.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the elevator managers had that direction from the Canadian Wheat Board through their head offices, you would see the cars dropped off in the morning, you would see a three hour stop at the end of the line in time for the last elevator on the line to load those four cars, and you would see that train crew leave and pick up 100 cars loaded with the same grade of grain along that line.

Mr. Speaker, what do you have? You have a unit train. You don't have it emanating from the inland terminal that our NDP friends are so concerned about; you have it emanating from a branch line, and you could do it if the incentive was there. The railroads would love to do it because they wouldn't have to hump those cars,

in C.N.'s case in Winnipeg, to separate them into the categories that are needed in Thunder Bay. They would have one unit train that could go directly down to the terminals in Thunder Bay; and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the railroads would be glad to offer a lower rate to undertake that than they would if they had to take and load a car of barley, a car of flax, a car of No. 1 wheat, a car of Glenlea, etc., etc., ad infinitum as they do now.

Oh, the Minister of Agriculture, he doesn't understand that because he doesn't understand the shipping system; but, Mr. Speaker, I saw the shipping system in Thunder Bay where a grain terminal - Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has a number of terminals down there. I was on a laker, and that laker loaded No. 1 wheat. They put half of a load on at one Pool terminal and then they backed that boat out, they took it across the bay and they put into another Saskatchewan Wheat Pool terminal to fill the load. Now, was that efficiency in the system? If that hundred-car unit train could go down, drop all of the grain at one terminal, it could load the boat at one spot. There are efficiencies in the system, Mr. Speaker, given the opportunity to use them.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that some of the concerns that the grain companies have about variable rates are concerns that would take some fresh thinking, some different approach, and some more work to make the system perform better. They would prefer the status quo where they don't have to necessarily make tough management decisions on how to organize shipping of grain; but the availability is there in the system, and I know that members opposite will not agree with that concept because, primarily, they don't understand what is being proposed.

Mr. Speaker, unit trains can logically emanate from branch lines with co-operation between the grain companies, the delivery points and the farmers. Two parts of that system can be there - are there now - the farmers would co-operate and the elevator managers would co-operate; all that is needed is the directive and the incentive to do it to the head office and to the railroads.

Mr. Speaker, I don't fear a system like that, because I think we would see something akin to the 72-hour turnaround on cars that we saw at Elm Creek and Glenboro in the fall of '78 become a daily fact of life on our branch lines if that kind of an organized system was there and available and the incentive to do it. But, Mr. Speaker, our honourable friends over here will not accept that.

Now, we have some serious concerns about the payment to producers. Mr. Speaker, I happen to agree with the Gilson proposal in terms that payments should be phased into the producer. I have no disagreement with that concept; I recognize there are politics on both sides of the situation. The Pools are saying that if it's paid to the producer, it can be too easily cut off by a political decision from Eastern Canada. That may well be; but, likewise, let's give the circumstance of an eventual situation where we have a New Democratic Federal Government. Knowing their hatred towards the private enterprise railroad of CPR, is a payment to the railroads any more secure because of that political influence from Eastern Canada? I suggest no, Mr. Speaker; I suggest no. So, the argument of politics is an equal balance argument, Mr. Speaker. There are pros and cons politically on both sides.

But, Mr. Speaker, my agreement with the Gilson concept is for this reason: And that is, if you have the producers given the Crow subsidy in part, or in whole, they are going to make objective decisions as to how they move their grain to export or, indeed, whether they want to move their grain to export because — (Interjection) — The hyena strikes again, Mr. Speaker. The Natural Resources Minister last year referred to a zoo and now he's laughing like a hyena. I suggest he knows all about zoos.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that payment to the producer allows the producer to make certain decisions. I think we've even heard members of the New Democratic Party say that farmers basically are pretty efficient fellows and, by and large, make good decisions; but yet they don't want to trust them with a decision on how to dispose of a subsidy which may be paid for them as Gilson proposed. I admit there are many kinks in that producer-paid proposal, because it shouldn't be related to the acre because our production is higher in Manitoba and, therefore, we are going to be shipping more grain. So it has to reflect that; but the concept, Mr. Speaker, has merit, even though it's not recognized by the New Democratic Party.

Some of the concerns that the Pool have, I fully recognize, are stemming from the fact that they have more points in Manitoba which they fear will be abandoned if variable rates were to come in as a result of payments to the producer. Mr. Speaker, that's a legitimate concern providing you don't want to use a fresh management approach, but if the grain companies would do the kind of co-ordination that I suggest is possible along the branch lines, they have no reason to fear giving the producer money to choose his option of transportation because they can make changes to improve the efficiency of the system within their own organization.

Mr. Speaker, I have very strong disagreement with the feds with the Pepin proposal in that he has chosen not to follow the recommendation made by Gilson that the producer contribution be no more than 4.5 percent after 1985-86, as proposed by Gilson. He has chosen to go to 6 percent, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that is something that all Manitoba farmers will oppose. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I want it to be clear that, if the Federal Government changes the Crow rate and requires the producer contributions of X number of percent of the increased costs, I want them to be shared to a maximum, not simply the first 4.5 percent, but the first half of the inflation up to a maximum of 4.5 percent. That means that if we approach 6 percent inflation that farmers will only pay 3 percent - half. If it's 10 percent, they will have reached their limit of 4.5 and the Federal Government will pick up 5.5.

My reasoning here, Mr. Speaker, is quite simple. I believe that the Federal Government and Provincial Governments contribute much more to the inflation rate than do the farm community. The farm community has helped to keep the inflation rate down by having lowered food costs consistently on the table of Canadians. So I don't want any agreement which would tie farmers into making payments based on an inflation rate that is set by the Federal Government. I would not accept that and neither will farmers.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution that the government wants us to pass contains reference to fuel costs. I

find it passing strange this year, Mr. Speaker, that they are voicing this concern about fuel costs and the taxation levels by the Federal Government, when last year I sponsored a resolution, the Minister of Transportation didn't speak on it and, more damning, the Minister of Agriculture didn't speak on it. Now, all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, he has these great concerns. But where were they last year when this situation existed? So appreciate our problem here.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite have asked, where do I stand on it? I think I have been much clearer where I stand on the Crow issue than I have heard from any speech of them. Mr. Speaker, if they fail to understand my position and agree or disagree with it, it does demonstrate a rather abysmal ignorance of the farm community and the transportation issue, and I'm afraid I can't help them out of their problem.

We do indeed, Mr. Speaker, have a proposal before us which is going to change the potential costs to farmers of moving grain. I want to tell members opposite that I ran some very rudimentary calculations on my own situation at home. I didn't use any of the Minister of Finance's staff, so I can't guarantee that these figures are definitely fudged but, Mr. Speaker, these are the best calculations that I could make, given the information I have. I want to tell members opposite what the basic assumptions I made on making my calculation.

First of all, I assumed that with greater payments to the railroad, there would be more effort on their behalf to move grain, so we would move indeed greater volumes of grain. Okay, that's a basic assumption. I made the second assumption that quotas would reflect that increased movement in grain. In other words, instead of having a nine bushel quota on hard Red Spring Wheat now, this time of the year, I assumed that we might have 12 or maybe 15 bushel quotas, higher quotas to reflect higher volumes of movement. I assumed interest rates at 12 percent, Mr. Speaker, and I assumed that I would no longer have to truck my flax production, for instance, to Minneapolis because the rail system would be moving higher volumes of grain. There would be more quotas on flax and I would be moving my flax through the Canadian system. I assumed also that I would receive the producer subsidy, even though that is a moot question at this time.

Mr. Speaker, my additional costs in the grain shipping year, 1985-86, would be more, but they would only be greater by the costs of shipping 3,000 bushels of wheat at \$4 per bushel 12 months earlier. That's all it was, is the interest on 3,000 bushels of wheat shipped 12 months earlier.

That could be any variable of combinations. It could be shipping 12,000 bushels of wheat three months sooner, entirely possible. It could be moving my rapeseed several months earlier at \$6 a bushel, not \$4 a bushel as it is now. That is all the additional cost that I would have.

What would I receive in benefit from it? I think we would see an improved reputation of the Canadian grain delivery system to meet world markets. Our customers would be more confident. They could get increasing volumes from Canada. When the customers are assured of that in the international market, that's to my benefit, because if I grow it I want to ship it. I don't want to store it on the farm, as happened in the late '60s and

early '70s where there were year after years of productions piled in the farmyards. That benefited no one and especially no benefit to the farmer.

So given those assumptions, Mr. Speaker, my trade-off was interest on 3,000 bushels shipped 12 months earlier, and my biggest saving was the fact that my flax would move at a much lower rail rate in 1985-86 than I am currently paying now to ship it to Minneapolis by truck. My freight rate to Minneapolis by truck is \$1.25 per bushel. That comes right out of my pocket in returns per bushel, and that goes an awful long way to pay any increased costs in the rail system and provide the spin-off employment in the rail system, in our terminals in Thunder Bay, in all of the transfer elevator system along the seaway, and indeed will provide similar employment in Churchill, in Prince Rupert and in Vancouver. I would far sooner have a system in place in which my grain, produced in Canada, would get to markets employing Canadians, not Americans. Not that I have a built-in hatred for Americans; I just have a built-in love for Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, one of the areas of concern I have about this resolution is that this government in being so quick to condemn the Pepin proposal may happen to put the "kiss of death" on a new flaxseed crushing plant that can be part of this Manitoba economy within the next year-and-a-half. If there is one thing we need in this province, Mr. Speaker, it is more and more secondary processing of agricultural commodities. We demonstrated that when Harrowby was put onstream in western Manitoba. This province has the opportunity of demonstrating that again with a consortium to put a flaxseed crushing plant in Crystal City and Pilot Mound. One of the very key factors in that plant locating in southern Manitoba, the key factor, is parity with the rapeseed oil industry, the canola oil industry, parity of rates for linseed oil and linseed meal.

The government's headlong rush not to reflect the Manitoba situation, not to recognize the Manitoba situation in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, causes me some concern. Because clearly this government must be interested in investment in manufacturing plants in this province; they clearly must be interested in further processing of agricultural products, and I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that southern Manitoba is the largest producer of flax in Canada. That area is the centre of it. The economics of production and everything are there for that plant to be there. What is missing is parity with the canola oil and meal industry. This government may well be jeopardizing that plant, and I don't want to see that happen, Mr. Speaker, we've worked too long, and the farmers in that area have worked too long to get that plant.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that we will be joining with this government, in opposing elements of the Pepin proposal. We will be proposing, Mr. Speaker, amendments, which more clearly reflect the Manitoba concerns. — (Interjection) — Now, the Minister of Natural Resources says, no you won't and I assume from that, that he wants to vote out any amendment that we are going to make, which better reflects the concerns of the Manitoba farmer. On the one hand, he says he wants to listen to them, and on the other hand, he says he won't accept an amendment that we're going to make to the resolution, which better reflects the Manitoba situation.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite are going to have some kind of a dilemma and, Mr. Speaker, we will make that amendment and we will expect the members of the New Democratic Party to take a look at it, to seriously consider it, and to finally realize that it truly reflects the concerns that Manitoba farmers have, about proposed change to the Crow rate. And, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to further contribution by members opposite on the amendments that we're going to make.

We are truly going to see, Mr. Speaker, in the ensuing debate, which can be very short, we will see, indeed, whether this is simply posturing by the NDP, or whether indeed, they are truly concerned with the future of agriculture in Manitoba. This debate in our amendment will give them the opportunity to prove to rural Manitobans in the farm community, whether they are only talking out of the side of their mouth with forked tongues, or whether indeed, they are truly concerned about this issue and not the handholding concern that we saw last year, where the issue was important, up until Blakeney got defeated and then unimportant after that.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to contributing at a later date - when the amendment is made - further contributions to this debate. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Mr. Phil Eyer: The Honourable Premier.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to find words, at this particular stage of the debate, to express my deep disappointment at the way in which this resolution appears to be proceeding through this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, we searched long and hard for a means by which we felt we could obtain one voice from this Chamber.

HON. S. LYON: Like you did last year.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in so doing, we had to put aside some of our own particular views, insofar as this resolution was concerned, as to the approach that should be undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, we have been chastised in some circles for not presenting to this House a stronger resolution reflecting Federal New Democratic Party positive approach re the Crow. Our response was, Mr. Speaker, that it was better to frame a resolution that would - and here we apparently erred - that would ensure support, unanimously, of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, you might ask why was it important that we attempt to frame a resolution that would ensure the united voice of all members of this Chamber? The reason, of course, Mr. Speaker, is that the only voice Mr. Pepin and the Federal Liberal Government will listen to, is a voice that is clearly the voice of farmers and governments of Western Canada - the only voice.

Mr. Speaker, this same resolution, I thought I had understood from the Minister of Agriculture, was introduced in the Legislature of Saskatchewan by the Conservative Government of Premier Grant Devine. I thought that was the message that I had received from the Minister of Agriculture, and if I am wrong, I would

ask the Minister of Agriculture to rise in his seat - on a point of order - to disassociate himself from my comment.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution was presented to the Saskatchewan Legislature by the Conservative Government, Premier Grant Devine, and I know that there were attempts, on the part of the opposition of the Saskatchewan Legislature, to change the wording of this resolution because they felt it was not strong enough. Those attempts failed and the end result, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, is that this identical resolution, that honourable members across the way have before them, is exactly the same resolution as passed unanimously in the Saskatchewan Legislature.

A MEMBER: How long did it take?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that resolution went through with the co-operation of members of the opposition in Saskatchewan in very short time. Because the members of the opposition under the Saskatchewan Legislature were prepared to set aside some of their own political concerns, some of their own particular petty areas that they could have raised, in order to bicker, instead they said, we want Saskatchewan to speak with one voice, regardless of whether it is a Conservative position, whether it is a New Democratic Party position, let's ensure every member in the Saskatchewan Legislature votes alike.

That was a responsible position from Saskatchewan, by both the government and the opposition to clearly indicate to Ottawa, the position of the western farmers in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, with some reluctance - because it's not our wording, we adopted the same wording as that which was passed unanimously in the Saskatchewan Legislature. Because we assumed that we too, in this Chamber, would enjoy the benefit of a responsible opposition, particularly when that opposition represents many of the rural seats in this province, an opposition which claims to be representing the thinking of the farmers of Manitoba, we felt confident, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative resolution of Saskatchewan would be adopted by the Conservative opposition in the Province of Manitoba.

We felt, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservatives in this Chamber would have set aside their political . . .

A MEMBER: Petty.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . well, I don't want to accuse the opposition at this point of pettiness - but certainly of their desire to be politically manipulative, to reflect the concerns of their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, what a powerful voice it would be, if we could say to Mr. Pepin, here is a resolution, this resolution was passed unanimously by the government and by the opposition members of not only Saskatchewan but of Manitoba. What a powerful voice that would be to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker.

HON. S. LYON: How about Alberta?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I now call upon some of the members across the way that I know represent

constituencies that there is very intense feeling amongst their farm populations on this issue to immediately disassociate themselves from the speech that we heard but a few moments ago by the Member for Pembina, because I warned those members that if they don't declare themselves and don't disassociate themselves, we will carry this campaign to their constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that we would not come to this point. I had hoped that we would not come to this stage. — (Interjection) — I had hoped, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . that honourable members across the way mainly representing rural constituents that are fundamentally in disagreement with the Pepin approach would have joined clearly and decisively in their opposition to the Pepin proposal. Mr. Speaker, instead what are we receiving from across the way?

We are receiving proposals that will supposedly be filed at some future date in this House by way of an amendment. We're being told that. We don't know what that amendment is. I can only conclude that despite hours of meeting together as a caucus across the way that we still have a House which is divided across the way on the Crow issue, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Because if they were not divided, there would have been an amendment that would have been introduced this morning by the Honourable Member for Pembina or some other member across the way.

Why the delay, Mr. Speaker? Why the delay in ensuring that this resolution is passed unanimously in this Chamber? Mr. Speaker, I want honourable members across the way, and I witnessed the fact that they are squirming and their leader is squirming at the present time, because we all know the position of their leader. Their leader may gain a position well ahead of the Pepin proposal in full support of the scrapping of the Crow rate. Yes, so we know where their leader stands, but we'd like to know where their caucus stands as a whole, Mr. Deputy Speaker. — (Interjection) —

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: What I'm concerned about right now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a very practical concern. This resolution provides for a Standing Committee on Agriculture of the Legislature being authorized to inquire into matters relating to western transportation initiative proposed by the Government of Canada to hold such public meetings as the committee may deem advisable and to report at this Session of the Legislature.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we've got to get this resolution through this Chamber. We have to move at the same sort of conscientious pace that the Saskatchewan Legislature moved in ensuring that their resolution would proceed through this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, feet dragging on the part of honourable members across the way is just not going to wash as far as the farmers of Manitoba are concerned - and I hear the Honourable Member for Pembina laughing. Obviously, he thinks that this is a matter of little significance or importance to the farmers of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution ought to be processed, ought to be processed quickly, so that we can move

to the rural areas of this province and hear the farmers of Manitoba. There ought to be no member in this Chamber, whether it be the Honourable Member for Springfield, whether it be the Honourable Member for Dauphin, the Honourable Member for Swan River, the Honourable Member for Russell, that is nervous about going out and hearing what the farmers of Manitoba have to say on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we know who will benefit from the Pepin proposals; the CPR is going to benefit. There's no doubt about that. Is there one member in this Chamber that will stand in his place or her place and argue that the CPR is not going to be the main beneficiaries? Mr. Speaker, we know the Federal Government will be a beneficiary arising from the Pepin proposals. Is there one member in this Chamber that is going to rise in his or her place and argue that the Federal Government will not benefit? We know, Mr. Speaker, who will be hurt by this resolution. Is there a member in this Chamber who is prepared to rise in his or her place and say unequivocally the economy of Manitoba will not be seriously hurt by the passage of the Pepin proposals? Is there one member in this Chamber who is prepared to so state?

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we know that this series of proposals by Pepin will hurt seriously rural villages and towns in Manitoba. We know that this resolution will result in the closures of businesses, be an impact on the revenue base of the municipalities and rural Manitoba, will have some effect on the City of Winnipeg as well. Is there any member in this Chamber who will deny that to be the case, Mr. Speaker?

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, is there any member in this House who is prepared to suggest that farmers will not be hurt by the kind of approach enunciated by the honourable member for Pepin, an approach that would in effect create variable rates insofar as rural Manitoba is concerned, rates that would affect many farmers with much additional burden from what other farmers would be paying? Is there any member that would deny that indeed that would not hurt the farmers in rural Manitoba?

Mr. Speaker, in addition, there has been some suggestion of trust, trust that the secondary processing industry will be assisted in Manitoba if we can get around the flag with Mr. Pepin and Mr. Trudeau on this issue. Mr. Speaker, I do not know. Mr. Speaker, it wasn't our party that voted along with the Liberals 75 times in the past year in the House of Commons in Ottawa. It wasn't our party. Look into your own mirror for the answer.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please, order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would urge honourable members to check out what I believe to be authentic reports of the Agricultural Minister, Eugene Whelan, and others, assuring the processors in Eastern Canada that they will not be hurt by the Pepin Proposals. — (Interjection) — There is an ad, the Minister of Agriculture tell me, that's being published in centres in Eastern Canada assuring Eastern Canada that they

will not be detrimentally affected by these measures that same relate to Western Canada. You can't have it both ways.

Mr. Speaker, that is the problem that we have with the Federal Government. They speak one way in western Canada, a different way in eastern Canada on this issue, that ought to be clear to honourable members across the way. Mr. Speaker, we've got a two-faced approach. We don't need a two-faced opposition in this Chamber. We need a one-voice expression from the opposition members in this Chamber. It's enough that that be the case in Ottawa on the question of secondary processing of farm products.

Mr. Speaker, is there anyone in this Chamber that would argue that the information is incorrect? — (Interjection) — The Member for Russell apparently doesn't appreciate what I am saying and I understand that very, very well because, Mr. Speaker, I happen to know that the farmers in his constituency would not appreciate the speech that was delivered this morning by the Honourable Member for Pembina, would not appreciate it one bit. He's got every reason to be nervous.

HON. S. LYON: The Free Press said you're two-faced.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with farmers' freight bill that will go up from about 150 million now to over \$1.1 billion by 1991, 1992. This is going to be a backbreaking load being imposed upon the farmers in Western Canada at a time indeed when the farmers of Western Canada are enjoying less realizable income than they have for many years.

Mr. Speaker, there is no guarantee for the farmers insofar as the price that they will receive for grain. We're guaranteeing CPR a return but, Mr. Speaker, there is no guarantee in the Pepin proposals insofar as the farmers of Western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also point out to honourable members because there was some comment about, what about B.C. and Alberta. I think that Premier Lougheed in Alberta has a lot of trouble on this issue. I haven't seen much public expression of his point of view in regard to this issue. I know where the Alberta Wheat Pool stands on this issue. We haven't heard from Premier Lougheed in Alberta. I understand why Premier Bill Bennett may feel it's important to support the Pepin proposals. It's going to boost the economic recovery of the Province of British Columbia. There is going to be one heck of a lot of construction work that is going to be done through the Rockies in B.C. Why wouldn't Bill Bennett support the Pepin proposals? Why wouldn't he?

Mr. Speaker, only 20 percent of the capacity to the west coast will be needed for grain. In 1960, just 20 years ago, almost all the system was used for grain. It is not grain, Mr. Speaker, that is taxing the system. It's coal; it's potash; it's sulphur; and it's forest products, mainly from British Columbia and Alberta that is taxing the system.

Mr. Speaker, the original deal offered for the farmers' needs at the Crow rates, the one offset for the farmers in the Confederation deal, that is what the farmers require. Mr. Speaker, I am again going to . . .

HON. S. LYON: Are you opposed to exports?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I am, Mr. Speaker, prepared to withdraw all my earlier remarks . . .

HON. S. LYON: Good.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . about this issue if honourable members across the way . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Come on, say it.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I only need again comment, surprise and disappointment. When we need a united voice out of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, a voice that will not be divided, we find that we don't get that kind of support from our own opposition in this Chamber. Even when we frame a resolution that was drafted by Conservatives in Saskatchewan, we find that our opposition, they flee for cover. They duck the basic issues pertaining to the Crow, Mr. Speaker. They talk about some amendment that they are going to bring in some time in the future into this Chamber . . .

HON. S. LYON: We danced to this same tune last year.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . rather than provide us that amendment that would indicate their position, Mr. Speaker, they talk in vague terms about some vague amendment that they will be bringing into this Chamber either next week or the week after next.

Mr. Speaker, I call again upon the honourable members across the way to recognize that the Pepin proposals will not benefit the farmers of Manitoba. They will not. They will not benefit the economy of Manitoba. They will do damage to rural villages and towns in our province. Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that requires honourable members to join together and to set aside partisanship . . .

HON. S. LYON: You certainly set a good atmosphere.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . and we have undertaken everything that we could possibly imagine in order to do so, even to the fact that we've presented a watered down resolution into this Chamber so it could be consistent with the Saskatchewan resolution, a resolution by which we could go out into the rural areas and hear what the farmers of Manitoba have to say. That's what we want to do.

Mr. Speaker, continued delay in this Chamber of passing this resolution is only going to frustrate the kind of response that we want from farmers in Manitoba. Honourable members know better than I that continued delay in regard to passing this resolution is going to make it difficult and, possibly, prohibitive for farmers to attend the hearings because they are going to be involved in seed preparation and seeding, itself, if this resolution is not processed quickly, Mr. Speaker . . .

HON. S. LYON: Why didn't you call the House back sooner then? Why didn't you call the House back sooner if you are really concerned? You called the House back a month late.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, again, the Leader of the Opposition, rather than dealing with the issue of

getting this resolution out into the countryside and hearing what the farmers have to say, wants to play party politics on the issue by raising the question that we didn't call the House into Session early enough.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Will the First Minister permit a question? Mr. Speaker, my simple question to the First Minister is this - if he's so all fired concerned about the Legislature dealing with this matter, why didn't he introduce the resolution much sooner? Why didn't he call the House back a month earlier, rather than dilly-dally on his Budget.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition, because I had assumed that the opposition in this Chamber would have used the same good sense as the opposition in the Saskatchewan Legislature and would ensure that the resolution passed in short order. That's what I had assumed. Mr. Speaker, if my information is correct, this resolution introduced by a Conservative Government in Saskatchewan, led by Conservative Premier, Grant Devine, passed their Legislature in two days time, very, very short time in any event . . .

HON. S. LYON: So what? This is Manitoba.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . in a very short time. Mr. Speaker, I want to again just urge honourable members who represent so many of the farmers of our province and farmers that are deeply concerned about this issue, about the impact that it's going to create, because I heard the Honourable Member for Municipal Affairs point out last night the Honourable Member for Morris's concern about the impact that this Pepin proposal will impose upon his own children that will be taking over his farm operations in future years. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Manitoba want to have an opportunity of ensuring that they can express their point of view to us, so there can be one voice expressed not only from Saskatchewan, from Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I simply ask and I can accept the fact that honourable members want to debate this some more, that's quite acceptable and if we want to go through next week, fine. I just ask, Mr. Speaker, that honourable members think not only of themselves in this particular issue, but think of all the farmers out in the rural parts of this province that want to hear from us and want to provide their views to us, because we can undertake a lot of fine debating points in this Chamber. We can introduce amendment after amendment. We can skirt the issue; we can duck the issue. We can try to muddy up the issue.

Mr. Speaker, what is important is that Manitoba enjoy one voice and that voice be the same voice as Saskatchewan. — (Interjection) — One voice, the same as Saskatchewan. I trust that my message has been

directed clearly to honourable members across the way, that they can reflect and consider, that they can think in the interests of their farm constituents that we'd not be running around rural Manitoba on April 25th, or May 10th, or May 16th, or June 2nd when farmers are trying to seed in the fields, prepare for seeding, but we get out there early, so that farmers are not prevented from being able to come forth and present their views. That's all I ask of honourable members across the way.

(1) Ensure that it makes it convenient for farmers to make their submission by passing the resolution within a reasonable period of time, keeping that in mind.

A MEMBER: In good time.

HON. H. PAWLEY: In good time may not be good enough for the farmers of this province, Mr. Speaker.

(2) That honourable members across the way think in terms of the strategic importance of joining with Saskatchewan and expressing one voice to Mr. Pepin.

I think if we fragment our voice, if we start chopping up our voice in Western Canada that it comes to Mr. Pepin and Mr. Trudeau in different ways, they'll continue to interpret the voice of Western Canada as being fragmented, as being weak, disunited on this issue. I ask honourable members to reflect upon that, not in the interests of the New Democratic Party, or trying to foul up the New Democratic Party, or to score some debating points in here, not in the interest of the Conservative Party as such, but the entire provincial rural community. That's what's important, Mr. Speaker, that we start thinking in terms on this issue; not on our partisan considerations, but that we pass this resolution, we get it under the rural areas, we hear from the farmers of Manitoba and we can transmit a clear and united strong voice to Ottawa on this issue that's so fundamental to agriculture in Manitoba.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the next member, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 12 students of Grades 11 and 12 from the Westwood Collegiate. The students are under the direction of Mr. Rosin and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park. On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this morning.

ADJOURNED DEBATE - CROW RATE CONT'D

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It was not my intention to get into the debate at this time; however, the remarks of the Honourable First Minister were such that it almost forced me into getting up at this particular time to bring things back to where we should be looking. We had a resolution brought forward in this Chamber by the Honourable Minister of Transportation, and I would suggest to the Honourable First Minister that he read the resolution and the presentation that was put forward by his own Minister when he introduced this resolution. The

Minister at that time suggested that this was going to be, hopefully, a non-political debate and here we hear the biggest diatribe I've ever heard in my life of political threats, intimidation from the First Minister trying to bully his way around in this Chamber, suggesting that this House must do what he says.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, there are 57 members in this Assembly, and I would say out of those 57 there are at least 22 or 23 that have the ability to think for themselves.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Twenty-two over there.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Twenty-two or 23 on this side at least who have the ability to think for themselves. He may be able to bully his own troops, force them into taking a particular line of attack or whatever it is, but he is not going to do that on this side of the House. It's unfortunate and he stands in his place and cajoles this Assembly and says, why don't you do it as Saskatchewan did? I ask him why didn't he do as Saskatchewan did?

HON. H. PAWLEY: We are, that's what we're trying to do. This is a Saskatchewan resolution . . .

MR. H. GRAHAM: No, you're not. You are not. Did this Minister of Transportation, did this government, which the First Minister purports to lead, did they at any time consult with the opposition before they brought the resolution? No.

Talk about co-operation. Did Saskatchewan do that? Yes. The Saskatchewan Government showed the way on how to get things through the Assembly. They co-operated, they suggested to the opposition and the resolution was jointly drafted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that does not mean that everybody agreed with it. Some of them wanted to have certain changes made in it, but there was consultation beforehand. This government doesn't know how to consult. This government and its present Government House Leader doesn't know how to consult, doesn't know how to co-operate, has no intention of co-operating, and that is the sorry state of affairs that we have in this province at the present time.

Our First Minister said that this should be a nonpolitical thing. He spoke in this Assembly for half an hour and all he did was espouse politics. Partisan politics, certainly; that's the only kind he knows, and I'm not too sure that he knows that too well. Mr. Speaker, I'm not that concerned, but it does bother me to see a resolution that was brought in, in a reasonable manner by a Minister, and having this First Minister turn the whole thing around and make it totally partisan politics.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it may be a good time to censure the First Minister for his position on the Crow. I would suppose that I would be severely chastised if I brought a motion forward of that nature. I think that there are even members in the NDP that would support a resolution of that kind. In fact, I'm sure there was a resolution of that nature that appeared at their convention.

I would like to refer to a resolution that was brought in by the NDP Association from the Honourable Member for Minnedosa's area. I'll just read the operative part of the resolution. It says, "Therefore be it resolved that we censure the Cabinet for its lack of leadership and reaffirm that the Crow rate is nonnegotiable." Mr. Speaker, . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Virden has the same opportunity to state his opinions to the House as every other member does and is entitled to be given the courtesy of a fair hearing.

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Where is the Constituency of Minnedosa? That is in the heart of the agricultural part of Manitoba, one of the finest agricultural communities - not the finest, because that belongs in my constituency, and probably the Member for Pembina would argue about that - but that is one of the areas where agriculture is a vital concern. And this area, even the NDP members, few as they are in that area, wanted to censure the Cabinet for its lack of leadership. We know that they have no leadership.

The First Minister said they spent agonizing hours trying to frame a resolution and they threw up their hands in utter futility that could come to no conclusion, and finally they said, well, we will go to a Conservative Government in Saskatchewan and adopt theirs. That is the leadership that we get in this province.

HON. S. LYON: Better than last year's resolution which they dropped.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister says there is a degree of urgency. There is a degree of urgency; the urgency is the same as it was last year. Last year, Mr. Speaker, in the month of June, from the 2nd of June till the 30th of June, the only member on that side of the House that spoke on the Crow resolution was the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. They never once called the resolution after he spoke on it, refused us the opportunity to debate, and now the First Minister stands up and he says, we want a spirit of co-operation, when he refused debate before.

Mr. Speaker, the present resolution that we have before us is one that is of concern to me because I represent an area that is as close to Saskatchewan as any other one in this Assembly, and yet even in my constituency there is significant difference between the agriculture of my constituency and the agriculture of Saskatchewan. So you've got different circumstances; and the answers that may appear plausible in Saskatchewan and the concerns of Saskatchewan are not necessarily the same as the concerns here in Manitoba.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Does that mean you oppose the resolution?

A MEMBER: Be quiet Andy; he'll get to you.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Springfield wants to speak. I suggest he sit in his own seat and then rise from there, but he doesn't want to . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: Do you oppose the resolution?

MR. H. GRAHAM: . . . He can find out in due course. Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden has indicated he will.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, at the invitation of the Member for Virden, I would like to ask him if he and his side are supporting or opposing this resolution based upon the comments he just made?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I will answer that question when the member tells me why he ducked the vote yesterday.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, the present motion that's before us is one that does cause some concern because we do know that the way the motion is worded, it refers to the Pepin plan, and we don't know what the Pepin plan is. We know what the present Pepin plan is, and we know that it is now in the process of being revised, and if we know that it is being revised, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, why is the First Minister so concerned about debating it immediately, when you know that what you're debating will be changed, or may be changed, and you're not even too sure of what you're debating?

So, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the reasons why I am somewhat reluctant to rise at this time, to take part, because I want to know what the Pepin plan is. At the present time, Mr. Pepin has had consultation with various members in the grain trade, in the agricultural industry, and he has been listening to their concerns, and has suggested there will be changes.

Those changes we don't know yet, and that is one of the reasons why I suggest that maybe we are a little premature in bringing forward debate at this time.

I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Saskatchewan is now realizing that maybe they were a little premature in bringing this resolution forward, because the Pepin proposals are being redrafted and I suggest that it is probably the wisest course to see what the new proposals are, before we really go to the people and ask them what their concerns and their interests are.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 12:30, Private Members' Hour, when this resolution next is on the floor, the Honourable Member for Virden will have 26 minutes remaining.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, by agreement, we will not have Private Members' Hour.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that's agreeable, but I wonder, prior to adjourning, if the Acting House Leader could indicate the order of business of the government for next week.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable resolution from the Minister of Transportation will be first — (Interjection) — the resolution on the Crow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will accept a motion to adjourn the House.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: So moved, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House do now stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, that the House do now adjourn.

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