



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 Welding
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 27 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 16 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	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, 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

Wednesday, 16 March, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . 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 Speaker's Gallery where we have 35 students of Grades 4 and 5 from Varennes School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Yanchyshyn and Mrs. Sahrman. The school is from the Constituency of St. Vital.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Engineers strike at Grace and Misericordia

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. I would ask him whether the operating engineers at Grace and Misericordia Hospitals have accepted the mediator's recommendation and ended their strike.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the last information I had - it's possible that the Minister of Labour has more information - is that the discussions were still going on and it seemed the people were quite optimistic but there is nothing final at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just to add to that, I think that honourable members may or may not be aware that the issues at the other hospitals, particularly at Misericordia, there were many more outstanding issues. The mediator is working with the two parties involved in that particular dispute to settle those items.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Honourable Minister of Labour then, or the Minister of Health, whether there are issues relative to the strike at Grace and Misericordia which differ substantively

from the issues that applied and existed in the case of the Health Sciences Centre?

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, the issues in any workplace, whether they are concerned with wages, which obviously exist at all workplaces, or working conditions, which exist at all workplaces, are going to be different in their nature.

I believe that there were simply more issues left outstanding at one of the hospitals than there were at the others, but there are many issues of common concern, and the mediator obviously worked with each of the hospitals separately since they are separate groups of employees and they are separate employers. The mediator is, at this point, working with Misericordia Hospital and I believe still with the Grace Hospital.

MR. L. SHERMAN: But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour told the House yesterday that the union negotiating committee had recommended to the locals at Grace and Misericordia that they accept the mediator's recommendation and that those two locals were meeting to consider that recommendation yesterday. One drew the inference from that that it was a conclusion that would be reached within about 24 hours. My question is, have the two locals accepted the negotiating committee's recommendation that the mediator's solution be accepted?

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the question yesterday had to do with Health Sciences Centre. That is where the vote was being taken and, yes, the employees there did agree to abide by the suggestions of the mediator.

The other two hospitals, the groups have not yet voted, in fact, as far as I know at this point in time there has not been a recommendation taken to the employees, to the unions there. These people, the employees, may belong to the same basic union, but they are different groups. They are different locals. They have different employers.

Closure of obstretical units

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister of Labour for her information.

My question now then, Mr. Speaker, is to the Honourable Minister of Health. I would ask him, in view of the announcement that he made yesterday about the closure of two obstretical units at two Winnipeg hospitals, and the opportunity for all of us to review that decision and that course of action in the past 24 hours, whether he can advise this House what kind of impact those closures will have on the abortion requirements in Winnipeg?

As background, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I would just stress that one of the rationales for an obstretical unit at Seven Oaks was because of the need for adequate therapeutic abortion capabilities in Winnipeg and Winnipeg hospitals. I'd ask him what the closure at

Seven Oaks is going to do in terms of impact on the demand for therapeutic abortions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this will not be a factor at all. This is completely, as far as I am concerned, a different issue and this will not have any impact on that at all.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there was heavy demand building up for abortion capabilities in Winnipeg, which to a substantial degree were being handled mainly by the Health Sciences Centre in the past two or three years; and in view of the fact that Grace Hospital, for example, terminated the practice of abortions, further reducing the capability in the city; and in view of the fact that the advocates of the Seven Oaks Hospital Obstetrical Unit claimed that it would be able to carry part of that volume, I have to ask the Minister of Health, again, Mr. Speaker, what the closure at Seven Oaks is going to mean in terms of that abortion demand?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that I gave an answer to that. I might say to my honourable friend that there are certain work renovations that are going on at the Women's Pavilion and that will add to the capacity, if needed, at the Health Sciences Centre for proper legal abortion.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Does it mean that other abortion facilities are also being considered in the city or in the province?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Other than what? Other than the present - no, there aren't.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister whether the closures at Seven Oaks and at Concordia forecast in any way a plan or a program on the part of the government to further reduce health care capabilities and further cut back health care services in the province, or whether this is an isolated decision related specifically to the one question of obstetrical capability?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This was treated as a separate problem, but certainly we are not closing the door to say that nothing will be curtailed. If we could save funds and still not cut down on the standards or in fact, in such a case as this improve the facilities, improve the care of our patients, we certainly will look at it.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, does it mean that there will be closures of obstetrical units in rural Manitoba hospitals and a classification and categorization of obstetrical capabilities in rural Manitoba?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this hasn't been decided yet. There is no proposal for any of that — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, if the members know the answer there's not much point in asking me the answer.

I'm saying that there has not been any change; it hasn't been contemplated; there hasn't been anything at all but we're not closing the door on anything. We're going to look at the situation the way it is. If we can improve the standards and facilities such as we're doing by — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, I would love to start a debate with these people and therefore let's wait. The Estimates will be on fairly soon. I welcome all of you to come in and we'll be able to discuss it.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to enquire of the Minister how this developing position that is now revealing itself in this House jibes with the position taken by the Minister and his colleagues, and particularly the Minister of Mines and Energy when he was in opposition, relative to Health Care Services in Manitoba and the pre-election material of the New Democratic Party which promised, "Restoration of the health care system;" promised, "Health care, not cutbacks." Where do the Minister's colleagues, such as the Minister of Mines and Energy, stand on this decision to cut back health services?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the challenge brought on by the former Minister of Health. Apparently he wants to draw the battle line now and I am ready. I might refer him to a letter that he's received from the College of Physicians in 1980 when he was the Minister of Health and they recommended that they do exactly what I did yesterday, and then if you hear from the MMA also, Mr. Speaker, the member will be told that this is going to be for the welfare of Manitoba, it's not cutting.

Mr. Speaker, I made a point yesterday to say that this was not money that would cut the deficit. It would be money spent on new programs and new prevention, that we've had a lot of lip service lately but not much action. This is what we're going to do with the money we are saving.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm asking . . .

HON. S. LYON: It's terrible when you're shown up for being hypocrites.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Health on a point of order.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: On a point of order. I wish the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the term that he called me, that I was a hypocrite in this House. This is something that I won't stand. — (Interjection) — there's another one that's saying I am. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we should be subjected to that kind of insult in this House and I don't intend to stand by and be called any name.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to withdraw the comment. I said it is terrible to be shown as hypocrites. My honourable friends are merely demonstrating now that they said one thing when they

were in opposition, they're doing another thing when they're in office, that's all. Let the cap fit as it may.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We did say in opposition that we should not cut the health care, this was our main thing. It doesn't mean that you don't plan and it doesn't mean you don't try to improve the situation. In fact, this was recognized not only by the members of the government but by many others, including the member that asked me the question yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: Had the Honourable Member for Fort Garry completed his question?

MR. L. SHERMAN: No, I had one more question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that my last question to the Minister was not related to the statement he made yesterday, but related to the answers that he'd given me to earlier questions today, indicating that further reductions and closures are being contemplated. I repeat the question, Mr. Speaker, as to how does this jibe and sit with his colleague, for example, the Minister of Energy and Mines, who was one of the sternest critics of our government and claimed repeatedly in this House that we were indulging and engaging in health care cutbacks? How does that sit with the Minister's colleagues and how does it jibe with their election material?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the answer I gave him was not that we were contemplating any cut at all. I said that it was not being contemplated. I said we're not closing the door on anything; there's nothing sacred. We're going to try to protect the plan; we're going to spend the money wisely. There might be some other areas where we'll be successful. I hope, as in the announcement I made yesterday, that it will be recognized as a step in the right direction. We might bring new programs like we did, the \$800,000 worth of programs that I mentioned yesterday, in prevention. Certainly we will do that.

Eating Disorders Clinic

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health, in correspondence with me in November of last year, indicated to me that it is not intended that government funding for the Eating Disorders Clinic at the Health Sciences Centre will be reduced in either the fee for service or hospital funding areas. I've now received information, Mr. Speaker, from a constituent, that the funding for the Eating Disorders Clinic has been completely withdrawn, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister please deny that that is the case?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of commenting on a statement that I haven't seen. If I can see a copy of this statement, I'll certainly be glad to give the answer to my honourable friend.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask then that the Minister take this matter as notice in view of the

fact that there are approximately some 25 patients being treated for anorexia nervosa and another 31 on the waiting list, Mr. Speaker, and I think we're all aware of how serious this is, particularly for young people. I ask the Minister to take the question as notice and advise me later, whether or not funding has been withdrawn for this program.

Unemployed workers funding

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Could the Minister of Labour indicate whether her department and the Provincial Government will be supporting the application of the City of Winnipeg for provincial funding for approximately 395 unemployed workers in Manitoba, or in Winnipeg, which has been criticized, Mr. Speaker, because of the wage scales for the people involved, for example, \$600 per week for a Parks Program Co-ordinator, will her department be approving that program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, this application has not yet come to us for either review or for a signature for approval.

The process is that the application, after it has been reviewed by staff, goes to the Needs Advisory Committee. As I understand it went to them on Monday and they asked for more information from staff, both federal and provincial staff, and that information will be brought to them at their next meeting which I believe is next Monday.

When they have finished perusing this application, which I understand is made up of some 13-or-so different programs, then they will be sending it on to myself and to the Honourable Mr. Axworthy for our signatures, or not, as they recommend. We will then have an opportunity to look at it and make that determination.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask then that the Minister advise the House later on as to how the Province of Manitoba handles this particular application and, when doing so, part of the application apparently covers 50 health aid jobs for which people - mainly women - would be paid \$4.25 an hour to help out at two city hospitals, in contrast with the over \$16.00 per hour that would be paid to the Parks Program Co-ordinator. When she brings this information back to the House, Mr. Speaker, perhaps she could indicate how that jibes with the NDP election promise, by which the NDP said they would act or guarantee equal pay for work of equal value to help women break out of low-paying jobs, Mr. Speaker.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I have not seen the request; I have heard this information; I have certainly heard it on television, newscasts, in the paper and so on. I understand that this is what the city is asking. I can't say that with any assuredness because I haven't seen the application. If it is as the member suggests - and as far as I know there certainly is no declaration into which jobs men or women will be hired - I would suggest that women be hired into the \$600

a week jobs and men into the \$140 a week jobs, maybe that would be a nice change.

Eastern Manitoba Telephone Directory

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on March 4th the Honourable Member for Emerson indicated to this House that his name was deliberately omitted from the Eastern Region of the Manitoba Telephone Directory, and there were calls by the Member for Pembina to table instructions given last year by the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System to rectify those omissions in the future. I promised to bring back the report on that and I wish to give that briefly, Mr. Speaker.

I want to inform the House that on March 24, 1982 the Minister responsible for the MTS wrote a letter to the Chairperson of the MTS Board instructing the Manitoba Telephone System to ensure that each MLA is listed in the proper directory and, wherever a constituency boundary overlaps the MTS directory region, the MLA's were to be included in both regional directories. Following that, I want to remind the honourable members that they received, on April 20, 1982, a copy of the following correspondence and that is a memorandum dated April 8th from the Chairperson of the MTS Board, Mr. Saul Miller to the Honourable Len Evans, the Minister responsible, indicating that he was advised that the problems associated with the MLA listings in the regional directories will be resolved in future publications, Mr. Speaker.

Despite these efforts though, regrettably, oversights did occur. To ensure that they do not recur, Mr. Speaker, I have directed that the MTS forward the proofs of all MLA listings to the Government Services Communications Branch to be reviewed for their approval prior to MTS publication.

We hope this will prevent such mistakes in the future and I would like to inform the honourable members that this issue is not a case of deliberate negligence but one of error for which I apologize on behalf of the MTS.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take this moment to thank the Minister for his apology of the incompetence of two years in not being able to get the thing corrected. I appreciate the fact that it will be looked after in the future.

Single mothers' employment program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Community Services. It's about the Single Mothers' Employment Program. The Minister replied yesterday that we have modified our Work Activity Program so that we can place single

mothers of this category in useful work experience. My question to the Minister is, is the new modified program going to be paying these single mothers a dollar an hour?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the majority of these people are recipients of social allowances and in keeping with the policy that we have under the Work Activity Program, and indeed the modification that I mentioned, the Work Experience Placement Program, that would be the same type of payout. The fact is though, Mr. Speaker, and the point I was making yesterday, is that we are providing an opportunity for single mothers to have work experiences and opportunities that they didn't have previously. I'm very pleased to report that we received some very favourable correspondence from employers who have been able to use the services of such women in various settings, one in a nursing home, another in an office of a Manitoba organization. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the program is working very well.

As a matter of fact, I would point out - for the information of the Member for Pembina who again is talking from his seat - when the Work Activity Program was in existence under the previous government they cut it by \$2 million, and the fact is that we added 60 percent. So we've gone from \$2.6 million in 1981-82 to \$4.1 million and we have many hundreds of women today who have useful jobs, who are being given an opportunity, who are getting a bit of life-skills training who never had that opportunity before.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, in light of the Minister's answer - and he may not know that the women he is talking about were placed in the work force at \$4.50 an hour - does that mean that people on welfare now can be hired at \$1 an hour? Is that what he's telling the people of Manitoba that this government is going to pay them \$1 an hour?

HON. L. EVANS: What I'm telling the honourable member is that the Province of Manitoba, through its Provincial Social Allowance Program, does look after the needs of these individuals and their families, so that's provided for. In addition to that, they're given an incentive and they're given an opportunity to find work. As a matter of fact, those two letters that I referred to I believe indicate that there's an opportunity for those people to come on permanently eventually; that is the nature of the program, Mr. Speaker. I'd also remind the honourable member that in addition we added in last year's Budget \$10 million in Supplementary Supply for new labour job creation opportunities. I think it's a progressive program, it's a program in the right direction.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: My next question is to the Minister of Labour. Is the Minister of Labour really going to go along with her colleague, the Minister of Community Services, allowing single mothers to be put in the workplace for \$1 an hour?

Interest rates - reduction

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: I have a couple of answers to questions that were posed. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, it appears to me maybe members don't want answers to questions they've posed that I've taken as notice.

I have some answers to questions that were posed by the Member for Emerson. I gave some information directly to him but I'd like to put it on the record. It dealt with the interest rates of MACC. Mr. Speaker, the effect of the present interest rates through MACC loans, 5-year term at 11.5 and they range in 5-year blocks up until a 30-year term which is presently at 13 percent. When is the rate established? Mr. Speaker, the rates are established by the Department of Finance monthly, what the current rates will be effective the 15th of each month; and how are the rates established? The rates are established by the Department of Finance based on their borrowing rate on behalf of the Province of Manitoba, and the rates are set at the nearest one-half percent above the provincial borrowing rate.

Mr. Speaker, as well, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, in questions last week, dealt with the average size of beef herds in this province. The 1981 census shows that there are approximately 12,000 farms with 389,363 beef cows in the province; the average cow herd size in Manitoba is 32.4. Signups to the plan for Manitoba beef, as of February 2nd, 4,962 contracts with 269,932 beef cows, or 54.4 cows per contract, Mr. Speaker.

Oil industry at Melita

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, two days ago, the Member for Arthur asked for information about the number of jobs created relating to the oil boom or in the oil drilling area. The information we have is that in 1981 there were approximately 8,000 person days or 22 person years that can be directly traced to the oil boom. In 1982 that number had risen to 78 person years and approximately 20 percent to 30 percent of the people employed in the activity are Manitobans.

Marxist Study Conference

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Energy and Mines. Apparently the Minister responsible for Energy and Mines was one of the guest speakers at the Marxist-Leninist Study Conference that was held last weekend, and I am wondering whether the Minister will be prepared to table a copy of his address to the Marxist-Leninist Study Conference?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I had been invited by that organization to chair a panel. I had informed them some weeks ago that I was not available to chair the panel; that was carried in the press incorrectly. But obviously, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Emerson, followed a rumour without checking out any of the facts, which he could have done, which he chose not to do, which again indicates the type of questioning he tries to pursue. I find that unfortunate.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. I wonder whether he could indicate whether he spoke to that study conference, the Marxist Study Conference, or whether his colleague the Attorney-General was speaking at it?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I was asked a specific question as to whether, in fact, I spoke at that conference. The clear answer is, no, I didn't, Mr. Speaker. I might add though, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be at all nervous, from an intellectual point of view, of going to conferences that might deal with Ronald Reagan's monetarism, to deal with Ronald Reagan's monetarism, or that might deal with Keynesianism, Mr. Speaker, or might deal with Marxism, because the people on this side have an open mind and we are willing to look at all the alternatives, unlike the people on the other side who have a closed mind and can't comprehend even one alternative.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please, order. I believe the Honourable Member for La Verendrye wishes to pose a question.

World oil price

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Energy and would ask him, in light of the Premier's statements in Ottawa that energy prices should be rolled back because of the dropping world oil prices, is it this government's position, since some 70 percent of every dollar of gasoline right now is taxes, that the Federal Government and the producing provinces reduced their taxes on gasoline?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I have previously indicated that a government's taxation policy is geared to its determination as to what revenues it needs to build highways, to build bridges, to build drainage ditches and the likes, and that it establishes a taxation regiment for that purpose. What it comes to oil pricing we have oil prices being set by a worldwide cartel in a completely artificial and price-fixing manner; we have no instruments internationally to deal with the cartel that has fixed the price in an artificial manner way beyond its cost of production, Mr. Speaker. So, when that price fixing cartel loses its strength and decreases the price, Mr. Speaker, we believe that the prices then, in producing countries, should indeed go down; and

there is an agreement in place which says that if the prices go down the Canadian price would stay at 75 percent of the world price. That is something that the Federal Government and Alberta will have to deal with, and agreement that both of them arrived at in good faith and which the people of Canada presumed that they were going to follow in good faith.

MR. R. BANMAN: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, could he confirm that the position taken by his Premier, and obviously by the New Democratic Government in Manitoba, in seeing oil prices drop right across Canada, will mean a reduction in taxation to the Federal Government as well as the producing provinces?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government a few years ago changed this taxation policy in such a way as to create some tax leeway for individuals and corporations and they assumed, Mr. Speaker, that revenue would come from resource taxation tied to some - I wouldn't say a hope - projection of higher oil prices which indeed caused the western economy to go into a downward tailspin, Mr. Speaker. Now that the oil prices may, in fact, be coming down there could be a situation whereby the worldwide economy may indeed pick up as a result of lower world prices for oil; and that is certainly the hope of people on this side. If that happens, Mr. Speaker, the revenues of Canada and the revenues of various provinces would go up, if there is an upturn in the economy.

What we have right now, Mr. Speaker, is a situation where there is a downturn in the economy, in part caused by high world oil prices, in part caused by high interest rates, and only a few of the provinces benefit from that. Mr. Speaker, while the great majority of the provinces are hurt. We would hope that we would have a more equitable situation where there would be an increase in the worldwide prosperity and all people would benefit as a result of that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. BANMAN: Maybe, it's me, Mr. Speaker, or maybe it's the Minister, I am not sure, but I wonder if you could tell me whether or not the position his Premier has taken, in other words, to roll back the price of oil in Canada, and since the price of oil is now some 70 percent taxation from the Federal Government and the producing provinces, does that mean that the position of the Manitoba Government is that the Federal Government and the producing provinces should take a cut in taxation revenue?

HON. W. PARASIUK: There are some taxes which are, in fact, related to the price of oil. If that means if the price of oil goes down, they may have some decrease in their taxation level, Mr. Speaker; at the same time that will be more than offset if we, indeed, have some growth in our western economy, in a North American economy, in a Canadian economy, because of the stimulus that'll be provided to the consumers if, in fact, they have to pay less for oil prices.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, since the Provincial NDP Government here has put forward the position that oil prices be reduced in Canada, and that

will mean a corresponding reduction to the producing provinces and the Federal Government; since they want to see taxes reduced on that particular product to bring it down and stimulate economic growth in this particular province, why is the government in their particular Budget adding 5 cents a gallon to gasoline in the Province of Manitoba at a time when they want the Federal and Provincial Governments to lower their prices?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I have clearly said that we felt that the price of oil at the wellhead should indeed go down if, in fact, the world cartel, which has been artificially setting an oilhead price for oil, weakened and allowed and led to a situation where the price of oil could go down. We believe that decrease and the power of that cartel, the decrease in their strength which will lead to lower oil prices, the benefits of that should be passed on to the consumers of Canada and should be passed on to the consumers of Manitoba. There may be a side effect which will lead to an ancillary decrease in taxation revenues realized by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is, we believe that lower world prices for oil will be indeed a help for the world-wide economy, for the Canadian economy, for the Manitoba economy. From the line of questioning, I wonder what is the position of the Conservative Caucus on this issue? Do they believe that world prices for oil should go down if there is a weakness in the cartel, or are they asking me to defend their past positions where they wanted increases in the price of oil?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm having some difficulty in hearing the questions posed and the answers given. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in light of the Minister's own admission that lower oil prices and lower energy prices will stimulate the economy, could the Minister then explain why this government has chosen to put 5 cents a gallon on gasoline starting April 1 in Manitoba, when we already have the highest unemployment rates we've ever seen in this country; when we have the highest jobless rates for people under the age of 25 in this country.

By his own admission, he has indicated that increased energy costs have a negative effect on the economy. Now, why is he instituting a 5 cent a gallon tax when he has just admitted that is the problem?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I indicated before that a government's taxation policy is geared to its need for revenues to produce services which the opposition constantly asks us to provide - housing, bridges, drainage. We try and provide a tax system, Mr. Speaker, which is a fair system.

What the member opposite is saying is that we should somehow be pushing for increased oil prices if one follows their logic. Mr. Speaker, they may be content to be the party pushing for higher oil prices. We, on this side, believe that oil prices should be lower, Mr. Speaker. We will take that position publicly. If they want

to push their position for higher oil prices, let them take that out to the public, Mr. Speaker, because we believe the public does want lower oil prices.

MR. R. BANMAN: Since the member has indicated that he felt that we would like to see some increases, I want to assure him that is not the fact. As a matter of fact, I would ask him whether or not he would support a move to have the 5 cent a gallon tax, which this government is going to impose on the consumers of Manitoba April 1, have that wiped out, deleted and not tacked onto the backs of the consumers in this province?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that a taxation regimen is determined by a government in determining what its need for revenues are, to in fact try and keep the deficit within manageable levels; to in fact provide for the services which the opposition members constantly want us to provide. They can't have it both ways. They can't get up and say that we should be having more in the way of roads, in the way of highways, in the way of drainage, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: They can't then attack us for having a high deficit, Mr. Speaker. Then, they come along and say to us that we should decrease the taxes, Mr. Speaker. They want to have it not only two ways, they now want to have it three ways.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Minister of Highways.

Legislation Analyst - transportation of dangerous goods

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, and yesterday, the Member for Pembina had asked a question with respect to the employment of a legislation analyst. I have here a report from the personnel manager of the department, which indicates that the position of legislation analyst was created to provide support for the development of legislation on the transportation of dangerous goods.

The report also indicates that it's of a temporary nature, and that it is standard practice within the Civil Service to not hold a competition for a position that is of a temporary nature, therefore, the position was not bulletined, in accordance with standard practice.

To that, I'm sure that members opposite would agree with me that the qualifications of the incumbent are such that we would all want to support him in that position.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the Minister of Highways has so kindly provided the answer, and has indeed, referred to the member's unique qualifications to be a Legislation Analyst, would he mind

telling us just what his background and experience in analyzing and drafting legislation is?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to respond to that. The Member for Pembina perhaps has not been here long enough to appreciate that is the very role that we are all involved in; that very background lends itself for this particular individual in his interfacing with municipal councillors who are elected people, with political people throughout the province, with respect to the introduction of the legislation, the drafting of it, the introduction of it, and the regulations that will follow, and the public relations that has to flow out to the communities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the individual is well qualified for that role.

Support for Canadian Farmers' Survival Association

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that yesterday the Minister of Agriculture, in his answer to the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, indicated that he would not reduce the interest rate of 18 percent to the farm community, I ask the Minister of Agriculture, is there a penalty for paying off those Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation loans, lowering them from 18 percent?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned to the Honourable Member for La Verendrye yesterday, I said there were two ways of handling the problem and not in the way that the Member for Arthur has put forward, that there were two ways of handling it.

One was for the individual involved, and I should tell the honourable member that there are several types of loans that are in place. The loans that are reviewed on a five-year basis are subject to review on an ongoing basis, Mr. Speaker. In terms of the specific question of the five-year review, those loans are continuing to be reviewed and the interest rates are changed on those as the review period comes up, as they have been since they were instituted from Day One.

Insofar as the penalty payment, I will take the question as notice. But there is no penalty if the loan is paid off at any point in time by anyone who has a loan outstanding and that was the other process that we're looking at.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister is really unable to explain the reason why he is not able to reduce the interest rate, why is he, through his department and his authority with the Department of Agriculture, in control of the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation, continually refusing to help farmers who are financially distressed, in a distressed situation; why is he continually refusing applicants who have been requesting support from his government?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Arthur appears to forget very quickly that

we just introduced a \$100 million Operating Loan Guarantee Program for all the farmers of this province who would be eligible and who are having difficulty. We also have in place an Interest Rate Relief Program of which over 700 farmers have been approved on the program, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what the honourable member is saying, that if MACC should reduce the interest rates for those clients who are in that program, that everyone else should pick that up. Mr. Speaker, those clients who would be in that position would of course be very fortunate to have that interest rate reduced. However, there would be many other clients who would have tied themselves to additional loans through other institutions who would not have that privilege or who would be subjected to a penalty or whatever circumstances those institutions would have.

I told the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that the specifics of the amount of farmers and the specific amount of money involved in this area is being reviewed and we are looking at that question for those people who are involved.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions having expired. Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 27 - THE SOCIAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, would you call the Second Reading of Bill No. 27 at the top of Page 4.

HON. L. EVANS presented Bill No. 27, An Act to Amend the Social Services Administration Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate to the members of the House that this is a bill that is of an administrative nature. It provides for some minor administrative changes, albeit of some significance in terms of making the job of the Social Services Advisory Committee easier.

The first amendment deals with changes to subsection 3(4) and is intended to streamline the work of the Social Services Advisory Committee. This committee I might remind members is also sometimes referred to as the welfare appeal board.

The Members of the Legislature also would be familiar I believe with the responsibilities of the committee. It's an appeal board, not only for provincial assistance recipients but also for municipal welfare recipients; and, in addition, for persons who wish to appeal decisions on homemaker and day care services, as well as the

Manitoba supplement for pensioners and, in addition, the committee can advise the Minister from time to time on various matters in its field of interest.

Under the operating procedures now in existence the committee divides itself into panels of three for the purposes of hearing an appeal. The panels must always either include the chairman, chairperson or the vice-chairperson. Occasionally neither the chair nor the vice-chair are available to sit on the panel and as a result it is possible for a backlog to build up and in some cases over the years hearings have had to be postponed.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, will enable the chairman, or in his absence the vice-chairman or vice-chairperson, to appoint from among the remaining committee members a chairperson for the purpose of hearing an appeal. In other words, at the moment either the chairman or the vice-chairman must be among the three on the panel. With this amendment some other person can be named as a temporary chairperson. So, in effect, what we're doing by this Act, is streamlining the administrative operations and helping the committee do its work with greater flexibility.

The appellants will not be inconvenienced and, hopefully, all appeals which are required to be heard within a 15-day time limit will be heard within that particular time frame.

The other section proposed here is Section 11.5 which is a new provision governing fines to persons operating a residential care facility for the infirm, elderly, the mentally retarded or the mentally ill and all children. Members of the Legislature will recall that Regulation 41/81, under The Social Services Administration Act, sets out licencing standards for these facilities. This legislation here provides a minimum fine of \$200 and a maximum fine of \$1,000, each day of violation or contravention being considered a separate offence.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the Legislature that the legislation has always required licencing but without this provision, there has been no authority to impose a fine up until this point.

I might say, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the matter of fine was brought forward by Legislative Counsel, by our legal advisors, saying that it would be fitting in order for us to better bring forward a higher level of standards for residential care in the province. I know the previous Minister is very interested in the subject and is very much involved in bringing forward licencing procedures, etc. This is a step forward in the sense that we're trying to bring a little teeth into this particular legislation. The intent is a step forward in improving the facilities know as residential care facilities for these various categories of disadvantaged people. I would commend this legislation to the House.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 21 - THE MUNICIPAL ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 21 on Page 3?

HON. A. ADAM presented Bill No. 21, An Act to amend the Municipal Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, Bill 21, the 1983 amendments to The Municipal Act are primarily intended to clarify some existing provisions or to correct references to other legislations. The position of a municipality, for example, located adjacent to unorganized territory requires some clarification respecting municipal boundary extension. Similarly, the procedure for regulations passed by the Municipal Employees Benefit Board is clarified, as well as the position of the Public Utilities Board respecting the construction work necessary to install cable television distribution system.

The role of a municipal firefighter is clarified respecting right of entry in order to suppress a fire. Most of the remaining sections of the bill are intended to remove doubts in references to other provincial legislation. The right of a municipality to make a grant to a non-profit corporation providing television programming services in a municipality is clarified and there has been a general rewriting of the portion of The Municipal Act that deals with business licences. That rewriting is primarily intended to update the existing licensing provisions.

There is a provision for increased fees for business licence. The right of a municipality to hold referenda is clarified by removing existing restrictions and permitting municipalities to determine matters which should be referred to the electorate for an expression of opinion. I did not intend to deal in great detail with various references to the housekeeping changes, Mr. Speaker.

If members opposite wish I have detailed summaries of the proposals in the bill which I could distribute for ready reference before the bill is referred to committee. As a matter of courtesy, Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of my comments to send over to the Member for Swan River.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of clarification. Could the Minister indicate whether or not there is included in this bill authorization or the power for a municipality to hold a referendum on nuclear disarmament or on any other question?

HON. A. ADAM: Section 92 does deal with that. It doesn't specifically state any question that a municipality wishes to deal with, but that would be one of the items, I presume, if a municipality wanted to deal with that question they could put that question or any other question that they feel they would like to have an opinion on.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, since it was announced that there would be a change in that particular section,

my phone has been swamped with commendations and compliments for having changed that section.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Member for Minnedosa that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 4 on Page 2?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Energy Mines, Bill No. 4, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. (Stand)

BILL NO. 5 - THE SURFACE RIGHTS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 5?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Minister of Energy and Mines standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Every once in a while in this legislature we do find the odd subject that there is basically unanimous agreement on. I shouldn't say unanimous but I should say majority agreement on. I suspect that this bill is probably one that fits into that category and it's a bill that I have to give the government a certain amount of credit for, because the present government followed the policy that was set out by the previous government. The government of the previous administration set up a commission, the Nugent Commission, to look into the whole issue of surface rights. That commission reported, albeit after the election, to the present government. This bill is basically the result of the Nugent Commission of Inquiry. So, I say, I give the government credit for following through and acting on the report of that commission.

Mr. Speaker, when I say that, I have been cautioned and warned by people of considerable renown in political realms that you should never give government credit for anything. But I don't follow that today because I think basically what we have here is a bill that is going to be a good bill. It is a bill that is going to meet the needs of a certain segment of the Province of Manitoba that have been asking for legislation of this kind for quite some time. You only get legislation arriving, Mr. Speaker, when you find that legislation that is presently in place doesn't work well.

I am told by people in the oil industry and people that are affected by activities in the oil industry that the Manitoba Legislation that was in place prior to the

bringing in of this Act, was machinery that was very difficult to work with. It was slow, cumbersome and basically ineffective. So if we can find something in this bill that will expedite the activities of operators in the oil field, that will deal adequately with and protect the rights of those who are affected by activities in the oil field, then I think we should look at the bill, look at it carefully, and be thankful that we have legislation coming forward at this time.

Now that doesn't mean that the legislation that is proposed is going to be faultless. In fact, I think there are several areas in there that probably could and should be changed. We will make recommendations today that I hope the government will listen to and possibly amend the bill. The reason we make the recommendations now is that I hope the government will listen to them seriously and have time to think through the impact of what I am going to suggest and maybe others on this side will suggest, to make it a better bill for all those people that are affected by it.

I would say that there are basically four areas that concern me, areas that have been brought to my attention by people who are involved or might be affected. I think they are of sufficient concern to raise at this particular time for the attention of all Members of the House.

Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I do have a cold and I have some difficulty with it.

The first area, I think, is the one that probably is the most political of all and that is in the field of setting up a Surface Rights Board. The Nugent Commission was fairly explicit in that. The Nugent Commission recommended that the members of the board that would be set up should be people who are familiar with the agricultural industry. I believe that is very important for several reasons. First of all, the major portion of the work of the Surface Rights Board will be dealing with compensation - compensation for the detrimental effect of oil-field activity to the agriculture practice of the person who is either leasing the land or owns the land, but has no tie-in whatsoever with the mineral rights. I think it should be adjusted, that compensation boards should have adequate knowledge of the agriculture practices and know very well the value of agricultural land and its inherent use and the potential damage, long-time and immediate, that any disturbance will affect.

I think it is pretty important that that particular field be one in which either farmers or people who are immediately associated with agriculture be the members on that board. Mr. Speaker, when this bill goes to committee - and I hope it goes to committee quickly so that farmers can make their representations before the spring seeding occurs - I know that farmers will make that case very strongly.

There is a second element in that board, a second reason why I think it should be farmers that are on it. I know there are people in the oil industry who would like to be involved in that board and protect what I consider to be a vested interest. But there is another avenue available to them, Mr. Speaker, and that is, if the board makes a series of decisions that injuriously affect one segment of society as compared to the other, there is always the avenue of appeal to the courts. If there are a whole series of appeals that go to the courts, the board, being composed of farm people, people who

are very knowledgeable in the agricultural field, I know those people to be very fair-minded people and if they find that they are seriously in error, they will rapidly change their thinking to find an avenue that is fair and just to all people involved. I would have to say, I believe every member in this House probably has the greatest respect for the farming community as individuals, as to their ability to be fair, honest and just. I know of no particular segment in society that has a higher esteem in the public eye, in that respect, than the farm community. — (Interjection) — I don't want to be distracted by the comments of the Honourable Member for Elmwood because it's not my intention to discredit any segment of society.

One of the other areas, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to look at in this bill, is where we have to basically understand the procedure and that is the right of entry. Right of entry is probably one of the most important aspects in this bill, and that is the means by which an operator, a landman, an oil company, a drilling rig, how they can move onto a piece of property on which they own the mineral rights below the ground, how they can get to what is legally theirs and to do that, they have to have access to the surface rights of someone else's property.

The right of entry is the area where so much concern has been raised by many many people. This bill deals with a procedure which basically I don't find too much fault with, dealing with the right of entry, the method they go about it. However, there is one thing in it that does cause me some concern, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the bill is lacking in giving any guidance to the board in the time frame that they should be looking at in trying to operate with respect to right of entry.

A person who is applying to get access to what is legally his should know when he makes his application how long he can reasonably expect before he gets approval to obtain that right of entry. This bill does nothing towards setting out guidelines with respect to time frame in how long it would take from the time a person applies for a right of entry until the date he receives it. I think that we should address that problem when we are bringing forward legislation. It is important to the bodies or the people that are involved because there are large sums of money involved and if there's an indefinite time and the whole procedure and mechanism is left open-ended, it could be costly and expensive to parties that could be injuriously affected.

So I suggest to all members that we should address that problem when we get to committee and possibly make some amendments that would set forward a time frame for the Surface Rights Board to operate under, so that when a person makes an application, and I'm just using arbitrary figures, when a person makes application on the 1st of March he knows that within a certain period of time, maybe six weeks, the board will be making a decision and within another 30 days that he will have his right of entry. I just use those figures arbitrarily, Mr. Speaker. It may be advisable that it should be a six-month period rather than a two-month period, but we should give some leadership and show some direction to that board so that all the parties involved will know that when they start an action to obtain the right of entry, that at a certain period down the road they can expect an answer, so they can govern their activities accordingly.

That's very important in this country, Mr. Speaker, because we are now approaching a period where the Honourable Minister of Highways may very soon, possibly in the next 10 days, be bringing forward temporary restraining orders that would prevent the movement of any heavy equipment in this province, any equipment over a certain weight limit. That is fit and proper I believe, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister of Highways has a responsibility to protect the road system in this province and we don't want heavy drilling rigs moving over the roads during a spring breakup. So the operator who is applying for a right of entry has to take that into consideration; the Surface Rights Board, who are dealing with that application, have to take that into consideration. So, because of the nature of our province and the fact that we do have freezing and thawing and certain periods in the year when there are restrictions on the movement, it's important that we set forward a proper time frame for rights of entry to be granted by that board.

Mr. Speaker, some of the other concerns that I find in this bill are probably not as important but I think they are significant, and I'm sure that when we get to the committee that we will be able to get the adequate representation to make some adjustments. This bill will set forward a standard lease form which I think is probably a good thing. However, it's not the only form that should be considered. There has to be some flexibility. It is pretty important, Mr. Speaker, that we recognize that a contract made between two people, whether it be in a form that this Assembly deals with or suggests, or another form, one that is mutually acceptable to both parties, it should be one that is legal, reasonable and just.

There is a principle in this bill that may cause some concern with members of the legal fraternity. However, I have done some investigation and it doesn't seem to bother people in Alberta and Saskatchewan, and that is the law of contract. The law of contract may be violated by this Act, and that may cause some concern to members in the legal profession, but it doesn't bother me that much.

Another area that I think we should address in this bill is the activities of the Crown. Now, Mr. Speaker, the bill makes only passing reference to the Crown in this bill. I think there's only one small segment that says, this Act applies to the Crown with respect to the exploring for, developing or producing a mineral. That's the only reference that I can find in the bill to the Crown. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are other activities where the Crown is going to be involved that maybe the Minister might consider some changes, and I refer specifically to drilling activities and exploration activities which involve municipal road allowances.

At the present time, any activities of that nature require the signature of the appropriate Minister of the Crown. I believe in this particular case, is the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Well, Mr. Speaker, this causes, quite often, unnecessary delay, inconvenience and the fact that the headquarters for the Surface Rights Board will be in the area that is mostly affected. I think the Minister should give consideration to having the municipalities affected, who, I suggest, are also agents of the Crown, having those municipalities acting on behalf of the Crown. Rather than having to come all the way into Winnipeg to get the signature of a Minister,

I would hope that we can make some accommodation in this bill which would give the local government, the rural municipal council who are elected people, who represent the Crown on Crown owned lands within their jurisdiction, I would hope that we would give consideration to them as being the official agents of the Crown with respect to leasing activities in the land that comes under their jurisdictions within their municipal boundaries.

Now, whether that would involve, say, 5 or 10 sections of Crown-owned land, I would maybe think that there would have to be some consultation in that field. Where it comes to just the activities on road allowances, I think the local council should be sufficient authority and be able to act on behalf of the Crown.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I've taken up a fair bit of time of the House. I have voiced a few of the concerns that I have. I'm sure there are other members that may want to add a few more, but I would hope that this bill gets speedy passage in this House and referred to a committee, and have that committee meet before spring seeding activities take place in this province. I would hope the Minister would call it before a committee quickly, so that it does not injuriously affect the agricultural practices in this province, because I know there are many farmers who are vitally interested in passing this bill and seeing it passed and making their recommendations.

We, as elected people, are the servants of those people and we should do everything we can to accommodate them if it doesn't mean going too far out of our way to do it. Whether we call this bill before a committee next week or two months from now, I don't think it would inconvenience any member of this Assembly at all from the timing of the calling of that committee.

So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill does get to committee quickly, so that the farmers can make their presentations to whatever committee of the House that may be sitting to handle it before the seeding operations commence this spring. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm as well pleased to rise and speak in support of Bill 5, as my colleague from Virden. I want to say that the legislation, as I see it today, will put to rest some of the difficulties that some of my constituents are having; some of the difficulties of the negotiations that oil companies have been having with in trying to get into and develop a resource, that through our government policy changes and regulation changes actually encourage the development of the oil industry in the southwest.

Mr. Speaker, as well, I want to make sure that members of this Assembly and the people of Manitoba are aware of the fact that I am a member of a family who was born and raised in the southwest and, because of land ownership and mineral rights, there is a direct connection or interest that I would have, not only as an MLA but as a resident of that constituency and, therefore, want the House to be aware of that. I have no difficulty with that, Mr. Speaker, because this legislation has been prepared properly and brought forward and it is in the best interests of both parties as I see it.

The history of the particular legislation was handled quite capably by my colleague from Virden, suggesting that the Nugent Report was started, set up during our term of office. That particular action came from, Mr. Speaker, the formation of what I think is a pretty important body in the southwest area known as the Surface Rights Association, which is an association of landowners who have joined together to get a single voice to represent the farm community, to let government know what their concerns were and that would save individuals from coming forward in an approach that didn't carry the kind of weight. I want to, Mr. Speaker, compliment that surface rights organization for putting together what I would consider a pretty reasonable approach to, and moving along through the process of changing of government legislation.

I, Mr. Speaker, want to touch on two particular areas that I have seen as a lifetime resident of that community and why I think it is important that this change take place. Traditionally, Mr. Speaker, some of the older oil fields in the Virden area were somewhat before a lot of people realized some of the damages that could be brought about because of either salt water spills or oil spills or some form of foreign material put on agricultural land that wouldn't be in the best interests of that landowner. Because of that, Mr. Speaker, there has been somewhat of an animosity and a financial loss incurred by the farm community that had very little opportunity to be heard by government or to get any form of protection from government through the legislative process. Mr. Speaker, as that was being brought forward, the area which is directly in my constituency, particularly the Waskada oil field, was a new oil development as I said, resulted pretty much from our changing of regulations, but as well the World Oil Pricing Agreement and the fact that there was oil there and there was desire by the private sector to develop that oil field.

That, Mr. Speaker, has caused quite a few of my constituents some difficulty, due to the fact that they were unable to negotiate or to get fair settlements in their minds made by some particular people in the oil industry. They look for, Mr. Speaker, some protection or some guidance from a governmental instrument. The governmental instrument that was available under the old Mining Act was the mining board. The makeup of that, Mr. Speaker, as has been again pointed out by my colleague, did not appear to, at least, protect the interests of the agricultural community to the extent which they felt was necessary.

First of all, the difficulty that many of them had is that the individuals who are on the mining board are government employees. I have nothing against government employees, but the fact that they did not seem to be a neutral body set out from government, representing or trying to keep a balance between the farmer and the oil industry, I think, had to be addressed. That was addressed and I am pleased that it is mentioned in the legislation that people who are on that board should be, in fact, of agricultural knowledge or actually involved in the agriculture community.

I compliment the Nugent Commission, that's who I want to compliment, Mr. Speaker, because this basically came from his report. I compliment him and the surface rights people for making that very point, because it is

somewhat like this, Mr. Speaker, so that people who are non-farm people can understand. It is as if you owned the surface which your house is sitting on in the City of Winnipeg; you have a large lot. And someone else - probably the Crown or some other individual - owns the mineral rights underneath and because that mineral owner, or the person who has the right of access to that mineral says to a board who is hired by the government, who is employed by the government, we feel if you and I couldn't negotiate on the right to go in and put an oil derrick on your front lawn, that the board would give the permission to that oil company through the mining board to, in fact, go in and drill that hole. Well, you, Mr. Speaker, as a landowner or the owner of that home, I think, would have an extremely difficult time with an oil derrick sitting on your property and then all of the machinery that goes along with it and it would, in fact, cause you somewhat of a major disruption. If some board hired by government made a decision that was right and just, that they go in if they pay you compensation, without very little opportunity to be heard, I think is really treating the system or the people within that system unfairly.

It is not unlike, Mr. Speaker, the farmer who may have one of the best fields of wheat or flax, as my colleague for Virden saw when we did an oil-well tour of the southwest last summer where we probably saw a field of flax that was as nice a crop as you would want to see, with that same oil activity taking place in that particular field. The balance which is developed and the fairness of play which has to be put in place, has to be so that both parties are treated justly. I think that has to be the main objective of the board that's in place and the legislation that is giving that board the authority.

Mr. Speaker, the size of the oil field, as it has been developing, has again put some urgency on this legislation because of the numbers of people who are affected and the numbers of wells that are going on each of these properties. I have one particular constituent, Mr. Speaker, who has had somewhat of an extremely different situation, that one oil company - and it was a company known as PetroCan, which is the Federal Government company - because they possibly wanted visibility or because they were using taxpayers' money and not having the same accountability as the private sector, went in and made a settlement for one site. Some of the values are variable and in most cases there is reason to be variable, but this particular Canadian taxpayer-owned company came in and offered approximately \$7,000 to \$9,000 - I think \$7,000 was the figure - for a site to drill an oil well on it, whereas the general going price in that area through the private sector had been somewhat less, but had been negotiated by the farmers and the oil companies - not saying it's right any more than the other one was right - but did, in fact, cause some real difficulties with this particular producer who on one hand, one company gave him \$7,000, on the other hand the other companies were giving him \$3,000 to \$4,000, and it was hard for the individuals in the community to understand why that difference in price, for a site of land to drill an oil well, was actually there and I have had people suggest to me that this legislation should put a value on what should be paid.

Mr. Speaker, I don't support that approach, but I do think that as the board does its work, actively becomes

involved in the activity of the settlements of these drilling sites, that there will be a price established through the negotiations of the individuals and the companies but as well as some of the settlements that are made on behalf of this board.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important and urgent to get this legislation through so that, in fact, there can be what would appear to be more of an equalized approach to the actual use of land for the oil industry - and I don't support a fixed number but I think as this legislation and the board do their work, Mr. Speaker, there will be known figures that people will feel comfortable with and as anything else in society, particularly when you're in a small community, fairness and equality, not through legislation, not through strict dictatorship, but through just good fair play. A good sounding board and a good mechanism, I think, will provide that kind of stability.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Tell them about ManOil, Jimmy.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin-Russell mentions ManOil. That's one of the concerns that I have with the government getting involved in the oil industry where, in fact, they have access to government funds, like PetroCan, like the proposed ManOil Company, in fact, if they do go into the business, then they somewhat seem to feel that they could make themselves look better in the eyes of the public by the use of taxpayers' funds to pay more than in some cases, may be the proper value. That again is a concern. I think, Mr. Speaker, the board doing its — (Interjection) — after I'm through my speech. That after the board has an opportunity to do its job, then that will be the case.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation as I have seen it - and I know there will be several people making submissions to the committee hearings - one question that I have had in recent discussions with some of my constituents is that there is some urgency to it. We would like to have seen it a little faster, however, but that apparently wasn't possible, but the process now I would hope, would be allowed to be continued and I would hope that the government would now - and none of my colleagues or any other members of the House want to speak on it - would close the debate on it and put it into committee so we could get on with the clause-by-clause recommendations, or debate on it, in the committee stage.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I asked the honourable member whether he would answer a question. Presumably he would now, if we put it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable member indicated a concern apparently about a farmer in the Waskada area receiving a substantially higher lease fee from PetroCan, than other companies who were paying lease fees for drilling rights in the area, and then he further somehow suggested that perhaps government should control the level of lease fees. Is he suggesting that there is something wrong with a farmer in southwest

Manitoba getting a higher price for oil and gas rights on his land? Is he saying there shouldn't be a free market, that there should be open competition by a public corporation in this sector?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, very much to the contrary. I stated that the farmers, I think, feel comfortable in negotiating on behalf of themselves. But there is need for this legislation, with a board to arbitrate or to make sure that there is fairness within the system, and to give them backing as a farm community in their dealings with the oil companies. What I am stating is that I had concern, that when a government-owned oil corporation came in and paid somewhat higher than had been traditionally paid, it was hard to understand for the overall community whether, in fact, it was based on the actual loss of the land that was being used in that particular case, or whether, in fact, it was because the government-owned oil company had access to monies that were really not available to other groups, and that was the concern that I had, Mr. Speaker.

As I indicated, as the legislation is in place and the board operates, that there will be a consistency within the oil industry, both in the private sector oil companies and the government-owned ones, to bring a figure that will be acceptable to the negotiations, or a range in which the negotiations will take place, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other honourable members indicating a desire to speak on this, in the Minister's absence - he's in a meeting - his Legislative Assistant could say a few words and then it can go to committee.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister I would like to acknowledge the contributions that the Surface Rights Association has made towards this bill. We would also like to acknowledge the work that Russ Nugent carried out in bringing this bill to the point it is right now.

We realize that there are some questions still being asked concerning the bill and one of the areas is the makeup of the board. Some members have suggested that it should be made up strictly of the agricultural industry and we feel that the oil industry should also be represented on the boards, they have a stake in it as well.

We'd like to thank the members who have made contributions toward it and we are willing to let the bill go forward to committee, at which time it will be open to representations and suggestions from all sides.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Acting Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 6?

BILL NO. 6 - THE PESTICIDES AND FERTILIZER CONTROL ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 6, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, standing in the name of the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My comments on this particular bill will be brief, however they will follow to some extent, earlier comments made by my colleague, the Member for Pembina.

I believe when the Minister introduced this particular bill, he said primarily his intent in introducing it was to make some housekeeping amendments. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to accept that because on our first glance at the particular bill. However, in reading again his introductory remarks and then trying to compare them closely with the existing Act and the regulations under that, we have since that time, developed a few concerns.

I believe the Minister said that the amendments proposed in Bill No. 6 are to strengthen the procedure and before that he made reference to the procedure for training courses and examinations to ensure that retailers and commercial applicators fully understand the safe handling and usage of pesticides. I suppose, Sir, we were readily prepared to accept that because certainly one of the changes that he had proposed came under the specific area of inspection and inspectors and there was also a new clause under that particular section that seemed to allow investigation of breaches under the Act and under the regulation.

But then, when we filed the regulations in the Manitoba Gazette dated February 21, 1983, and really began to fully understand all the regulations and all the rules that would apply to a certain sector within commercial agriculture and realizing that potentially, farmers themselves, under some interpretation of the Act, may fall into that area, we began to become concerned. The major area then of our concern falls into the area of the definition of commercial applicator and it seems to me that the old Act used a definition, "Commercial applicator means a person whose application equipment is used for hire or for service to others for a fee charge or other valuable consideration to the extent of 50 percent or more of the annual usage of that application equipment."

The new recommendation that has come forward by way of the bill drops the last part of that. It drops the part, ". . . to the extent of 50 percent or more of the annual usage of the application equipment." So it was within that area that I think the Member for Pembina began to feel terribly concerned as to whether that Act or the new Act would impact upon him as an individual farmer who may, for any number of reasons, be prepared to spray what was remaining of his last tankful on his neighbour's property or indeed, as I think he drew out the case, of the individual who may go into a small village and do his babysitter's dandelions within his lawn.

I think it is subject to the interpretation that possibly he had more than a strong point and, hopefully, throughout this whole exercise the Minister will give us his specific rationale for introducing it and, again, some we'll be somewhat amenable to introducing some

further changes that will clarify our concerns. Of course, I suppose there are a number of areas in which we could build on the argument by the Member for Pembina. Certainly I know, in our case, as an individual within our own farm who is now experimenting with soy beans and using a chemical called basagram, which costs some \$25 an acre, if there's 50 gallons left you just don't dump it, you try to go to your neighbours to apply it and use it all up, and should be allowed to do so. You could also make the argument with something called Round-up and I don't care where you farm in this province, you usually have quack grass problems.

So, Mr. Speaker, as one reads the new bill which I believe the government would want to be enacted, your first introduction when you read it is that I, as a farmer who leaves my farm, am indeed a commercial applicator. Then you go to the regulations, those regulations that were filed on February 21st and Regulation 4(1) makes first reference to myself and it's Class 2 and it says that I, as that farmer, have to have a licence for the application of pesticides classified as commercial or restricted and (a) under that specifically makes reference to agricultural pest abatement. So I feel then, as the individual, before I read all these regulations that I have to have a licence.

Moving on through the regulations, 5(a) says any person desiring to obtain a pesticide dealer's licence or commercial applicator's licence (a) may be required to attend a course approved by the Minister respecting use and control of pesticides and also, if I want to obtain a licence, I shall satisfy the Minister that I am a person qualified in the use and control of pesticides.

Moving on to 6(4), another one of the many stipulations that I'll have to be prepared to accept is, and I read, "Every person licensed as a commercial applicator under the Act shall record within 24 hours of every application of pesticides and maintain for three years the following information for each application job."

These are the onerous requests of the Minister for all the information that I have to put down and here they are: the customer's name, in other words my neighbour's name; the mailing address of the customer; the date and time of application spraying or treatment; legal description of area and total area; type of crop or property treated; state of crop growth; weeds, pests or other purposes of application or treatment; wind direction and velocity at time of application; air temperature at time of application or treatment; name, formulation and concentration of pesticide use; total amount of pesticide applied; pest control products that registration number of pesticide used; then the carrier used, whether I had mixed my particular chemical with water, fuel oil, or other, and amount per unit area; then a final area dealing with remarks. So those are some of the earlier stipulations.

Then, we come to Section 8 (2), the one the Minister feels clarifies everything. It says, a farmer is not considered a commercial applicator when the total of pesticide application off his farm is less than 1,235 - I've converted that - 1,235 acres, and work is carried out for not more than three individuals in any year. I think with that, the Minister feels that, fine, we should have no concerns at all. Any difficulties that we may have with this new bill should be laid to rest because that answer is all our concern. Of course, we realize,

Sir, that in fact, this regulation is subject to change by Order-in-Council, by any whim, by any desire, by anybody whatsoever. So it begs a question. Why isn't that in the Act, or why isn't the original reference to a 50 percent share, why isn't that changed or some number put in to take care of that particular concern?

So, Mr. Speaker, let's say then that No. 8 was removed by the whim of this particular Minister of Agriculture. If that is removed and that particular regulation is removed, definitely each and every one of us, as farmers, then become commercial applicators. If you move on through the regulation, if we do not do all the requirements specified under 6 (4), then we move to No. 10, and it says and I quote: "Every applicant for a Class 2 licence for renewal shall provide a certificate of insurance for himself and his employees, certifying that he's covered for: (a) the public liability stipulation," as mentioned by earlier speakers; and "(b) The chemical misuse or spray drift damage by bond or insurance of not less than \$50,000 for any one plane."

So to review, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister, again, in addressing us, will state specifically why the bill was introduced, who wants the changes and why, that he has brought forward? We're wondering if he can build the farmer exemption into the Act per se, and if he cannot maybe work with the original clause, and if he feels he can develop some rationale for dropping that. Really, maybe he should tell us why he wants to drop it below 50 percent and if it need be, what that proper figure should be to tie into, again, with regulation No. 8.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, these are my comments on this bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 7 - THE DAIRY ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, will you call Bill No. 7, please.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call Bill No. 7, An Act to Amend The Dairy Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have spoken to this bill and raised general concerns that they have with respect to the Dairy Commission, I think principally being the kind of personnel that are appointed to boards from time to time.

I'm pleased to indicate to the Honourable Minister that we are prepared to move the bill forward into committee and deal with the bill further at that stage with perhaps only this one further reservation. That is,

recognizing that this board has operated for a number of years, it is also the board that is responsible for the licensing or the approval of plant expansion, if you like, of whatever nature in the industry and as such would be, I suppose, called upon to approve, if it should be this government's will, as indeed it was another NDP Government's will to do away with all present plants and build one giant plant in Arborg, let's say for instance, or in Selkirk.

I am, of course, referring to the old Crocus idea that all members had when they suggested that one plant could do all these things more efficiently and the kind of rationalization that the now Minister of Transportation foresaw in the dairy industry with that proposal would, of course, had to have been approved by this board.

So, Mr. Speaker, in approving the bill to move forward I just put on the record that although this board, as has been mentioned by numerous speakers, has been in existence for a long time, it has a role to play in the dairy industry. We are concerned and that really has been the concern as expressed by the Member for Emerson; it's been the concern as expressed by the Member for La Verendrye; all of them who have substantial dairy interests in their constituencies. The concern is valid on our side.

We have the dairy industry very much at heart. We have, without question, the responsibility of representing by far the majority of dairy farmers in Manitoba. So we are concerned about the kind of people that are appointed to these kinds of boards from time to time to further carry out the responsibilities this particular board has in the dairy industry.

Mr. Speaker, I understand there may be another contribution at this time on The Dairy Act, but I certainly want to indicate to the Minister that I will be supporting the bill and be prepared to move it forward into committee.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 14 - THE ELECTIONS ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you call Bill No. 14.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call Bill No. 14, An Act to Amend The Elections Act, standing in the name of the Member for St. Norbert.

The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish, Mr. Speaker, to make four or five points with respect to The Elections Act, and then I believe other colleagues of mine may wish to adjourn this bill and speak to it and raise other concerns.

Mr. Speaker, the first point that I wish to make is with respect to one of the first sections. Section 1 of

this Bill appears to be a very simple section, but I think involves a very important principle, Mr. Speaker. That section repeals Section 3 of The Elections Act. Section 3 of The Election Act says, "For purposes of this Act every British subject shall be conclusively deemed to be a Canadian citizen."

Mr. Speaker, this recommendation was indeed contained in the report of the Chief Electoral Officer, who pointed out that only three other provinces now permit only Canadian citizens to vote. So currently in seven provinces in this country British citizens do have the right to vote, Mr. Speaker.

We did go through this debate, I believe it was 1980, when I brought a bill forward which I think even contained similar suggestions to this. In committee, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the current Speaker, then the Member for St. Vital, raised a concern, as did members of our side of the House, and it was a unanimity, I thought at that time, between both sides of the House that British citizens should continue to have the right to vote in Manitoba. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe it should refer to all three parties at that time in the House. The Member for Fort Rouge at that time, Mrs. Westbury, was also very much in favour of retaining the right to vote for British citizens in Manitoba.

This section attempts to invoke a sunset clause, I believe they refer to, whereby British citizens would have the right to vote until July 1 of 1986. The rationale I suppose being, Mr. Speaker, that British citizens would have the right to vote in the next provincial election in Manitoba. They have notice of this section and if they wish to vote in any elections thereafter they should make application for Canadian citizenship.

The first rationale, Mr. Speaker, may very well not prove to be actually what happens and the way things are going for the government it may very well be that there will be no election before July 1, 1986. The members opposite would have until November of 1986 to run their full five years and in order to avoid defeat, Mr. Speaker, they may very well wait until the fall of 1986 before an election.

Mr. Speaker, we went through this debate in 1980 and, as I say, I believe there was unanimity among all three parties at that time, that British citizens should continue to have the right to vote in Manitoba and we, on this side, remain with that view. We believe that British citizens should continue to have the right to vote.

In view of the return of the Speaker to the Chair, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he may very well be moved to forward copies of his contributions in 1980 to this debate to all members of the Legislature. That is the first point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side do not support the principle that British citizens should lose the right to vote in Manitoba.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, is with respect to Section 4 of The Elections Act, that being the one that would make it mandatory that elections must take place in future years on a Tuesday, Mr. Speaker. I am of the view, that while that may be administratively convenient, it does remove some flexibility from the government, from the party in power at that time, and I don't think just simply for the sake of bureaucratic convenience that flexibility should be lost to whomever is in power.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, and I place it on the record, the fact that the Chief Electoral Officer's report has

pointed out that 9 out of the past 11 elections, I believe, have indeed been held on a Tuesday. Mr. Speaker, I think that discretion should be left to the party in power to determine on which day they wish to have an election.

Probably, Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious disagreements that we have with respect to this Act is Section 19 and the principle that is contained in that section. I point out, first of all, that the Attorney-General, in his remarks, indicated that virtually all of the amendments are being introduced by the government in response to recommendations contained in the review of The Elections Act, prepared by the Chief Electoral Officer, and submitted to the government. I had asked the Attorney-General for a copy of that report and then obtained one from the Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Speaker, and this is a case in which the Chief Electoral Officer did not recommend that this take place.

On Pages 5 and 6 of his report he deals with the question of vouching, and he firstly points out that 10,773 voters were vouched for at the polls in 1981, representing 1.6 percent of all registered voters, Mr. Speaker. He goes on to discuss the advantages and the disadvantages of vouching and makes a recommendation that, while the current system of vouching is often criticized, we think the procedure works reasonably well and is a convenience to a significant number of voters. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, we believe that the abuse of the procedure is quite limited, if it exists at all. To open the system up to a declaration procedure does invite the possibility of abuse and would make the provision of formal and continuous revision almost redundant. We, therefore, do not make a recommendation for a change in this area.

Conclusion: In considering the available options, it is our opinion that as much consensus as possible should be obtained from the political parties before any changes are made. Further, any substantial change should be advertised widely.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House have not been consulted in any manner whatsoever by the Government House Leader, by anyone on that side, with respect to this change in the Legislature, as certainly was the recommendation by the Chief Electoral Officer if any change was to be suggested to this system and, Mr. Speaker, we oppose this change. We think, as the Chief Electoral Officer has pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the existing system is working well. We think that to open this up, as the government proposes to do, does invite the possibility of abuse and we are not of the view that there should be any changes. There have been changes which we made, Mr. Speaker, which certainly gave much more opportunity to voters to get on the voters' list. Certainly a large number of people, some 10,773 took advantage of the existing provisions of the Act to be vouched for at the polls and to get on the voters' list and vote. We do not see the justification for change, Mr. Speaker, and we'll oppose that.

I reiterate the comment that this was not recommended by the Chief Electoral Officer and contrary to the remarks of the Attorney-General. I am not suggesting that he said specifically this vouching was recommended by the Chief Electoral Officer, but he said virtually all of the amendments are in response to recommendations — (Interjection) — that's right.

Mr. Speaker, there is a minor section in Section 25 of the Act, it refers to marks allowed on ballots, it's subsection 116(2)(g). I place our concern on the record that the use of the wording "without any apparent intention of identification" is a rather loose type of wording, but all of section 116(2) is not. We would like to review that in some detail with the Minister when this bill goes before committee, Mr. Speaker.

So, those are my general comments, Mr. Speaker. We do not support the removal of British citizens from voter lists in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. We would like to review that in some detail with the Minister when this bill goes before committee, Mr. Speaker. Those are my general comments, Mr. Speaker. We do not support the removal of British citizens from voters' lists in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. We do not support the inflexibility of requiring an election on Tuesdays. We do not support the doing away of the vouching system, Mr. Speaker. There are other more minor concerns that I have that would be more appropriately raised in committee, Mr. Speaker, and I intend to do so with the Attorney-General at that time.

MR. SPEAKER, J Walding: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, the Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: I have a question for the Member for St. Norbert if he had time left, and I believe he does. Mr. Speaker, my question would be to ask the Member for St. Norbert why his side has changed their position on the British subject question, since Bill 95 which he introduced as Minister responsible for that Act in the Session of the spring of 1980, included a provision which would have removed the rights of British subjects to vote without as extensive a sunset clause as is proposed in this bill. I am wondering if he can explain what has transpired in the last three years to bring about that dramatic change in position on his side.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I spoke to that earlier on. Perhaps the Member for Springfield was absent at the time. I pointed out that I had indeed included that in the bill which was introduced in the House in 1980, that upon reflection, upon concerns raised by members on this side, by members on that side of the House, by the now present Speaker then the Member for St. Vital, by the Liberal Party representative Mrs. Westbury at the time, there was unanimity in committee, Mr. Speaker, when we discussed this matter. It was agreed by all three parties at that time that British citizens should retain the right to vote in Manitoba. We changed our mind in committees as a result of the discussions that took place. We think there were good and valid reasons at that time, Mr. Speaker. I might very well,

Mr. Speaker, ask the Member for Springfield or the Attorney-General why the NDP have changed their position?

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Would you call Bill No. 15, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Pembina? (Stand)

Bill No. 16, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. (Stand)

Bill No. 19.

BILL 19 - THE SURVIVORSHIP ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 19, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill that I have given a great deal of thought to. I would like to divest myself of some thoughts on this bill, The Survivorship Act. Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to see this bill moved forward to committee and in general support the bill. It is a fairly straightforward bill that sets out some of the legal problems that arise, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, largely brought about by the modern age and the unfortunate and sometimes tragic multiple deaths that occur most often in automobile accidents, where the question of the legal survivor and the subsequent wills and testaments and legal rights pertaining to the survivor are important. It sets out in more precise detail as to who, in effect, is the legal survivor in the case of multiple deaths that occur and I commend the bill to the House.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Could we deal with Bill No. 33, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health, Bill No. 33, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. (Stand)

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Now what do we do?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of matters standing in the name of members who are for other reasons obliged to be elsewhere. The only thing we can do is call it 4:30, by agreement, and move into Private Members' Hour now if that's agreeable, Mr. Speaker.

MR. H. ENNS: Let's convert to question period, Mr. Speaker.

HON. A. MACKLING: Will you allow, Mr. Speaker, the roles reversed so that I can question the opposition?

Mr. Speaker, by agreement, we would call it 4:30 and deal with Private Members' Resolutions at this point.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to call it 4:30?

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Provided, Mr. Speaker, we're going to deal with Resolution No. 4, because that's what we prepared for.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour and Wednesday afternoon it's Proposed Resolutions. On the assumption that the House wishes to hold Resolution No. 1, we will then move to Resolution No. 4.

RES. NO. 4 - PORT OF CHURCHILL

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas, WHEREAS the Port of Churchill has tremendous potential to become one of Canada's foremost ports; and

WHEREAS, in particular, the Port of Churchill offers the shortest and cheapest route destination for 25 percent of Western Canada's grain producers; and

WHEREAS the amount of grain being shipped through the port is less than 2 percent of the total output of grain in Western Canada; and

WHEREAS the Port of Churchill has the existing capacity to ship in excess of one million tonnes of grain, even though less than half this amount is presently being shipped through the port; and

WHEREAS proper investment in the upgrading of the Hudson Bay rail line port facilities and in lengthening the port season would greatly expand the capacity of the port to ship grain; and

WHEREAS with proper investment and promotion the port could expand the shipment of other goods and commodities; and

WHEREAS this would greatly expand economic opportunities for Manitoba in general and Northern Manitoba in particular; and

WHEREAS the Federal Government's commitment to the development of the Port of Churchill has been lacking as most recently indicated by the fact that no reference to the port was made in recently announced changes to the Crow rate; and

WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba has recently indicated its interest in the development of the port in its Capital Project Proposals to the Federal Government;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Assembly urge the Federal Government and through it the Wheat Board to utilize the port to its present capacity for the shipment of grain;

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Assembly also urge the Federal Government to clearly commit itself to the upgrading and development of the Hudson Bay rail line and the Port of Churchill in order to fully utilize the potential of the port.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to be able to move this motion and propose it for discussion in this Assembly today for a number of reasons.

First of all, it's of concern to me as a Northerner because I feel the development of the Port of Churchill is vital to our economic development in Northern Manitoba. It's also of concern to me as a Manitoban because I think the proper development of the Port of Churchill would greatly expand Manitoba's economic opportunities. I must say, it's also of concern to me as a Canadian because I feel that development in Canada really should be aimed more and more in the upcoming decades at our north because I think that is where our greatest strength lies on the one hand, and our greatest underutilized potential lies on the other.

I also feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is an appropriate time to move this particular motion because, over the next few months, decisions are going to be made which will impact on the Port of Churchill for the upcoming decade, in fact, upcoming decades. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that over the next few months, decisions will be made which will either make or break the Port of Churchill.

In this regard I would say that I'm an optimist. I think that we can make the Port of Churchill a thriving, vital seaport because it does have a future and the key element that is required to live up to its potential, live up to its future, is the right kind of commitment from various levels of government here in Canada.

This should be a two-stage process, Mr. Speaker. I feel, first, that it's important to expand the shipment of grain to the potential of the port presently and also to the potential of the port in terms of its hinterland, the percent of grain that offers the most economical shipment to, but I must also indicate that I'm really looking personally toward the second expansion that I see taking place, and that is in the transshipment of goods. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this transshipment of goods and commodities is vital to the development of Northern Manitoba. It's particularly vital development of such communities as Thompson. This is the way that we're going to get the second industries that communities like Thompson, Lynn Lake, Leaf Rapids and other communities in the north need to balance the unpredictable situations they are faced with as single-economy, single-industry towns.

In moving this motion, I think the best place to start is with a bit of background on the port for those members who perhaps aren't familiar with that background. The first commitment to building a railway to the Port of Churchill was made back in 1908. Originally, it was a decision largely between the Port of Churchill and Port Nelson. Despite this initial commitment, construction was delayed until the First

World War was over and was not resumed until 1927. Construction was completed in 1929 and the elevators took over operation in 1931.

The Port of Churchill, in its early days, had some initial advantages. It offered a more sheltered location than Port Nelson, a deeper harbour and a longer season of navigation. It was also to be constructed at a cost differential of \$12.6 million less as well as providing the advantage that maintenance to the port was approximately \$1 million cheaper than it would have been at the Port Nelson location.

Despite these initial advantages the port grew slowly. I think this was largely the cause of the opposition of grain companies, of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway ports, as well as vessel operators themselves. Sure, Mr. Speaker, a number of powerful vested interests were opposed to the development of the Port of Churchill and it, indeed, did develop rather slowly in its initial years. In fact, for many years the greatest significance of the community of Churchill was not so much the port itself but the military bases and installations which were stationed there. This though, began to be phased out in 1964 and, in fact, the strategic importance of Churchill has declined to the point today where there is very little military presence in that community.

In looking at it, Mr. Speaker, I must say that it's rather sad at the number of advantages that the port does offer, that it hasn't been developed further to this point in time. I'd like to review some of those advantages for the benefit of members of this House. Most importantly, I think, is the fact that there is approximately a 1,000-mile advantage for the product movement between Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta to European markets as compared to the St. Lawrence route. That, of course, is because it utilizes the great circle route, and I'd also point out the majority of disadvantages, waterborne, while the inland rail advantages vary from origin to origin. This shorter distance, or course, buys great potential in terms of savings in transportation expenses which would accrue, of course, to the users of the facility.

The Port of Churchill also has some advantages in terms of ship size, Mr. Speaker. It can handle 40,000 tonne ships with relative ease. With dredging and turning basin modifications that are ongoing it won't be able to handle 45,000 tonne ships - that's metric tonnes, Mr. Speaker - and it can, in fact, handle considerably larger ships than the locks on the St. Lawrence Seaway. Perhaps most importantly in economic terms, is the fact that it offers significant cost advantages.

I have some statistics here which I have available for members in this House which compare the costs of moving wheats and barley via Churchill and Thunder Bay. It shows that there's a significant cost advantage to the movement of both wheat and barley by the Port of Churchill and I would urge all members, in fact, to peruse these statistics if they have any doubt whatsoever, about the economic viability of the port.

There are a couple of other advantages I'd like to mention, Mr. Speaker. One is, that the port has an excellent record in terms of route safety. There have, in fact, been only three major accidents since 1931 and all three of these accidents were through no fault of the route but, in fact, were caused by human error or world weather conditions. So it does have some significant advantages in that regard.

I think the port has perhaps out-performed many other ports in Canada. As an example of this I point out the fact that Churchill turns over an average of five times in three months versus five times in 9 to 12 months at other facilities, and of interest to members opposite as indicated by their attempt to amend our resolution on the Crow debate, I point out that Churchill has had labour problems only once in 50 years and I think Churchill workers are justifiably proud when records can be made, and will be made, of their work record over this entire period.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of advantages I would say the bottom line is that the Churchill port is, even at its present stage of development, the only fully developed and established deep-sea port in Canada. But as I've said, despite the existing potential, despite these advantages, there hasn't been the proper usage of the port to the present day. As an example of this, Mr. Speaker, I point out the fact that despite the fact that the catchment area of the Port of Churchill consists of 25 percent of grain produced in Western Canada, only 1.5 to 2 percent is actually shipped through the port. Incidentally, catchment area refers to the area where the port offers the lowest cost and shortest inland route for information of members of this House.

Another indication of the lack of use of the existing potential is indicated by the fact that less than 50 percent of the capacity of the port, the existing capacity, Mr. Speaker, is being used, that capacity being approximately one-million-or-more tonnes, as indicated in the resolution when, in fact, less than 500,000 metric tonnes are being shipped through.

Mr. Speaker, many different excuses have been given for the fact that the port has not been living up to its potential. You'll hear many of them from the Wheat Board, sometimes from the Government of Canada, sometimes from the vested interests direct, you'll hear about the lack of a CN-CP interchange agreement; you'll hear about restrictions in regard to the use of hopper cars because of the condition of the rail line. You'll hear about the timing of the season; you'll hear about the shortness of the season which is approximately 90 to 100 days. You'll hear about problems with insurance. In fact, more recently you'll hear about the problems that exist in the Port of Churchill with the lack of access to hydro.

But I think in reviewing these problems, Mr. Speaker, it's quite apparent that most, if not all of them, can be readily overcome. An interchange agreement can be signed and, in fact, I think it should be signed at the earliest possible opportunity. The season can be extended. In fact, the Hall Commission and the National Research Council have indicated that it could be extended by one month even with existing resources and facilities.

There are other ways too, Mr. Speaker, in which the length of the season could greatly be expanded. A tidal barrier above the harbour could be established to improve the situation in the shoulder season. They could transfer icebreakers from the St. Lawrence to Churchill in June and July and November and December and this would greatly expand the use of the port. Also, they could use ice-strengthened dry bulk carriers in the period when the bay is beginning to freeze up and that, too, could expand the length of the season.

In terms of insurance, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that instead of looking to the traditional insurer, that

being LLoYds of London, that we look at Canadian-based insurance because, I think, in looking at the enviable safety record of the port, that far lower insurance rates could be forthcoming with the right kind of approach. Now those, as I said, are some of the, what I would consider, more minor objections which have been made to the use of the port and as I said, I think they could be overcome quite readily.

One of the major objections, though, relates to the condition of the rail line itself and in particular the problems that exist with permafrost along the route from Wabowden to Churchill. Now, that's no surprise to those of us who live in the north, Mr. Speaker, that's been a problem not just for the rail line for the last many years, but also with highways. We face that problem constantly in terms of Highway 391, for example, to Thompson. In fact, I think there are approximately 250 sink holes at present as a result of this problem with permafrost.

Now, I'm not going to dwell too much on the rail line itself. I believe, my colleague, the Member for The Pas will be addressing this particular aspect of the resolution further in his remarks. I would say, though, that the technology does exist to overcome this problem. In particular, at the present time we have cryo-anchors which provide a way of controlling the heat, the permafrost level, and thereby preventing this problem with freezing and the resulting sink holes. So in other words, Mr. Speaker, it can be fixed.

Now, as I said, Mr. Speaker, most of the problems can be overcome. We certainly, at the provincial level, have been the first to make suggestions in this regard, but it's not just the Province of Manitoba that has been concerned about this question. I would point out that the Port Churchill Development Board, of which I am a member, has in fact made a number of submissions itself. I'd also point out for the information of the members that this Development Board encompasses not just Manitoba, but also the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, both provinces which have representatives on the board. One of them in each case is an MLA; one is another appointment. So, there's quite a broad acceptance of the need to develop the Port of Churchill across the prairies.

As I've said, Mr. Speaker, the Port Churchill Development Board has made a number of specific recommendations to the Federal Government asking for commitments to the port. I've mentioned some of them in passing. They need to increase the throughput of grain to at least 800,000 metric tonnes minimally or annually. I've mentioned the need for a permanent agreement for the interchange of rail cars between C.P. and C.N. to allow grain originating on C.P. lines access to the Port of Churchill. I've mentioned the lengthening of the season of navigation. I've also mentioned some of the problems that have been stated in terms of the timing of the season. What has been proposed as a solution is the movement of grain to Churchill well in advance of the shipping season to ensure an adequate supply of grain for loading at the beginning of the new season.

There are a number of other suggestions that have been made, Mr. Speaker, by the province and the Port Churchill Development Board. One I would note is the freight rate structure which would encourage traffic over the bay route. I think one of the key elements here is

that there be a constant rate structure based on mileage, rather than variable rates or incentive rates or whatever term one wishes to apply, which would only work to the favour of the east-west more established routes when, in fact, Churchill, I feel, should have the advantage or it certainly would under a mileage rate system.

I could list further specific areas where we've sought commitment, but I think that I've given the general idea, Mr. Speaker, of the extent to which we had made representation to the Federal Government; but I would like to go further than merely listing what some members might consider to be a sort of a shopping list that we have approached the Federal Government with, because really it's not a shopping list. We're not asking for one or two things out of 10 or 20. We're asking for a major commitment. We're asking for it now as well, Mr. Speaker, and in a very urgent way.

I say it's urgent because of a number of reasons. One, as I've alluded to before, is the changes to the Crow rate which have been announced. There are basically two reasons that I am concerned about these changes. One is the question as to whether distance related or variable rates will be adopted following the removal of the Crow rate. The second is in regards to the use of the money which was allocated for rural development in Western Canada. I feel at least part of it should go to the Port of Churchill, and neither of these particular points were addressed by the Minister of Transport at the federal level, Jean-Luc Pepin.

Mr. Speaker, beyond that particular concern, I have a concern which relates to the increased use of hopper cars that is taking place at the present time, because the rail line to the Port of Churchill at the present time is not equipped to handle hopper cars because of the problems with permafrost. As I've said, if the rail line is upgraded, and I feel it can be, these hopper cars can be used. I think that's why we have to develop it now, because if we wait too long, if the port is not upgraded, if the rail line is not upgraded, well, Mr. Speaker, with the continued use of hopper cars, more and more grain will go to the east-west routes and less and less to the Port of Churchill, which is in the total reverse of the way it should go.

In general, Mr. Speaker, what I am seeking through this resolution from the Federal Government is a change in attitude; is a renewed commitment to the Port of Churchill and the north. I think that would be indicated by a number of specific changes that I have already mentioned, but also an overall commitment to the development of the Port of Churchill and the north. I must say, Mr. Speaker, the lack of this commitment is what I would consider to be the most significant barrier in the way of its present development and, for that matter, the development of the entire north. For too long, Canada's development has taken place on an east-west basis and that east-west development has been backed up by very powerful vested interests. The North has become little more than an economic outpost, an economic colony in a way of the southern parts of the country.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is a gross waste of our resources, gross waste of our potential. There's no reason why communities such as Thompson, the community I represent, should be single industry towns. We are so close to a major port, the Port of Churchill.

We have such excellent facilities. We have access to the cheapest hydro in North America, and for that matter, the cheapest hydro in the world. There's no reason that we should be simply a one industry town, but because of the economic strategy that governments, both at the provincial and federal level have adopted for years, we don't have a chance at the present time, Mr. Speaker. We simply don't have a chance.

I feel with this change in attitude, that we can have a chance and the place to start here in Manitoba in regard to northern development is with the Port of Churchill. If we upgrade it, if we commit ourselves to using it to its existing potential, we will see, I think, what development economists would describe as something of the "Big Bang" theory of economic development. If we commit ourselves enough, we will see a whole rapid series of changes in the way the North's economy functions.

If we get that port developed, first, we'll get the grain shipments; second, we'll get the other goods and commodities shipped; third, we'll develop the second industries; fourth, we will develop the entire economy of the North; communities such as Thompson, outlying communities, Churchill itself. That is why I propose this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps you might call it something of self-interest. As a northerner, as someone who grew up in the north, who represents a northern constituency, perhaps that's the case. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I will argue for the north, not just as a northerner but as a Manitoban and as a Canadian, because I feel quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, that the future of this country lies in the North. We haven't heard those kind of words for many years. The last time I heard it was from the Right Honourable John Diefenbaker back in the '50s. Perhaps it's time that we, as legislators in the 1980s, took the same commitment to the north, to Canada, and changed our whole policy of economic development.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I was having some difficulty with the Member for Thompson until he mentioned the Honourable John Diefenbaker's name and the work and effort that he had done in Canada and in the north in particular. He certainly has swayed me with those last few words to give consideration to supporting a resolution which not only this member has seen fit to put on the Order Paper but, for probably the last three or four years we were in government, we would see this same kind of resolution. But, Mr. Speaker, it came from a member not from Northern Manitoba, but from a colleague of ours, the former Member for Rock Lake Constituency, Henry Einarson . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Great man, fine man.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Good old Henry.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . who was truly committed, and not just through resolutions, Mr. Speaker, but spent a lot of his time on the Hudson Bay Route Association

Organization, actually got involved, just not in verbal debate in this House and tried to make the rest of the people think that he was letting on he was supporting it, but actually spent a lot of his time supporting and dedicated to the development and future expansion and use of the Port of Churchill. So, this Member for Thompson should not stand and say that he is the only person, it is he that brought this forward, that there hadn't been any talk of the north, because it was now his great idea.

Mr. Speaker, I want to, as well, put on the record the fact that the opposition, the Progressive Conservative Party, have for many years and particularly in our term of office, shown support and not only shown it from this Assembly, but have actively organized and assembled politicians, people in the grain industry, the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board at the Federal level, to participate in a transportation and Churchill meeting at Dauphin. Then we proceeded - and we used government expenses to do it - to Churchill to meet and to personally view the facilities there and to be right on the site to which the member refers, some of the best facilities for movement of grain out of Canada that there are available.

We actively participated, Mr. Speaker, we organized the people who had the decision-making power and participated in that activity. As well, we've brought the politicians, the Ministers responsible for their different jurisdictions in Alberta and Saskatchewan, to participate in and to show their support for our government, Mr. Speaker, in full support of The Port of Churchill. What were some of the things — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Speaker, that's right. I'm glad the Member for Emerson was here.

MR. H. ENNS: That's why we amended the Crow Resolution.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the initial stages of our coming into office in 1977 saw a tie-up of the movement of grain at the Port of Churchill. Mr. Speaker, I don't mind giving credit where credit is due. I had a colleague from Lakeside who was the Minister of Natural Resources at that time, I believe, who suggested because he had farmers and because I was the Minister of Agriculture and he wanted to talk to me - he gave me a call and he said, Mr. Minister, I would suggest that you should do something about the Churchill strike and I said that I felt very responsible and that we should take some action and try and resolve the problem at the Port of Churchill, which was created by a labour dispute. That, Mr. Speaker, again, should tell these members opposite and the government why we wanted to include that in the Crow Resolution. Because that is another example of the difficulties that have been within the grain handling and transportation sector for many many years - just another example, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, we did in fact offer. We offered, Mr. Speaker. As the Minister of Agriculture, I took the responsible role of offering the services of the farm community to proceed to Churchill to load their grain, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the farmers were ready to go. But, what did the then Minister of Agriculture — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If other members desire to enter the debate, they will have the same chance as the present member.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, what was the criticism of the opposition at that time? Do you know what the criticism of the opposition was at that time? The Member for Lac du Bonnet said, you know why farmers shouldn't go up there to move grain? Because they don't know how to do it. Mr. Speaker, don't send the farmers to Churchill because they don't know how to move that grain through that terminal. Well, Mr. Speaker, I never in all my life heard such a ridiculous statement come from any member who had been the Minister of Agriculture for as many years as he had been in this province. The farmers wouldn't know how to move grain.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that if a farmer can handle the grain off the farm into the grain elevators, into the system at his farm level, that it isn't that much more difficult to operate a grain terminal into a boat. Well, Mr. Speaker, not only that. I would say that there were a lot of people up there who now work at Churchill when the grain is moving that actually are off farm communities and are farmers themselves.

So, in fact, I think it was a discredit to the farm community for the New Democratic Party at that time to say farmers don't know how to handle grain. It just totally shows their ignorance, Mr. Speaker, in the whole area of agriculture.

MR. H. ENNS: That's just like saying farmers don't know how to milk cows.

MR. J. DOWNEY: It has been demonstrated time and time again, so I am pleased that my colleagues from Emerson and Lakeside reminded me of that particular opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the members say, well, what really did it accomplish. Well, Mr. Speaker, the record of last year's movement - I think there was some doubling of the amount of grain put through Churchill last year than was the year before. I again think, Mr. Speaker, some of the results of that increased movement came from the actual involvement of people who are interested in the system to be, or to have a first-hand look at, and to show our concern and our interest in that particular port.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that it was our direct responsibility, but it was the collective efforts that put more grain through the Port of Churchill as well as the collective efforts of all of the Provincial Governments, all the grain handling transportation people that gave us an increase, a record increase, in all the movement of grain out of Canada, some 27.1 million tonnes moved out last year, and that was a million tonnes above the target that the Wheat Board had set.

So, it is positive action that comes from — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture says, poor workers. No, Mr. Speaker, they're good workers, good workers, and when they are working I think they are pretty good at the job. The concern I have is as stated in the Grain Authority Report and every report I have seen, that it has been a labour dispute that has slowed the thing down - not the fact that when they are on the job, they are not working - it is the labour disputes that have to be straightened

out, Mr. Speaker, not their ability to work and perform when they're on the job. So he had better pay a little bit more attention to the actual issue rather than try and drag a red herring across.

Mr. Speaker, what about the capacity of The Port of Churchill? The capacity of the actual elevator itself is some 5 million bushels. I would sooner refer to it as bushels than I would in the metric because I still understand bushels. Five Million bushels is the actual capacity of the elevator. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, I can tell you one thing, wouldn't know very much about the grain business and I'll tell you another thing, he would be better off dealing with the fertilizer that he continues to spread in this particular place because that's what he's more familiar with.

Mr. Speaker, the point the member makes about filling that elevator in the winter months when it's there to load in the spring is quite correct and that is one of the things that could be done to increase the capacity. As well, Mr. Speaker, we had our meeting in Dauphin and Churchill in June of that particular year to demonstrate and to show the public that we didn't have to wait until the middle of July to bring boats into The Port of Churchill, but in fact they could be brought in June, Mr. Speaker. The first part of June, the bay is clear of ice and big boats could be brought in to load but no, Mr. Speaker, they aren't brought in until about the 23rd of July. That, Mr. Speaker, is again the reason why we spent taxpayers' money to take people who were involved in the industry there to show them that it was in fact possible.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the 1st of June there is no ice and the boats don't come in until a month and a half later. As well, Mr. Speaker, the extension at the other end is even more important because it doesn't ice up probably until some part of the first part of November. When is the last shipment taking place? Well, somewhat about a month, I think, prior to that. So there is in fact quite an extension of that season that is real practical.

As well, Mr. Speaker, there should be and could be Federal Government or insurance made available to give insurance or provide insurance for those boats that would go in on an extended basis, Mr. Speaker. So there are some practical things that can be done and, in fact, it's projected without very much difficulty that the turnover of that elevator could increase by some ten times, which would put out some 50 million bushels of grain without a lot of activity, expenses, or anything else done other than putting the grain in place.

How does the grain get there, Mr. Speaker? Well, the member referred to the fact that there were some expenditures that could take place; but let us not get the provincial taxpayers into providing the funds into that rail system up to Churchill. That is a railroad responsibility or a national government responsibility, Mr. Speaker, but I heard the other day the Minister of Economic Development suggest that we probably should put some provincial money into that rail line. No, Mr. Speaker, that's not our responsibility and we shouldn't be putting money where it's other people's responsibility. — (Interjection) — That's right, Mr. Speaker. My colleague from Swan River says it's like killing the Crow. That shouldn't be done.

What about the heat exchangers that the member refers to? The problem with permafrost, Mr. Speaker,

and again this was pointed out to those people who were on that tour, that there was in fact, and is in fact, technology available and it's called a heat pipe. And why do you have to use a heat pipe, Mr. Speaker? Because when the surface of the ground is cleared off of the moss and the leaves and all the natural cover that is there . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DOWNEY: I said the moss and in some areas there are trees. Why doesn't the Minister of Agriculture take time to go and find out? We were there, Mr. Speaker; he wasn't.

HON. B. URUSKI: I've been there about half a dozen times or more.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the heat transfers or exchangers - after this moss is cleared off, the sun shining down thaws out the permafrost and the line becomes soft and sinks into the ground. The purpose of the heat exchanger, and at that time, Mr. Speaker - in fact, I don't why this resolution doesn't include it to request a Federal Government study that was being carried out at that time, should now be available for public consumption, and I don't know where it is or why it wasn't made available. That heat exchanger, Mr. Speaker, is put in the ground, the cold air in the wintertime is taken in and freezes that ground permanently and removes the problem, takes away the problem that the removal of the moss and the natural cover that is there and keeps it permanently frozen. That is the way in which the heat exchanger works. There were several miles of track on test and I understand, Mr. Speaker, from what we saw at that particular time on film, that it is working very well and I would the hope the member would carry out his commitment and get that study and provide it to this House and to the public so we know that it in fact would work. I believe that it would, Mr. Speaker; so there is activity.

Mr. Speaker, what about the other purposes that we should have a Churchill line? Let me put it this way. If we'd have been allowed to continue on in government and continue the resource development and not have the massive layoffs at Thompson in the mines that are taking place now, without having shut down the proposed aluminum plant, without having Limestone not go ahead, Mr. Speaker, and the power grid that would have created activity in the North, that would have given a lot more need to the use of the track up to Churchill, a lot more northern activity which was stopped by this government. Mr. Speaker, how can they bring in a resolution and give lip service to using of the Port of Churchill when if we'd have had the resource development that the Progressive Conservative Party had started and carried on, it would have been in fact used.

I would be somewhat more supportive of this if they would not be so - how shall I put it - I think probably they're just being insincere, Mr. Speaker, about this resolution because they are standing up saying, we would like to expand the Port of Churchill, we want all these nice things to happen, we would like to carry

other products on that line; but under their policies, Mr. Speaker, it isn't happening. They are chasing those investors, those private sector people who would put money in here to develop our resources, they're chasing them out, Mr. Speaker. So then again we have very little real meaning in this resolution on the support of the Port of Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, the whole purpose of this resolution, I am sure, is to point out that we do have, and hopefully it is, an inland terminal or a terminal that has tidewater access right here in the Province of Manitoba because that is big, that is important; but it has to have the development of other resources as well as the support of the agriculture community to go ahead. I think that if this government had have been sincere, more sincere when we were talking about the Crow rate, that they would have in fact put this on the table as one of the things that they would have been able to live with. If there had been some commitment by the Federal Government to make sure the Port of Churchill was fully expanded, to make sure that the rail had been upgraded for future use, then in fact this was one of the things that they were prepared to sit down and talk about with the Federal Government on negotiations with the Gilson Report; but no, Mr. Speaker, they wouldn't even put it in the resolution. They picked the Saskatchewan resolution up and said, because it's in our best political interests to try and embarrass the Progressive Conservative Party in Manitoba by making them vote against the Saskatchewan resolution, Mr. Speaker, we'll leave Churchill out of it; we'll just adopt it as was brought in by Saskatchewan. So, Mr. Speaker, I really have a hard time finding, in my capacity as a Member of this Legislature, the real sincerity of the government that are in office. I don't think it's there, Mr. Speaker. I think it is simply a smoke screen, or a lip service attempt, to try and tell the people of Churchill, yes, we care about you because we put a resolution on the Order Paper. Well, Mr. Speaker, it won't wash. It won't wash today, it won't wash when the next election comes, because the activity in our resource development we would have hoped for and could see with the vision we had with the Limestone development, with the other resource materials being developed. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Thompson nickel mine certainly has undergone the same problems with the economic recession in the western world.

Mr. Speaker, if we were building a massive power grid in western Canada, and if we were building massive dams on the Nelson River, those people could have left that mine. They wouldn't have had to leave Northern Manitoba and be uprooted from where they wanted to live. They could have gone to work in those jobs at Limestone. They could have remained in those jobs, Mr. Speaker, but they stopped it, the Government of Manitoba, the New Democratic Party who promised that wouldn't happen, did happen. So it won't wash, Mr. Speaker. It won't wash today; it won't wash in the next election. Mr. Speaker, I think there'll be a lot of our members who will want to speak on this because I don't know one person over here that doesn't want to see the full development of the Port of Churchill.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, that the member did refer to John Diefenbaker. He was a great Canadian. He did have a vision, Mr. Speaker, and I think it was that kind of vision, it was the same kind

of vision carried by the Progressive Conservative Party that wanted to see — (Interjection) — that's right. The Diefenbaker vision has been left with the majority of Progressive Conservative Party members and I would hope that the Member for Thompson reads and studies a little bit more about the vision that John Diefenbaker had, because if he would apply that to his caucus and his colleagues, it may help them out of the economic dilemma and the problems that we're having in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the member a question if he would permit.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. If there is leave of the House? (Agreed)

HON. V. SHCROEDER: Very good, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member was referring to investment in Manitoba and yesterday Statistics Canada came out with the new set of predictions for investment in Canada for the coming year. There is one province west of the Maritimes which Statistics Canada predict will have an increase in investment in the upcoming year. I'm wondering whether the member knows which province that is; in order to help him the name of that province starts with an "M" as in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister refers to Statistics Canada which is, I'm sure, in a lot of people's minds, a good base to work from and sometimes can be questioned. We will continue to watch them, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister is quite proudly suggesting that Manitoba is somewhat up. I'm not against increased economic activity and don't let him try and say that, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I think if they hadn't been in office and we had, those figures would even have been a lot greater than what they're shown to be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to second the resolution and I'm pleased to have the opportunity to speak on the Port of Churchill. The constituency I represent is affected to a great degree by what would happen in the Port of Churchill.

I have been very privileged because I've had the opportunity to work at the Port of Churchill, both as a passenger man, so I've seen the potential for tourism there. I have worked on the grain movement and I've also been involved with the work trains when the Churchill line was being rehabilitated so I know the area very well and I'm pleased to have the opportunity to speak on it.

My colleague from Thompson has already given some history on the Port of Churchill. I would go back to it a little more because I think Churchill has a very rich history that goes back to the year 1689. The Hudson's Bay Company's first port was built in an area which was five miles north of the mouth of the Churchill River.

Over the next two centuries Churchill played a major role in the area of fur trading, exploration, and research.

The grain production in Western Canada increased during this period, resulting in a congestion of the eastern seaports and led to western producers demanding a shorter rail route and a shorter ocean route to the European market which was being built up at this time.

There was a strong competition between locating the port at Port Nelson or at Churchill. As a matter of fact, they started building the grade to Port Nelson but then the war came along so they stopped the construction, and it was after the war was over that the site of Churchill was selected because it offered more of a sheltered location, a deeper harbour and also a longer shipping season for navigation.

Mr. Speaker, the rail line to Churchill was completed in 1929, and the elevator facilities were completed in 1931, and two grain vessels were loaded at Churchill for shipment overseas in that year.

The Port of Churchill has met with a lot of opposition ever since it was built. The opposition has come from grain companies, the seaports and also from the railroads, and Jack Murta. I believe these organizations have opposed the Port of Churchill because of the vested interest of moving traffic over main line transportation routes.

The Government of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba have realized the opposition of these organizations to the Port of Churchill, so they have continued to fund the "Port of Churchill Development Board."

The purpose of the board is to promote the use of Churchill, better known as the Hudson Bay route, and also promote the use of the Port of Churchill itself. They have also had a high profile in encouraging the modernization of the port itself and the rehabilitation of the rail line to Churchill. The development board also provides information for all potential and interested shippers. The Hudson Bay Route Association has also been a strong supporter of the Port of Churchill and one of my constituents, the present Reeve of the Local Government District of Consol, John Bodner, is presently an Executive Director of the Hudson Bay Route Association. Mr. Bodner has held various positions on the executive with the Hudson Bay Route Association since 1958, has been a tireless promoter of the Hudson Bay Route Association and the Port of Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, the major problem facing the Port of Churchill is the refusal of a Canadian Wheat Board to commit a million tonnes of grain annually to the movement of grain through the Port of Churchill, even though European buyers have stated that their preference would be to receive the grain at the Port of Churchill.

On one occasion, the Chamber of Commerce of Churchill sent a telex to the Government of the Soviet Union asking them to increase their shipment of grain via Churchill. The Soviet Union replied that it was up to the Canadian Wheat Board to decide at what port they would receive delivery. In turn, the Canadian Wheat Board stated that it was the purchasers' choice as to what port would be used. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the efforts of the Churchill Chamber of Commerce were in vain.

The reasons advanced by the Wheat Board for not using the full capacity of the Manitoba port include:

The season opening when on-farms inventories are low;

The season concluding before the Wheat Board knows which grades are available from the new crops;

Buyers in the northern hemisphere countries preferring to utilize local grain and draw upon imports to cover shortfalls. The Churchill route is closed by the time harvesting overseas is completed and shortages identified.

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

MR. J. DOWNEY: I wonder if the member would permit a question?

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will permit a question after I'm finished my presentation.

Another common complaint about Churchill is:

Shipments from Churchill being confined to only one or two grades of grain due to the elevator design;

Churchill having access only to those grains originating from CN lines;

Restrictions against covered hopper cars caused by permafrost problems - which the Member for Arthur has alluded to;

Foreign buyers would take advantage of any volume commitment the board would make with respect to Churchill;

However, some of these contentions have been challenged since that time:

Some of the problems related to the seasons of navigation are also experienced on the St. Lawrence Seaway, the same problems that hinder the shipment through the Port of Churchill also hinder the St. Lawrence route;

Additional grades and types of grain can now be handled in the Port of Churchill; could be handled if they were requested;

Churchill offers the lowest cost and the shortest inland rail route for approximately 25 percent of the grain produced on the prairies, yet only 1.5 percent to 2 percent is moved through the Port of Churchill;

The lack of CN and CP rail car interchange agreement prevents one-third of the grain movement from Churchill from having access to the port. I was a member of the railroad employees when they had an interchange between the CN and CP, and that year the grain moved very well which increased the area which the Port of Churchill could draw from.

Mr. Speaker, another problem faced by the Port of Churchill is the short season of navigation. Again, the Soviets have ports that are located in colder climates than the Port of Churchill, and yet, their ports are utilized all year round. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we have the technology or we can import that technology if we don't have it, to lengthen the shipping season. I'm sure that there is technology available to overcome the freezing of fresh water at the port itself, possibly by causing turbulence of air to keep the water from freezing.

Mr. Speaker, the phase of the rail boxcar fleet which could eliminate future grain export through the Port of Churchill is another problem that we face. I do not believe that we should continue to have a special fleet of cars only for service to the Port of Churchill. We must continue to improve the rail line, so that the covered hopper cars can be used on the Hudson Bay Rail line for movement to the Port of Churchill.

The rail line to Churchill has had a continuous rebuilding program for the past 20 years. When I was first employed by the CNR in 1964, I worked on a work program which rehabilitated lines, worked on upgrading and ditching between Wabowden and Gillam. The rail line is again being rebuilt in the last five years at an estimated cost of \$30 million. The rail is at least 100 lbs. of steel or better, right to the yards at Churchill. The rail line has a gross carrying capacity of 263,000 lbs. Mr. Speaker, that is the weight of a loaded covered hopper car, so it has the capacity to move that car at this time.

For the first time, the CF 94 engines, which are 3,000 horsepower units, will be used north of Gillam. It is in their present time card that has just been printed and it's included in that time card. Mr. Speaker, we are making progress, but I believe that unit trains can now be used. The only change required is that railways would have to put in a number of floating work gangs, so maintenance of the rail bed could be carried on at all times, and that was the only thing that should be kept up at this time.

Mr. Speaker, a federally-funded research project, which the Member for Arthur has alluded to, has led to an experiment of installing heat pipes called cryo-anchors at five serious trouble spots on the Hudson Bay line. These heat pipes were installed, and they have been successful. The pipes allowed heat to escape during the summer months and encourage deeper penetration of frost in the winter months. The roadbed has become stabilized in all five spots where the experimentation was being carried on.

I have spoken to C.N. officials and they are convinced that the cryo-anchors do work. They estimate that the cost to install the cryo-anchors in all 250 trouble spots would be \$15 million. Mr. Speaker, we should compare that cost with building of a second line through the mountains. I don't think we can afford to let that experiment lie idle.

Mr. Speaker, at hearings which were held dealing with the reduction of the passenger line rail service, it was pointed out that the railway would lose \$12.5 million annually. I would suggest that the \$15 million which is required to remove the 250 sinkholes by using the cryo-anchors, could be used as an investment for the improvement of the Hudson Bay Rail Line. If this rail line was improved, the schedule could be set so that the train travel would become more appealing to a larger number of the public. I'm sure that their losses would be cut to a great degree. I have spoken to many people when I worked on the train, and more recently when I traveled, and there are many people who would sooner travel by train if the schedule was improved. I think if the rail line was improved, the schedule could be picked up to a great degree and would make it much more appealing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the major problem facing the Port of Churchill is not one of economics, but rather

one of attitude. The majority of those speaking against the Port of Churchill have either a vested interest or else they are not aware of all the facts concerning Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lack of private companies located in the Port of Churchill and because of this, grain companies without facilities are apathetic and prefer to move their grain through the St. Lawrence Seaway and Vancouver.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with the Port of Churchill is that there are no available agents during the off-season and also there is no direct line of communication to Churchill with agents connecting with Churchill. The ultimate authority for Churchill lies with Ottawa which does not provide the local authority with the means for attracting business to Churchill. The cost advantages reaped by producers of grain do not go to those producers whose grain does go the Port of Churchill but is divided equally amongst all the grain producers through the Wheat Board system.

Producers are docked at either the St. Lawrence or Vancouver costs, thereby, not allowing the individual producers to see the net benefit. While Churchill is dependent upon one supplier the supplier is a government agency directed to do the best for grain producers over all of western Canada. Churchill's inability to handle various grades of grain is another complaint that is often heard. Churchill's optimum handling runs in excess of 45 million bushels of grain. By diversifying two or three grades of grain Churchill would not only lose 4 percent to 5 percent of its throughput ability, this would be leave capacity far in excess of what has been programmed to it so far.

There has been considerable political antagonism towards Churchill by eastern interests. The principle reason for this antagonism is lack of knowledge relative to the Port of Churchill. Financial concerns, such as, the shipowners along the St. Lawrence Seaway, and companies with facilities along the St. Lawrence, have lobbied against Churchill. Grain terminal operators have certainly not considered the producers, but have only considered themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I know that tourism has increased in the Churchill area. If there had been further improvements made to the passenger rail service I know that there is room for a lot more expansion in this area. I took my family on this trip last year and I know that they were very pleased to have seen some of the unique tourist attractions that are in the area, including the polar bear and the old port, and many unique flowers and birds that are drawing many tourists to the Churchill area.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would - I know that this has been alluded to before - I would like to mention John Diefenbaker who was a former Prime Minister of our

country and a national leader of the party who sits in opposition. I know that the Right Honourable John Diefenbaker had a vision for this country which included the northern part of Canada, and his vision was that the rail line would be a road to the natural resources that are present in the northern part of this country. I would only hope that the members opposite would share the vision of their former leader and would join us in supporting this resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur has a question for clarification?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the member said he would respond to a question. Mr. Speaker, I won't embarrass either he or the Member for Thompson and ask them if either one of them ever voted for John Diefenbaker; I wouldn't be that mean. Mr. Speaker, the question to the Member for The Pas is, rather than bash the Canadian Wheat Board as this resolution has done and as the Member for The Pas has done, would the member support requesting that the private grain trade, as well as the Canadian Wheat Board, be encouraged to use the Port of Churchill?

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, to begin with I have never lived in the Constituency of Prince Alberta so I was never faced with the issue of having to vote for John Diefenbaker, but I know that he was a man with a great vision and who believed in western Canada, so he was the last Tory to have a vision so I would have been faced with a difficult decision if I would have been in that area.

In talking about the Port of Churchill when we had presentations from a number of private grain people, including Cargill Grain, I asked them what their position was on the Port of Churchill. When I asked them that question Cargill Grain, who is a private grain company which you referred to, said, we have forgotten about the Port of Churchill and I wish the rest of western Canada would as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the will of the House to call it 5:30.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the resolution could be left standing in my name?

MR. SPEAKER: When the resolution is next before the House it will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Morris.

The time being 5:30 the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)