



**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. 48 - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 21 JUNE, 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>DOWNNEY, 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

Thursday, 21 June, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

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

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I have a statement.

Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House of two energy sale negotiations the Manitoba Energy authority presently has under way. These are in addition to those that have been recently announced. Each has the potential for providing Manitoba and Manitobans with significant economic benefits.

As members are aware, the government has successfully negotiated a major contract with Northern States Power of Minneapolis, Minnesota, to supply 500 megawatts of firm power for 12 years beginning May 1, 1993. This sale will generate \$3.2 billion in revenue and result in an estimated \$1.7 billion of profit for the people of Manitoba over the life of the contract.

In addition, a Letter of Intent has been signed with the Western Area Power Administration of Golden, Colorado, regarding a possible export sale of 1,200 megawatts of electricity for 35 years beginning in 1993-94.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the western negotiations, the Manitoba Energy Authority has two other sets of discussions under way with U.S. utilities under signed Letters of Understanding.

Since June of 1982, the Manitoba Energy Authority has been discussing the possibility of a long-term sale of about 1,000 megawatts of Manitoba electrical power and energy, over 20 years, with eight electrical utilities in the Wisconsin, Minnesota area. These eight utilities are:

Madison Gas and Electric Co. of Madison, Wisconsin;  
Wisconsin Electric Power Co. of Milwaukee, Wisconsin;

Wisconsin Power & Light Co. of Madison, Wisconsin;  
Wisconsin Public Power Inc. of Sun Prairie, Wisconsin;  
Wisconsin Public Service Corp. of Green Bay, Wisconsin;

Upper Peninsula Power Co. of Escanaba, Michigan;  
Minnesota Power of Duluth, Minnesota; and  
Northern States Power Co. of Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Phase I of a joint study was successfully completed in 1983 indicating the possibility of substantial benefits from a sale. A detailed Phase II study is expected to be concluded by August of this year. We expect this study to confirm significant benefits for each party. Should it do so, the Manitoba Energy Authority intends to negotiate a Letter of Intent with these eight utilities.

Mr. Speaker, a similar set of discussions has been under way for nearly one year with the Minnesota-Wisconsin Power Suppliers Group. The amount of firm power being considered for export is approximately 1,100 megawatts over a 20 to 30 year period.

This group is comprised of nine investor-owned and co-operative power utilities and includes:

Minnkota Power Co-operative Inc., Grand Forks, North Dakota;

Interstate Power Company of Dubuque, Iowa;  
Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency, Rochester, Minnesota;

Ottertail Power Company, Fergus Falls, Minnesota;  
Dairyland Power Co-operative, La Crosse, Wisconsin;  
United Power Association, Elk River, Minnesota;  
Minnesota Power, Duluth, Minnesota;  
Northern States Power, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Discussions with these utilities have now reached the point, Mr. Speaker, at which all parties have agreed that the mutual benefits are sufficient to warrant moving the discussions to the next phase. Accordingly, the parties will now turn to the discussion of sale principles. The parties will attempt to reach final agreement on a transaction by the end of this year.

On a smaller scale, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Energy Authority recently reached an agreement to export, short-term, 40 megawatts of power to Ottertail Power Company of Fergus Falls, Minnesota over existing lines this summer. Discussions on a longer-term firm power sale of 60 megawatts to Ottertail, starting in 1990, are also under way.

Mr. Speaker, those with whom we are holding power discussions - the U.S. utilities I have just referred to and the aluminum companies - know that, while Manitoba's hydro-electric resources are vast, they are not limitless.

Manitoba's strategy of diversifying our opportunities has been tremendously successful. Consequently, we can now evaluate the alternative prospects in order to obtain the maximum economic benefits from Manitoba's abundant renewable resource for the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the result of the successful completion of any one of these arrangements will not only produce significant profits, but also thousands of jobs and investment opportunities that would result from a decade of continuous Hydro development in our province.

Thank you.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We can all move one step along the line in terms of these announcements. As is taken from Letters of Intent, confirmed contracts, power announcing discussions that are being held, and I welcome those discussions, I must remind members opposite and more importantly Manitobans that of course the acid test in all of these discussions and all of these sales will really come down

to a very understandable - understandable that is by most Manitobans - as to whether or not Manitobans will be asked to pay more for their, for our, domestic hydro consumption as a result of some of these sales, or will they benefit from having the benefits of selling surplus power, surplus to our needs and at the same time enjoy the obvious added economic activity in this province?

Mr. Speaker, I suppose, a greater question has to be asked, or should be asked at this time: to what extent are we encouraging dependency on our energy by the Americans? Mr. Speaker, it's a little bit like water. I know that the Minister, in these announcements, speaks of 12, of 20 or 35-year agreements, but is there anybody in their mind really thinking that those agreements can be cut short or cut off should it be to our advantage 20 years from now, 25 years from now, to provide the permanent jobs here in Manitoba, here in Canada? Of course not, Mr. Speaker.

These are very serious long-term agreements that we're getting into. We'll be very interested in our discussions commencing tonight with the Manitoba Hydro officials as to whether or not the profit that the Minister speaks about is indeed real.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have reason to worry about their definition of such words like "reasonable return" on investment. Mr. Speaker, a reasonable return on \$160 million that the taxpayers have invested in Manfor is hard to come by, just what a reasonable return on that investment is. It's difficult to understand, Mr. Speaker, that the \$10 million that Manitoba taxpayers have invested in the Mineral Resources Co. Ltd. today has only returned \$10,000 to the investor, to the shareholder, to the Manitoba taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, we have yet to see a reasonable return on McKenzie Seeds. We have yet to see a reasonable return to the taxpayer of Manitoba on any venture that this government has entered into.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have every reason to be cautious. We have every reason perhaps to be worried about this government's capability in signing long-term — (Interjection) — contracts that . . .

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** . . . that may well remove from future Manitoban's use of their most precious resources in the province.

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

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**MR. D. BLAKE** introduced Bill No. 29, An Act to amend An Act respecting The Agricultural and Community District of Newdale.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Milk prices

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

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

My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. It follows upon reports that retailers in Manitoba operate - or suggesting that they will be selling milk at less than the minimum price set by the Milk Prices Board of this Provincial Government. My question to the Minister is: will the government be prosecuting these retailers who sell milk at less than the minimum level set by this government?

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question of the Leader of the Opposition, one has to look at the situation in its perspective to what has occurred. Initially, when the prices increased to the farm community by the Milk Prices Review Commission which increased the price per litre at the retail level of somewhere around approximately 5 cents a litre, which was followed by an industry increase of anywhere upwards to 14 cents a litre, the government took action and rolled back these prices, Sir, which rolled them back to the 82-cent range.

Subsequent to that roll-back, Sir, the Commission attempted to establish a range which would allow a fair margin of return to both the processors, distributors and retailers, as well as providing consumers of Manitoba a reasonable price of milk which in fact had been rolled back. There were increases, as I've indicated, of up to 14 cents per litre.

Following that regulation that was set down by the Commission, the representations were made to myself and to members of the Commission from the processors, retailers and distributors that the margins that they were receiving in their respective components of the pricing mechanism were not adequate, and yet we find that one of the retailers who, by the way, I have said the prime retailing venture is not to sell milk but is to sell soft drinks . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Speaker, the Commission will be reviewing the information that it has and will be making a decision as to whether or not it warrants any type of legal action. But I want to tell the honourable member, having had representations from the retailers, that their margins were inadequate, we now find one retailer who says, my margin is more than adequate - we'll have to review that situation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. I am informed that the difficulties with the sound system have to do with fluctuations in power. To put the matter right, it will be necessary to switch off the sound system for a couple of minutes.

Accordingly the House will recess for approximately two minutes.

## RECESS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Oral Questions.  
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

Following up on the response of the Minister of Agriculture, in view of the fact that the roll-back to which he referred, actually set a minimum price that

in some cases was as much as 23 cents per two litre container over what retailers were willing to sell it at and had been selling it at; and in view of the fact that the net effect has been indicated by some of the retail chains as requiring them perhaps to lay off people, making them uncompetitive and even in fact reducing the consumption of milk, is the Minister or his department meeting with these retailers to find out just what the effects of his new policy are and to re-evaluate the policy?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the honourable member that if our measures to roll back the price of milk will drop consumption and would have the effect of decreasing consumption in the Province of Manitoba, all that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has to do is phone the major retail chains in Toronto where the price of milk unregulated, in where the price of milk in Ontario ranges from a dollar and up per litre in an unregulated province, whereas the provinces to the west of us, in Saskatchewan and Alberta, where regulations have been in effect for many years, are in fact in the 80-cent range, Sir, at the retail level.

The problem, frankly, Sir, has been created by the passage of the legislation in 1980. That's where the problem occurred. The retailers advised me that while they didn't make a lot of money prior to 1980 they were reasonably satisfied that the market was stable and they could compete with their competitors. They preferred controls because what they foresaw, Sir, was that in this fight and in this war of discounting and rebating between the processors, what would be left on the Manitoba market scene is likely Lucerne, in terms of the Safeway chain, and Modern Dairies, part of the multinational Beatrice Foods, and the other dairies would be out of business, Sir. That's in fact what the retailers have said that they could foresee in the Manitoba retail market.

They wish price stability and they wish some competition from the dairies in terms of service, in terms of quantity and the type of service that they give to their client. That's the kind of competition that they want to see, but they want to see some price stability, Sir, along the lines as has been the case in this province prior to deregulation, as is envisaged and can be seen in the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta where regulations have been there for many years, Sir.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the very policy to which the Minister refers is playing right into the hands of the multinationals because they're vertically integrated and Safeway owns their own dairy, and they make the guaranteed profit as a result of his new initiative, and in view of the fact that the small retailers can't compete now, will he not sit down with these people, find out what the problems are, and change the minimum price that he's put on so that people can now get a better deal and retailers don't have to be thrown out of business at the hands of the multinationals?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the Conservative Opposition wants now is basically to have one or two

dairies left in the Province of Manitoba. That's really what they're after, that's the policy they are advocating, Sir. They have no concern for the co-operatives in this province, they have no concern for the small processors in this province, they want to use this issue to have only one or two dairies, two processors left in this province, Sir, by virtue of the chaos that was created a year to 14 months after the passage of their legislation.

The very predictions, Sir, that we made when we were in opposition have come through. The chickens have come home to roost, Mr. Speaker, in the milk industry, and it is clearly as a result of the legislative changes that the then Conservative Government made in the Province of Manitoba.

The retailers, Sir, we have and will continue to have discussions with the retail trade, with the retail business association, the independent grocers, who have in fact made representations to us, so that their concerns can be expressed and they can be taken to the Commission and if there is any fine-tuning to be done vis-a-vis the wholesale price and their margins, it will be looked at, Sir. That undertaking was given early on in the week when I met with some of the retailers.

But to suggest that there should be uncontrolled competition and to make sure that - and even the retailers, Sir, saw that there would be a lessening of competition in the province. Had the discounting been allowed to continue and cause the demise of processors in this province, there would only be virtually one or two processors left in this province. Then we could hear the Leader of the Opposition whistling as to what prices of milk should be.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this Minister's policy has directly resulted in an immediate increase of 23 cents per two-litre carton of milk, will he stop his war on consumers, will he stop his war on small business and get down to policies that are good for Manitobans?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The question is argumentative and hence out of order.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on a point of order.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition leaves a figure on the record that is a figment of his imagination, Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. That is not a point of order.

### Finance, Dept. of - financing scheme

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

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance.

Given the Federal Government's opposition to the government's recent financing scheme, can the Minister of Finance offer assurance to potential buyers of this security that the Federal Government will not move retroactively to plug the loophole that is being exploited?

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I've had opportunity to speak with officials of the Federal Government and I can give the assurance that the Federal Government has no such intent. I don't believe there's much purpose however in giving assurances to potential investors in view of the fact that the issue has already been over-subscribed.

It's an issue that has been fully - more than \$150 million has already been sold. The managers, Wood Gundy, and Richardson Securities, advise us that there is good retail demand for the issue and we're certainly most pleased with that.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Were the discussions and the assurance that he received from the Federal Government held and received before the issue or after the legislation had already been passed?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, there were discussions, not with me, beforehand, there was a brief discussion with our Deputy Minister, and there were discussions with federal officials by the Deputy Minister of Finance yesterday and there were discussions with financial officials by me, several discussions this morning.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Minister table today a copy of the prospectus that is being used to back this issue?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I'll take that question as notice and see if I have any available here in the office. The member can wander down the street — (Interjection) — I'm sorry, in fact the wording for it is not a prospectus because it is not an issue that was required to be listed on stock exchanges because each one of the Securities Commissions in this country had cleared it for that type of procedure.

I believe the members were informed of that fact. So it's not a prospectus in fact. The document involved is one that I, in all likelihood will be able to table this afternoon.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that B.C. Rail had a prospectus for their issue after which this issue is patterned. Has the province received some preferential treatment then, from other provinces, that was not available in the case of the previous issue?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, I'm just checking to see whether I might have one of the initial copies of that document here. But I should say that there was no difference in terms of the treatment by the Securities Commissions of this country, of this particular arrangement of the Government of British Columbia, when it entered into a similar arrangement.

I have here a document - well this document doesn't have some of the numbers in it, so I'll just wait - this is the document that we took to the Securities Commission, with the understanding that you don't set rates ahead of time because market rates fluctuate, and there is a later document, which certainly when I obtain it, I'm prepared to table it. It is a public document. Every securities trader who was involved in this issue had it, and I'm sure that we can get it for members.

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance, and ask him whether he can confirm that his Manitoba Properties Incorporated, the newest welfare bum on the block - corporate welfare bum - will directly benefit the wealthy investor, rather than the little guy?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** We indicated that the money, the investment comes, obviously, from large blocks of funds and there's a certain amount of those funds available in the Canadian market. They will either buy this issue or they might buy an issue by Massey-Ferguson, if this issue isn't in the market, and so for them it makes no difference that we are in the market. This issue is one that they will buy, as likely as another one that is guaranteed by the Government of Canada or the Canada Development Corporation, which has issued many tens of millions of the identical kinds of preferred shares.

The benefits will go to two groups of people. The Manitoba taxpayers will get direct benefit, where we provide lower cost mortgages to people building homes, which is something that the Member for Elmwood, I'm sure, would want us to do - take money that would otherwise go to Bay Street and build homes in Manitoba and allow people to have lower cost mortgages, that's No. 1. I'm sure that he would not be opposed to the notion of using this money, as we will, with the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to provide lower interest mortgages, loans to farmers in the Province of Manitoba, who we think deserve that kind of treatment, far more than the people that he seems to want to get access to this money.

I'll just give you one example. There's the notion out there, Mr. Speaker, that only after tax profits can be passed on in these kinds of dividends in the private sector - I would direct the member, for instance, to the 1982 Annual Report of the Royal Bank of Canada, which shows that not only did the Royal Bank not pay income taxes, it got back \$28 million and paid out more than \$200 million in dividends in one year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member should not debate a matter that was dealt with by this House in the last couple of days.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, as one of the members on the Conservative benches said it doesn't feel the same in here now that we're renting the Legislative Building.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to also ask the Minister, given the fact that the moment the stocks are released or the shares are released, that the price will fluctuate, and given the fact that they will fall in relation to rising interest rates, which now appears to be the case and therefore will affect the sales of these particular shares, will the Minister and the government be buying back blocks of shares in the market, in an attempt to hold a particular market value, or will they have a hands-off or laissez-faire approach in that regard?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, once they're out there, I don't expect that we will be repurchasing in

order to keep prices up. I don't see any reason we would follow that kind of procedure — (Interjection) — we do expect that they will probably sell at a premium sometimes, sometimes not.

Right now, for instance, the B.C. Government's indirect Crown corporation, a new corporation, its stocks are selling at 25 1/8 and they started out at 25. I don't believe that the B.C. Government is intervening in the market and we don't have any intention of doing that. Once the issue is sold . . .

**HON. R. PENNER:** We got the money.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** . . . the money is here and that's the end of our involvement in it and the issue is the same . . .

**HON. R. PENNER:** Take the money and run.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** . . . the shares are exchanged on the stock exchanges . . .

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

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, these shares are traded . . .

**A MEMBER:** They just don't understand what these shares are at all.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** They are traded just like . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. R. PENNER:** What a bunch of dodos. I don't think they know one end of the finance market from the other.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, these issues are traded in the identical fashion as our bonds, which sometimes are above par and sometimes below par, depending on the fluctuation of the interest rates and we have never ever ever purchased in order to keep them up.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, given that the government has now moved from a New Democratic to a Conservative to a Social Credit approach, I would like to ask the Minister whether he has been in touch with his counterparts in the Province of B.C., where they have this type of scheme under way, where they have been under pressure, political pressure, in regard to falling prices, and whether or not he has, in effect, had discussions with British Columbia, which has had the same intentions and the same type of plan and has had an experience which is not quite as comfortable and pleasant as they first envisioned.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, that reminds me of the old riddle that used to be told on the farm. "Do you know the difference between a cow's tail and a pump handle?", and if you don't, the answer that

the other persons says is, "I wouldn't want to send you for water."

What the Member for Elmwood doesn't seem to understand is the difference between the sale of common shares, as in BRIC, the B.C. Resources Investment Corporation from some years ago, which is having some difficulty and where shareholders are in a position where if the assets increase in value their shares increase in value as the converse has.

What is happening here is what the B.C. Government did with B.C. Rail, which is the sale of preferred shares, which don't vote, which don't get an increase in value in terms of being able to resell them to the issuer, and these preferred shares terminate. We have the right to repurchase them at the identical price we sold them for within 10 years and the holder has no right to keep them, and that's quite different from BRIC.

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

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Minister of Finance can tell me whether individual investors and shareholders in the new company, Manitoba Government Properties Incorporated, whether or not they will receive an Annual Report indicating and listing the activities of that corporation.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would expect that this corporation will provide an Annual Report.

**HON. R. PENNER:** But not more than once a year.

**MR. C. MANNES:** I'm wondering if the Minister can tell us whether those Annual Reports will give details of the assets of the company that have been bought or purchased from the government. Will they be listed in detail?

**A MEMBER:** . . . McKenzie Seeds in on this thing.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** That might be tempting. Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice, but clearly, we will be required to file returns, so there will be a fair amount of public disclosure.

**MR. C. MANNES:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Minister indicates that the whole issue has already been subscribed. I wonder if he can tell me what properties of the province have been pledged or transferred to the new company at this point in time.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** None have, Mr. Speaker. I make the point that the guarantee on these issues is identical to the guarantee of bonds of the Province of Manitoba; that is, the Province of Manitoba is a guarantor and that is really the concern that investors have. They don't particularly care which buildings they are. They know that they have their dividend guaranteed by the Province of Manitoba. I can assure people that — (Interjection) — the Member for Elmwood mentioned the Legislative Building, which I made very clear the other day - not in the House but outside - will not be transferred into this corporation.

### Milk prices

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

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Could he please tell the House how much the price of milk has risen in stores in Winnipeg due to the actions of the Milk Prices Review Commission?

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, as a result of the roll-backs and the actions of the commission, there's no increase in the price of milk. There's been no increase in the price of milk at the retail level, at the 82-cent level, following the roll-back and the Commission set at the 82-cent level, Sir. The roll-back occurred following the increases put on at the retail level by the distributors following the Milk Prices Review Commission settlement or allowance for farm prices. As well, Sir, at the high end, at the 87-cent level, there have been reductions in the retail prices, because there were some small retailers in the City of Winnipeg who, because of the inability to gain any kind of rebating from the dairies, had to charge more than 90 cents for their milk, and at the high level, at the 87-cent level, there have actually been reductions from over 90 cents down to 87 cents based on the new formula.

### MPIC - Board of Directors

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

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. I wonder if he can inform the House and the people of Manitoba why it is necessary to change the number of directors on the MPIC board from seven to eight.

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

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** As Statute Law Amendments, I think that would be the appropriate time to discuss that.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, the Statute Law Amendments explanations that we received, 3.(2), increases the maximum number of members that can be appointed to the board of MPIC from seven to eight. I'm asking the Minister if he can inform us why it is necessary to change it from seven to eight?

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, by the member's own account, the matter he raises in a question is appointed for discussion in debate on Bill 18. That debate should proceed on Bill 18 through second

reading and committee stage where those types of questions can be answered.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa to the same point of order.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** On that same point of order, I think that was a legitimate question placed to the Minister - no point of order?

**A MEMBER:** Yes, on the same point of order.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Yes, I'm on the same point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa on the same point of order.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Yes. The explanation that I'm seeking is going to enable us to handle that and to debate that when the bill gets into committee. There has to be a reason for it. We might want to debate this bill in second reading to some degree.

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

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the Minister well knows, the reason for boards being five, seven, nine or 11 is to have an odd number to avoid a tie in any debate or any decisions, to avoid tie decisions, so there must be a reason for this and I'd like him to explain it to the House unless he doesn't know, Mr. Speaker, and that's very very possible.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

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

On the same subject with regard to the last question, I refer you, Sir, to Citation 357 in Beauchesne, Item "(v) anticipate an Order of the Day or other matters."

### Hydro power - sale of

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

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Mines arising out of the . . .

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

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Members opposite may not be interested in Hydro development, but I certainly am. My question was a question arising out of the . . .

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

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

**MR. S. ASHTON:** . . . expressed by the opposition House Leader as to the potential use in Manitoba of

any power that would be contracted to the American power utilities. I'd like to ask the Minister whether there would be any problem using that power following the termination of the date of the contract, whether it could be used for Manitoba purposes?

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

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to answer that question. Also, I was pleased by comments from members of the Conservative Party who indicate that Thompson will indeed benefit from these types of developments.

Mr. Speaker, I was indeed somewhat surprised, as undoubtedly was the Member for Thompson, at the comments of the Member for Lakeside on my statement. For a minute there I thought we were listening to Indiana Enns and the Temple of Doom he was so negative, Mr. Speaker.

What we have is a contract. We have a signed contract here that will . . .

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

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

I think the honourable Minister knows he should refer to other members by their constituency or by their appointed office and not by name.

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

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

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** That's right. In the end Lakeside does not sound as good.

What we have here, and I'm surprised at the Member for Lakeside's . . .

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It's not a question of what we have here, it's a question of a Minister answering a question. So, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, from time to time to assert your authority with respect to answers that are being given by Ministers of the Crown?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member is surely aware that the Chair does not dictate to the Minister how or in what way he should make an answer to a question.

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be completely and totally relevant to everything that was said in the House in this question period. That may hurt them, but it will be relevant.

The question very clearly was: will Manitobans be able to use the power after an agreement with United States utility ends? The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker. We have done that in the past and I am surprised that

there would be this suspicion of doing business with Americans that is somehow being put forward by the Member for Lakeside now. They are honourable people, Mr. Speaker; we are honourable people. Surely it is possible to conduct fair business deals between honourable people.

I must remind people here, that what we are selling is a renewable energy resource, Mr. Speaker. When our contract with an American utility is completed, we get all of the power back that we need. That is unlike non-renewable energy sales which governments to the west of us have made with the United States and in that instance you are giving up natural gas or petroleum never to ever get it back again. Here, with hydro-electricity, Mr. Speaker, we can sell it to the American utility for a period of time and have all of it come back to Manitoba for future use.

### Aboriginal rights

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I would ask the Attorney-General whether or not he could inform the House as to what position the province took at the First Minister's meeting on aboriginal rights with respect to the amendments which are now before the House of Commons, which would seek to restore Indian status to Indian Native women who've married non-Indians?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. In fact both the First Minister and myself were very active during the course of the First Minister's Conference with respect to the equality question.

We were foremost among those that supported equality for Indian women and the need, not only to change the legislation which I'm happy to see is happening, but the need to make sure that the constitutional guarantees of equality which are phrased in somewhat general terms, both in the Charter section and in succeeding sections of the Constitution Act 1982, were sufficiently well articulated to cover and therefore give constitutional protection to Indian women.

At one stage in the proceedings when there appeared to be an impasse, I in fact, was delegated to meet with Attorneys-General and Ministers of Justice in another part of the convention hall to try and work out an acceptable constitutional amendment to achieve that. That didn't prove possible, but I'm happy to see there is now at least a legislative initiative being taken so that the inequitous 12(1)(b) of The Indian Act will be removed.

### Charter of Rights - prosecutions

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

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Attorney-General. Yesterday's newspaper had a headline on it, referring to the Crown as feeling the

Charter of Rights somehow or other favoured criminals. Does that headline reflect departmental policy, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. It is not a proper question to ask for confirmation of an article in a paper. Would the Honourable Member for Inkster want to rephrase his question?

**MR. D. SCOTT:** In that case you have to rule half of theirs out of order because they get . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster will withdraw those remarks.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I must apologize, but most questions in the House do come . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the question and attempt to rephrase the question if I could. Mr. Speaker, I've withdrawn the comment, may I ask a question?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Oral questions. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, does the Crown in anyway feel that questions or that the Charter of Rights, limits our ability to prosecute people who have committed crimes under The Criminal Act.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say - and I have said this many times, that the Department of the Attorney-General strongly supports the Charter and the rights that are guaranteed thereto. It has not come to my attention from senior officials in the department that the Charter in any way has created difficulties in carrying out the normal duties of the department in bringing matters before the courts and having them adjudicated upon fairly.

It has been said many many times, and I believe this very strongly, that the Crown is not an adversary, it seeks to bring matters before the court and present the facts and the law and allow the Justices to make the decisions. That is the policy that I am sure was articulated and developed under the former Attorney-General. At least I hope it was. It certainly is in this case and let there be no doubt about where this department stands with respect to the Charter of Rights.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for oral questions has expired.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE CHANGES

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

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Mr. Speaker, the composition of the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee; I

would like to put on that committee the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology replacing the Member for Wolseley. The Member for The Pas shall replace the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security.

On the Statutory Regulations and Orders Committee the Honourable Attorney-General replacing myself, the Member for Inkster; and the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation replacing the Member for Piel.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, would you please call adjourned debates on second reading in the following order in which they appear on the Order Paper: Bill No. 11, Bill No. 16, No. 18, No. 19, No. 21, No. 22, No. 28, No. 17 and No. 7?

### ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

#### BILL NO. 11 - THE CLEAN ENVIRONMENT ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Minister for the Environment, Bill No. 11, the Honourable Member for Niakwa.

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

This Bill No. 11 is a very very important bill. If I could just ask if the Honourable Minister will be making himself available to listen to my comments, I would appreciate it very much because I do have some comments and some questions that I wanted to present to him. I wouldn't mind waiting just a few minutes if the Honourable Minister was on his way down.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of the Environment will be able to peruse the remarks of the Honourable Member for Niakwa. Unfortunately, he has other obligations at the moment and I don't believe will be able to attend the debate today. But they will be on the record and I know that he will respond to the concerns in closing second reading.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Well, I think it's our intention, Mr. Speaker, to proceed and possibly get this bill to committee after some of my associates have made some comments. So, I will carry on, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that the Honourable Minister will receive my comments.

Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Clean Environment Act, by and large, we have no real criticism of anything that will enhance the environment of the Province of Manitoba and anything that will make it into a better state. We are not against the bill as such. We're not completely against the punitive fines although they seem to be quite excessive, Mr. Speaker.

We are against the far-reaching powers that the Honourable Minister and the bureaucracy are requesting so that they can control the environment. We don't think that there is any reason to give them some of the powers that they are requesting.

The Honourable Minister, in introducing the bill, had cited four reasons for the presentation of the bill. We seem to be in agreement there where it's to accommodate The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act which we supported, Mr. Speaker, with some reservation.

It's to accommodate the implementation of a planned province-wide pesticide control program. Now, Mr. Speaker, they are asking for such great controls and under the amendment to the act where it's under action of the Minister in cases of danger and health that's going to require some permits which some of my colleagues will be speaking on in much, much greater length wherein the municipalities' hands will be tied, farm groups will be restricted by having to request permits and the time regulation is like shutting the door of the barn after the horse is out.

I don't think that we want to control the municipalities and the farm groups to the extent that this bill is going to give the Minister the right to control these municipalities. The Honourable Member for Pembina will be speaking on it and I'm sure the Honourable Member for Emerson will be speaking on it also, Mr. Speaker.

The third part was where they were going to bring the City of Winnipeg water discharges under the control of The Clean Environment Act. I can understand that, Mr. Speaker, because of some of the dangers that take place inasmuch as the water from the City of Winnipeg that is being discharged into the Red River is causing some environmental problems, particularly down river, around the Selkirk area. But I don't know whether in fact this bill gives them enough additional powers to control that, because I think that the government does have those powers now through negotiations with the City of Winnipeg. The Minister says, as it stands now, the province has no effective control over these discharges. The Province of Manitoba and the Minister does have effective control over these discharges if he wishes to assert his authority, Mr. Speaker.

The fourth part that he mentions is just some housekeeping changes regarding the enforcement and procedures of special cases. Housekeeping is what the Minister refers to, but it's not housekeeping, Mr. Speaker. It is greater than housekeeping. Housekeeping means just to clean up, to make the changes that are necessary, just to see that the bill is worked out in a convenient manner.

But let's get back, Mr. Speaker, to the punitive fines that we were talking about and whether those punitive fines - and I'm not making specific reference to articles, I'm just talking about the punitive fines that are suggested in the amendment where we go from tenfold where we're talking about \$500 to \$5,000 in fine, and where we were making reference to \$5,000 fines, to \$50,000 fines. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if that, in effect, will control the environment in the manner in which they are trying to control it, whether in fact it will eliminate the dumping of PCBs up in Thompson. I know that is their endeavour, but by raising the fines in a punitive manner is not going to correct the problem.

I just want them to know that, Mr. Speaker, it's not going to correct the problem. I think that all it will do is allow people who are going to be dumping some of these things that it will be illegal to dump at a time that they won't get caught.

Mr. Speaker, I really don't have too much more to say on this amendment to the bill. I want to put a lot of people's minds at ease who are very very nervous when it comes to not knowing what the regulations are going to be. Regulations will be passed by the Minister after the bill is passed. There are going to be a lot of people, municipal people, agricultural people, people in the chemical industry, and people in the transportation industry who are going to be very very nervous until these regulations come forward. The Minister has made some remarks that the regulations can be changed, that they can be adjusted if it so requires. This is just a temporary thing where they're going to make suggestions and then we will get some reaction from the public. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, there will be a reaction from the public.

Mr. Speaker, they're asking for control on the spraying of chemicals for the sake of eliminating, or being prepared for the sake of eliminating Western Equine Encephalitis, the spraying for cankerworms, the spraying for mosquitoes, things of that nature. Mr. Speaker, that is what this bill will cover.

The Minister is asking for permission to make a decision on whether they will proceed in this regard. I think that it's not necessary to put it into a bill, into a regulation. I think that the government has the authority, they've had it in the past, to proceed if and when necessary. If a danger has taken place or if the province is in danger of disease being spread, the government has always had the authority to proceed without bringing in these restrictive measures.

Mr. Speaker, I think what the government is trying to do is to regulate and get off the hook and eliminate the criticism of the public when they have to proceed in emergency purposes. I think that the government should be responsible to the people not just by regulations in government but by moral decisions that have to be made. They should be responsible to the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, just one more reference to the control on the Red River, wherein I think the Minister will be most interested in an observation that I have made concerning rendering plants. I don't know where it's going to come into the bill, but I'm sure that it will and must be covered somewhere in this Clean Environment Bill, wherein rendering plants are spreading their effluent into the sewage system into the City of Winnipeg which in turn gets dumped into the Red River.

Now, I'm not looking to cause any more damage to the environment, but some of these effluents, the smell, can be reduced by adding chemicals. I know that there is a problem with these chemicals getting into the Red River and getting up into the drinking source further down river, particularly at Selkirk. I don't want to see any greater danger up there, but I don't think that there should be a restrictive manner in controlling these elements being put into the Red River. If it's going to cause an environmental problem, fine, then I think it has to be eliminated.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Honourable Minister would be able to give us some sort of an answer

on whether these effluents can be dumped into the Red River through the City of Winnipeg sewage system. I would have hoped that I could have asked him that question, and I think that when he replies on the closing of second reading that he would have some answers of that nature for me. Some of my members, some of my associates, do have some additional questions concerning the regulations for the municipalities and the time element.

One more reference, just before I leave, and I don't think that we cannot be prepared and say that maybe in the future let's pass this Clean Environment Bill and in the future we will make the changes under regulation. I think those regulations and the bill must come in as one so that it can be discussed and passed, or rejected, or amended. I would just make reference to the spraying for mosquitoes out at the park the other day, out at Birds Hill Park, where an appeal could be made a day after the spraying took place. I think there has to be something more substantial in the bill to cover things that will happen before they happen, not after they happen, Mr. Speaker. I hope the Honourable Minister would give us some sort of a reply on that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I rise to make some comments on Bill 11 and to indicate my non-support for this bill. I think this bill is a dangerous bill. I think it is giving powers that we have grave concerns about, especially with the Minister that is bringing them forward. I want to indicate that I certainly intend to vote against this bill. The reason for that is because of the regulatory powers that it will establish for this Minister and in some of the initial information that was sent out by this Minister to municipalities and weed districts where he was working on the regulations.

This bill will give the Minister the power to pass any set of regulations that he wishes regarding the use of herbicides and pesticides, and that is where our concern comes in. When we see just some of the response that has come back from some of the comments from the people who have been contacted on this, I think we have to be very very concerned about this. I think the rural areas especially, the farmers, the weed districts, the municipalities, have a major concern.

I think the flow back is just starting with the Minister and that is why I say we will be opposing this bill because of the power that it gives this Minister in terms of setting up regulations and has already sent out copies of proposed regulations and is prepared to take some response to that. Just the direction that this whole thing is going leaves us very concerned - very concerned.

The intent, obviously under this bill, is to establish a pesticide-use permit system. I just want to deal with that portion of it to some degree, because my impression would be that there are always some problems, Mr. Speaker, in terms of use of chemicals, no matter where it is. Whether it's in the city, whether it's in the rural areas, there are always areas of concern that have to be expressed and have been addressed to some degree.

What we have here now, we have a Minister bringing forward a bill, which gives him a power to use a

sledgehammer approach on everybody, carte blanche, to cover the whole issue. And what happens, what will happen? I want to read a certain correspondence in here in reply to the Minister who sent out information and I just want to put some of these things on the record here, as to exactly what the concerns of the people are, that have been faced with the initial proposal sent forward.

"This new piece of legislation," and, Mr. Speaker, I think the people don't understand that this bill does not set the regulations out, it gives the power for the Minister to set out the regulations.

But in this particular case this letter indicates, "This new piece of legislation proposed seems to be aimed at the wrong people. It seems very unfair to specify organizations like the weed districts, which are municipal organizations. I feel that the Manitoba weed supervisors are the best trained and most conscientious users of herbicides in the province, and that this regulation would hit them the hardest. They are the group that has done most to promote safe use of chemicals. They have spent many hours promoting the use of herbicides, proper care and calibration of equipment.

"We have started education on a triple rinse of containers, set up many container disposal sites, crushed many cans and recycled them. Also, through our efforts, we educated farmers on the metric use of herbicides, proper weed identification in order to use a proper control, the proper stage of spraying, so minimum rates of chemical could be used, helped education regarding use of chemicals to prevent spray drift, oil contamination and contaminations of waterways, etc. We also spent many hours on operator safety in order to ensure our farmer clients safely apply herbicides. All in all, it is very unfair to weed supervisors and weed districts.

"Perhaps the government should pass a regulation that would make every municipality a member of a weed district with a trained weed supervisor. They could carry this further and put all the pesticide use in our hands and we would educate the farmers on its proper use. We could also monitor pesticide use in our respective districts in a safe manner.

"The long waiting period for permits, 90 days and the 45 day wait after receiving the permit, is far too long for weed control. We would have to apply a year in advance and a weed infestation could double in size within a year. This would mean a large increase in herbicide use and a large increase in cost. Also what about grasshoppers, flea beetles, army worms, etc.? It would be extremely difficult to enforce a Noxious Weed Act."

This is just one response of many that I have received, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the concern that the people of Manitoba are expressing about this act that the Minister is bringing forward. I think the intention, possibly - well I shouldn't say that. I think the intention is, yes the intention is to totally control the aspect of it and it will create endless, endless problems in the rural areas, in terms of control with the weed districts, with municipalities.

The proposed regulations are not clearly defined. For example, "private property" is poorly defined. What about golf courses, parks, dairy farms, U-Pick operations, vacation farms? These are all places where the public is exposed to. These people all have to apply

for a permit from the Minister under the proposed regulation and then there's a 45-day waiting period. Well in the case of grasshoppers, you don't have to bother after that. The crop's gone. So it is these kind of things and there are so many of these areas - you know who all will require permits and that is what it's all about?

This bill gives the Minister the authority to control the whole aspect of spraying, the use of chemicals. Individually, he can make a decision as to who can spray or not, other than that, you go through this system of making an application which takes 90 days - if you'd apply in April for the use of certain chemicals along roadsides, for example, it takes 90 days. Then after that you have a 45-day waiting period, where you have to advertise the fact that you'll be spraying. Even if the Minister changes these regulations, because of pressure at this stage of the game, the power is there for the Minister to do whatever he wants with it and pass regulations, and the public can have very little input into it.

It's for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that we intend to oppose Bill 11 and I hope that the members opposite that would be affected by this will take some time to check out exactly what this bill is doing, what it can do. Because it will create endless problems and it's going to get very very many people annoyed at them.

With those comments, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, once again, that I and our caucus intend to oppose Bill 11.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?  
The Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to add some comments on Bill No. 11. This is, I think, the first bill that this new Minister has brought in and I think that he has not done his homework in bringing this bill in. That's not unusual because we've seen Ministers make a number of mistakes in their legislative program over this last couple of years, including the Attorney-General, who admitted Wednesday to a mistake in legislation he brought in a year-and-a-half ago.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is legislation which has been drafted to comply and bring some order, primarily to mosquito spraying in the Province of Manitoba. Because when we were in opposition and we had emergency health situations because of the equine encephalitis threat, and we had to make decisions, as governments have to make in situations like that, where the public safety is involved, the Member for Churchill and others, when they were in opposition, kicked up a great deal of fuss about the application and the use of insecticides to control mosquito populations and to prevent a health problem in the province. They criticized in opposition, but when they were in government, they were faced with the same decisions we had to make and, Mr. Speaker, they made them, they made them. They made the decision to use insecticide to control mosquitoes.

They now, after hearings are coming in with a set of amendments to this, which we cannot support because certain sections of this amendment further strengthen and expand the Minister's responsibility to go to Cabinet with far-reaching regulations, Mr. Speaker.

Now we've seen where regulations have been passed, unscrutinized by anyone, including I might say, members of the government and the Cabinet, the implications of which are harsh on the people of Manitoba and are unworkable and are causing problems. This bill, this legislation allows and enables the Minister of the Environment to pass further regulations.

Now he's got a regulation circulated and I'm not so certain from answers given by the Minister of Agriculture a couple or three days ago to questions posed to him, whether his department knew that this regulation was going out. Because you have to remember, Mr. Speaker, I questioned the Minister of Environment as a result of statements in the Throne Speech, which said that they were going to bring in amendments which would apply to application of insecticides under The Clean Environment Act, by government agencies. I asked him on several occasions if these changes would affect the agricultural community at all and he said no, they wouldn't.

The Minister of Agriculture obviously believed they wouldn't because I believe these regulations went out, having a very serious effect on the weed control districts, without the Minister of Agriculture first knowing. Now that's just one example of the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing in this government. There are many many more of them. They don't seem to have an ability to plan and understand what they're doing to the people of Manitoba in legislation and regulations.

**MR. H. ENNS:** They can't chew gum and walk up stairs at the same time.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Now, Mr. Speaker, when these draft regulations went out for purview, I'm led to believe that the Minister of Agriculture was not very pleased when he found out his weed control districts would have to apply for permits 90 days ahead of time. Consider in agriculture, where you're growing, your entire growing season for most of the crops we produce in this province is 90 days, and you've got to know in advance of that 90-day period, exactly what chemical you're going to be applying and get a permit to do it in a weed control district. It makes for an impossible situation.

What the weed control districts will do or be forced to do under this regulation that's being proposed by the Minister of the Environment is to make a blanket application to apply every known pesticide on the market, for every known weed in the market, for every location they have jurisdiction, so that in the event that grasshoppers crop up, in the event that milkweed or other very difficult to control noxious weeds crop up, that they don't have to wait 90 days to control them after which they have gone to seed and caused the problem the weed district is trying to prevent.

So you're going to have anticipatory application for permits for every chemical that you could possibly imagine, and to do what? - to make a system that has been working very well with trained people, with good equipment. Why interfere, why put more controls, why put more bureaucratic red tape in front of these people? Because, if you ask your Minister of Agriculture, ladies and gentlemen in government, he will tell you that the weed control districts have been asking for more funding. They are underfunded right now. You throw

more red tape at them, they're going to have to hire more staff, they're going to have to spend more time in the office, rather than spraying the weeds that they're licensed to do and you're going to raise the costs to them.

I ask the Minister of Agriculture, in his absence: Is he willing to put more money into the weed control districts? I don't think so, because he hasn't, Mr. Speaker, he hasn't got the budget. But yet, these regulations and this legislation, allowing the passage of still further regulations, will require that, Mr. Speaker.

And what is even more bizarre, Mr. Speaker, there is a section in this proposed regulation which defines private property, public property, and you can have private property, to which the public has access, fall under this regulation.

Now that doesn't seem like that means too much, but I want to give you an example. The Minister of Agriculture in his department, funds through the department, the establishment of a number of test plots, they're under Agro-Man, they're for pasture experiments, they're for testing new crop varieties. His department does that directly. We approved money this Session for it, we've done it every Session. Those are on private land, but because they're test plots for the demonstration of agricultural technique to the farm community there is public access to them.

Now, the Minister of Agriculture, under this regulation, is going to have to apply 90 days ahead of time for a permit to spray grasshoppers out of his wheat trial plots in Melita. You don't know 90 days in advance whether you're going to have a grasshopper outbreak, Mr. Speaker. On the rapeseed test plots anywhere in the province, he's going to have to apply 90 days ahead of time to apply insecticide to kill the flea beetles in his rapeseed test plots. That's how bizarre this regulation is, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Agriculture is going to have to.

Now, there's a classic example. Here's the Government House Leader who is supposed to know what is going on in the Legislature, is a member of the Cabinet, says, who has to apply? He doesn't know what's in here. He doesn't know what's in here. That is what we are trying to point out. These people are passing legislation that they don't understand. They don't know what's in it and they don't know who it affects.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** It doesn't apply to agriculture . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs says, it doesn't apply to agriculture, and he says, I don't know. Well, Sir, it does apply to agriculture. It applies to the Department of Agriculture. It applies to test plots that the Department of Agriculture will establish. It applies to the University of Manitoba, faculty of agriculture test plots. It applies to the test plots established by all the private sector suppliers of herbicides and pesticides in this province who establish trial plots and invite the public to inspect them. These regulations will apply to all of those people directly to agriculture. They apply to the weed control districts which serve the farm community.

You see, Mr. Speaker, they don't know what they're doing, but they're asking us to give them more power

to pass behind closed doors around the Cabinet table further restrictions on the application of pesticides in the Province of Manitoba for whatever purpose. It's unworkable, and we question whether we should give this government the ability to pass more restrictions to the farm community. The answer simply is no, Sir, we should not.

The interesting thing about it as well, Mr. Speaker, is that, as I pointed out earlier on, the promise was to provide some sort of permit control which was really targeted at the Mosquito Abatement Control Program. Now to do that, if they wanted to narrow the scope of the regulatory ability, Sir, they simply had to not use the word "pesticides" in their amendments, which include herbicides and insecticides, i.e., any commercially made chemical available in the Province of Manitoba to control anything from wild mustard to flea beetles, in other words, the complete spectrum of weeds and the complete spectrum of insects that affect our agricultural community. If they were really interested in having a permit system which would give some formal control to mosquito abatement programs, they could have allowed the amendment to the legislation to read: Requiring a permit for the application of certain insecticides. That would have omitted the regulatory and permit requirements that are going to be developed by the Minister of the Environment on the weed control districts who are spraying herbicides to control noxious weeds. But no, this is blanket, it's for pesticides, which includes the full range of herbicides and insecticides, for the control of all insect problems as well as noxious weed problems.

So, Mr. Speaker, given the legislative record of this government and their ability to pass legislation and find out a year later it's wrong, after they've been advised by members of the opposition that it won't work and then come in again in the following year with amendments to change the bad legislation they passed, I simply ask the Minister of the Environment to withdraw sections of this bill which allow him further regulatory ability on the agricultural community. He has told me in question period it isn't designed to affect the agricultural community, but clearly it will. If he wants to live up to his answers in question period, he could restrict it to insecticides, not pesticides, and he could further clarify that it'll apply only to government agencies undertaking insect abatement programs as a public interest program.

That would leave out the weed control districts which serve the rural community very well. That would even omit the Department of Highways and Transportation who from time to time ask weed control districts to spray noxious weeds and get private sector firms to do it, because they have to, the weeds are on their right-of-ways. It would exempt the Department of Natural Resources from getting those very same permits for weed control in their drainage facilities that they own.

But, oh no, this government won't listen to anything as commonsense as that and they will plow ahead with their definition of pesticides, and roll several departments of government into this, the agricultural community into it, the municipalities into it, when they tell us originally all they were trying to do was put some control over a mosquito abatement control program. Well, Sir, they've done it. They've controlled the

Mosquito Abatement Control Program and they've controlled every other aspect of public noxious weed and insect control in the Province of Manitoba, something they told us they didn't want to do.

This is truly, Sir, 1984 legislation in 1984. Big Brother is evident in this bill in that Big Brother is going to take over and look over every aspect of this province, and you'd better have Big Brother's permit before you do anything in relation to pesticide application. Big Brother is alive and well in this government, Sir, and we wish Big Brother would listen to the spokesman for the little people in the Province of Manitoba and let life go on as it is, without harm and by very efficient and proficient people in the weed control districts and others not to be affected by these kind of legislative changes.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?  
The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to just add a few remarks to those of my colleagues who have spoken on this bill. My colleague, the critic, has spoken about the changes in fines and so forth, so I won't get into that. I wanted to speak from a point of view of the fact that this legislation will enable the government to pass regulations and, more importantly, to enforce regulations which probably are already drafted.

The Minister of the Environment circulated a few days ago a list of proposals for pesticide control programs, draft proposals he emphasized, and he wished to have some feedback and have people express their opinions on them. So with that in mind, I would like to give him a little bit of an insight into what some of the municipal people had to say about this.

It was unfortunate that the Minister of Municipal Affairs wasn't able to spend more time at Arden, at the district meeting the other day, or else he would have got an ear full on the subject of these proposed regulations. The way it happened was that a department official from Clean Environment had to get the full brunt of the flack from the municipal officials and he had to try and defend the regulations.

Now, as I said, this bill enables the Minister to impose regulations and to enforce them. One of the things that was very upsetting to the municipal officials at that meeting at Arden was primarily the 90-day regulation that said that the municipal people and weed districts would have to apply 90-days in advance for their spraying programs. Not only do they have to apply to actually to use the sprays and pesticides, but they have to in their application state who the applicators were going to be, what was going to be used and where it was going to be used.

Well, this is rather a difficult thing and many questions were asked concerning this; not too clear answers were given. Some of the secretary-treasurers were asking, for instance, in an emergency situation, which could arise, how was this going to be dealt with? They were told that well-organized municipal people did not have these emergencies, they always know what is going to take place every minute of the day and weeks in their municipalities.

Well, I'm sure they are on top of things very well, but emergencies do arise. When they were told that it would take approximately 30 days to process an application in the first place, it didn't impress them too much. In trying to answer a question that one of the secretary-treasurers asked, well, who is going to answer the phone on a Saturday when a council has a meeting and decide to spray later that day or the next day? The department official said, well, that just couldn't happen.

Well, having been on a council, I know that emergency meetings do take place on Saturday mornings and Friday evenings and various times when there are no civil servants to answer the call, shall we say, and that is a fact of life if you're on a council. Emergencies arise, councillors have to be brought in from their places of business, their farms, etc. They don't have a 9:00 to 5:00 schedule, or 8:30 to 4:30 schedule, they meet whenever they can. If a permit is needed, which will take some time to process, then they will be out of luck.

Now, another thing that concerned the municipal officials was the fact that in this 90-day period, in this application 90 days prior to use, they had to name the applicators. Well, we all know that people and staff change from time to time and on the 1st of January you do not necessarily know who is going to be applying your aerial spray. For instance, you may have a contract with a company that runs aerial spraying, and their staff may change. They may sell the company, they may go bankrupt before the season comes to actually do the work. So you can't have things as simple as the department would have us believe you can have them.

There are situations and it was not made really very clear to these people just how an emergency would be dealt with, and emergencies do arise, we all should be aware of that.

The municipal people are very aware of environmental problems. They are very concerned, they're co-operative. They would respond I'm sure, as some of them suggested, that if the Minister had sent forms out at the end of a season and said please tell us just exactly what pesticides and herbicides that your weed control district used or were used in your municipality, they would be quite glad to supply them with that information. But instead of going that route - shall we call it the friendly route - the department chose to try to implement something that should hit them with a broad axe when it could have used a feather.

So here we have the same problem that this government gets into most times when they try to do something, they attack it from the wrong end. They're the consulting government, but they don't seem to realize that when you consult you also listen, and you also adopt some of the things that you have heard. I think they're going to hear considerably more about this problem.

Now, also of course you may not have the same applicator, your weed control person may have left you and you may be faced with a different name so you have to reapply, get another, and more paperwork for the municipal people and the weed district, so it's not going to be easy if the Minister chooses to go ahead with this program. People were at that meeting, that particular municipal meeting, looking at one another and saying, yes, they're saying that this is just the

municipalities, but just wait, give them a chance to get their foot in the door and it will be each individual farmer with a 90-day permit next year.

So I think that would give the Minister some food for thought in that this is the reaction that people have to his proposals. Of course, as I say, we're all aware that they're proposals, but it would be wise for the Minister to take a good look at this and listen to the people who are actually involved in the use. He will find that they're quite willing to co-operate when it's explained to them why this information should be gathered. It is important to know what pesticides and herbicides are used in the country because of course we're all concerned with the environment. I'm sure that the municipal officials would be the first to admit that it is important to know what is going on, but I think it would be ridiculous to assume that they had to be forced into giving information.

I'm sure that most, if not all of them, would be willing to give that information without being coerced into it in this fashion. They're also very aware of course that not only these regulations but this Bill No. 11 would give the Minister power to step into and enforce many other regulations that are already on the books. They're not being circulated to ask whether we like them or not, and the Member for Turtle Mountain of course has already alluded to one which is of great interest to people in the line of regulations to do with food.

Of course, this bill also deals with things that are in danger to health. So I think people are becoming more and more aware that this government is creating a bureaucracy that is not going to let individuals think for themselves at all. It's going to impose things. It's going to enter into every facet of their lives, as my colleague for Pembina said, it's the big-brother attitude. I think it's time that this government realized that co-operation with people will get them a lot further than coercion.

I think if there's no one else wanting to speak on this, we would be quite willing to pass this onto committee. That is all the remarks I have on that at this time.

#### **BILL NO. 11 - THE CLEAN ENVIRONMENT ACT**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. Eyler:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of the Environment, Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Clean Environment Act, the Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak in the debate, I know the Minister would like an opportunity to respond on second reading. I would move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 16, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act. This bill is open.

Are you ready for the question? The Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I wonder, with the indulgence of the House, if we could have this matter stand.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 18 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1984).

On a point order, the Government House leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the last bill you called, Bill No. 16 standing, but I don't believe, Sir, that it can stand open. The debate was not adjourned and for the debate to stand, I believe the adjournment should be in a member's name.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Lakeside to the same point.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that the debate be adjourned on Bill No. 16.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 18 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1984).

Standing in the name of the Member for St. Norbert, the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I beg indulgence to have this matter stand.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Stand.

#### **BILL NO. 19 - THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 19 - An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act, standing in the name of the Member for Pembina.

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

It will just take me one moment to find a quotation that I want to use in the context of my remarks to this bill which will, Sir, be brief.

In general, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Attorney-General has admitted some error that was undertaken by his government and himself a year-and-a-half or two years ago by, in this amendment to The Summary Convictions Act, repealing amendments that were brought in, I believe, in 1982 by himself.

At that time the Attorney-General, and I'm looking for a quotation from the Attorney-General and I will have to paraphrase it and trust that the Attorney-General won't disagree with my interpretation of what he said, but basically in 1982, when the Attorney-General brought in the amendments to The Summary Convictions Act, he indicated that it was going to solve a long-standing problem in terms of the collection of parking tickets. People who simply chose to ignore the law could do so with relative impunity and a number of drivers do so on a regular basis. The Minister of

Highways indicates some eight to nine thousand drivers in Manitoba hold default convictions for which suspension of their driver's licence could be undertaken by provisions passed by the Attorney-General in 1982.

The Attorney-General passed, in 1982, these amendments. He did it with some pride, and he closed his debate, as I recall, on the amendments passed in 1982, by indicating that they had consulted with the RCMP, the City of Winnipeg Police, and I believe the City of Winnipeg, and they were all in unanimous agreement that these amendments were the way to go and would solve the problem of the uncollected parking tickets and would clear up the parking tickets. I pointed out in a grievance, some week ago or a few days ago, how this didn't work out. It didn't work out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the Attorney-General and the then Minister of Highways, although the Attorney-General checked with the various police forces in the City of Winnipeg, they didn't check with The Motor Vehicle Branch. They didn't check with their own staff to see whether the proposed amendments they made in 1982 would work. They found out they wouldn't work. Something that wasn't new. Something that, had they simply asked . . .

**A MEMBER:** Or even just listened to us.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** . . . they would have found out that it was an unworkable amendment they were passing. Sir, we warned them in 1982 that this was not the proper way to go, but they wouldn't listen. Just today, as I was warning the government on amendments to The Clean Environment Act, that they're not good, that there's no consultation between the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Agriculture - which there wasn't - the same thing happened here. The Attorney-General has come in like a rain-soaked puppy with his tail between his legs, repealing amendments he passed just two Sessions ago, because they are unworkable. They're unworkable, not because they were drafted in a faulty way, the legal drafting in the Attorney-General's Department is correct - the problem was they didn't consult with the people who were going to administer it in the Department of Highways, Motor Vehicle Branch, to see whether they could do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the Attorney-General - the learned professor, the learned man in law - coming back and repealing his amendments and saying, "Well, they just won't work." Well, we don't mind supporting legislation which repeals bad legislation, but Mr. Deputy Speaker, we wish the government would give us the opportunity to vote on many more acts repealing bad legislation passed by this government.

But, the government won't ever, until they're caught red-handed, with us on the record saying, "It wouldn't work," and then and only then will they bring in amendments cancelling bad legislation.

My learned friend the functionary from the last government says, "We got caught at the switch." No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the opposition didn't get caught at the switch, the government, the Cabinet and the caucus of the government got caught at the switch because they passed bad legislation. I don't know how many times I've explained to the backbenchers the way we used to try to pass legislation when we were

government. It used to go through Cabinet, it used to go through caucus and it was perused and Ministers had to justify the legislation they were bringing in and answer how it was going to work.

We made mistakes, I'll admit we did. There's no question about that. My honourable friend, the MLA from Ellice I believe it is, or maybe it's changed now, is chuckling. Well, he was in on a couple of exposés I have to admit, but you people aren't even checking your legislation before it comes to this House. Classic case in point; Minister of Highways and Transportation brought in a bill, this Session, he didn't even know what was in it, Sir. Now if he didn't know what was in it, did any of the caucus know what was in it? Where's your process to assure that bad legislation doesn't come forward? Now, we don't know.

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

The Honourable Minister of Culture on a point of order.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Yes, I was wondering if the member would permit a question.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, it's just something that I look forward to answering regularly two years from now.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** I've listened with great interest to the comments the member has made on this bill, but I have not been able to ascertain whether or not he is in favor or he is opposed to this bill. I wonder if he would inform me and the House whether he is in favor of the bill or he is opposed to the bill?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, not that I'm going to make any unkind remark to the Minister, but he wasn't listening because I said we would support any legislation brought in by this government repealing former bad amendments brought in by this government. This legislation does that and I said we would support it, because it repeals bad legislation passed by a bad government and a bad Attorney-General. I thank the Honourable Minister for that question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we've got but one more example of an incompetent group of legislators. I don't include the Minister who asked the question in that general group. — (Interjection) — Well, if he wished to be included - but that's a government that touts how many lawyers over there? Six or so lawyers that are part of that government? One, two, three, four, five. Five. Maybe I am thinking of teachers, there may be only five lawyers over there. But here is a group of lawyers, and many of them are in Cabinet; I think there's only one lawyer that hasn't made it to Cabinet yet over there. But they have the inordinate ability to bring in bad legislation, and for the life of me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask them again: where is your commonsense approach to legislation? Where is the process of scrutiny on your amendments before you bring them in? Where is the wisdom of the former functionary of this House who saw legislation passed by two previous governments? Surely he must be able to contribute some wisdom around caucus, but obviously not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because bad legislation has been passed and we're

now faced with repealing it only some eight months after it was proclaimed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'll close with those few remarks, and I would like just to ask the backbench to take a close look at what your learned colleagues in the front bench are doing in terms of legislation, question them on it so that these kinds of bizarre circumstances won't happen again. Bizarre, because all you had to do was ask the Registrar of the Motor Vehicle Branch or anybody in a senior position in the Motor Vehicle Branch whether these amendments would work and you would have been told, no. That wouldn't have taken very much time and it would have saved a lot of problems. It would have saved us having to repeal legislation and go through the charade, and it wouldn't have further destroyed your credibility in the eyes of the public of Manitoba who do not now believe you can negotiate or legislate anything with a degree of competence that would warrant your office. That's a problem you've got. You haven't legislated well, you haven't spent well and you haven't negotiated well. This is an example of bad legislation and we're going to support the repeal of that bad legislation.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The Law Society Act, standing in the name of the Member for St. Norbert.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Stand.

### **BILL NO. 22 - THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT AND VARIOUS OTHER ACTS OF THE LEGISLATURE**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act and Various other Acts of the Legislature, standing in the name of the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this legislation was introduced on June 13th and makes some major changes to The Manitoba Labour Relations Act which has over the last couple of years, Mr. Speaker, I will submit judging from the lack of confrontation, if I can use that terminology, served us, I believe, even though there were some changes I would have liked to have seen in it, has served us much better than the proposed bill that we have before us will attempt to do.

Mr. Speaker, this is a major, major piece of legislation that has been introduced by the government after a number of reviews and a number of public committees have been asking for input from all segments of the Manitoba society. One of the difficulties we have had from Day One, Mr. Speaker, is even though we did have a public hearing with regard to establishing some

guidelines and some feelings for this legislation is, the Minister has repeatedly refused to table that particular document - the Smith Report. We all sense that one of the reasons the government didn't want to table that report is that some of the recommendations were of such a nature, and I would refer to them as radical nature, that the government did not want to run the political risks of tabling that report, even though, Mr. Speaker, I point out to members opposite, that the information gathered was gathered in a public form, and we, as members of the Legislature, deserve to have a copy of that committee report when dealing with this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the government felt a compelling need to bring forth some labour legislation to try and appease their prime supporters. Mr. Speaker, I would refer to their prime supporters as not the average working man or working woman in Manitoba, but the multinational labour unions who really control the government opposite.

Mr. Speaker, one just has to read the type of literature that was put out after the last election by the steel workers, by the Manitoba Federation of Labour, by the Food and Commercial Workers, what we have seen here over the last number of years is a takeover by the multinational unions of this particular party across the way. Mr. Speaker, you only have to talk to the people who really believed years ago in the CCF movement, the now New Democrats, and those people will tell you about the dismay that they feel and the undue large influence that the multinational unions and the union leaders now have on this party. Mr. Speaker, I won't be the first to say this, but very often what is in the best interests of a multinational union or a union leader or a union boss is not in the best interests of the employee.

Mr. Speaker, what we are concerned about in this province and the government pretends to be concerned about is jobs, employment, employment opportunity, our children graduating with a degree don't want to go out and mow lawns and paint fences. Mr. Speaker, they want meaningful long-term employment. More and more parents, Mr. Speaker, something that I haven't seen in the last 11 years, are calling members of the Legislature and worried about their children getting jobs. So, Mr. Speaker, what we should have is a motivation within this chamber, the people who are running this province should have a feeling for those individuals and we should be doing everything possible to try and create a climate among management and labour which will encourage job creation and employment in this province of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you and I will go through the bill when I'm dealing with sections, not clause by clause, but the different sections in the bill, and what I will try, Mr. Speaker, is to indicate to the government how wrong-headed they are in dealing with this legislation at a time when we should be building investor confidence and be supporting our labour forces rather than trying to bring in legislation which will be divisive and which will be anti-employment. Mr. Speaker, this Bill 22 is the NDP anti-employment bill. It's anti-jobs, anti-employment.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, the government in its haste has spent a substantial amount of money of hiring Ms. Smith to do a report, which I mentioned

earlier, we cannot get our hands on because the government, I believe, is embarrassed by it. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the government went ahead then to try and recover and hired some legal people, two from outside the province, one from inside the province at \$600 a day to draft this legislation, many aspects of which are taken directly out of the Ontario Act. They have spent massive amounts of money in an attempt to appease some of their multinational union bosses and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba is not served well by this legislation.

It was interesting to note in the White Paper, one of the proposals that was put forward, the final selection which was supposed to be the sort of cornerstone of this new legislation which was going to make Manitoba just a wonderful place to do business in and to work in, that, of course, was lifted because you see the government opposite is starting to feel the heat, if I could use the terminology, of the average person on the street, not, Mr. Speaker, of the so-called elite community, and I would say that they like to think that this legislation will go after.

Mr. Speaker, I, as an individual, know full well after having dealt and done business with large corporations that they can look after themselves. Mr. Speaker, the large unions can look after themselves. But what this bill does, Mr. Speaker, does not go after the large unions or the large business people, it goes after the small little person who is trying to employ a few people in this province.

The Minister of Technology sits here. He knows that the majority of businesses, I think something like 85 percent of the businesses in this province employ less than 30 people, and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the 20 percent, the 15 or 20 percent of the larger companies, many of which are already unionized, are in a position to deal with that, because the Safeways, the Super Valus, these people can hire the legal expertise, can hire the conciliation people or the legal people who can handle their accounts and handle their problems.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to put a scenario before you. I'm going to deal, first of all, starting off with which I think is the most objectionable part of this bill, which flies in direct opposition to all the freedoms that we really stand for and believe in. That, Mr. Speaker, is the application for certification of a new union.

Mr. Speaker, let's take for example a little grocery store in Beausejour, Manitoba. You have an owner who is struggling to make ends meet, and I know, Mr. Speaker, that the independent grocers are having a hard time. So, Mr. Speaker, how will this affect that little grocery operator in Beausejour? He or she has seven employees. These seven employees are working shoulder to shoulder with their boss every day. One day the union walks in, under this new legislation - once they've got it in their hands - and they send in three or four organizers. Well, Mr. Speaker, they show up at the homes of these employees. Under the new legislation all that has to happen is that the employee has to sign a card. You don't have to pay; there's no money to sign up for the union. That's been removed. It was only \$1, Mr. Speaker, but it showed an intent of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, what really is happening is you can have these organizers, who know their business very well,

go out there and talk to people who have never had any dealings with a union. They walk in and four of the seven people sign the cards. Now, Mr. Speaker, here is a woman or a gentleman who is barbecuing on a nice summer day and suddenly you have a knock on the door and this guy says I'm from this union, I want to sign you up, I think we can do all these wonderful things for you, all you have to do is sign on the bottom of the card here and we'll see what happens. Mr. Speaker, they might be in the middle of eating or the middle of a barbecue and the individual says, okay, I'll sign, just to get rid of the organizer. Mr. Speaker, we've seen that in municipal politics. You see the petitions coming around and people, to be nice to other people, will go ahead, Mr. Speaker, and sign a petition.

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

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** . . . will sign a petition, to close a lane for the one neighbour and the other neighbour wants to keep it open, so he'll sign the other petition too and there are many people that will sign two petitions just to be nice to people.

So, Mr. Speaker, these union organizers have gone out and signed up four people, the first four people out of this store, they sign up, they get them to sign these cards. They drive home that night. The next morning they file for application to be the bargaining agent and what happens, Mr. Speaker? That particular little grocery store is unionized the next morning, within 12 hours he's unionized, or she's unionized.

Mr. Speaker, two things have happened. No. 1, the other three people weren't even contacted, don't even have a say in what's happened, because all you need is 55 percent and it's an automatic certification. You know what the devastating part of this is? That there isn't even a cooling-off period. The individual who signed the card may be under duress, doesn't even have a chance anywhere along the line to change his or her mind. You say instant certification. There is no chance to change your mind and, Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy of it is that members opposite talk about consumer protection and the right of the individual. They give someone that buys an automobile, somebody that buys a refrigerator - what? - seven days to change their mind. Now you're saying to an individual because some high-powered organizer walked in that they haven't got time to change their mind?

**A MEMBER:** The big union boss is laughing.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Now, Mr. Speaker, the big union boss across the way, as the member over here says, is laughing. But I'll tell you, coming from rural Manitoba, knowing small business, small business when dealing with a large multinational union is at a distinct disadvantage. Most employers that employ less than 30 people in this province have never dealt with a union. So when you put Bernie Christophe against a little store owner in Beausejour, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you who's going to win. It's a one-sided case. What's going to happen is this legislation is handmade for the big unions, and it's a payoff by the New Democratic Party to pay

some political debts. Mr. Speaker, unlike the accusations that they would like to level at us, I want to tell you that it is going to be an anti-employment, anti-job creation piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as I mention, not only don't all the employees get a chance to have a say in this matter, they also don't have a chance to change their mind and I think that's one of the most reprehensible things in this particular piece of legislation. If the government doesn't allow the people within that unit that is going to be unionized the right to change their mind, at least within seven days, Mr. Speaker, this bill really is a sham and really smacks of something that we in this province have never stood for and never will want to tolerate, and that is not allowing a person to have a sober, second thought when dealing with a matter like this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have is suddenly this little entrepreneur has been unionized. He now, in a matter of 12 or 14 hours, in a blitz, has his employees signed up, 55 percent signed up, and the bargaining agent that has signed them up will now, Mr. Speaker, be their bargaining agent. The bill then goes one step further and says that for the first year you can't decertify it, so now you got four members who signed this card, who really now find out they're not really happy with this union because they haven't had a real good chance to see who these guys really are and what they stand for, but suddenly it's all taken out of their hands and the bill says you can't decertify within 12 months.

So now you've got somebody dealing with you, for you, who you can't get rid of; even if you don't like them, you can't get rid of them. Mr. Speaker, then the other thing that happens is we've got another section of the bill that deals with first contract. You can have your bargaining agent, who you're not happy with, do really what he wants with you. Really what you've got is a no-cut contract and you've got a situation developing where really what's going to happen is in many of these cases to get rid of that mistake - if you've made it - to change your mind will take two years.

Mr. Speaker, I've talked to a number of people, before you can decertify, it will take two years to try and make any changes. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is that fair? With the exception of a few large multinational union bosses, I think the average person in a union, the average labourer in Manitoba, will not buy this bill.

That, of course, leads us to one area which I wanted to talk about briefly; that is, in light of the relatively good labour relations in this province in the last little while, why does the government bring this piece of legislation in?

Mr. Speaker, during the Labour Estimates, the Minister indicated that in 1983, there were eight work stoppages involving 512 workers and accounting for 12,310 lost work days. The work stoppages which occurred in Manitoba in 1983 accounted for the lowest number of work days lost and involved the least number of employees of any year during the period 1970-83.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba had the third lowest work stoppage record of any province during the first 11 months of 1983. Why this bill then, Mr. Speaker? Why this bill? I don't have to repeat, I think, what I said earlier, because the majority of people in Manitoba know why this bill.

I want to deal - as I mentioned earlier, the difficulty in dealing with the bill, there are 91 pages in this

particular bill, and to deal with it in the short 30 minutes allocated to me becomes very difficult, but I want to say when you have a bill, when you have a massive change in legislation like this, I think that what's going to happen is that the legislation will not only work to the disadvantage as I mentioned to small employers and the employees involved, but it will have one positive effect on the Manitoba economy and that is that it will create a chance for the legal profession to make a lot more money.

Mr. Speaker, as one legal person told me the other day, this is a virtual gold mine because there is virtually no company that when faced with this new legislation and faced with some of the ramifications when they start hitting them, that they will not require some legal advice in one way or another because it's just too complicated. It really means that people will have to seek legal advice, whether they're on the employer side or the employee side, because once you get involved as I mentioned earlier, it takes two years to get out.

So there are some very very significant ramifications and that's why I believe that the bill is really tailor-made, if you're in the legal profession, I'd start dealing with labour law because that's the place where there's going to be money to be made over the next couple of years if this legislation passes in its present form.

Mr. Speaker, I talked briefly about the first contract legislation and of course the first contract legislation is one of the problems that the NDP dealt with several years ago and of course caused one of their senior members to leave their party, namely one by the name of Sid Green who many of us served with in this Legislature over the years. Mr. Speaker, we all know that Glen Stevens and a few others put up quite a bit of money to get rid of Sid Green because they wanted the first contract legislation put in place. So, Mr. Speaker, what has happened now with first-contract legislation? Well, they've taken it one step further.

Mr. Speaker, they have removed any discretion on first-contract legislation. I believe that is totally wrong. If first-contract legislation, the way it was introduced was supposed to work the way they said it was going to, then what would have happened or what theoretically was supposed to happen, it was a force that was supposed to make both sides bargain in good faith. It was supposed to put a little added pressure on both sides to bargain in good faith. But there was discretion, there was ministerial discretion whether or not to impose that contract. But what they've done with this legislation now, is they have taken away the discretion on first contract.

So what in essence have you done? You have told both sides that the contract is imminent. It's just a matter of time because there is no discretion. You will have a contract. So there is, instead of bargaining in good faith, there is almost an incentive for either side to hurry up the process and not bargain in good faith because the contract is going to be there.

It works, I believe, just in the reverse from what they were saying it would do. But I cannot support an ideal or a philosophy which does not enhance good bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, how could the members opposite impose a first contract unless they really feel that it will make it that much easier for unions to organize and unions to expand their membership? This particular section actually will reward the person that deals in bad faith.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support that section and I think the majority of Manitobans can't because it has been proven that when you impose a contract, when you impose a contract on a group, on an employer, what happens is that that agreement is a troublesome agreement. In very many instances, those first contract impositions end up in decertification about two years later. I haven't seen the total national statistics, but that is the record. That is the record.

Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing here is a final step to go ahead and really take away the bargaining in good faith. I don't believe any government should or can implement agreement or compel an agreement on any two parties. That of course comes back to some of the problems they had as I mentioned earlier with one of their former colleagues who has steadfastly argued the fact that labour legislation is something that has to be looked at very carefully because the only way you're going to finally end up with a solution that both sides can live with is if they arrive at that solution voluntarily without legislation.

What we are attempting in this bill here to do is to legislate contracts. I think that, Mr. Speaker, is just totally wrong.

The government has gone one step further on the sale of a business and they have tightened up that section. How can the government who is trying to create jobs in this province say to someone that is coming in to take over a business in receivership or a floundering company or a company that can demonstrate they're in financial difficulty; how can they say that that particular individual has to take and live up to the agreement that's in place?

Mr. Speaker, I have no question that one of the things that the new employer should do is talk to the bargaining unit that has been in place, but to say to that individual that that contract is in place and nothing can be changed is absolutely ludicrous. There was a reason why this company went into receivership. When someone walks over and takes a company that is floundering, you do a number of things. You talk to your suppliers and see if he can't bring down the cost. You talk to your clients who are buying your product and see if you can arrive at some mutual pricing structure. Of course if your labour costs are too high and you're not competitive with the guy down the street, you're going to talk to your union.

But this government says, no. If the company is in receivership or floundering, there is no way that you can change the contract. The contract is in place and that's it. That's wrong, that's wrongheaded and I believe is anti-jobs, anti-employment and the people of Manitoba won't buy it.

Strike breaking - they've introduced a clause about strike breaking. They say that - it's the same as the Ontario clause with the exception of one, what I think, major difference, Mr. Speaker, and that is that they have changed it to really say that one whose primary object is to strike break. Well, I say to you and to the people of Manitoba that definition is much too wide. That could mean just about anybody. I would like the government to tighten that up because it's so loose the section is subject to wide interpretation, and I believe in its present form should not be passed either.

They have made a number of changes with regard to conciliation and mediation. One of the things I'd like

to point out with regard to conciliation, they have now said that the conciliation officer will be placed in a position where he is party to penalizing the one side or the other. I believe that essentially is also wrong, Mr. Speaker. Up until now the conciliation has been sort of a voluntary process essentially and to go ahead and have a conciliator side with one side or the other and make him or her a party to penalizing one side or the other will not enhance the job of the conciliator nor will it enhance the process that is taking place. I would again ask the government to have a serious look at that and I know that during the clause-by-clause recommendations there will be many changes which will be proposed in this bill.

The powers of the Labour Board, Mr. Speaker, have been expanded quite dramatically, and the authority of course for this tribunal will now take on a position of almost, I guess, the role of an ombudsman, in that it will require a substantial amount of support from the Legislature to either remove that person; and of course the tenure of the term is seven years which means the we'll be looking at having an individual in place, with regard to the Labour Board, for a longer period of time.

They have also strengthened, I believe, the jurisdiction of the board in doing one small thing, which seems small but which really is a fairly large move, and that of course is to do away with the right to appeal to the courts on any matters that are within the jurisdiction and competence of the Labour Board which really says that the Labour Board now becomes the final verdict on any decisions and that the court challenges will just not take place because they won't be allowed. I have some concern about that.

I know, as a member of the Legislature, that we have to accept our responsibility and I know the government's attempt in dealing with this is to try and put these decisions as far away from them so they can say, well, it really wasn't us, it was the Labour Board. But I would point out to members, whether it be through a Crown corporation or through other boards, we have over the last number of years seen that the final responsibility rests with the Legislature and to go ahead and remove that authority is something that I would seriously question. To say that the board is now going to deal with all these problems and will solve all deals within the labour-management relations is something that I just can't buy. I feel that even though they're trying to distance themselves from maybe some of the tough decisions that will be made by the Labour Board when this new bill is introduced, those particular problems will come home to roost with them because they were the ones that introduced the bill and they will be ultimately responsible for what happens out there at the Labour Board even though they try to distance themselves from those decisions.

As I mentioned earlier, there are a couple of clauses which are smaller and won't have that big an effect on the general public, but one of the ones that I would just like to point out because my colleague, the Member from Lakeside, and myself have been dealing with this particular clause ever since the government, back I believe in 1974-75, removed it out of the act and then inserted it in another form not too long ago. It was the one dealing with the clause about religious objectors belonging to unions. I would say that what has happened here today, or what we see before us today, is that the

bill has been tightened up to say now that you have to be a member of a religious group in order to qualify for the exemption. I say to members opposite, that particular clause that has been in the bill now for the last number of years, which allowed people because of their own personal religious beliefs to opt out of belonging, or having their union dues paid to a charity which was mutually agreed to by the union and employer, is a clause which has really given a lot of people, and I say a lot - I say a very few people have taken advantage of it - and therefore there really hasn't been a problem to any union or to any government. Why tamper with that clause now? Why not give someone the right who believes that he or she should not belong to the union, to designate their union dues to the Red Cross or to Mennonite Central Committee or to whomever they feel that money should go to?

Mr. Speaker, I know the Member for St. Johns is going to support me on this, I just know it, because I think that he really believes that someone who has very strong religious convictions that they shouldn't belong to a union should be given the opportunity to opt out of that and have his or her donations go to another charity which is mutually agreed to.

So I say the members opposite should delete this section in reference to religious persuasion. People that because of their religious persuasion object to belonging to unions, leave that alone. It hasn't been a big problem, why change it now? Give the people the freedom, who because of their religious beliefs, don't want to belong to unions. Take it out and do away with it. Five minutes?

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker - you've given me my five-minute sign - the difficulty in dealing with this particular piece of legislation is that we are in a position of having very limited time and very limited input at this present time because we haven't got the background material. The government hasn't given it to us and I want to say to members opposite I believe this is an onerous bill. It's a bill that is designed to be a political payoff to the big union bosses that supported them. It will do much to destroy the job creation drive that the government is on. It will hurt small business.

As I said earlier, big business can look after itself and the big unions can look after themselves, but what we're concerned about is 80 percent of the Manitoba businesses that employ less than 30 people. We don't need this type of legislation because of some political hang-ups of members opposite, and to pay off some political debts that they have to saddle Manitobans with a piece of legislation which nobody really wants in this province. I say to members opposite, the best thing they could do, since the implementation of this thing isn't until January 1, '85, drop it, and let's come back and discuss it next year when everybody has had a chance to look at it.

**MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding:** Order please.

When this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have four minutes remaining.

The time being 4:30 and Private Members' Hour, the Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I believe there may be an inclination to dispense with Private Members' Hour today, so the honourable member would have an

opportunity to complete his remarks. If there is leave to do so, I believe we then could continue with the bills under debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)

Leave has been given to dispense with Private Members' Hour.

The conclusion of the member's debate on Bill 22 - the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I said before the 4:30 Private Members' Hour came that I believe that since this bill is going to come into effect January 1, '85, the government could do the public of Manitoba a great service by doing what a number of governments have done over the past number of years, and that is to not call this bill again. Let it die on the Order Paper. Give people a chance to digest what it really will mean to them and then allow for the process to take place where we can develop some kind of legislation which will foster harmonious labour relations in this province and not create the type of divisiveness that this piece of legislation will. I don't think that Manitobans who have seen the haste in which this government has moved on a number of issues would like to see that particular mistake made again.

I say to the members opposite, we just dealt with a bill before here which repeals a bill that was passed by this government awhile back. It was wrong-headed and it was ill-conceived and had some real bad spots about it. They're moving this year to change that. I say to members opposite, this bill is not good in its present form. It should receive more public input and, Mr. Speaker, if they insist on passing it in its present form, it will, there is no question, do more to destroying labour relations in this province and good will between small employers and their employees. It will do more to cause more unemployment, it will act as a disincentive for people to hire, which means it's a disincentive for job creation, and I say to the members opposite, please come to your senses and withdraw this bill, let it die on the Order Paper and let's deal with it once industry, labour and employees have had a chance to digest it.

You didn't have the courage to table the Smith Report. You jumped right from the public hearings right into this bill and I want to say to members opposite, withdraw it, do yourselves a favour and withdraw this bill because it's going to cause you a lot of problems and the unfortunate thing is the end loser will be the average person in Manitoba who wants a job, the working person who wants to make an honest living in this province.

Mr. Speaker, that's all I have to say. Hopefully the government will see the error of its ways and withdraw this bill and allow people to comment further on it when we next meet sometime next February.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 28, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Stand.

Would the Honourable Government House Leader indicate the next item of business?

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, did you call Bill 17 and Bill 7? I didn't hear whether or not those two bills had stood?

**MR. SPEAKER:** I note that those two bills are both listed under Private Members' Hour and not under government business.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, although government business takes precedence outside of Private Members' Hour, I'm asking that they be called. I believe there is an inclination though to have both stand, so that may not be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, would you please call Bill No. 17?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Chair would ask for advice on the matter, bearing in mind our Rule 20.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the bill stands in my name. I have no objection, of course. Indeed, I'm pleased that the Government House Leader is calling Private Members' Bills on government time, although I suppose technically we have agreed to dispense with Private Members' Hour, so in a sense we are in Private Members' Hour.

By leave, Mr. Speaker, I see no difficulty in not proceeding with this bill. The Government House Leader calls the business, by leave we should be able to accomplish it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, as I recall, and I go from recollection, I don't have the Journals and the appropriate reference available, almost all private bills that have been passed in this Legislature, either as private bills or public bills, were called on government time after the passage of Speed-up motion. Sir, that calling and the Speed-up motion does not suspend the operation of Rule 20. There is no reference to Rule 20 in the Speed-up motion and the calling of those bills that are normally in Private Members' Hour, as government business, I believe is available to the Government House Leader at any time to call items from Private Members' Hour, during government time or during Private Members' Hour, they must be done in accordance with the precedence established under our Rule 19, I believe it is, with respect to the order of business during Private Members' Hour.

But, Sir, I believe the operation of this House in past practice has been that the calling of Private Members' business, particularly during a period of Speed-up has allowed the Government House Leader to call that business at any time. If there is a problem with that, Sir, then I will defer on that so that matter can be considered. I don't wish to pursue the matter, I

recognize, Sir, that the interpretation of Rule 20 could be such that the option of calling matters out of Private Members' Hour is not available.

I suggest, Sir, that the precedence established in past practice has been that that has always been allowed, that any Private Members' business can be called during government business time. But if there is a concern about that, Sir, I'd be inclined to move the Supply motion so we can commence consideration of the Jobs Fund and you, Sir, can consider that question so that we don't cause any difficulty at that point.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Just very briefly, Mr. Speaker, to the same point. It's, I suppose, not good practice to establish if you so believe, a bad precedent that may not serve the House well in the future, but I tend to agree with the Government House Leader and I just simply want to indicate my concurrence in this instance in having the government call a Private Members' bill on government's time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** If it is the leave of the House? (Agreed)  
The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, rather than establish that this is being done by leave, I would prefer not to have the matter called and ask you, Sir, to take the point of order then under advisement as to whether or not government or Private Members' business can be called on government time. I think that is an important question, particularly in view of the possibility that we may not be utilizing the Speed-up motion. Sir, the ability of the government to then call business, particularly private and public bills that are introduced by private members during government business in the absence of the Speed-up motion is an important question. Sir, I would appreciate your taking that point of order under advisement to address that question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Since the Honourable Government House Leader is correct that under Speed-up the government has called items under Private Members' Hour, our Rule 20(1) is quite clear in the order of precedence and probably does not apply when Speed-up is not in effect. However, I shall take the matter under advisement and check the precedents that have been in effect in this House.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would then move, seconded by the Minister who is Chairman of the Jobs Fund, 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.

## COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY MANITOBA JOBS FUND

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Committee, come to order.

We are considering the Estimates of the Manitoba Jobs Fund. Does the Minister have an introductory statement?

The Honourable Minister of Culture.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am pleased to present the Estimates for the 1984-85 Manitoba Jobs Fund. It is the same fund that provided a buffer for Manitobans against the worst effects of the recession last year. However, this is a change in emphasis for this year's fund, a change which recognizes our improved economic conditions and the fact that while unemployment levels remain unacceptably high the sense of urgency for immediate job creation has lessened.

The Jobs Fund will continue its successful job creation activities such as Careerstart and the Employment Action Program, but it will also increase its support to the private sector to help bring about greater economic development and more long-term employment which are vital to sustain growth.

Through the first year activities of the fund, we are able to shore-up our economy and buy time for the private sector to shrug off the economic downturn and begin the movement towards full recovery.

One of the key engines of growth is the small business community. A research study has shown that between 1975 and 1982 companies with fewer than 50 employees provided all the new jobs in Canada. Larger companies which have previously accounted for 30 percent of new jobs actually lost jobs during that period.

In Manitoba most of our businesses are small; in fact, more than 90 percent of them employ fewer than 20 people and less than 30. It is to these small businessmen and women that we must look for much of the growth and development necessary for healthy economic future. This year the Jobs Fund will look at priming the pump of this engine of growth to act as a catalyst in support of that growth.

Let me give you an example of what I am speaking about. Recently, I made an announcement in the House concerning the start-up of our initiatives and information technology. Our society is rapidly changing from an industrial to an information society and that has tremendous impact on all of us.

Prior to making the announcement I was privileged to be given a tour of computer facilities at a local high school. I can't pretend that I could understand what all the students were doing, or what the machines were doing, for that matter. We certainly didn't have any computers in my school when I went. But the computer instructor told me that the equipment was already out of date, that there were limitations to what the young people could be taught and there aren't sufficient teaching aids to fully integrate computers into the classroom. That wasn't really news to me. In fact, that type of situation was one of the reasons why education was included in our info-tech program.

Working with computer firms, we are about to create Canada's first joint venture government private sector computer resource centre. This centre will allow our educators to see first hand what is available in the state of the art computer technology. It will also be used for teaching development, honing their skills, so that our children are prepared to meet the challenges of our

technological world. As well, school divisions will be able to take advantage of bulk-purchasing prices. They will also be able to tie into a central computer system for access to data and curricula and so forth.

You may well say that doesn't amount to much, a few sales for the computer firms, better education, but where are the jobs and the economic stimulation? Well, the second phase of our education technology is really where the need is. Courseware development, the computer-based teaching aids, workbooks and so on is a quickly developing market. Estimates are that the courseware market alone will reach \$75 million in Canada over the next three years.

We believe that Manitoba can share in that market and so apparently do a number of major computer companies who are working with us right at this moment to develop a courseware industry here. Negotiations with the various industry participants are proceeding well. No doubt you can appreciate the co-ordinated six or seven separate negotiations of this type takes time and requires considerable commitment of programmed resources.

While we have had preliminary proposals made by some of the potential participants, no final agreements have yet been signed. These companies are interested. One of the companies wrote to us and said that, and I quote: "Your concept is refreshing and deserves a great deal of attention from our industries. We are extremely interested in participating in the program." Another called it innovative and unique. We are however beginning to see some early signs of the economic development spinoffs from the program.

For example, a feasibility study is being conducted by Sperry to evaluate Winnipeg as a site for the manufacture of new micro-computer products. This study is scheduled for completion by September and could possibly mean the expansion of the existing manufacturing activity in Winnipeg.

Of course, information technology is not the end of the technology story. Businesses too can benefit from the introduction of newer technologies in the workplace. That's really nothing new. It has come under different names in different times, mechanization, industrialization, automation, whatever it is called, businesses can benefit from technology and become more competitive on the local, national and worldwide markets.

The Manitoba Jobs Fund will be working towards assisting businesses to adopt new technology which is appropriate to their situation. At the same time it will also support research and development into new technologies which are tailored to our environment and resources.

We will also be helping employers and employees make the transition to new technologies, for our human resources are the most important, and if the human factor is overlooked all the technology in the world won't help.

Our investments in technology will have an impact for our children, our business sector and for the overall economy of Manitoba. The Jobs Fund will not make this happen, it will help to make it happen by acting as a catalyst to spur the necessary development. Another way in which we will act as a catalyst for business growth is through our Venture Capital

Program. We introduced this program on a one-year pilot basis last year offering to participate with business in establishing or expanding small independently-owned and operated companies.

The pilot program was well-received, resulting in the formation of 11 venture capital companies. These companies created 167 new permanent jobs in Manitoba. The program also allowed the retention of 137 more jobs which would otherwise have been lost.

This year under the Jobs Fund, our Venture Capital Program has been expanded to provide up to \$4 million worth of investment with Manitoba businesses. It is this type of program to which the chairman of the Canadian Manufacturers Association referred to publicly the other day when he was quoted as saying that this government is properly focusing on the need for investment.

Another tool which the Jobs Fund will employ in support of the private sector is the development agreement which is relatively new in North America. Through these agreements, major businesses will be offered incentives to encourage the establishment or expansion of facilities in our province. These incentives could include loans or loan guarantees, provision of training, equity investment, or industrial development, hydro-rate grants during the start-up period. In return the businesses make a similar variety of commitments which could include specific levels of employment or investment, implementation of affirmative action programs or compliance with environmental standards.

As you can see from the Estimates before you, the Jobs Fund is a concentrated, co-ordinated approach to strengthening our economic foundations. In total, there are 12 sectors which we in concert with business and labour and other Manitobans have identified as being essential to long-term stability and growth in our economy.

In addition to these initiatives I have already mentioned, perhaps I might give you a brief thumbnail description of several of our planned activities in other sectors.

Agriculture will benefit from initiatives ranging from encouragement for the expansion of the food processing industry to expansion of the grain handling season at our Port of Churchill. We will provide additional monies to strengthen our forest agreement which will be above the \$25 million Forestry Renewal Sub-agreement recently signed with the Federal Government.

We will be continuing to provide assistance to Manitoba youth and other disadvantaged in the areas of employment and training including an expansion of last year's Employment Action Program to provide a training component as well as continuous intake. We will continue to assist in the building of long-term facilities in Manitoba communities while at the same time creating employment on these projects.

Stimulation of the construction industry will be continued through housing and urban development programs. I've only highlighted some of the programs which will be introduced to the Manitoba Jobs Fund this year. These initiatives are part of what the Canadian Investment Dealers' Association called a careful, prudent administration.

They are part of this government's long-range strategy which will help build a stronger Manitoba.

If you notice, I used the phrase, "helped to build." The success of the Jobs Fund in its first year was not

accomplished by this government in a vacuum. It took the participation and co-operation of all sectors of our economy. Without that participation, that sharing, there could not have been jobs for Manitobans; there could not have been as many new homes or community facilities. No, if it was not for that old-time prairie spirit, we might have been facing a different situation in this province today. Manitobans have a right to be proud of their accomplishments during the recession. Their resilience and steadfastness have made us a motto for all of Canada. As a result, Manitoba is working again. We are on the grow and we did it together, not at the expense of the less fortunate in our province.

The Manitoba Jobs Fund represents an investment by all Manitobans, an investment of our financial and human resources. We have already seen the dividends, as a result of our first year of those investments, in the sense of jobs and the many lasting facilities which were created. But the long-term pay-back on these investments is yet to come and that will be economic stability and growth for Manitoba's future.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was called out of the House just as the Minister was in full flight of his introduction of this material. But, Mr. Chairman, we have from Day One, I think appropriately, named this entire operation on the part of this government, not as the Jobs Fund, but we refer to it time and time again as the "fraud" fund. Mr. Chairman, we don't do it ill-advisedly and I'm even prepared to acknowledge that perhaps under an energetic Minister, perhaps many of the government's activities can be focused in a way - perhaps in a better way than it has been to date - in providing or helping to encourage to the extent that any government can, or indeed should, be involved in the creation of jobs. That's not really the criticism.

Mr. Chairman, let me, at the outset, just say to the Honourable Minister, to give him some time to get the figures for us, we would like him to come clean with us, to this committee at this time, and simply put on the record, without any flowering of the facts, precisely the dollars that have been taken away from line departments that have been put into the Jobs Fund.

We have identified some very specific ones, like the monies taken away from the Department of Highways, the monies taken away from the Department of Natural Resources, the monies taken away from other departments. It would help the debate on the Jobs Fund to proceed in a relatively orderly way, if we could just have that as a base. I would ask the Minister to provide that information for us.

But, Mr. Chairman, I suppose, when it comes down to the whole concept of the program before us, and when it's being talked about as being unique and innovative, which is relatively new in North America, I ask myself, gee I guess maybe I'm getting old-fashioned, but I can remember, for instance, the Department of Labour being involved in supporting apprenticeship programs. That's what we called them in those days - job training. I can remember, when he sets out before us something being unique and innovative, something that's happened for the first time in North America, that there will be incentives, which includes loans or

guarantees, to provide training, training for who? - for young people coming into the work force - that in return that businesses will be involved in this training process, that they will co-operate with this government, they will commit to take on so many trainees, so many apprentices, so many up and coming journeymen in various crafts in the whole spectrum of the industrial activity of this province.

I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that since the initial concept of apprenticeship training programs was always housed in the Department of Labour, that we have now gotten high-tech jargon, it's now computer this, computer that. But, Mr. Chairman, that is simply responding to the needs of today. The truth of the matter is we do need more computer operators today than we need carpenters. There's not that much demand for aspiring to become a journeyman carpenter or to become a journeyman bricklayer, or indeed to become a journeyman sheet metal worker, as there once was. But those were all the kinds of programs that governments of all descriptions, of all political descriptions, have been involved in.

Agriculture will benefit from initiatives - this is the first time in North America, new and innovative - agriculture will benefit from initiatives ranging from encouragement for the expansion of the food processing industry. Well, my goodness, I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, I first came into the House as a Minister of Agriculture and I can recall my colleague, who then became my Leader, Mr. Spivak, who was then the Minister of the Department known as Industry, Trade and Commerce. I can recall holding big business summit conferences, not in Portage la Prairie, but right here in Winnipeg - to do what? - to help stimulate the food-processing industry in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, the great debate that used to rage and still rages from time to time, with respect to the Ministry of Agriculture, the control of marketing boards and how they can complement or how they can hinder the development of food processing capacity within our province, Mr. Chairman, new, innovative, for the first time in North America?

Mr. Chairman, we will provide additional monies to strengthen our forest industry which will be above the \$25 million. Well again, Mr. Chairman, and I've never hesitated to tread where angels - I'm not saying that right - but I want to tell you back in 1964 and 1965, yes, even that arrangement that led to the difficulties of Churchill Forest Industries, but that was inspired, conceptually, to do something about our forest reserves, at the same time provide some meaningful employment for that sector of our community that traditionally, unfortunately, still lacks in employment opportunities and economic development.

So, Mr. Chairman, what is new and what is innovative in the Jobs Fund proposal of putting \$25 million towards our forestry resources? Mr. Chairman, of course there's nothing new. We will be continuing to provide assistance to Manitoba youth and other disadvantaged areas.

Well, Mr. Chairman, how many years and how many different Ministers of Labour have been involved in providing programs of assistance to youth? I can remember my colleague, Ken MacMaster, being able to stand up in this Chamber as the then Minister in a Conservative administration, announcing programs, particularly as the school year and the university year

came to a conclusion, to talk about the number of jobs we could create for our young people coming out of high school, for our university students.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'm not suggesting for a moment that there's anything that I should take a contrary and opposite view to, to this Minister's or this government's effort in providing or continuing to provide assistance to the Manitoba youth. Nobody in his right mind would. What I take exception to, Mr. Chairman, and why we continue to call the Jobs Fund the "Fraud Fund," is the manner and the way it's being presented as something new, innovative and something happening for the first time in North America.

Mr. Chairman, they'd have you believe that only in Manitoba are there programs being developed to help our young people towards getting meaningful employment.

Mr. Chairman, it goes onto say again for the first time in Manitoba and unique to North America, we will continue to assist in the building of long-term facilities in Manitoba communities.

**A MEMBER:** What?

**MR. H. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, how did those arenas and how did those community clubs and how did those curling clubs and how did those community centres ever get started in the first instance, long before government assistance was vogue, we had community centres. They were modest, the kind of community halls that we had in Woodlands or Killarney back in the '20s or the '30s, long before government money was available, but they were there. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is fair to say that the impetus and if there was anything unique and innovative in terms of providing assistance to community facilities that occurred possibly with the centennial celebrations, centennial year of our nation, 1967, to be fair, when governments, both federally and provincially, said how can we mark this centennial year in a particularly demonstrative and tangible way? And that was probably the year that for the first time substantial amounts of public money were provided to all kinds of local community facilities. I remind you, Mr. Chairman, it was a Conservative administration then in office in Manitoba that was happy to participate in that program but, Mr. Chairman, we didn't get a bunch of green signs up that said that for the first time this was happening in Manitoba. What we did, Mr. Chairman; it was housed in the departments that were involved, whether it was Municipal Affairs, whether it was a sports and fitness department, I don't know what department it was. There were signs, certainly there were signs, centennial signs. I can remember the signs, making a special reference to the fact that this was a centennial project supported in many instances by the Federal Government and the Provincial Government. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Energy and Mines says, "One time only." He knows as well as I do that these one time only programs don't stay one time only programs. They carried on and they became very much a part of the system of support that the Provincial Government and the Federal Government provided to small communities.

I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman, where else they had their genesis. It was about the same time, in fact it was at

the same time that a former Minister, Maitland Steinkopf, introduced for the first time, and it was also only going to be a once only shot, lotteries into Manitoba; lotteries in Manitoba to help generate some of the funds required to do the many things which were considered at that time to be extra-curricular for government prior to that time, but he convinced the Legislature to introduce lottery bills into this House for the first time.

Mr. Chairman, you and I know that we never stepped back. Lotteries from that day grew larger and more of them. 1967, when we introduced lotteries to the Province of Manitoba, and it was from that time on, to answer the Minister of Energy and Mines' question, that some of those funds on an annual basis were dedicated to various programs, but certainly among them, to a large extent among them was the provision of dollars for local communities to improve their facilities be they curling rinks, be they arenas, be they community halls. Mr. Chairman, most members recognize that being the case.

Mr. Chairman, the next major impetus in that regard came in 1970 when Manitoba celebrated its centennial. It was the New Democratic Party that was then in government under the Premiership of Ed Schreyer. We had another kind of boost in the kind of assistance that this Minister now says under the heading, and this is the objection, Mr. Chairman, under the heading that this is happening for the first time in North America, this is something unique and innovative to the Province of Manitoba and that is why, Mr. Chairman, we call it a "fraud fund," Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, they say that they will continue the stimulation of the construction industry through various housing programs. Well, Mr. Chairman, one can argue again at the degree and the level of support for housing programs but, Mr. Chairman, are housing programs new to this province?

Do you honestly want to tell me that the Schreyer Administration did not have a housing program? Does the Minister of Energy and Mines, who was then a principal mover and shaker in the planning priorities committee, that during the '70's the New Democratic Party Government had nothing to do, had no housing support program in place? Well, of course they had one in place, of course they had one in place. So, Mr. Chairman, don't have this Minister parade and present before us the fact that for the first time we are having support for the housing industry in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, it's not my intention to berate at any great length this Minister on the Jobs Fund. I think, Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is that among the general population there is an understanding of what governments have been up to for the last decade, two decades. They have been able to call on their Minister of Municipal Affairs to ask for assistance through various types of programs, community assets type programs and they've been provided - various per capita grants were provided for that purpose and given the tenor of the times, given the intention of the government in times they have been bumped up, they've been increased or reduced, depending on I suppose, the feeling that a particular Minister or government had at that time.

We have, since 1967, used our lotteries funds, a portion of them, for many of the programs that this

Minister now is taking credit for as being something unique to the Jobs Fund, Mr. Chairman. As I said before, in the whole area of training, youth support programs, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Labour traditionally, very often in co-operation with the Minister of Education, has undertaken all kinds of different programs to help, to assist, to provide the kind of training necessary to make it possible for our young people to have opportunities of meaningful employment in this province.

Mr. Chairman, all these objectives are laudable; all these objectives are ones that I and most of my party members are pleased to support. We continue to object that this government can't present them in a straightforward manner and cannot resist the temptation to bamboozle the public with the idea that here's an entirely new ministry that's being created, entirely new pool of capital that's being created. We know where a good portion of that pool of capital came from - \$26 million from the Department of Highways; \$7 or 8 million from the Department of Energy. How much from the lotteries fund? I don't know.

Mr. Chairman, as I said to begin with, if this Minister can show us results after a while, that by focusing them in under the heading of the Manitoba Jobs Fund, if he can bring together the different parts and pieces of different departments under this appropriation, Mr. Chairman, I don't take all that great exception. I take exception to the manner and the way in which it's being presented and to the deliberate manner and way in which this government and this Minister is trying to hoodwink the public into believing that some way or other this government has found a pool of capital that didn't exist before to bring about the kind of ongoing programs, the kind of ongoing assistance to various communities and/or people in this province that has always been the tradition of governments for the past two decades in any event, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to rise on a point of order, and this relates to an incident that arose on Monday night, June 18, 1984 and I would refer members to Hansard for that night - Pages 2089 and 2090.

**A MEMBER:** Just hold it now. What page again?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Pages 2089 and Pages 2090.

**A MEMBER:** 2089?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Yes, and 2090.

**A MEMBER:** And 2090.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** That's right.

During the course of that night, as you can recall, there was possibly more heat than light at certain times, and this is my first opportunity to raise this matter since the Hansard has come out, because this is the first time that we've gone into Committee of Supply since that evening.

On the bottom of Page 2089, Mr. G. Filmon is quoted in Hansard as saying, "You lie every time you speak, Willie, that's the whole thing."

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

That particular point of order has been taken under advisement by the Chair and it should not be referred to in committee until the decision has been given.

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Yes, I would ask, if you're taking into account the statements of Mr. Filmon and the statements of Mr. Orchard, which are stated at the bottom of the first line of Page 2090.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That entire matter is being taken under consideration.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister at the outset of my short remarks whether or not he could compile for us, now that he has his officials before him, in general ballpark figures, the aggregate amount of dollars that have been identifiably taken from other Estimates. I refer specifically to the Department of Highways, specifically to the Department of Energy and Mines and/or indeed any other departments that we're not aware of that come under the appropriation before us.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that I'll answer the question in the manner that the member is requesting because I don't know if that question can be answered. What I will indicate for him is the amount of money, in terms of the total, that is in the allocation for the Manitoba Jobs Fund this year, and the member will note that there is \$91.2 million which is budgetary and then there is the additional amount which is contained in the loan authorities. Of those amounts in the case of budgetary \$38.6 million is carryover requirements to complete projects that were initiated under the Jobs Fund in 1983-84, which would be in essence old money, if you will, and under the non-budgetary, the loan portion, \$40.9 million in carryover requirements to complete projects initiated under the fund in 1983-84 so the total for both the budgetary and non-budgetary would be \$79.8 million.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister to perhaps take advantage of this time to introduce members of the committee to who the senior officials are, who are responsible for the Jobs Fund in carrying out the various programs?

Mr. Chairman, I ask this question because, unlike a line department where it's more structured, we know there is a Deputy Minister, director of the various branches of that particular department who are by and large known to members or who we can make ourselves familiar with, could the Minister perhaps just take this occasion to introduce his fine staff in front of him and indeed tell us who is the head honcho in that department? Who do I have to appear before when the Woodlands Community Club wants to receive some of the largesse that may be flowing from this particular fund?

I know who the head honcho is, I'm looking at him, but . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The Minister of Culture.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You can come see me at any time if you need assistance with respect to getting employment opportunities in the Lakeside constituency. I'd be pleased to co-operate with you at any time in that regard. I'll introduce the staff in a moment. I believe the question was who the staff are here and also the management or operation of the fund.

The fund is administered, if you will, by a Cabinet committee, which is the Jobs Fund combined Economic Resource Investment Committee of Cabinet, which has as its members myself, acting as Chairperson; my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Business Development and Tourism, who is the vice-chair of the committee; the Minister of Energy and Mines is a member; the Minister of Co-operative Development; the Minister of Finance; the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security; the Minister of Community Services; the Minister of Agriculture and the Attorney-General.

**A MEMBER:** They're the drones. Who are the workers?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Chairman, all members and staff on this side are workers.

In terms of the staff, resource, the secretary to the committee is Mr. Michael Decter. He is secretary to the Jobs Fund and ERIC of Cabinet. Sitting to my front left, the Director of Communications is Mr. Murray Weppler, the distinguished looking gray-haired gentleman here. The present Director of Administration is Mr. Wes Henderson. In total there are 13 staff people that work for the Jobs Fund directly, including the persons just named.

All of the programs are administered and run through specific departments. The Jobs Fund as itself does not administer or run any programs. They are run through specific departments.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for that information.

Of the 13 staff members, as I understood him to indicate are directly involved with the Jobs Fund, are these new positions or have these been persons seconded to the Jobs Fund from other activities of government? While I'm on my feet, I would also ask him, in addition to these 13 positions, are there persons employed by contract or under term arrangements to the Jobs Fund in addition to these 13 people?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Last year, the staff complement was 10 positions, 10 SYs, plus four contracts. This year, the complement, as I indicated was 13, six of which were existing positions and seven of which are term positions.

I should also just indicate in the case of the secretary, he is not paid from the Jobs Fund staff directly. He is an SY with the Executive Council.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could indicate to us the nature of what these people

are classified under or called? Are they job expeditors or communicators or just good P.R. people for the Minister and his government, and what general range of salary are we talking about, particularly in these term and contract positions? I'll ask specifically, for instance, the Minister indicated he has seven term or contract employees in the Jobs Fund, what kind of contracts are we talking about in terms of salary range?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** In terms of the latter portion, I'll table for the members who are interested a list of all of the employees, or in the case of vacant positions, the title of the vacant position and a list of actual salaries paid or that those people are classified at. So you can have that detail as it's being passed. The range is from 17,000 to 45,000. I have that detail there. As I indicated before, the secretary does not appear in that because he is part of the Executive Council. Mr. Weppler also does not appear on that list because he is in the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology and does double duty in terms of being the Director of Corporate and Community relations for the Department of Industry Trade and Technology and the Director of Corporate and Community Relations for the Jobs Fund. The other positions are, in the communications area, there are four staff of that area. There are positions under the Administration and Management which include secretaries and monitoring staff and programmers and analysts.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I just have another question. Another member of the committee will want to pursue other matters further. I can recall, Mr. Chairman, that in the original announcement of the creation of the Jobs Fund, there was the hope expressed that in addition to those monies that were particularly set aside from the Provincial Government, either from other departments, or indeed new money that the Jobs Fund, part of its ambition, I suppose, was to attract a considerable amount of private sector money to work in tandem with the efforts of the province as well as federal money. Again, in ball park figures, can the Minister give us some idea as to how successful the Jobs Fund has been in attracting private sector dollars to add to the impact of the Jobs Fund as well as federal dollars?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** The actual figures we have for - best we have for last year in terms of levered funds - in terms of other levels of government, there was approximately \$34 million, and in terms of the private sector, \$50 million, which would be a total of \$84 million. Our projections for this year would be: other levels of government \$68 million; the private sector approximately \$91 million.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, those last two figures?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Our projections for this year in contributing funds over and above the Jobs Fund authority would be \$68 million for other levels of government and \$91 million for the private sector.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I want to thank the MLA for Ste. Rose for that ovation. That's very kind of him.

Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate the advertising budget that was expended last year and what you project to be your advertising budget for this year?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** The total for communication's budget for last year was \$1.1 million which included advertising and other costs associated with communication, that is, program brochures, that kind of information. The Jobs Fund budget for this year for communications is a total of 900,000.00.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister, since there appears to be more than simply advertising, is it possible for him to break out, out of the \$1.1 million and the \$900,000 how much was expended on advertising?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Just give me a minute.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I can wait for that until next time we meet, because we obviously aren't going to finish tonight. One other question I'd like to pose to some of the advertising, was individual-oriented, endorsements by people who participated in the Jobs Fund programs. My question to the Minister is this: Would the Minister and the government be using those endorsements of the Jobs Fund by Individuals throughout the Province of Manitoba for instance, advertising during an election campaign or anything of that nature?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** The thought has never occurred to me, Mr. Chairman. I don't quite understand . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Do I take it from the Minister that those endorsements or those voice clips that were used were simply for Jobs Fund advertising and the government would not be able to use them in pre-election or during election advertising? That's my question.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** That's entirely correct. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to deal with that one because there was - I'm glad the member opened that up because there were accusations made by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to endorsements.

**A MEMBER:** Never!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Well I'll bring out Hansard, Mr. Chairman. The member says, "never." The accusations that were made by the Leader of the Opposition were that some members, one rural, and I'll quote it directly: "A mayor of a particularly large community in southern Manitoba had indicated that he would not receive Jobs Fund grant approval for his community until he signed a release saying he would participate in the Jobs Fund advertising."

That is simply not true, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the Leader of the Opposition has the opportunity of

hearing that comment because that comment was totally and patently untrue. There was a release signed by a mayor of a particularly large community in southern Manitoba. It was subsequent to the grant approval, subsequent to the grant being announced, and he was asked and volunteered to sign the release and to appear in the advertising. He did, I should add, Mr. Chairman, indicate subsequent to the ad appearing that he was under some pressure to have that removed and at his request that endorsement was discontinued in any advertising. I don't know who or how that pressure was put on him, Mr. Chairman, but it was subsequent to the advertising appearing, subsequent to him signing the release, subsequent to the grant being approved.

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

The hour is 5:30 p.m.

The Honourable Government House Leader, committee rise?

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Committee rise.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Call in the Speaker.

### IN SESSION

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

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

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### COMMITTEE CHANGES

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, prior to the motion for adjournment, could I indicate some changes to standing committees?

On Statutory Regulations and Orders, Mr. Steen replaces Mr. McKenzie, Mr. Mercier replaces Mr. Sherman, and Mr. Nordman replaces Mr. Kovnats.

On Public Utilities and Natural Resources, Mr. Manness replaces Mr. Orchard.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader. The Chair will accept the motion to adjourn.

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

I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).