



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

---

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

---

33 Elizabeth II

---

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



**VOL. XXXII No. 17A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 8 MAY, 1984.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 8 May, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

## NON-PARTISAN STATEMENT

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

### PRESENTING PETITIONS

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Central Trust Company and Crown Trust Company, praying for the passing An Act respecting Central Trust Company and Crown Trust Company.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. C. SANTOS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the second report of the Committee on Economic Development.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Your Committee met on Tuesday, May 8, 1984, to consider the Auditor's Report and Consolidated Financial Statements of McKenzie Steel Briggs Seeds Ltd.

Mr. Ray Kives, Chairman, Mr. Keith Guelpa, President and Mr. Ken Robinson, Controller provided such information as was required by members of the Committee with respect to McKenzie Steele Briggs Seeds Ltd. The fullest opportunity was accorded to seek any information desired.

Your Committee examined the Financial Statement of McKenzie Steele Briggs Seeds Ltd. for the year ended October 31, 1983 and adopted the same as presented.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. C. SANTOS:** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report the same, and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, as Deputy Premier, I would like to make a statement.

In light of the tragic incident that has taken place . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable Member have copies of her statement?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Non-partisan. It's a non-partisan statement, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. M. SMITH:** In light of the tragic incident which took place this morning in the National Assembly in Quebec, I would just like to express on behalf of our government and the opposition the shock at hearing this news and to extend our sincerest sympathy to the families who have members who were killed or wounded. I understand the trouble is still unresolved and we would like to convey to the Province of Quebec that our thoughts are certainly with them today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We, in the opposition side, certainly share in the expression of shock and concern that has been put forward by the Acting Premier. We too hope that the troubles are able to be resolved with respect to the affairs of the National Assembly in Quebec and we certainly extend our sympathy to the families of those who have been involved.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It gives me great pleasure to provide to the members of the House, copies of the Mantario Hiking Trail Brochure, produced as part of the Whiteshell Master Plan signed in August, 1983. This brochure has been described as the best nature guide of its type by the editor of the Canadian Heritage Magazine.

Sold for \$2 through map sales and park offices, this brochure is made of water resistant material. Its light weight — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, it's particularly appropriate to members opposite who often are all wet on subjects. Its light weight and durability will ensure good use over the entire 60 kilometres of the Mantario Hiking Trail.

The Mantario Hiking Trail is one of the many outdoor recreation opportunities the government provides to Manitobans. 20 kilometres of self-guided trails with interpretive pamphlets or on-site signs can also be enjoyed by visitors interested in learning more about the natural and cultural history of the Whiteshell Provincial Park.

Our government is concerned to enhance the opportunities of Manitobans and visitors to our province to enjoy the abundant natural heritage we possess.

Trail hiking is becoming a highly popular recreational activity in the world. Not only does it afford quiet serene enjoyment of nature but moreover it reflects the growing concern for more healthy lifestyles.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In reply to the Minister's comments here I have to express some concern, I suppose, that he uses this kind of an issue to make a Ministerial Statement in the House.

First of all we're dealing with the Minister's Estimates at the present time and I suppose we'll be dealing with this particular area, and we have major concerns that we would like to express. For the Minister to make this announcement at this time I find it sort of irrelevant really I suppose.

The other thing is if the Minister has some concern about the Lake Mantario area, and the hiking prospects out there, I wonder why he didn't attend the rally that was taking place there this winter when myself along with three of my colleagues were out there, and there was literally hundreds of people that were concerned about the action that this Minister's taken in regard to Lake Mantario. So I can't see that I am very excited about this kind of announcement and I don't think that people of Manitoba necessarily are because according to the information that we get from the area there's very few people that take advantage of the hiking trails in that area and we'd like to pursue that further in the Estimates.

Thank you.

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

Order please.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before Oral Questions may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 20 students of Grade 9 standing from the Fort Alexander School under the direction of Mr. Hogan. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Tourism.

There are 80 students of Grade 11 standing from the West Kildonan Collegiate. They are under the direction of Mr. Butler, Mr. Hanson and Mrs. Bailey. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Culture.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Home Orderly Service

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Honourable Minister of Health and arises out of a recent announcement that the government would be moving into the home orderly service field, into that field in which services have been supplied by a company in Winnipeg and Manitoba known as Home Orderly Services Limited.

I'd ask the Minister, as my initial question, Mr. Speaker, as to whether Home Order Services, as a company, as a firm, is going to be permitted to remain in business?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I can't see why not. I understand that they have some private clients and I think their intention is to stay in business. As of now I can't see anything that would prevent them from doing so.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, given the fact that were references, in the news stories at the time of the Minister's announcement, to the termination of a contract with Home Orderly Services and the fact that there had been no contract signed, there is considerable insecurity and indecision in the system at the present time, both on the part of the orderlies who work for the service and on the part of the clients who were served. I wonder if the Minister can advise the House as to whether clients of Home Orderly Services will continue to have a choice - once the government moves into the field - as to whether they wish to be served by the government service or by Home Orderly Services.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** First of all, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain that the choice of words of terminating a contract certainly wasn't mine and I made that correction on the first opportunity. In fact, Saturday morning or early Saturday afternoon. There has been meetings with Mr. Watson. He has pledged full co-operation with the department for the period of transition. That is being looked at now. I have no reason to believe that he will not go along with this. As far as Mr. Watson operating - the first question I was asked - could he still operate? Certainly, but it's obvious we are not contracting with him for home care. This is strictly on dealing with his own patients.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister appreciates, I'm sure, there are a number of clients of Home Orderly Services that come to the company via the referral route, because they're referred there through the Office of Continuing Care, but there also are a number who are federal clients, who are clients of the Department of Veterans Affairs, for example. There also are a number who are contracted for service through Home Orderly Services by their own families and relatives through private arrangements, and my question on their behalf, Sir, is whether those clients and others are going to continue to be able to contract

with and be served by Home Orderly Services, once the government service gets into operation?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I've answered the question quite clearly. There is nothing that will prevent the giving of service by the gentleman in question. The point is that as far as the service we are giving, as an insurance service, it will be done by the department when that program is in place. We're not going to farm this thing out. We've asked for tenders on this and the situation is we feel now that with the grants also from the Federal Government when we're delivering the service ourselves and with increasing the rate, the level of standard that we want to do. I made it quite clear, and I'd like to repeat again, that I'm certainly not holding Mr. Watson as the patsy or that I've done anything wrong, he delivered what he was asked to do. I have no complaints with him, but we do want to enrich the program or improve the program and we will be delivering it.

Now, if anybody wants the service of Mr. Watson they're certainly free to obtain that, but it's not going to be covered by any of our programs.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Can the Minister confirm that the tender call included a request for a much expanded, much broadened, much more sophisticated, and consequently much more expensive service than the one that's in place at the present time?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Guess we'll have to define "much," but in general with the member saying that it's an improvement, as I just finished mentioning, that we want to improve the level of the standard. The member's absolutely right, we're not comparing the two.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House whether he received or his department received any bids on that tender? If they received a bid from Home Orderly Services?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I'll have to double-check that, Mr. Speaker, I understand that we have. We certainly received bids, we received some from out of province, and I understand that there was one from Mr. Watson's company. I'd have to verify that for sure. I'm 90 percent sure that we did receive a bid which was quite a bit higher than the one from out of the province.

### Farmers, assistance to

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I find that there are a disturbing number of farm people who are nearing what would normally be considered a retirement age who are losing their farms as a consequence of the economic condition, the agriculture area, and I'm sure that the Minister of Agriculture is aware of some examples of that. Can he advise the House whether his department has made any assessment into the numbers of people so affected?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, we do attempt, and we have attempted to assist farm families who are in financial difficulty through our Interest Rate Relief Program. That has probably been the best method and the only method that we have been able to have direct access in consultation with the farm community in addition to extension work with other farm families who may be in difficulty.

It is - I want to say very clearly - very difficult to obtain any information as to any numbers of the like from the financial institutions as those kinds of numbers, if they have any, are kept very close for obvious reasons. We know, and the honourable member has drawn to my attention, one or two instances which I have asked the Agricultural Credit Corporation to look at to see whether there may be any options in terms of assisting the inter-generational transfer of farm land to allow the difficulty that some farm families who are in as a result of low prices and bad weather and to see whether that can be done.

The corporation is in the process of reviewing its entire lending program which was begun this winter. It is my hope that later this year there may be some changes in that area, but to give the honourable member some concrete advice as to there being easy solutions to the financial difficulties of many of the farm families, Mr. Speaker, he knows as well as I that we cannot do that.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, during the election, the NDP made the commitment to the farm community that nobody would lose their farm as a consequence of high interest rates. This is a tragic situation of older people now. During the election and previous to that, the NDP had talked about debt moratorium legislation. The question to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, in view of this really heart-rending situation that is developing out there, has the Minister any program that he's contemplating putting in place that would be used to save the homestead, for example, that would save even the home quarter so that these people who would normally be coming to the retirement age will not be put off of the home quarter of land that in many cases has been in the family for decades?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the honourable member that I think if he's suggesting that we on a provincial basis examine some area of debt moratorium, I would like to have some further discussions with the honourable member.

The honourable member should not forget that he was Minister of Finance when his colleagues were allowing loans to be made as high as 17 percent. It was his colleagues, Sir . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** . . . who derided myself as Minister in an attempt and chided me for not doing anything about the high interest rates, Mr. Speaker, and we acted on that.

We saved Manitoba farmers over \$18 million by one move, Mr. Speaker. We have assisted in the long term,

not in the short term, made a long-term commitment to our livestock industry in which we have in the last two years put in more than \$40 million into the livestock industry to support the incomes of producers.

Mr. Speaker, when we came into office, MACC was short of money. They were putting off loans to farmers who came to me and said, look, where is my loan application? We were told there is no money. Mr. Speaker, we virtually doubled the funding to MACC, and have gone even further than that in these two years. So we've far extended the programs of credit arrangements to farmers.

Mr. Speaker, we as well put in another program, the Loan Guarantee Program, which does assist the farm community. It is one program, Sir, that I believe that there is some misconception about. I think I want to explain to the honourable members that the Loan Guarantee Program with the financial institutions does not only guarantee that 12.5 percent of every loan, it guarantees in terms of the aggregate that a financial institution has on the loan. For example, if a lending institution has \$1 million in the program, and there is a loss of \$125,000 in that program, MACC and the people of Manitoba cover 100 percent of that loss. So it is a percentage of the aggregate of loans in that program.

So, Sir, we have done and we will continue to try and do more for the farm community, more than any government in the history of this province, Sir. We stand by that record.

**MR. H. ENNS:** The farmers are going broke.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister.

Despite all of the programs of which the Minister speaks, people are being forced off their farms at a time when they would normally be expected to be entering retirement, has the Minister exhausted his imagination and the imagination of this government when it comes to dealing with this extremely serious situation in the agricultural community?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, we have not exhausted all avenues. I want to say that the matter of financial difficulty that is faced by Manitoba farmers along with other farmers in this country is a matter of national interest and should be of national concern.

Mr. Speaker, there is a bill before Parliament now, I believe C-18, which was the previous Bill C-12, dealing with foreclosures and bankruptcies. We have, as a government, made submissions and continue to make submissions to the Federal Government to strengthen those bills when it comes to foreclosures on farmers and small businesses. So that in the event that a foreclosure is imminent, if an offer is made and it is refused by the lending institution, that whole issue can be taken to a court and arbitrated to see whether alternate solutions are made.

We have made those kinds of submissions, Sir, and we will look if there are other ways to assist farm families who are retiring from losing their farms, we will examine that. I am pleased to hear the honourable member suggesting that this may be a time that we should be considering debt moratorium:

## Education graduates - employment

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education and ask her whether she has any concern for English-speaking Education graduates who are unable to find employment in today's market?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. When the honourable member asks for the Minister's concern, he is asking for an opinion. Perhaps he would care to reword his question to be in the form of information.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Minister of Health thinks this is a laughing matter.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I think you're a laughing matter.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** My question is this. Is the Department of Education studying the impact of French Immersion Programs on unilingual teachers, especially in view of the fact that what may appear to be a trend today may prove to be a fad tomorrow?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell the Member for Elmwood that my department is monitoring this issue, we're watching it very closely, and we are always concerned when Manitoba students, educated in Manitoba schools, are not able to get jobs. We are getting information on the numbers and we are looking for the reasons why. But to address this specific point, I want to make a few points. First, to my knowledge at the present time, I have no knowledge and we do not believe that there will be any layoffs for unilingual teachers, related to the expansion in the French Immersion Program. It appears to us now that we're going to be able to meet our own demands in Manitoba this year. Three years ago we were not able to do that, we increased our capacity. Last year we met our own requirements almost completely and we expect with the courses and the programs that we have in place this year that we will be able to meet our own requirements with Manitoba-trained and retrained teachers.

However, there is still a problem with graduates from the Manitoba Education program getting jobs. I have begun to discuss this as a major concern of mine with the trustees and the teachers and the superintendents of this province. Because we trained - although we trained 489 graduates last year, 212 out-of-province hirings took place, Mr. Speaker.

Are you getting ready to stand? — (Interjection) — Yes. I guess to sum up, Mr. Speaker, I am simply saying that there are some problems with our Manitoba educated students getting jobs. One of them is that we can't get them to go out to the country, and we need to look at why. But it cannot be put at the lap of the French Immersion Programs, that is not the cause.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying then that in recent times, and perhaps her figure was from last year, that approximately one-half of the teachers required for the bilingual programs, the French Immersion Programs, have come from outside of Manitoba?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, Mr. Speaker. The member was mixing up the point I was making about Manitoba-trained graduates and our ability to meet our needs for teachers to teach in the French Immersion Programs. What I said was that two years ago we could not quite meet our own needs in Manitoba, and we did have to bring in some teachers from other provinces. Because we recognized that, we improved our programs and our accessibility, doubled the capacity at St. Boniface and met our own needs last year, and I expect us to be able to do so again this year.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister be willing to consider a program of job security for English-only teachers? And I'm now thinking of the recommendations made from someone in the St. James-Assiniboia School Division where approximately a dozen English-speaking teachers are being laid-off while bilingual teachers are being hired?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important, since the reference is made to St. James-Assiniboia, to talk about a school division that was one of the first school divisions by choice to become one of 12 participating in the pilot project core French program. Because they chose to go into that program, because they increased the numbers of classes and students every year for a three-year period, and because they even went beyond what they were being provided funds for and expanded their students beyond those for whom they were receiving funding, I would say that part of their long-term planning in that school division must be the retraining and the help and the identification of teachers in their division who have some skills and need some upgrading, and to take advantage of the provincial programs that are available for upgrading so that they are meeting their own requirements in that school division.

I do not think in the school division themselves that they have made any suggestion that the layoff on the one hand is due to the hiring on the other.

### Ice storm - clean-up costs

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Government Services. Yesterday, he indicated that private individuals and businesses could apply for storm damage assistance funding. Could the Minister indicate whether there is a threshold of damage, a dollar above which they should make application for compensation?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, the request for damages will be dealt with in the usual manner that has been

dealt with in the past. The area appears to be one that may be declared a disaster area, and that recommendation will be coming forward from EMO and the Manitoba Disaster Assistance Board. Once we have been able to determine the amounts of damages involved, they will be reviewed and brought forward for Cabinet's decision.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** In view of the fact that this government has some 81 personal staff serving Cabinet to write press releases, to do the public relations on behalf of the government, to polish their image . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** . . . would the Minister of Government Services consider the possibility of having some of those people write a press release describing the circumstances under which storm damage compensation will be paid, and to what criterion individuals, businesses and municipalities should apply for storm damage compensation, and clear the air of the confusion between his bureaucrats and the statements he's making in this House about things will be handled in the normal manner? Would he turn out a press release, please?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

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

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, the only person who seems to be confused is the Member for Pembina, as I indicated yesterday. The municipalities are quite familiar with the procedures in the Province of Manitoba. They know the arrangements that have been made in the past and that where an area has been considered to be a disaster area the province will consider providing assistance to those municipalities when it becomes apparent that it's unreasonable for the local government to absorb all those costs all on their own resources.

The member knows very well that under the present, current assistance that the first dollar of assistance is provided at the local level. If it goes beyond the \$1 per capita of the population of Manitoba, then he knows very well that we can request assistance from the Government of Canada. Those provisions are still in effect, and I'm sure that most municipalities - if the Member for Pembina doesn't know, people do know.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Now that the Minister has clarified that when damages to municipalities exceed \$1 per capita, the province is going to pick up compensation for losses, could the Minister indicate whether small business and individuals experiencing more than \$250 of storm damages should apply to the government for damage assistance?

**HON. A. ADAM:** Once the disaster has been determined that it's a disaster area, certainly those people who have sustained damages because of a storm . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

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

**HON. A. ADAM:** I believe the Honourable Member for Lakeside wants to answer the question.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I'm just trying to help you fight the disaster.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I make a final request of the Minister. Would he please have his people in his department, his Executive Assistant, his Special Assistant, his public relations person, someone in his department, to write a press release explaining under what circumstances individuals and small businesses can apply for storm damage compensation? Would the Minister undertake to make that information public via a press release, and throw out some of the other apple-polishing press releases that come out of his department and others, and give the people of Manitoba some real information that is needed?

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, with regard to private individuals as well, even public facilities such as buildings that have been insured and are covered by insurance, for instance, wind insurance, wind damage which I'm sure there was very substantial in the last storm - you know, we sustained some on our own farm. All facilities that are covered by insurance certainly do not need to be covered by an assistance program from the Disaster Fund. But all those facilities that are not covered by insurance and that have sustained damage in excess of the \$250, then they could submit in the usual way. There is a \$250, similar to automobile insurance where there is a \$250 deductible.

### Education funding

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable Minister of Education. I have in my hand some 412 signatures on a petition from St. Vladimir's College, parents, students, interested citizens. The originals went to the Minister of Education and the Premier urging this government to grant reasonable and financial assistance to our Catholic and independent schools, and thus provide equality, justice, and opportunity for all.

Can I ask the Minister of Education, is she prepared today to announce the grants structure for the private and parochial schools for the year ahead, or will she give the reason or reasons to these 412 petitioners why they have continually neglected to make this announcement that's so important to schools like St. Vlad's?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, I can say today exactly the same as I said last week, and that is that

I will announce all of the grants for education agencies and institutions when my Estimates are up.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I know St. Vlad's wonder how they're going to run their school the year ahead, what this Minister has got in store, what the government has in store. Can I ask the Minister of Education today to contact the Member for The Pas who has kinfolk attending St. Vlad's and see if they can't somehow together resolve this problem and let the people at Roblin and St. Vlad's know where this government stands on aid to private and parochial schools? I think it's an insult to St. Vlad's, one of the better schools in this province, who have continually requested, day-after-day, all she has to do is give the grant structure, announce it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** What's the secret, what's so important about withholding it till the Estimates? These 412 petitioners are sincere, honest, dedicated constituents, Mr. Speaker, and they deserve a better shot from this Minister than we're getting right now.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The question is repetitive, does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Education if she'll be kind enough to go over and contact the Honourable Member for The Pas who has kinfolk attending St. Vladimir's College, or the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, or others, and see if there's some way that the Department of Education and this Minister can announce to St. Vlad's and these 412 petitioners what is the grant structure for private parochial schools for the year ahead?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite wants to talk about insults, he might talk about what is insulting to the people of Manitoba, to have members of the opposition who did nothing when they were in office stand up in this House and ask for increases for aid to private schools. If he had wanted to know the grants earlier, if he had wanted to know the grants . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

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

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, what I can say and the members opposite will know to be very true is that had they, when they designed the Education Support Program, which was a three-year program, put it inside the Education Support Program, it would have automatically been entitled to the inflation factor and the question wouldn't even arise, but they did not do that.

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

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell wishes to ask a question.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the government of which I was a part of have any fear about the formula for aid to private and parochial schools.

Can I ask the Minister, she was part and parcel of this propaganda of such an open government of the people of this province were going to be exposed to during the regime of this government, and can she finally give me the reason or reasons why she and the Premier are withholding this information from these taxpayers and constituents of Roblin constituency who are pleading for this information? What is the grant structure for the year ahead to the private parochial schools?

### **Children's Aid Society - administration costs**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Oral Questions. The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Yes, I have a question for the Minister of Community Services and Corrections. Under the old Winnipeg Children's Aid Society there was one executive director. The newly formed agencies are now advertising for five executive directors to replace one at salaries up to \$52,000 a year.

Since this is consistent with the government's own rising administration cost, what assurance is there that administration costs of the new agencies will not get completely out of control?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, there are budgetary amounts, there is a commitment to stay within those budgets and to deliver the most efficient, effective service.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Yes, another question to the same Minister. Will the agencies be duplicating other administrative costs such as computer services?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, every effort is being made to develop the most efficient way of handling the different services. The computer services and record keeping is most effective when it is centralized and coordinated, and that is the approach we're taking on that particular factor.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Yes, I just have one last question to the Minister, and I just wonder how she is going to have more efficient services and how this is going to help the children that are being serviced by the Children's Aid Society by the extra hiring of five new executive directors at such prices as \$52,000 a year?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, the presence before of a very large structure with many layers and a lot of distance between the executive director and the service-delivery end was not necessarily efficient. Because there are now to be five executive directors who will work in a closer team-way with their other employees and they will be closer to the delivery of service, we expect overall efficiencies in the system.

### **Motorcyclists - helmet legislation**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Transportation on behalf of one of my constituents residing in the community of Stonewall, one Mr. Terry Goresky, who was recently charged under The Highway Traffic Act for failure to wear a helmet. I might add, Mr. Speaker, he duly paid his ticket.

My question to the Minister on his behalf and on others is that he was in possession and is in possession of a letter from his doctor certifying that Mr. Terry Goresky has a medical condition for which he is not able to wear a helmet as required by The Highway Traffic Act for the Province of Manitoba. He had sustained an injury, I believe, some 18 months ago which made wearing a helmet not possible for him. Does the Minister consider bringing in any amendments to The Highway Traffic Act that would accommodate a person such as Mr. Goresky?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I think the honourable member is referring to a medical exemption provided by a practicing physician and this has been provided for by regulation.

There is a regulation in place for seat belts, if a physician feels that a patient may be negatively affected by wearing of a seat belt, he can issue a letter stating that this person could be exempted. This also applies to helmets and that is the regulation that is just applied. Perhaps the officer decided on his own that he was going to make a decision that a ticket was warranted at that time, but all of the RCMP has been notified that this is in effect at this time, the regulation is in effect. Law enforcement agencies have been made aware of this and we would expect that they would be adhering to this when enforcing the helmet law.

We are also considering the matter of a standardized certificate that could be issued by physicians so that there would be no question as to its authenticity, and we're looking at that at this time.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I thank the Honourable Minister for that answer and simply, by way of supplementary, indicate to him that there is apparently some confusion, perhaps he should be talking to the Attorney-General. This same person was stopped by one RCMP constable and the letter provided the exemption from being charged. Within a day or two he was stopped by another RCMP officer and he received a ticket, which he subsequently paid.

My question to the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker, seeing as how he's in a charitable mood and I'm hoping that perhaps that generosity would extend to my constituent, would he advise me to ask Mr. Terry Goresky to apply for a refund with respect to the penalty that he's paid in this instance?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** It depends when this occurred, Mr. Speaker. It came into effect on May 1st, the exemption for helmets, the medical exemption provision.

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

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RULES  
OF THE HOUSE - BELL RINGING**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please call the government resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Services, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't intend to speak at great length on this resolution at this point, Sir, because I fully appreciate that it is simply a referral resolution, a motion to refer the report of the Rules Committee to the Committee of the Whole House, and at that point in time, once it reaches consideration in Committee of the Whole House, there will be opportunity to make the various comments that one would wish to make and to participate in the kind of debate that we on our side think is called for and justified in respect to the principle involved here. But I do not want the motion to pass this stage of the procedures in the House and be referred to committee without some comment or some response or some reaction from me, because it touches on and involves a subject in which, not only am I deeply interested, but one, Sir, in which, through my membership on the Rules Committee, I have been - or at least attempted to be - deeply involved.

Three of us on this side of the House, my colleague, the Honourable Member for Lakeside; my colleague, the Honourable Member for Virden; and I are members of Rules Committee from the Progressive Conservative Caucus. We have taken an active role in the Rules Committee's consideration of the subject matter, which is now before us in the form of this report, and the views that we hold and share are fairly effectively, I hope, recorded in the transcripts of the meetings of the Rules Committee as held on this subject in the last few weeks and months.

I do want to say one or two things before we proceed past this stage of consideration of this motion. In doing so, I intend to keep in mind the remarks of the Honourable Attorney-General yesterday, who entreated us to search for a consensus on this point, but not look for occasions of political rhetoric. It's not my intention to engage in political rhetoric on the subject at the moment, Mr. Speaker. There has been considerable political rhetoric waxed and weaved about the subject, and no doubt there will be again, both in the Committee of the Whole House when the resolution goes before it for debate, and subsequent to that, in my view, Sir, and complementary to that, in the general public. So I don't intend to engage in political rhetoric at this point in time.

I do wish to say for the record, for the benefit of those in the House who care to have my expression of opinion on this subject at this juncture, that I am extremely disappointed with the result that emanated

from the work of the Rules Committee on this subject, Sir. I think that the prohibition that is being placed on the mechanism of bell ringing, the mechanism of delaying votes, the mechanism of preventing the Government of the Day - of any day in Manitoba - from forcing issues to arbitrary decision point is extremely regrettable and retrogressive in terms of the political and democratic history of this province and this Legislature.

I think the prohibition is unnecessary. I think it's extreme in that it limits the use of that mechanism for all practical purposes to a period of 15 minutes, which is not, in my view, realistic, Sir, given the deliberations and consultations that have to be held from time to time with respect to controversial matters before members of this House.

Further to that, I see the additional provision for an extension of the time period, in which that mechanism of bell ringing may be employed, to 24 hours with the concurrence and participation of the government and Opposition Whips and the Speaker, as being one that really is only in there, Sir, for the benefit of the government and it doesn't offer very much succor, solace or satisfaction to the opposition and to those members of the electorate whom the opposition represents and attempts to protect.

It seems to me that that extension provision is really one of convenience for the Government of the Day, and, in fact, the wording of the extension provision makes no attempt to disguise that fact. So that effectively what we're dealing with here, Sir, is a limitation on the use of the mechanism of bell ringing or delaying the vote that holds it, or will hold it in the future to 15 minutes. I find that to be extremely heavy-handed. I think it places a very severe limitation on the atmosphere of the environment and the opportunity for free debate in this Legislature.

But more than that, Sir, I find it highly unnecessary. The point, I think, has been made by others in this debate, by my House Leader, the Member for Lakeside, and certainly the attempt was made by those of us on this side to make it during Rules Committee, that Manitoba and Manitobans and this Legislature and the process of democracy in this Legislature have - in the experience of many of us, perhaps most of us - been well served by the rules as they have applied to situations of this kind for many many years. Those rules were silent on the use of this type of mechanism. It was felt, by mutual understanding, perhaps understated, perhaps not stated, that there would be circumstances in which conceivable difficulties in defending public positions could reach a point where an opposition had to have the opportunity to slow down the arbitrary headlong dash of a government.

As a consequence, our rules have been silent on limitations on the use of this bell-ringing mechanism and that silence has served this province well. In my experience it has not been exploited, it has not been abused, and I think that the provision now before us is being brought forward by a government that is overreacting to an extremely difficult and convulsive situation, admittedly, extremely unpleasant in the main of the past 10 months.

But that was a unique situation, Sir, and I think that it's unreasonable and in fact unrealistic and illogical for the government in defending the proposal that they

are putting before us to argue that the experience of Manitobans, legislatively speaking, requires that kind of a stiff constraint on the use of debates slowing, vote slowing mechanisms and procedures by an opposition. That kind of application of that legislative opportunity for an opposition in this province has not been exploited or abused in my experience, nor would I suggest, Sir, in yours. You and I have been in this Chamber for approximately the same length of time. I would go so far as to say of course that it wasn't even exploited or abused during this recent debate on the proposed constitutional amendment brought forward by the government, because we believed that we were doing what was necessary on behalf of the vast majority of Manitobans who had spoken up and who wanted the government stopped in its purported intent.

However, I recognize the partisan nature of the debate, that I could get myself into on that subject at the moment, so I don't want necessarily to focus on that conviction of mine. But I think, Sir, it can be safely argued and shouldn't be facetiously exploited or attacked by the government. It can be safely argued and reasonably argued that there has not been that kind of abuse or exploitation of this mechanism in the past. To react as severely as we are doing with this 15-minute limitation at the present time, Sir, is in my view not to react but to overreact; not to respond, but to permit ourselves to be stampeded; not to be proceeding with logic, but to be proceeding out of panic; not to be doing the needed and the necessary, but to be allowing ourselves to be pushed into doing the unnecessary. So that essentially is my position, represents my feelings on it, Mr. Speaker.

I don't have any grave difficulty with the application and implementation and introduction of some kind of measure that would have some restraining influence on the use of that mechanism where conventional legislation is concerned. I think my colleagues and I had made that point in Rules Committee and in the remarks of my House Leader in this debate yesterday. But we feel that we were in special circumstances, and we feel that 77 to 85 percent of Manitobans would agree with us that we were in special circumstances in this past 10 months in this province, and that the mechanism we employed was highly desirable and much required, much needed in those circumstances because we were dealing with a constitutional amendment that was being attempted by a government without sufficient notice to the people and demonstrably without a mandate from the people.

I just want to cite, if I may, for the record, Mr. Speaker, a comment or two that I made in Rules Committee on the 22nd of March, 1984, on this point, from Pages 6 and 7 of the transcript of that meeting of the Standing Committee of the Rules of the House in which I said, Sir, that I was requesting that we proceed very carefully on this proposed change, and that we think about it for a while before rushing to any conclusions. I said, Sir, at that time that we had to acknowledge the fact, and here I'm quoting from my own remarks, but I wish to have this view of mine on the record in this debate, that all of us in Canada are feeling our way with a new Constitution. In fact, we're dealing with a hybrid situation; we're dealing with an inherited British parliamentary system and a concept of an American Constitution.

This situation, that is, Sir, the one where closure was invoked repeatedly, and the bells were rung repeatedly on the constitutional resolution debate that so preoccupied us and convulsed us in the past year in this province and in this legislation would never, I pointed out at that Rules Committee meeting, have occurred in Westminster. I said, as you well know, Sir, it never would have occurred because there is no Constitution to amend in the United Kingdom, and therefore there would not have been a resolution amending the Constitution that provoked, or invoked, or produced the response of closure by the Government of the Day because there is no written Constitution to amend.

We now in this country, Sir, have a written Constitution that can be amended so we're faced with an entirely new and unique situation in Canadian life, in legislative life in each of our provinces, e.g., Manitoba, and in Canadian life generally. So I said, Sir, that as we feel our way into an appreciation and understanding of this hybrid system that we've now got here and consider some refinements and some fine tuning that's going to have to be done, let us not remove vestiges of defence of the public interest from those rules in this Legislature that have served Manitobans so well for so many years. Mr. Speaker, that represents my view on this subject.

I have the very strong feeling that when the Government House Leader rises to close debate on this resolution he's going to argue that the justification for this new prohibition on bell ringing, this 15-minute constraint, Sir, rests in the fact that "nearly everywhere else there's a limit on the ringing of the bells." Those last few words I offer for the record in quotes "nearly everywhere else there is a limit on the ringing of the bells," because that precise phrase was raised in Rules Committee, was used by the Honourable Member for Inkster and I think by the Government House Leader in discussing this issue at the Rules Committee meetings that have been held in recent weeks.

The Government House Leader and his colleagues attempted to stress this point in Rules Committee and I don't challenge their right to attempt to stress it. I think it's important though that the emphasis that almost approached the point of being an overemphasis on that argument obscured the reality that really faced us and continues to face us here in Manitoba.

The fact that "nearly everywhere else there is a limit on the ringing of the bells" belies the fact, Sir, that there's a basic question underlying what took place here and what we're considering here. It's a basic question that was never addressed by the government. We put it to the government again and again, and I put it again now, Sir. That question is this, where else has a government in this country attempted a constitutional amendment against the expressed wishes of the people?

So to say, Sir, that nearly everywhere else there is a limit on the ringing of the bells really diverts attention from the real issue and the real problem that we're attempting to address here. In Rules Committee and in this House we were confronted with an attempt, the first that any of my colleagues know of, by a government in this country to push through a constitutional amendment that did not have the support of the people. In fact, Sir, it was demonstrably in opposition to the

expressed wishes of the people so that is why we had to employ the tactics that we employed. I've also made the point, so has my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, that our tactics were a direct response of the government's tactic, namely, the repeated invocation of closure.

But if you're not in a situation like that, Sir, and we had never been in that kind of situation in Manitoba in my experience before, there is no repeated use or application of that kind of a tactic or that kind of a technique; and therefore, Sir, there is no need to worry ourselves or stampede ourselves into making rather severe, rather extreme changes to our rules that alter the way that we have been proceeding and the way that has served us so well in this province and in this Legislature for so many years. That's my basic objection.

We are taking one unique situation where we had a government acting arbitrarily in a condition that is new in this county now, a condition that permits us to deal with amendments to our own Constitution and for which we haven't yet worked out probably the ideal mechanisms of approach. We are saying because there was some difficulty experienced, indeed admittedly traumatic convulsive difficulty, but because there was some difficulty experienced for some months we now are going to bring in a structure that is going to prevent that from happening in the future and we're not really considering the consequences. The consequences could be that a government could act in arbitrary, high-handed, and run away fast in the future and the public would have no defence. The opposition could not prevent the government from acting in that arbitrary way, and the people whom the opposition is here to defend and protect and the rights of the people, which are so deeply involved in the whole process here, would be trampled, Sir.

So, as this resolution goes forward to the Committee of the Whole House for consideration, Mr. Speaker, I just would commend those thoughts . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** . . . and views of mind to members on both sides of this House once again and ask members opposite on the government side to give very careful consideration to the action that they're taking.

It's not too late to pull back, it's not too late for the government to refine and revise its position a little bit, it's not too late for the government to amend the kind of heavy-handed posture that it's articulating through this committee report. The change can be made, the action can be softened, the heavy-handedness can be reduced, Mr. Speaker, and I appeal to members on the government side to do that.

Finally, I would say I am encouraged in any event, Mr. Speaker, by the conciliatory tone of the Attorney-General. His remarks yesterday seemed to reflect to me an intention on his part to try to proceed in a co-operative and conciliatory way on this. Perhaps there's some hope that there will not be a heavy-handed attempt by the government to ram this proposal through

in a way that is designed to achieve its ends through its mathematical advantages in the House. I have some optimism for the moment that that kind of co-operation, unity of action, bilateral action can be achieved. We'll have to wait and see, but there certainly seemed to be some reflection of that in the remarks of the Attorney-General yesterday. That attitude also was reflected in the apparent willingness of the Government House Leader to look at provisions that will guarantee different status and different treatment for constitutional matters as opposed to conventional legislative matters.

I say "apparent" because again we have to wait to see how sincere the government is in proceeding on this suggested course of action. But on the basis of the Government House Leader's remarks there appears to be some hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will be able to achieve a situation here that guarantees that no government in the future can arbitrarily, unilaterally try to ram a constitutional change through, try to push it through on the people of Manitoba and foreclose debate in the process.

So there's hope that perhaps that lesson has got through to the government. If it hasn't I suggest, Mr. Speaker, they will be the losers because certainly the public is fully aware of what's involved here; they're fully aware of what has come out of that Rules Committee series of sessions; fully aware of what's involved in this Rules Committee Report. Without descending to the completely cynical, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the public reacts to that Rules Committee Report by interpreting it as a method and a means being employed by this government to achieve what it couldn't achieve through the democratic process of debate. By going to the people, being forced to go the people with that issue, by being turned down by the people on it, by being prevented by the opposition from proceeding in the House on it, the government had to surrender and had to withdraw.

They have now decided they couldn't achieve their ends that way, so they may be able to achieve them this way through mathematical superiority, numerical superiority in Rules Committee where some votes were taken on this matter and in the House and the public is aware of that.

So, although my advice, I suppose is gratuitous, I offer it anyway, Mr. Speaker, that if the government proceeds to act in a dictatorial and heavy-handed way, they will be the losers on this, because the public is fully aware of what's happening. Twice in Rules Committee at the last meeting we went to a vote, twice we were out voted - perhaps it was even three times - on the three crucial questions of the main proposal offered by the Government House Leader and amendments offered by my House Leader and me. All three times we were defeated by vote, an unprecedented situation in Rules Committee - as described by my colleague from St. Norbert yesterday - an unprecedented situation, forcing contentious issues of this sort that require and deserve consensus forcing them to a vote and then seeing the opposition position repudiated by sheer numerical superiority on the government's part.

So the public is aware of that, and I would hope that the government keeps that in mind as we proceed on this matter, and that we move very carefully with deep consideration for the way that democracy and the rules,

both written and unwritten, about democracy have served Manitobans for so many years.

To react with a sledge hammer, where some delicate fine-tuning is all that is necessary, seems to me, Sir, to be politically and democratically unwise. It will win no friends and no marks for the government, so I would appeal to them once again to consider revising and refining their position contained in this report at the present time. Perhaps we can get into Committee of the Whole House to look at a different kind of a suggestion from the government. It's not too late, the public deserves it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Business Development and Tourism, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means of raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair.

## COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

### CAPITAL SUPPLY (1)

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Committee, come to order. We are considering the issue of Capital Supply (1).  
The Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few questions dealing with the Manitoba Hog Income Stabilization Plan.

When the program was initially started by our administration, Mr. Chairman, the government put some \$5 million of the direct grant into the hog program. Since then, as well as that, there was a loan guarantee. Has the Minister of Agriculture, has this government put any other money into the Hog Stabilization Program, other than the loan capital that they have shown here and proposing for this year as they had last year, the loan portion of the program? Has the government put any funds other than this loan amount into the program?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that the program that he speaks of ended after an advance payment to producers for

previous years' marketings and an additional year. The new program is a long-term program of which the province does contribute 2 percent of the premium, and the producers at the present time contribute 4 percent of the premium.

In terms of the loan guarantees, I don't believe that there is an additional amount other than the \$5 million that was requested last year in the program and this \$5 million in terms of loan guarantee for this coming year.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes reference to the premiums paid. There was four dollars - is it? - that goes from the government, and two from the hog producers - two from the government and four the hog producers put in, four and the government put in two.

The last funds that were put in place, has the government made an arrangement with the hog producers to pay back on their loan guarantee? As I understood it, the last \$5 million had been used up something like the first part of this year and that they had to either go to the government for additional funds - what repayment program is in place on the last year's 5 million before they get this next 5 million? Is there a repayment arrangement made by the hog producers? Increase in premiums, is that how they expect to get it back, or what is the mechanism?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that, I believe, at the end of 1983, approximately \$4.5 million of the previous loan guarantee was issued under the old loan guarantee, leaving remaining approximately \$500,000 of the original loan.

The method of repayment between the producers and the government of the guarantee is based on premiums. The Commission that is operating the fund has indicated that there likely will be an additional pay out this quarter, and that premium increases will occur on July 1st, that there will be a premium increase on July 1st. At that point in time, the estimates are - it is an estimate - that there will be a further pay out in the second quarter. Towards the end of the year, the estimates are that the market prices will improve, and the loan guarantee portions of it will be paid back, leaving approximately as estimated somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$5 million outstanding.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister points out that the initial \$5 million or last year's 5 million was used up, all but \$500,000; that the hog producers will be expected to pay an additional premium this coming July; that there will be an increase to the premiums of producers. Will the amount that the province puts in increase as well at that particular time, or will it only be the hog producers that increase the premiums? First question.

The other one is: is there any interest being charged to the hog producers, and what period of time does he expect it to take to pay back the \$5 million that will be outstanding or \$4.5 million that is outstanding? Will there be interest? How long will it take to pay it back? And will the government be increasing their contribution to the program as well as the hog producers?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware - if he does not recall, I will try and refresh his memory - that when the original program was set up, the provincial contribution that was to be put in was to a maximum of one-third to a maximum of 2 percent, the Provincial Government contribution, bearing in mind that discussions were continuing between the Federal Government and the province and producers for a tripartite stabilization plan in which the Federal Government would contribute its one-third share. That is one of the areas of concern to ourselves as a province, that the new program that is being envisaged will, in fact, have an interest rate attached to the advances made to producers.

The present program of income stability to producers has an additional benefit. It has no interest rate attached to the farmers of Manitoba. That, Mr. Chairman, is a substantial amount of support to the farmers, in addition to the income directly from support to producers. There are no interest charges on the fund, on the deficit in terms of income support to the producers which does - and I do not have those calculations here, but I will bring them for the honourable member - attach greater significance and greater importance to the program that is now in place. Because of the low market prices, there is added stability given to the fund with no interest charged to the producers in terms of repayment.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to see the Minister carried on with the same program that was in place where there wasn't an interest charge attached to the loan guarantee.

I have a further question to the Minister of Agriculture. As he has laid out before us, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's projecting that there will be two more pay outs, one for the first quarter of this year, one for the second quarter of this year, and because of the deficit position of the Stabilization Fund, the loan fund, that as of the 1st of July, there will be an increase in premiums. What guarantee does he have as a hog producer who may be looking at higher returns towards the end of the year, maximizing his pay outs from the stabilization program, and seeing an opportunity to, say, opt out of the program at a time when the Fund is at its lowest? What protective mechanism has he put in place for the taxpayers for the longevity of the program to keep those producers participating to pay back into the program when it's in a deficit position?

Are there safeguards, or what does he propose to do at the period of which producers no longer see an opportunity to get an immediate refund out of it, looking at higher premiums to pay back the shortfall that the fund is in, and may possibly opt out? Is he taking precautions, doing some encouraging, or what is his policy to continue on? Has he had indications from the hog producers that some of them want out when it comes to a particular time of repaying the program? I think it's important that the taxpayers and the rest of this Legislative Assembly know what the policy of the government is, and how he's working this out with the producers.

The other question, Mr. Chairman, is: when does he project that the Federal Government will implement a three-party program, the provincial, federal and producer participation in a program? Who is dragging

their feet? Has he worked hard to discourage the charging of interest on it, or what involvement has he had? Has he had ongoing negotiations, or just precisely where it is at and when, in fact, the Provincial Government and Federal Government join forces to support the hog producers, will it still be the obligation of the producers to pay back the commitment to the province, and how will that be worked in on this \$5 million that he's asking for, Mr. Chairman?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the honourable member does not want to leave a misrepresentation on the record dealing about trying to take credit for a program that was not in place.

I think he is trying to leave on the record some impression here. I would ask that he at least have the courtesy to indicate that the program he had in place and his administration had in place, was only, in effect, of one-year duration. — (Interjection) — No, the member says a two-year program. Mr. Chairman, they made a payment back - a retroactive payment for previous years marketings - and then carried on the program for the balance of the years, Mr. Chairman. While it did take into account two years of marketing, the honourable members should recognize that the program did not take effect until the last year, in effect, the year that they were putting money into the program. They made a retroactive payment and carried on one more year and there was no long-term commitment. There was no long-term commitment to the industry.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have attempted - because there is no way and I think producers have agreed that in order to have the type of production in Manitoba - I don't have those numbers here. I will have all the statistics dealing with the Hog Program when my Estimates are before the House, Sir, so I will not go into great detail on the federal stabilization plan, only to indicate to the honourable member that we do have some concerns and we've raised them with the Producers Marketing Board, our reservations with the federal plan and indicate this, that before any transition takes place, that the funds that are owing to the Province of Manitoba under the program are in fact recouped, that the national plan should be on its own. If producers accept it, it should be on its own and the province's advances to the producers are repaid over however long a period of time it takes, because there may be producers who enter the national program who are not on the provincial program, one cannot tell. I'd have to get the numbers, if there are any, of producers who have opted out under the provincial program.

I go from memory, I believe that any support, if someone is opting out of the program, that any funds received are to be paid back. I'll have to just check that clearly, but I believe that the provisions under this program are similar to that under the beef program, that if someone opts out of the program and has received benefits, automatically those benefits, in relationship to the monies received, are to be paid back. There is a percentage of forgiveness under the beef program, where I believe that there may not be any type of forgiveness on the program under the Hog Stabilization Plan, but I will get those details for the honourable member when my Estimates come up.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the record should show that the Minister of Agriculture is the one who

is misleading the House and the committee - that it was a two-year program that was in place and that actually it was the basic guidelines for which they have followed for the provincial program that's now in place. I don't think he has to wiggle or squirm to try and say that we hadn't done anything. He's just trying to make a political point which really doesn't wash.

I asked the Minister - he's indicated that he will provide the information - does he personally think if there isn't a safeguard in place that the province is going to get their funds back, that one should be put there? Is he making sure that, both on behalf of the long-term interest of the stabilization program for the hog producers and for the people who are putting the funds up to guarantee, or the taxpayers, there is an agreement that both will be protected, Mr. Chairman?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there is an agreement. I will, as I indicated, bring those details when my Estimates come up and we can have a more lengthy discussion on it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, can one of the Ministers give us the information about the \$39 million for the Jobs Fund? How is that expected to be allocated?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the \$39 million is broken down into three components of which \$19.3 million is in the area of business development; \$16.5 million is in the area of housing, urban development and human resources; and \$3.2 million is in community and capital assets. I can give a further breakdown if my honourable friend wishes me to.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I would be interested in knowing, Mr. Chairman, about the \$19.3 in business development.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, within the various programs that we have put together into these components, we have announced and not yet announced packages, so we can't be specific on the ones that were not yet announced.

The announced ones, in that particular component, have to do with the hydro line to Churchill, for which we are providing in this Estimate about .5 million in the first phase or interim spending that's going to take place between now and the end of September. The other announced one is the venture capital addition, the expansion of venture capital in the Department of Small Business Development and that's a \$2 million item that is to be cash flowed between now and September 30th. Those two have been announced.

Others I'm going to deal with in a general area. There's \$5.3 million in the area of agricultural processing, which is yet to be defined or developed. I'm not sure just how much will flow in that area, but that's sort of the pot of money in that area.

There's development agreements with the private sector involving about \$11.2 million, and Co-op Development about \$250,000.00. Those are yet unannounced programs.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that all of this money is self-sustaining capital that will come back to the government, it will be repaid. Why is there .5 million going to build a hydro line in this through the Jobs fund, and will it be repaid as self-sustaining capital as expected to be, and are all of the other items self-sustaining in that they will be paid back?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't give a definitive answer to those items that have not yet been finalized and not yet been announced. With respect to the hydro line, I don't know whether there's a return on that - it's a capital loan project - other than there is some arrangement with the Government of Canada, as I recall it, with respect to the rates that will be charged for a period of years that will go in as an offset to the capital spending that is taking place, but I believe we'll have to talk with the Minister of Energy to refine that further. I don't believe that there's total recapture of that amount of money, although I'm not certain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, this is what I was afraid of last year, and perhaps what appears to be happening isn't happening. I hope that the Minister or the Minister of Finance can assure us that's not the case, but last year when they brought in the act dealing with the Jobs Fund, I raised a question and sought the assurance that capital sought under self-sustaining authority would not end up being spent in a way that isn't, in effect, self-sustaining. Because what that does is lessen the amount of money that shows up for budgetary capital spending and it shows up in the deficit.

Now the government has taken one step to split the deficit and try and tell us that the capital items that are included there don't really matter. It now appears that they've actually taken money that will be out-of-pocket expenditure and put it into self-sustaining loan authority rather than into the budgetary requirements. If that is the case, and perhaps the Minister is going to be able to get the detail and assure us that that's not the case, but if that's the case, Mr. Chairman, then this is wrong. This is an abuse of the system then that provides for authority for self-sustaining loans.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Perhaps the Minister of Finance may want to enter into the discussion, but my impression would be, just from looking at the items here, that not all of these items are self-sustaining. Some are, but I can't at this stage quantify that. I know with respect to venture capital that is indeed a loans program, but if you understand the Venture Capital Program, there is risk involved. To the extent that there is risk it may not be self-sustaining. There may have to be additional capital requirements put into the program to keep that program alive. But its intent is to be self-sustaining to the extent that it's possible.

With respect to Co-op Development, I don't believe that that's a self-sustaining component. I believe that's a thrust in Co-op Development towards the stimulation of further co-operative ventures, but I believe it's in the form of seed money and I'm not qualified to give you detail on that. Perhaps other Ministers may be able to respond. I would hazard a guess that a good part of this is not self-sustaining.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess there's no point in getting into detailed debate on this at the moment until we get some assurance, but I don't like what I'm hearing from the Minister because it seems to me that the distinction is being blurred even further. I've said that I didn't think that the distinction that was made on the budgetary side between capital and operating was really meaningful, but I can understand the government's reasoning in doing that and the bottom line is really the same. But if this is a shifting of the budgetary deficit into loan authority, then I think that is totally wrong and the government should change it, that money should be taken out of here then and put into the other side.

I can accept that there's a risk involved, but if the expectation is that the money will come back, then that's acceptable, but if they already know that there's no expectation of having some of this money repaid, then it shouldn't be in here, it should be taken out. I won't belabour the point for the moment until we get some clarification from the Minister of Finance, or from the Minister who's answering for the Jobs Fund.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, if one were to examine these items by item, I believe we could categorize the agricultural component as being self-sustaining, at least that's the intent. Venture capital is in the same category. The development agreement package, which is a loans package for private sector development agreements, is intended to be self-sustaining. Now they may not all turn out that way, depending what happens through the experience of those programs, but that is the intent.

I believe the exception to that probably is the Hydro line and Co-op Development, which are the small figures, .5 million and .25 million respectively. — (Interjection) — No, all right, by comparison, small out of the 19 million.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions regarding the item for Housing, Housing and Renewal Corporation, \$15 million.

I wonder if the Minister is available. If not — (Interjection) — Well I was wondering if he could give me some idea if any of these funds are allocated for the Critical Home Repair Program. There's certainly been some problems in my constituency, a delay in some of these programs being fulfilled and the obligation fulfilled and I was wondering if there's any dollars in that for the Critical Home Repair Program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister will be here in a minute, but overall the department plans a gross capital program of \$73.5 million in the coming year, of which the 15 million we're referring to here is required immediately for a number of ongoing programs of the corporation. The remaining 58.4 would be provided for in the next loans act.

The programs we're asking for funding for today are infill housing at 500,000; the Buy and Renovate

Program, \$1,250,000; the Logan Redevelopment, \$375,000; Non-profit Housing, \$7,847,000; Rural and Northern Housing Program, \$1,695,000; Critical Home Repair Program, \$833,000; Land Purchases and Development, \$2,500,000.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** I guess, Mr. Chairman, I can get those figures out of Hansard. I didn't get them all down, but I can possibly get them from Hansard later.

I'm wondering, in that, if the Minister can give us any idea, or maybe it's not the time to raise the matter of the rural housing projects that the Minister has in mind in the portion that he allocated of those funds, but maybe, Mr. Chairman, I can ask some questions about the Jobs Fund. Is the monies for Careerstart included in the allocation for the Jobs Fund?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, on that question I can't give him the answer, but I do want to indicate to members opposite that the items here under Housing and Urban Development, and Human Resources are two figures, both of which have been announced, so it's not as if they've not been made public. Thirteen million is in rental housing supply, and \$3.5 million is in the Co-op housing end, so those programs have been made public some time ago.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Just a question to the Minister of Finance. He has to raise this money through borrowing. What's the approximate borrowing rate today to go and get \$92 million?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** The member will appreciate that it depends on circumstances. We just did an issue, a 10-year Canadian dollar at 12 percent. It was about a week-and-a-half ago, I believe, that it was, or a week ago that it was signed. I might say that was at a time when the Federal Government was issuing 10-year bonds, yielding net 13.25. I believe that rates have basically gone up since then. They'd be in the range, and depending on the circumstances, depending on what other arrangements are being made, in the range of about 13.75 percent on 10 years at this stage for 10-year Canadian money and, of course, other rates for other currencies. U.S. dollars are very close to that. It would probably be about 13.5, and Swiss francs would be somewhere in the range of 5.75. I believe that the Yen would be in the range of 8 percent.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** One question that's not strictly related to this, but the comment that the Minister of Business Development made reminds me of it in that he said that five of these programs had already been announced.

I understand that students who are expecting jobs with the government over the summer, that many of them are still being told that they can't be assured

whether they'll have a job until the Estimates pass the House. Now that's an old practice that goes back for decades, I guess, and I think it's still being carried on within the system. Obviously, the government is going ahead on the assurance that it knows it's going to get the money. Perhaps one of the Ministers could look into that and see if that's happening because it's — (Interjection) — the Minister of Northern Affairs says it happened to him and used to happen to me when I worked for the government 25 years ago, and I guess they're still giving you that same kind of answer. Maybe you could look into that and if the government has money in its Estimates to hire a student, surely they should be able to give the student the assurance that the money's going to be there and they'll hire them. — (Interjection) — Out of that 1.5 billion, that's right they should.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, I haven't heard about that concern before, but if the Member for Turtle Mountain says it's happened, the Member for Flin Flon says it's happened, certainly we all know that when items find their way into the Estimates, they eventually will be approved and it doesn't make much sense for departments to use that kind of an argument. If the member can tell me which department is using that, I'd be glad to look into it and see what — (Interjection) — all of them. Well, I'll check with my department and determine whether they're using that line with students, because I don't think they should be.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are you ready for the question?  
Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for Capital purposes the sum of \$92 million be granted out of the Consolidated Fund—pass.  
Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

**IN SESSION**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, H. Harapiak:** The Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** I move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon, that the report of Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**HON. V. SCHROEDER** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 2, An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and authorize the borrowing of the same, The Loan Act, 1984.

**SECOND READING  
BILL NO. 2 - THE LOAN ACT, 1984**

**HON. V. SCHROEDER** presented Bill No. 2, An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and authorize the borrowing of the same, The Loan Act, 1984, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the bill is intended to provide borrowing expenditure authority urgently required for specific non-budgetary capital programs for the new fiscal year which began on April 1st. These requirements are included in the Capital Estimates for non-budgetary capital purposes which were tabled earlier in the Session and which will be authorized in two parts by The Loan Act, 1984, and The Loan Act, 1984 (2).

Capital authority is needed immediately to provide additional funding for the Jobs Fund, Manitoba Forestry Resources, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, and the Manitoba Hog Income Stabilization Plan, as well as funding for the Manitoba Energy Authority.

Due to the urgent nature of these requirements it is important that this bill be approved as quickly as possible. When the bill reaches committee stage, I and my colleagues can provide any further necessary explanation for the information of members.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources, and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of the Attorney-General.

**CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY  
SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** This Committee of Supply is resuming its deliberation. We are now on Items No. 4(a) and 4(b), taking together, relating to Land Titles Office, Salaries and Other Expenditures.  
The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, could the Attorney-General explain the number of people reduced at the Land Titles Office? I believe it is four. Is he not concerned that this may very well result in a reduction in service?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Actually what's happening is this. This is part of a five-year computerization program.

It's not something that is just unique to this year, and that figure indeed for reduction of full-time persons was projected in material supply to me by my officials over a year ago. What will be happening is this. We are concerned about service, and we do hope that the computerization program is going to assist service.

In this year, we will between now and December 31st - the target date when we think the program will be in place - reduce full-time staff by four. Indeed one of those full-time persons has already been redeployed. But to do two things, one is to maintain levels of service while we're completing the computerization and to do some of the workload necessary for programming for the computerized program, five term persons will be taken on between now and December 31st of this year.

So that the net result is that we will be subtracting from the central registry of the Land Titles establishment four persons, quite likely by December 31, 1984. As these persons slated to leave that service are redeployed, we will be employing term people to carry on the work. That works out to a net change in the order of - I have the figures here - about 2, 2.5 when you total what those five term positions are over that period of time.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Just for clarification, Mr. Chairman, is the Attorney-General then indicating that the four people who are to lose their jobs will be kept on staff until they are either redeployed or find alternative employment outside of government, and then the five term people will be hired, or as many as are needed, until the end of December.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Fortuitously, Mr. Sinnott has just arrived, and if you'll just wait 30 seconds . . .

In fact, the five term people have already been hired because part of it, Mr. Mercier, relates to a workload situation. I can't give you the exact figures. I do know that in dollars, the February over February revenue volume, revenue amount in Land Titles Office is more than double. Most of that or a considerable part of that is a workload increase, so in order to cope with that, which will be handled in part by the computerized program when we get it in place, we already have in place the five term employees.

Of the four full-time who will be replaced, one has been redeployed, and we have until December 31, 1984 to complete the redeployment.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** A further clarification then, Mr. Chairman. The Attorney-General then is advising the committee that the four people who are to lose their jobs will be at least kept on until the end of December of this year.

**HON. R. PENNER:** That is right.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** If anyone is to leave, I assume it would be the term people.

**HON. R. PENNER:** The aim, in fact, is that by December 31, 1984 or perhaps shortly thereafter - one hopes by December 31, 1984 - both the four full-time and the five term would be out of the system, whether or not we'll be able to realize that goal. But certainly if it came

to a question of a choice having to be made if we weren't computerized or the workload continued at that volume and we needed people and some of these four hadn't been redeployed, then preference would be given to the four or the three who are remaining.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** When were the five term people hired?

**HON. R. PENNER:** Since the beginning of the fiscal year. I am advised that, in fact, what we have is authorization for five term persons times the time, but it may from time to time be more than five people and from time to time less than five people as we handle the workload.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, a news article, April 17, 1984, indicated that on the previous Saturday, six employees were working overtime earning time-and-a-half. I'm just wondering about perhaps whether or not the Attorney-General is satisfied with the predictions that the staff can be reduced by that number in view of the overtime work that has been going on at the Land Titles Office. There always is from time to time some overtime at the Land Titles Office when there is an upsurge in the amount of work, but there does seem to be a bit of a contradiction here.

**HON. R. PENNER:** That's a very good question. It may well be the case that if this workload increase continues at the levels we are now experiencing, we will have to reassess, even with the computer program, the staff needs at Land Titles.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, dealing with the Land Titles Office, the estimates of revenue indicate that revenue from Land Titles' fees will go up from \$6.6 million to \$7.8 million. I assume that these estimated revenues take into consideration what was referred to in another article at the beginning of February, '84, referring to the cost of - I'll quote from the article. It said, "The cost of registering the purchase of an average-priced house at the Winnipeg Land Titles Office went up by 52 percent under a new rate schedule that took effect today." Does that estimate of 7.8, is that based on the new fee schedule at the Land Titles Office?

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, that and volume.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, the expenditures at the Land Titles Office are estimated to total \$4,339,900, which is down approximately \$9,000 from the previous year; expenditures going down, and revenue going up by \$1.2 million resulting in what in effect is a tax. Revenue from the Land Titles Office is approximately \$3.5 million greater than the expenditures incurred or the cost of operating the Land Titles Office.

It's interesting that this government on the one hand is introducing programs to encourage first home buyers with 10 percent mortgages and encourage home ownership in that way is on the other hand taxing the people who are buying these homes by this very significant increase in the rate schedule that is not justified in terms of the expenditures of the Land Titles Office. Could the Attorney-General perhaps explain his

rationale for this very significant increase in the new fee schedule? Or was he forced into it by the Minister of Finance?

**HON. R. PENNER:** No, no, although it's a strong Minister of Finance, heavily muscled, but, no, I wasn't forced into it.

We do try, both in this department and in other departments, to keep something of a balance between public service programs which are delivered with some fee attached to them between the fees and the costs of running the program. By and large, if one were to take all of the programs which have fees attached to them in whole or in part through the system and assess those fees against the cost of delivering the program, you would find basically that we're delivering at cost.

Indeed in some years, we fall below cost. Some years, as is clearly the case at the moment in the Land Titles Office, in a particular program we will be delivering at something of a surplus. Those surpluses, which perhaps should be put in quotes, are surpluses for a given year, perhaps for a couple of years, and then as costs, by the very nature of the beast, escalate, they get back into balance, and indeed we may go for a period of time at something of a loss in delivering the service.

The basic structure of the Land Titles fees - there have been some changes, and you'll recall that, Mr. Mercier. There had been some changes here and there in the Land Titles fees over the years, but this was the first sort of major revision. In looking at it, it was my hope and indeed expectation that we would not be making annual revisions, that this was a bit of a catch-up and would hold for a period of time.

Fortunately, in this particular program, most of the users by far - I would hazard a guess something in the nature of close to 90 percent of the users - are one-time users, perhaps in the course of their lifetime two-times users with respect to buying and mortgaging. We are talking about the individual homeowner. So it's not in the nature of a tax or impost on an annual basis for each individual, but relates to the one or two transactions during a lifetime where they may have to pay a Land Titles Office-related fee.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The time being 4:30 p.m., the Chairperson is interrupting the proceedings of this Committee of Supply for Private Members' Hour.

Committee will reconvene tonight at 8:00 p.m.

## SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Committee come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources. We are on Item 2.(k)(1), Fire Suppression, Salaries.

Mr. Minister.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Before the Member for Emerson asks some questions on this, I would like to provide some further information with respect to this item.

As honourable members will recall, last year in September, we had a very serious fire which occurred on the east side of Lake Winnipeg.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I remember it well.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside remembers it well. I'm sure the Honourable Member for Emerson does likewise.

The occasion of that fire was we had a particularly dry fall and we had a very extensive lightning storm and it was a dry storm. We had a very very large number of lightning strikes in that area. As a result of that we had, not one, but numerous outbreaks of fire on the east side of Lake Winnipeg and that was followed by strong wind conditions and those fires moved very very rapidly through the forest.

We lost a great deal of valuable forest. The result of that fire was, of course, in addition to the loss of forested area, a request and an emergency funding from government that came to, I understand, \$6.1 million, out of which services were purchased, both from Abitibi, and emergency crews were flown in, bused in, brought in and a very heroic piece of work was done by staff that minimized personal property loss in the area. I believe there was only two cabins that were destroyed. — (Interjection) — Yes, two cabins and a boathouse. I think that was at Long Lake.

I have received a number of phone calls and letters complimenting the department on its effective organization to minimize fire loss. We, as you know, have entered into agreement with both Ottawa and other provinces in providing the national centre for co-ordinating in respect to firefighting. That's centered in Winnipeg. We have pursued the very latest developments in respect to provisioning ourselves for firefighting, which includes the locating of a significant number of lightning detectors throughout the province and through this process we're able to reduce the cost of other services that normally would have been employed in respect to fire detection.

In addition to that, I might point out, we did acquire through the emergency purchase of equipment for the fire on the east side of Lake Winnipeg - a very large amount of additional equipment was necessary - and a good deal of that, we've been able to inventory for the future. So the Estimates do reflect that there is a reduction in the amount of firefighting material that we are intending to buy at this fiscal year, because we were constrained by a good deal of extra equipment last year, and that will be inventoried.

In addition, as I've indicated, there is a reduction because of the fact that we are using substitutional technique which we think is superior to detect fire. I think that's all I'll say at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

I believe, and the honourable members know that we did enter into an agreement with the Federal Government to acquire a further CL-215 under that program, an additional CL-215 for \$1.00 from the Federal Government, so it means that our base fleet, that is the base fleet that is available to the Department of Natural Resources, will be five CL-215's in the future. I don't think we take delivery. We've still got the three right now and the additional two will be coming - at the end of this year? One in 1986 and one in 1988, so we have the three CL-215's now, plus the other equipment. I think honourable members are familiar with the Helitac crew operations and the excellence of the organization to deal quickly with fire.

I want to reiterate, no matter how much equipment we have and how efficient our organization, there would have been no amount of equipment and organization

that would have been able to deal with the very unusual situation that occurred last fall, where we had such a large number of fires occasioned in a very very short time in that area.

I think one other thing I might add is that, as a result and that's the normal course of action of the fire loss, Abitibi and the forestry section have been looking at the area from the point of view of salvage and the best effort that can be made to get what we can and is still obtainable from that forested area that was burnt over.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions on the administration end of it under Fire Suppression. No. 1, I'd like a clarification. The figure, well it's actually under (m), so I want to ask the Minister whether he can indicate - it's hard to make predictions - but what is the anticipation of the fire situation for this year? The initial predictions are that it's very dry at the present time unless we get substantial rainfalls. As the temperature goes up, the fire hazard possibly could become extreme again, and I'm wondering if the Minister has some kind of a backup system or are all systems go? Is he ready for a bad year? Does his staff have any indications as to what we can anticipate in the coming year?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I, unlike - well I won't be caustic about it - I have never claimed to possess a crystal ball, nor has anyone on my staff been able to indicate any certainty about what the future holds in respect to fire.

What we do know is that we had a bad start this spring. We had a lot of brush and grass fires. No serious forest fires, although there was certainly some valuable trees. I know, from my driving out to Ashern seeing the burnt-over area, that a lot of good spruce stands were destroyed south of Ashern, but fortunately we didn't have any major fires in our forested area thus far.

Indications are to this date in 1983, we had 46; to this date in 1984, we had 150, so we have had a high incidence of fire already this year. Fortunately most of that has been brush and grass, as I've indicated.

We were hampered by the fact that with these fires occurring earlier, water supplies available to our CL-215's were limited because of the lake still being icebound or hazardous, from the point of view of still ice in them. We've had pretty good precipitation, I would say excellent precipitation in the North part of the province. But I believe that the whole of the southern part of the province, including the Honourable Member for Emerson's area, the southeastern part of Manitoba would require considerable moisture to make us feel more comfortable about it.

We will monitor the situation very closely, and if there isn't sufficient precipitation, I think that we will have to, first of all, indicate more caution on the part of those going out in forested areas in the southern part of the province, and, if necessary, there will be strict limitations in respect to fire.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** In view of the fire that hit the northeast part of the province last year, can the Minister

indicate whether there was a fair amount of salvage out of the burned-over area there? Is there some recovery for the province in these terms? Has all the salvageable timber been harvested at all, or I wonder if the Minister could indicate where it's at?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I couldn't give you detail on that, Mr. Chairman, at this time. Under Forestry, I will have staff available and they may have those statistics now, or having heard the question, may be in a position to respond more fully to it.

I know that it takes time to get at all of that area and in the case of the serious fires up in the Porcupines, for example, it was some years afterward that some salvaging was still taking place. So I think that there will be the same practice in that area. I understand that there are six operators ongoing, including Abitibi, involved in the salvage, so that likely will continue for some time.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I'm looking at the figures under both (k) and (m) under the last year's costs. Would that accurately reflect the money spent for fire suppression, and equipment-wise, etc.?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, and in my remarks I alluded to the fact that there were reductions in those items because of the fact that we had equipment that was purchased in September that now is available for use in 1984-85, so the equipment which otherwise would have been purchased, we had already purchased in the previous fiscal year.

The number of casual fire fighters reduced somewhat because we have more trained staff now: one less contract helicopter, reflecting our Helitac efficiency; and a reduction in aircraft charters because we have much more efficiency in lightning detection devices that I've referred to; a biweekly reduction in Firetac crews in the southeastern region; and then there's the salary increases as well that affect that. So all of those items, in combination, affect the changes in the dollar spending that you see there.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I wonder if the Minister can maybe clarify - in a news release on September 9, 1983 it says, "The Manitoba Cabinet has authorized a \$4 million special warrant for forest fire suppression, bringing the total allocation for this year to \$13 million." When we look at the figures in the last year's expenditures, it does not come up to that. I'm just wondering if there is an explanation for that.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The allocation last year, 1983-84 was \$7.736 million. It was necessary to receive special warrant of \$6.1 million to augment our Budget, because of the fire that occurred on the east side of Lake Winnipeg.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** That \$6.1 million by special warrant is not reflected in the figures that we see then . . .

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That's right.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister has indicated in his remarks that there was a purchase of two additional water bombers. Did he say it was by agreement with the Federal Government, or if not, what was the cost to the province for those two pieces of equipment?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** A commitment has been made with the Federal Government for the purchase of one water bomber, and I don't have the details here of the contract price. I think it's in the neighbourhood of about \$6 million. — (Interjection) — Well they don't exactly give them out in popcorn boxes, if they ever did, Mr. Chairman.

Under the arrangement, the Federal Government - to ensure that continuation of the production of these water bombers by Canadair - offered to supply an additional water bomber to any jurisdiction requiring them on a basis of one-per-one. They will supply that water bomber to us. It will be available in 1988; the additional water bomber in 1986.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure. The total water bomber complement that the province now has is five or will be five.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It will be five.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** The justification for the purchase of it, Mr. Chairman, was because we needed the additional capacity within the province or was it to further support Canadair? Was the decision made based on need? Because I think traditionally we had one firebomber, and then they increased to two about the end of 1980-81. In that year there were two. There was a complement of leased aircrafts made available and now the taxpayers of Manitoba will be up to a complement of five. Has there been a demonstrable need that we can make justifiable use, because as the Minister indicated, he thinks that they're in the neighbourhood of some \$6 million? I'm for the protection of our resources, and I think it's essential that we have equipment available, but I think it has to be done in a justifiable way. If it's a \$6 million piece of machinery we're buying and the reason for it is to further support Canadair through government policy, and the Federal Government and Provincial Government policy, then I think the taxpayers should be told that's the reason why they're doing it. It's in support of the Trudeau Government policies, not based on need of protecting our resource.

I don't think there has been an increase in the fire hazard other than the last year's dry weather conditions and this spring. I think again we have to remember that it is public funds we're using to protect public assets. We want the public assets protected, but it should be done in a reasonable way.

I'd have further comments to make, Mr. Chairman, that it appears again we're seeing the administration of the department maintain 14.2 staff, as opposed to 14.46 last year, but when it comes to the operational side of the department - somebody to look after the out-in-the-field activities - we've cut them back by eight people, eight positions cut back when it comes to, I would say, on the site type of handling of protecting our resource. Again we're seeing the bureaucracy within the administration part of government being maintained,

where the services provided on a hands-on approach being cut back. There has to be justification for it, whether it's - I again say there should be an explanation as to why that kind of cutback is taking place.

I would also like to know, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister - I know several weeks ago when there were several bush fires or brush fires that he made a statement I believe that there would be no more open fires for a period of time. Has he lifted that restriction on fires, or where are we at with the open-fire situation in Manitoba, seeing as we've had some rain and some storms and some moisture? Where are we at with that particular order by the government? I think it's important that he again tell the public where he's at.

As well, I would like to know if the department has an estimate of the loss of the resources in dollar value over the past, say, five years on a yearly basis, again to point out the effectiveness of the investment in fire protection as to the money invested and the kind of losses that we're incurring. I think every taxpayer knows and certainly supports protection of our resource, but they don't need a waste of our funds to support the Federal Government in the buying or building of airplanes that the country can't afford. Again, the Minister should clearly state his position and his policy on it, and I would be anxious to hear the member's comments.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'll try to deal with these questions or the comments in reverse order. In respect to the fire ban, that has been lifted, Mr. Chairman.

I think that I've spent a fair bit of time talking about staff and redeployments, and we think that we have done an effective job in maintaining staff and redeploying them throughout the province.

In respect to the fire loss in the east side of Lake Winnipeg, I don't believe I have the figures available to indicate the acreage of merchantable timber that was lost. Abitibi - oh, I have that, okay. The total burn during the '83 fire season was - I know the Member for Arthur wants to hear this - 99,153 hectares, of which 86,400 burned as a result of the September 2nd weekend when 41 fires were started.

The average size of the 1983 fires, excluding the weekend, was 25 hectares. Now, we have statistics about the - oh, and I might say that Abitibi have indicated that, as a result of the fire-fighting initiatives and activity, \$200 million worth of usable forest product was saved.

In respect to the fire-management statistics, I have statistics for '79-80, '80-81, '81-82, '82-83, '83-84, which indicates the total number of fires, the total hectares involved, the average size of each fire, the budget, the warrants, and the total cost in each year. Perhaps it might be helpful if I fairly quickly put some comparisons on the record.

In '79-80, there were 644 fires, comprised - I'm rounding it here, Mr. Chairman - 82,500 hectares. The average fire was 128 hectares. The total money spent, adjusted to 1983 dollars, were \$5,880,000.00. In 1980-'81, the total fires were 1,082. The total hectares involved 514,000. The average-size fire was 475 hectares. The total cost that year was \$16,607,000.00.

In '81-82, there 662 fires. The total hectares were 376,000; average size, 568 hectares. The total budget

at the end of that year of the total cost was \$13.34 million.

In '81-83, there were 425 fires; total hectares, 15,444; average size, 36.3. The total bill at the end of the period was \$8,183,000.00.

In '83-84, we had 535 fires; total hectares, 99,152; average size of fire, 185 hectares; the total budget \$15.1 million.

What this confirms, Mr. Chairman and members, is that we have a relatively large number of fires, and the average size of those fires is not all that great. For example, '82-83, the average size of fire was 36.3 acres. Even last year when we had that very bad year, the average-size fire was 185 acres. When you have relatively large numbers of fires and relatively small size in fires, suppression of fires by water bomber certainly is advantageous. What the water-bombing technique can do is minimize the size of the fires. They get there fast through our lightning-detection recording and aerial spotting, can get on-site and minimize what otherwise would become a very large conflagration. It is very very effective in minimizing the scale of the fires we have to fight.

We, in Manitoba, are particularly blessed from a strategic point of view in respect to the use of water bombers, because of the fact that we have many fresh-water lakes of sufficient depth and reasonably free of hazard, although we did have one scrape on one water bomber, that we can pick up water very very quickly and readily, and apply it throughout our forested area in a matter of minutes from location of water supply. So we are particularly favoured when it comes to the point of view of using the water-bomber technique in suppression of fires.

We looked long and hard at the proposal by the Federal Government, and thought it was in our interest because of the very very substantial value of forest that is at risk in fires, the track record of losses throughout the years. We felt that the investment was well-founded. It will mean that we had adequate capacity to meet the standards that we think are necessary in fire suppression.

We think that the water bombers have proven themselves. All too often, we'll have one unit that may be down for repair, so that we can generally figure that we'll always have four units available for action.

I think that gives the member a response to his question.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I don't want to prolong it. I just wanted the decision to spend taxpayers' money based on need rather than supporting the Federal Government when they've got themselves in a difficult situation building airplanes.

The other question is, and it would be hopeful that the government is looking at alternative uses or use of aircraft such as this in other jurisdictions when they may not be used in this particular area. Is there any use of them in other areas, other than in summertime use and forest fire fighting here in Manitoba?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Something that we can continue to look at, because . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Are you doing it or aren't you? That's the question.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member asks a question and, while I'm trying to answer, he wants to ask another one. Perhaps I'll sit down and let him get all the questions out of his system, and then I'll answer them.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I didn't mean to upset the Minister. He's very touchy. I had done that earlier when he called my other question, and this was just a final supplementary that I had.

The question was: are they or are they not using them in other jurisdictions? Now, fine to look at it and do it, but if he is or if he isn't, that was basically the question. Are they or aren't they - that's the question - using them in other areas, jurisdictions? Are you using them in other jurisdictions?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I think the honourable member has exhausted his question, and I'll try and answer it.

We have no plans at this time to lease out the aircraft for use in other jurisdictions. We have considered that, and waived the value of that. Part of the problem is the long distances that they're ferried oftentimes to be used in fire suppression, because during our winter season . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** They're helping the left-wing movement.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I know the honourable member asked questions so that he can get the answers.

**A MEMBER:** He can chew gum and walk upstairs.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Maybe that would improve the Estimates process if he chewed gum and walked upstairs, and didn't bother asking questions if he doesn't want answers to them.

**A MEMBER:** Testy, testy.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, I am just being very matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, because I think this process costs the taxpayers a good deal of money, and I think it should be a responsible process. I'm here to answer questions. When the Honourable Member for Emerson asks me a question, I believe that it requires a response. I am beginning to wonder about the Honourable Member for Arthur.

Mr. Chairman, we would have to look farther afield to lease our aircraft, because throughout Canada when we have an off-season in respect to fires, so do they in Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia and throughout the east, other areas of Canada that rely on forests in their economy.

So we have to look for leasing arrangements far to the south. We have looked at that and the costs of ferrying them a long distance, the uncertainty about the condition upon their return, all of that is being weighed, and we think that what we should do is maintain the fleet in condition. We'll be able to service them during the wintertime, and ensure that fleet is ready for action and not put at any risk for the investment we've made because we have been leasing it out in some distant area. We don't think that it's in the interest of the taxpayers to do that.

We have sharing agreements with sister jurisdictions, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, in the event of disaster. That is co-ordinated through that inter-agency task centre in Winnipeg that I alluded to.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. I am leaving the Chair, and will return at 8:00 p.m. tonight.

Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

#### RESOLUTION NO. 2 - WESTERN CANADIAN GRAIN PRICES

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The first item on the agenda for Private Members' Hour is Proposed Resolutions, Resolution No. 2.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture has six minutes remaining.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday when I left off on the honourable member's resolution - I have a copy of his resolution here - I indicated that we certainly were not opposed to contents within the resolution dealing with the difficult times that the farmers of this province are facing.

I indicated as well yesterday that I felt that the Federal Government was taking a contradictory position vis-a-vis grain producers. I said that they're prepared to amend The Western Grain Stabilization Act, which we believe a pay out should be made immediately. In fact, we were pressing for a pay out and a reconsideration of the legislation as far back as July of 1983 at the Ministers' Conference.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** If it wasn't for Downey who suggested this, you wouldn't see the need for it.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Pembina or wherever he's from indicated that if it wasn't for Downey, Mr. Speaker - I want to tell you that the Honourable Member for Arthur and his colleagues, I guess they want to at least appear to be in front of an issue, but they are not. They are months behind on this issue.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. B. URUSKI:** No, I'm serious, Mr. Chairman. They had no other suggestions to make for support of the western farm grain sector, other than a pay out from The Western Grain Stabilization Act. It's very clear.

Mr. Speaker, it's members like the Honourable Member for Pembina who talked about incentive rates and incentives to the railway companies to give benefits to farmers. Those kinds of comments, Mr. Speaker, led to the killing of the Crow. It is comments like his former Leader made in Prince Rupert when they were at a conference there that the Crow had to go. It is comments like the Honourable Member for Arthur made to his western colleagues, saying that the Crow is an impediment to the livestock industry, and it should be

ended, Sir. Those are the kinds of comments that have placed western grain producers behind the eight ball.

Now to say that yes, there will be a pay out under the Western Grain Stabilization Fund to assist Manitoba producers which may amount to \$40 million or \$50 million. On the other hand, the initial payments are reducing producer cash incomes by between \$45 million to \$50 million. So, Mr. Speaker, we certainly support this resolution in that context.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how well the members opposite support that resolution when all of their comments, both federally and provincially, are saying that the deficit of the Province of Manitoba, the deficit of the Federal Government - because, Mr. Speaker, should these initial prices be left at a rate or an amount higher than the world prices for grain will be paid into the pool, it may increase the federal deficit. Now I wonder how the honourable members opposite and their national party are prepared, how they square that with the national party saying, we have to lower the federal deficit.

Mr. Speaker, we do not take that position. We believe that Western Canadian farmers are the backbone of Canadian economy in the production of grain, Mr. Speaker, and they do require an income commensurate with their cost of production in grain. This move will add to the difficulties that many of those farm families now experience.

So, Mr. Chairman, those members opposite have great difficulty in speaking out of both sides of their mouths. On the one hand, they want to kill the Crow, to increase the cost to the farmers. On the other hand, they're saying, we stand up for the farmers. Mr. Speaker, what they are really doing is just like the fellow who took his friend to the edge of the diving board on a pool, saying, we're behind you farmers, and they pushed him off the end. That is the way the Conservative Party is treating the farmers of Western Canada. It is taking them to the brink and then saying, we're with you . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** . . . and push them off the edge into the pool. That's how the Tories speak on behalf of the farmers through both sides. They are a friend, Mr. Speaker. With friends like that, who needs enemies, Mr. Speaker? Who needs enemies?

It is members opposite, while we have no difficulty with the resolution, Sir, but their speeches and their statements certainly do not reflect the sincerity of this resolution, Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The first thing I want to do, Mr. Speaker, is to say how pleased I am to second the resolution by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell who has demonstrated year after year and time after time his commitment to the farm community, to the people that he represents in again bringing forward a resolution that has a lot of meaning to it, a lot of common sense approach to it, and I would hope that any Minister of Agriculture in his right mind in government would support in this Legislative Assembly.

I am disappointed that the Minister did not lay out a little more reasoning or make a better case for the rest of the people of Manitoba and the rest of the people of Canada as to why it is essential that the price of grain handled by the Canadian Wheat Board, supported by the Federal Government be maintained at no lower than this current year's prices. Mr. Speaker, that was negligent on the part of the Minister, and I would have thought that his department would have been able to lay out for him some of the things and the reasons why this resolution should be supported for the Member for Roblin-Russell, which came from the Town of Roblin, some of the businesspeople there, as well supported by the Chambers of Commerce from that community. I compliment the Member for Roblin-Russell in putting it on the Order Paper, and bringing it forward.

The importance of Canadian wheat to not only the Manitoba economy and the Canadian economy is certainly not questionable, but just to put it into relative terms it is the greatest income for the farmers of Manitoba. The only one that comes close to it is the production of beef cattle in Manitoba, but the production of wheat is king still in Manitoba. Even though we have a diversified agriculture, the majority of the incomes for farmers comes from the wheat production of this province.

Again pointing out the contribution to the total of Canada's economy with Saskatchewan again being even the greater producer of wheat and Alberta than Manitoba, but the collection of the three provinces in wheat production puts us in the major position as far as a country in this world of exporting a grain to the hungry people, and again was pointed out by the honourable member.

Inflation and high costs of farm fuels - and when I'm speaking of farm fuels, Mr. Speaker, two years and running, there has been a resolution on the Order Paper asking this administration to support us - my colleague for Pembina prepared the resolution - going after the Federal Government to remove the federal fuel tax from the farm community. And what did he do, Mr. Speaker? He voted against it. He voted against it, Mr. Speaker - one of the major costs to the farmers - the Minister of Agriculture didn't even support it.

Why should it be supported, Mr. Speaker? Because farmers haven't got the kind of opportunity, the kind of system that they can set the price or pass through the costs that are incurred by them. A lot of people will debate whether it's right or wrong. They say, well, the free market system is no good, Mr. Speaker.

Well, what is happening to the price of rapeseed right now in the free market? Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, that word may not be parliamentary, I'll change it to canola. But, Mr. Speaker, it has to be pointed out that the free market in certain areas has worked well. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture didn't point out that he didn't support the removal of federal fuel taxes by the opposition when they forwarded it.

Some 150,000 farmers in Western Canada are affected by the lowering of wheat prices and let us talk a little bit about how much the wheat prices were lowered. It is indicated that the Wheat Board prices for No. 1 Red Spring wheat will be lowered from \$4.63 to \$4.35 a bushel this coming year - the only commodity in society that I know of, Mr. Speaker, that's lowered

when everything else is going up in price. How do we expect, Mr. Speaker, our farm community to maintain the kind of confidence? How can we accept the Minister of Finance's optimism that we're now starting to come out of the recession? We aren't, Mr. Speaker, we aren't, because it's being demonstrated in the price mechanism of farm commodities that the prices are lower and going to be lower.

Let us look at the other side of the picture as well, Mr. Speaker, as far as the farm community is concerned - grain prices down, wheat prices down. What's happened to the elevation charges at the elevator company level, Mr. Speaker, over the last few years? It is now approximately 18 cents a bushel, almost \$8 a tonne. I don't like using tonnes because I think it's easier for farmers to understand it than bushels. I understand it better than bushels, but 18 cents a bushel, Mr. Speaker? To elevate a bushel of grain from your truck, up 50 feet in the air, and stored in the elevator, to put it back into a tank car, to send it to the Lakehead - 18 cents a bushel. A proposed increase again this year, 5 percent last year, 4 percent this year, to elevate those grains, Mr. Speaker - increased costs paid for directly by the farmer off of that bushel of wheat that he's selling for less.

Let's take a look at another area, Mr. Speaker. Freight costs - and you know here's where we really have to point out what this government has done when it comes to the transportation of grain and the little bit of credit that they're not going to give us in the work we have done, as far as the transportation of grain in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister made reference to our former Premier in Prince Rupert. Mr. Speaker, if he wants the track record of our government and our former Premier, when it came to the movement of grain in Canada, he should take his hat off and say thank you on behalf of the grain farmers, because action was taken. Record movements of grain are now being handled in this country and we didn't say get rid of the Crow, Mr. Speaker. We didn't say throw away the Crow, holus-bolus, and trade it off to the Lloyd Axworthys for some other piece of money that he's going to spend in Manitoba to help his own image and sucked in the NDP as he's done in the last few months - the NDP-Lloyd Axworthy coalition, Mr. Speaker. That's what we have taking place and they're trying to cover up and say they have protected the Crow rate. They failed, Mr. Speaker. But our position was, Mr. Speaker, that we did not want to see the Crow rate go away unless the benefits were protected for the farmers of Western Canada, the benefits of the Crow rate retained for the farmers of Western Canada. We wouldn't allow to have happened what happened under this administration. We would have spoke up loud and long, Mr. Speaker. We wouldn't have joined with the Lloyd Axworthys of his world, who is trying to buy his way into the House of Commons again, Mr. Speaker. We wouldn't have tolerated that, and what has it been? This is what I thought the Minister of Agriculture would have pointed out to us. What have the increased costs of transportation been to farmers? A 33 percent jump this year, increase in cost of transportation. An increased cost of transportation that this government allowed to happen, Mr. Speaker, because they joined with Axworthy to help get him elected. That's what they did, Mr. Speaker, they sold Manitoba farmers out to

help Lloyd Axworthy, that's what they did. But the total increase since the act came into place, Mr. Speaker, on the backs of farmers is 58 percent increase in transportation costs - 58 percent, at a time when the product that they sell is going down.

Mr. Speaker, it's a shame in society that this kind of thing is taking place, and yet we are seeing farmers who haven't got the financial capacity still go to the field this spring - not with as much optimism as we would normally see, but again with optimism to grow a crop, to keep the thing going until there is relief in sight. They, Mr. Speaker, are committed people. They're committed people, even though their costs of doing business have gone up and the returns are going down. I have to compliment them for it because there aren't many people that would do it. There aren't many people that would do it, but there are 150,000 committed Western Canadian farmers who see fit to feed the Canadian people and those markets that have been established. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there has to be support come from not only this Legislative Assembly but the Legislative Assemblies from all across Canada to ask the Federal Government to finally pay attention to that community.

You know, the reference was made from my colleague from Lakeside, when the Minister of Agriculture said, well, we're against deficits. Who wouldn't be against deficits when it's spending billions of dollars to build executive aircraft that nobody will fly in, Mr. Speaker? I'm sure MacEachen learned that lesson when he was flying over South America, when he had to make an emergency landing, Mr. Speaker, and yet we continue to pump billions of dollars of Canadian money into an air fleet system that isn't flyable? What do we have to do, Mr. Speaker? What do we have to do to get them to realize the urgency in the agricultural community?

Mr. Speaker, I again have to make another comment that relates directly to the pricing of farm commodities. I believe, because we have cheap food policies in Canada, in the United States, and these major producing areas, that we have far overestimated - not us, the farmers - the bureaucrats, the people in the system have overestimated the supplies of grains that are available. I won't even take it off the backs of farmers. I believe that farmers - I as a farmer, my colleagues as farmers - sometimes when it comes to a bin of grain you have to go to your banker and you need a loan - you know if you're going to estimate it, you're going to be on the high side rather than the low side. A lot of thousand-bushel bins sometimes have 1,200 bushels when it comes to a rough estimate, but when it hits the elevator scale, it may not weigh quite 1,200 bushels. There may be a shrinkage there. The imagination is always a little greater than the actual bushels that are there. That's one place that there's an overestimation, but again when it comes to the elevator system, Mr. Speaker, every elevator agent has to overestimate the bushels he has to ship, so he gets more rail cars, so he gets his fair share of rail cars - again an overbuilding of volume in the system.

What does this all do when it adds up? It translates into a supply of grain that I don't think we have, Mr. Speaker, and I think if there were a true figure put on the amount of grain that was in this country, that you'd immediately see an increase in the price of every grain in every country that there is, because there isn't as much in stock as what is being estimated.

I challenge those people that put those numbers together. I challenge this Minister of Agriculture not to record the rain and tell us, walk in and say we had an inch of rain yesterday, but I challenge him to ask his department to see if there can be a little bit more, a little better way of getting an accurate assessment of the grain, and don't advertise it worldwide if you get a large production of grain. Protect the people that are growing it, Mr. Speaker, protect the people that are growing it. I, Mr. Speaker, would support him in that kind of a move. It's unfortunate, as I said, that we didn't see the Minister of Agriculture put the kind of facts and figures on the table that we should have seen.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, in his resolution, continued to point out that we are competing in an international market. We're competing against the United States, who is one of the largest grain producers in the world and, of course, one of the major price setting mechanisms. We really aren't asking for a handout for the farm community, all we're asking is fair protection and justification for being there and getting our fair share. That's why I think it would have been important for the Canadian Government to say to the Canadian Wheat Board, you maintain the level of grain prices to the farmers this year because of every other problem that they've had, the setbacks they've incurred. We wouldn't mind, as the taxpayers, to represent the people of Canada as taxpayers and maintain that level. It would only be for a short-term period, Mr. Speaker. In fact, it may not be at all. That's the big point. It may not be at all that we'd have to use taxpayers' money.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, if in fact that one thing could be done, if the farmers were told, the wheat prices weren't going to be reduced, explain to the people of the United States and worked out with them that we're not trying to undermine them, I believe that it could be accomplished that we could send one good piece of news - well, there were two good pieces of news, the Grain Stabilization pay out, even though it's too late and too little, actually is a move that I think everybody kind of feels there is at least somebody that cares about them.

The other piece of good news would be to maintain the price of grain at its existing level for this coming year. I think that would again put some heart back into the people that are going to the field right now on their tractors and their equipment, and their fertilizer expenditures, that they would have one more piece of good news that would add to the highlight of their day.

Mr. Speaker, what do we see again this particular government doing when it comes to agriculture? It's extremely interesting. The Minister of Agriculture stands in his place and continues to tell us about the programs that have helped the people of the farm community. I don't deny that he's helped some people in the farm community, Mr. Speaker. He has taken every program that was in place when he got into office; he expanded a little bit on a few, but he really hasn't come forward with a new thought. He really hasn't come onto new ground, new ideas, new thoughts that could add some revitalization to the farm community. There's nothing there. It's like the rest of the government ministers. If it hadn't have been for four years of Tory administration prior to him getting into office, they'd have nothing to work with, Mr. Speaker. They're working on a pretty barren piece of ground out of their own minds. It had

to be our ideas that they carried on with, Mr. Speaker, and I don't mind them doing that, in fact, I'm pleased they are, but it's the way in which they go about it.

Mr. Speaker, I made reference again to the costs of farm production and grain going up. I'll just go over them again. We've seen the elevation charges continue to increase by four and five percent in each of the last two years; we've seen the transportation rates go up by some 33 percent this year and a total of some 58 percent in the past year since The Transportation Act was passed, and to have this Minister of Agriculture stand here and say, "It was our fault, we supported the changes to the Crow Rate." We didn't, Mr. Speaker, support the changes to the Crow Rate, unless the benefits were maintained for the farmers of Western Canada.

This government hasn't even asked the Federal Government to be a part of the review committee that's taking place. I'm surprised. In fact, I will be recommending - I'll recommend today to this government - to the Governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and they've got \$100 million each in the transportation system in this country. We had several million dollars invested through the leasing of hopper cars, but I think that Mr. Axworthy, the Federal Minister of Transport, should ask the provincial jurisdictions to sit in on the review of The Transportation Act to see if there can be some ideas come from the provincial governments on making sure that it works. Possibly this government would clear its position on whether or not maybe Gilson's recommendation may not have been better than what the present system is.

This government hasn't said a word about it. All they do is come out and say, "The opposition supported changing the Crow Rate." They're talking about history. I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, let them look into the future, let's ask Mr. Axworthy, who's trying to buy his way into the House of Commons again, let's ask him if we can participate on the review commission on The Transportation Act that's put in place. Let's have the Saskatchewan Government involved, Mr. Speaker, in the review, and let's have the Alberta Government involved in the review. I think it's imperative that we do so.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks today, I want all of society to know that all the farmers of Western Canada that grow wheat and grow grain, that they are selling a commodity for less money, and every cost that they're putting into that production is going up. It's not fair, it's not just and I think this Assembly, as I think all the assemblies across this country, have to deal urgently with the problem so we can put some confidence back into the main industry in this nation.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to join with honourable members of this Assembly to speak on this resolution as presented by the Member for Roblin-Russell, and I want to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have any quarrel with the intent of the resolution in support of allowing the Grain Stabilization Fund to

have payments made out as soon as possible. We have no quarrel at all with that. In fact, this resolution is probably too little, too late. Much too late, because it was back in 1983, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Agriculture met with his colleagues and the Federal Minister to ask that this be done.

So, you know, this resolution, while we support the intent and we know the problems that exist there, to us it's a "me too" resolution. "Me too, I want to get on the band wagon." It's after the fact, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I say it's too little, too late.

Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to have the opportunity to speak after the former Minister of Agriculture, who will probably - heaven forbid if he's ever again the Minister of Agriculture. Farmers will know that that minister was nothing short of a walking disaster. He was nothing short of a walking disaster insofar as agriculture policy is concerned. I remember the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. ADAM:** . . . Mr. Speaker, the first piece of Legislation that I remember, the first session, the first year, they brought in something that was going to resolve the beef problems. They were going to resolve once and for all the problems that were faced by the beef sector. What did they do, Mr. Speaker? They brought in a bill that would, on a compulsory basis, force every beef producer to join a farm organization whether that farmer wanted to or not. He would have to be part of that group.

Mr. Speaker, only from a Tory Government would you see that happen, only from a Tory Government. No other democratic party would dare to force farmers to belong to something that they did not wish to belong or they did not wish to finance, or did not wish to participate in. Only a minister like we had in the previous government would do that - the walking disaster, Mr. Speaker.

Let me tell you, he began his remarks by saying, "You know, last year, we brought in a resolution here to request the Federal Government to remove farm fuel tax." Now, Mr. Speaker, I have before me here a document that was just placed before all of us, just yesterday or even this morning, I'm not sure, but, Mr. Speaker, the member has made a falsehood by making that statement. He has put on the record a falsehood.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution was passed unanimously, right here on Page 334, and I will read it . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Arthur on a point of order.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is making accusations that are not correct and I would like him to clearly state in this Assembly that the resolution as originally presented to this House by the opposition members was not supported by he or his government. They amended it to support it, Mr. Speaker. Let it not be said and left on the record that I did not tell the truth, Mr. Speaker, it is the Member for Ste. Rose that's playing dangerously with the truth and trying to mislead this Assembly . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

I'm sure that we recognize that members have different opinions on matters. If there is clarification to be made, I'm sure it will be made.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the resolution that was passed . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. ADAM:** . . . the Member for Arthur stated in his remarks that they had introduced a resolution that would remove the tax on farm fuel, and he said that we had voted against that, and the record is clear, Mr. Speaker, that we did not vote against that. We did vote in support and it was carried, it was agreed to by both sides of this House that we request the Federal Government to remove the sales tax. So, the Member for Arthur has put on the record something that was not correct in his statements. It was wrong, Mr. Speaker, and I can read the resolution over again, but it's there:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to remove the federal sales tax from farm fuels consumed by the farm industry for agricultural production."

It's clear, crystal clear as glass. There it is right here. It was agreed to, the question being put was agreed to, and who had the majority last year in this House?

So, let not the honourable member come forward and try to justify these arguments, particularly when they're weak, Mr. Speaker. Members will recall that many of the problems facing the farm community today, the major causes of farm problems today has been high-interest rates, high fuel costs, high energy costs, Mr. Speaker. Those are two identifiable causes of the problems facing farmers, not only in Manitoba, but right across this province.

I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that those two policies, the policy on interest rates, the policy on farm fuel, was supported by Tories. In statements made in this House when they were on this side of the Chamber, when they were in government, I heard the former Minister of Finance in the Tory Government say, what else could be done but high interest rates, what else could we do. I'm only paraphrasing — (Interjection) — I'm only paraphrasing . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. ADAM:** . . . if I'm wrong he will stand up and object.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** . . . if you're telling a lie you mean.

**HON. A. ADAM:** He will object.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

Would the Honourable Member for Pembina who shouted from his seat care to put that on the record?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** When I speak, Mr. Speaker, I will.

**MR. SPEAKER:** If the honourable member declines to I'm sure the House will take note of the fact.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's not uncommon to hear unparliamentary comments from the Member for Pembina who is not sitting in his seat at the moment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. ADAM:** He's sitting in the seat of the person that he tries to emulate, Mr. Speaker; Little Caesar . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. ADAM:** . . . Little Caesar.

Mr. Speaker, we know where the former Leader of the Province of Manitoba, the now Member for Charleswood, where he stood on energy costs. I heard him say when I was sitting in that seat over there, probably the one that's occupied by the Member for Pembina for the moment, that the sooner the price of fuel should go the world price, the better. That was a statement made by the former Leader of the Conservative Party on this side of the House, the champion of the farmer — (Interjection) — and I heard from either this seat here or this one where the former Minister of Agriculture - I think it was in this seat right here - when he was Minister of Agriculture - I heard him say that if he had his way he would wrestle the Wheat Board to the ground; another champion of the farmer going to destroy the Wheat Board.

The third issue, Mr. Speaker, the very crucial issue was the cost of transportation. We have gone over the subsidies, yesterday my colleague and others have said that Manitoba farmers are one of those few in the world market that have received less subsidies than other countries, and we know that. One of the only benefits they had, Mr. Speaker, was the Crow rate, and it was a confederation bargain. They were entitled to it because of our wide country, great distances to travel to get our grain to our terminals on for export market. That is one small advantage that they had to try and be more competitive with countries that are close to terminals, close to the seaboard and close to the ports where they can export the grain. That was one advantage that we had, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let not the Member for Arthur say, they talk about the Axworthys and that we were in bed with the Axworthys and all this kind of thing. They were in bed with the Liberals on the Crow rate. They were not only opposed to the Crow rate, Mr. Speaker, they also had another plan. Mr. Speaker, they figured that once the Crow rate is gone, the Wheat Board will be soon to follow. They know that the Wheat Board has been under serious attack and, Mr. Speaker, and that is what the intent was, get rid of the Crow rate, we'll get rid of the Wheat Board, then you'll have that free-market system that has looked after the farmer so well over the years. It has looked after them so well that we don't even have to talk here today, this resolution is irrelevant. That is the kind of arguments that we get from members opposite, Mr. Speaker. So, let them not come in here holier than thou and tell us how they speak for the farmers and that they are champions of the farm community. They are not, Mr. Speaker. They are opposed to marketing boards that will give some stability to the farm community. — (Interjection) —

**A MEMBER:** Who says I'm opposed to marketing boards?

**HON. A. ADAM:** That is a policy that's long known, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Arthur on a point of order.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Government Services is making statements that are not correct and imputing statements or motives by the opposition that are not correct, and I would ask him to withdraw and apologize dealing with marketing boards, saying that we are opposed to them. That is not correct, Mr. Speaker, we are fully supportive of properly operated farm marketing boards.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

That is not a point of order, that's a clarification.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I hope that you don't detract from my time because of the interruptions I'm receiving.

Mr. Speaker, that member has a resolution on milk producers. He has a resolution that we'll be debating, requesting that we have more quotas but you know the intent of that resolution is to try and downgrade the marketing system that we have.

But, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party has done more. We have done more for the agricultural community in the last two years than any other government in the Province of Manitoba that has ever been governing this province including the four years of disaster that we had under the Conservatives, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have brought in credit and financial support. When we took over the MACC fund was dry. There were no funds left because they were getting farmers into trouble lending them money to buy land at exorbitant high interest rates, forcing farmers to have to make those capital payments.

Mr. Speaker, they were forcing farmers to buy land at high interest rates so that they would have to provide capital, Mr. Speaker, dead capital that doesn't give you any money back that might appreciate in 20 years, 30 years time, but doesn't do anything for the young farmer going in and ties up all his capital into dead capital that doesn't give back a return on it. Maybe in 20 years, 30 years he might see the benefit of it.

That was one of their policies, and many farmers have gotten into trouble over that policy. Right today some of those farmers that are in trouble are in trouble because they bought land and had to pay high interest rates and those mortgages are coming forward, and those payments are coming forward, and they've got to also make payments on their farm equipment and their fertilizer, and everything else so they did not help the farmer when they brought in that policy, Mr. Speaker. We did help in that respect, Mr. Speaker.

We've also brought in stabilization for livestock, and hog producers, Mr. Speaker. I give them credit for

bringing in a program for hog producers but, Mr. Speaker, it was a year too late. As far as the Beef Stabilization Program was concerned, there's no way that you could budge the disaster on that one. There's no way that he would bring in a program to help the beef producers, no way.

Oh, we're going to set up a study. You didn't have to ask the livestock producers, you know, for a study. They knew where they were. They knew what kind of a situation they were in, Mr. Speaker. They didn't have to have a study, everybody knew what was going on.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have brought in a plan for the Manitoba beef and I think, you know we must have spent 25 million at least in provincial assistance to 6,000 beef producers. You know, Mr. Speaker, it was about that program that members opposite said that it would be a failure, that we'd be lucky if we got 10 percent participation of the livestock herd, the cow herd, the cow calf herd and all that. We'd be lucky if we'd get 10 percent involvement. Mr. Speaker, the involvement is 73 percent. That's the same kind of arithmetic that they use when they talk about the Budget, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the stabilization for hogs was introduced in May of 1983, and over 50 percent of the hogs marketed are covered by the program, so there is much more than 10 percent. 7.5 million in payments have been provided to Manitoba Hog Producers.

Mr. Speaker, we have stood firmly for preservation of the Crow rate which is going to be a disaster for the farm community. These fellows here are ones that undermined this, they undermined the Crow rate along with their Liberal friends and the farmers know that, and I want to tell them that I am getting memberships from the farm community that never, never would join our party, I'm now receiving memberships that are coming forth based on our farm policies, Mr. Speaker.

My time is up I understand.

Thank you, very much.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member's time has expired.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** I welcome this opportunity to put a few remarks on the record, Mr. Speaker, on this very important resolution as brought forward by the Member for Roblin-Russell.

I find again that I follow the Member for Ste. Rose and I must admit, Sir, that he did a somewhat better job this time than he did in the Budget debate. I always enjoy his presentation, but agree with it very little. I must make some further comment to that. I know he's basically sincere in his own mind at least of what he speaks, but I say with the greatest respect, Sir, as I suppose as one reaches those sunset years and hopefully to the member opposite there are many, many, many more left, that the truth sometimes gets caught up into what you think has been said, and of course that becomes important. So when the member opposite makes the indication that, of course, we're the ones that brought the Crow down; we're the ones that want to see the Canadian Wheat Board dismantled, and we're the ones that are against marketing boards, he probably honestly believes that, Mr. Speaker, but really there are no facts, of course, to prove that whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with this resolution. I'll go on the record at this time as supporting it. Although I'm at a loss as to determine whether the members opposite, the government Ministers particularly are supportive of it — (Interjection) — Oh yes, the Member for Ste. Rose indicated he supported it. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I had some personal concern originally at lending my support to this resolution. It's not that my sympathies don't lie 100 percent with the farm community and those of us who are grain producers, but I'd say more so due to the fact that my concerns are that I have watched closely other major producers of food grains throughout the world and their dependency upon government, and their increasing dependency once it started, particularly in the area of price support. So it's to that end that I feel that it's only fair that I indicate some of my concerns although the situation at this time is probably reaching such a desperate state that no doubt we have to begin to consider the total health of the grains community within this nation.

Many of the preamble whereases, Mr. Speaker, depict quite accurately the situation within the industry, and I think I'd like to tie it into specifically where we stand within the province and the consideration that seems to be given the grains community by this government. I think you could address that from many different directions.

It comes, I suppose, as a mild disappointment to me that members opposite, in my view, have a total misunderstanding as to where wheat and grains fit into the whole economy of this province. One looks at specifically the cash returns and the cash flow generated to the provincial economy by way of grain production, and I believe it's somewhere in the area - this is strictly grain - of \$1.1 billion. Within the Province of Manitoba some \$400 million to \$500 million of that is through wheat production. Those are no small numbers, Mr. Speaker. Of course, as farmers are famous for spending their money, someone said if you want to get the economy going, just take all the money and give it to farmers because they'll spend it all very quickly. One can see how that, of course, multiplies pretty quickly. That's why those of us on this side quite often make the general statement that the agriculture community probably creates one-third of the economic activity within this province.

Mr. Speaker, I very rarely see members opposite fully understanding those basic figures. I suppose it could lead a person like myself to ask the question, why is the grains industry within this government particularly and quite often within Provincial Governments generally, particularly in Manitoba, given such, what appears to be a low priority? That's a major concern to me.

I realize that many of the responsibilities for involvement within the grains community are those of a federal nature. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it behooves those people in power in this province, certainly the Minister of Agriculture and other members of the Treasury Bench, to be very fully aware of the situation within the total spectrum of agriculture within this province. Again, I have noticed on too many occasions where this particular Minister of Agriculture has a very scant knowledge of the grains industry.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt, the second preamble talks about the great contribution that grains make

towards the economy of the nation. That goes without saying. Again I made reference in my Budget speech to the fact that some \$90 billion of our GNP is generated by way of export. I believe that some \$10 billion of that is of grain. Of course, on the net side, grain is probably the largest earner of foreign exchange. In other words, we export many more agricultural goods than we import. On the net balance, it becomes if not the largest, probably the second-largest earner of foreign exchange.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as we go down these particular preamble sections, I couldn't help but notice specific reference to high inflation and high cost of farm fuels and, having read that, again recollecting all the debates we've had over the last two Sessions regarding that specific issue. I don't know if members on my side had spelled out specifically what farmers within the nation contribute by way of federal tax, the 9 percent federal fuel tax, but I happened to hear it on a news report today that it's in the area by somebody's estimate of \$250 million paid directly by farmers in all parts of the country as a contribution to general revenues of the nation. I found it very interesting that three of the candidates within the Liberal Leadership are now promising, should they become the Leader of that party, to remove that particular tax.

So I would hope that the Member for Pembina would again reintroduce that particular resolution, and again determine whether members opposite have had any change in their attitude toward that particular resolution - Mr. Speaker, \$250 million specifically on the federal portion of that tax.

Sir, we can go on, and I suppose as one looks specifically into the economics of operating a farm today, one whose major enterprise is grains, one of course wonders how many farms can survive at all. I can tell you that - you probably realize, Sir, I know members opposite don't, but just yesterday or the day before, being Friday when I say the day before, the price of rapeseed broke through an all-time record. That was maybe of interest to you. That was in 1974, 10 years ago. The price, I believe, hit some \$520 or \$530 a tonne, and just the other day it was broken.

I point that out to indicate to members opposite that this industry has been able to survive only because of massive increases in production such that this 31 million cap that was put on the new Crow this year, I understand, has been surpassed by two-and-a-half million tonnes. That's the only set of circumstances that has allowed the farm community, through major increases in volume of production, has allowed the farm community to at least to float and to continue to survive, because today prices are below what they were 10 years ago. I would ask members opposite to name one other industry within the economy where that has occurred. I suppose as close probably within the beef industry.

Agriculture per se is now being asked to survive by the nation at prices which today are lower than they were 10 years ago. I wonder how many of the members opposite would be prepared to work for wages that were of 1974 levels. Well, Sir, I think it's very important that we realize what has happened.

We can talk about other countries who have subsidized grain, and I guess I'll allude back to my concern. The E.C. today, European Common Market

today has a budget of \$21 billion to keep the nations of Europe trying to work in some unified manner towards their major goal. Some 14 billion to 15 billion of that is used within the area of agriculture to subsidize predominantly French grain producers, to subsidize wheat in the value of \$9 or \$10 a bushel, whereas those of us producing that commodity today in Canada are receiving around \$4.10. So, Sir, let's understand where subsidies might lead, but also let's understand what we are competing against in the world.

The situation is bad, Mr. Speaker, within the industry, and I can tell you that's why many many farmers today are loading producer cars. I think the Member for Arthur alluded to the fact that elevation today is 18-cents-a-bushel within an elevator and climbing. The cost of moving that particular bushel of grain from my elevator though to Thunder Bay, I understand, will cost me this year 14 cents. The cost of elevation just to move it up and to drop it into a car is 18 or 19. That's why farmers are looking in every direction to save a cent today.

I can tell you as a supplier of seed to the farm community, our business has been affected somewhat this year because of farmers, rightfully so, being very concerned about the cost of seed. They're also

concerned about tag axles. They are concerned about what costs are going to be coming down upon them for them to upgrade supposedly their equipment.

Mr. Speaker, I think we find ourselves in a situation within the industry where it's very serious, and I would hope that we could have unanimous support for this resolution as proposed by my colleagues.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. When this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have seven minutes remaining.

The Chair will accept a motion to adjourn.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, it is our understanding that the House will meet this evening in Committee of Supply to review the Estimates. With that understanding, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).