

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 25 June, 1986.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

It is my pleasure to table a Return under Section 66 of The Legislative Assembly Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It is my pleasure to table the Annual Report 1984-85 of the Manitoba Horse Racing Commission; and the Annual Report 1984-85 for Business Development and Tourism, which includes the Annual Report for the Manitoba Design Institute 1984-85.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. H. HARAPIAK introduced, by leave, Bill No. 28, An Act to amend The Northern Affairs Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les Affaires du Nord.

HON. R. PENNER introduced, by leave, Bill No. 30, The Justice for Victims of Crime Act; Loi sur les droits des victimes d'actes criminels. (Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

HON. G. LECUYER introduced, by leave, Bill No. 29, An Act to amend The Workers Compensation Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les accidents du travail.

HON. L. EVANS introduced, by leave, Bill No. 31, An Act to amend The Social Allowances Act, The Municipal

Act and The Mental Health Act in relation to liens; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aide sociale, la Loi sur les municipalités et la Loi sur la santé mentale en matière de privilèges. (Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

HON. A. MACKLING introduced, by leave, Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les prestations de pension.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK introduced, by leave, Bill No. 33, An Act to amend The Municipal Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before proceeding to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 40 students from Grade 5 to 12 who are in the 1986 Canada-wide Science Fair and are the Manitoba Science Fair award participants. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Janet Boonov, the chairperson of the 1986 Canada-wide Science Fair, which I'm pleased to announce will be held in Manitoba; and Mr. Ernie Kuch and Mr. Ron Hallock, the co-chairmen of the Manitoba Schools Science Fair Symposium.

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

I would also like to advise all members that the Votes and Proceedings in the Hansard for June 27 and June 30 will not be available, because of the holiday, until July 2.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Versatile Farm Equipment

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

I wonder, in the wake of the decision of the U.S. Justice Department with respect to the application for the sale of Versatile to John Deere, whether the Premier could indicate if there have been any new developments with respect to the operation of Versatile in Winnipeg.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, first, before I answer that question, I think I would be remiss if I didn't seize this opportunity to congratulate the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I believe it is 20 years since the Honourable Member for Lakeside was first elected.

I don't like to add a sour note but, despite my best efforts, the honourable member remains in the Chamber to serve the people of the Province of Manitoba.

In response to the question from the Leader of the Opposition, I forwarded two letters which I would like

to table in the House. One letter is from myself to Robert A. Hanson, President of John Deere Ltd., which reads as follows:

"I've been advised of the U.S. Department of Justice decision regarding the John Deere and Company takeover of Versatile Farm Equipment. I believe it important and beneficial to Manitoba, to Canada, that John Deere and Company proceed with its intentions towards acquiring Versatile's agricultural equipment operations, as was originally announced.

"Your efforts to realize this opportunity would be greatly appreciated. Be assured that the Government of Manitoba would welcome John Deere and Company to our province as a significant corporate citizen."

I've also forwarded a letter to the Prime Minister asking the Prime Minister to do as I have done and write to the president of John Deere, indicating to John Deere our desire, not only as Manitobans, but as Canadians, that this transaction be completed, as had been earlier intended, by the June 30th deadline.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Madam Speaker, given the tone of the letter, is there any doubt in the Premier's mind that John Deere is now not willing to go through with the transaction to purchase Versatile?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I don't believe there to be any doubt insofar as John Deere's intentions, but of course there is doubt insofar as the conditions that were attached by the U.S. Department of Justice, whether or not the transaction will be completed by June 30. We, as a province, and I'm sure the Federal Government would want to add all we could by way of assistance to insure that the transaction is completed as earlier intended.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I understand that they have put a 90-day hold on the transaction, subject to determining whether or not there's any other suitable buyer and obviously it won't be completed by June 30. I wonder if the Premier has had indications or any discussions with the local management of Versatile, as to whether or not this might result in some layoffs in the near future?

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, I believe, has had some recent communication with the local management.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition is correct, in terms of the 90 days; however the agreement for purchase and sale between Versatile and John Deere had an expiry date of June 30, 1986, which was the same date as the expectation for completion of arrangements with the U.S. Justice Department and, therefore, that agreement technically would expire by June 30th if there were not a clause added to it, adding 90 days with whatever conditions might be attached, and that's what we're concerned about.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if I could ask the second part of my question, Madam Speaker, whether or not

this will result — this 90-day delay — in any layoffs at the Versatile plant as a result of the transaction not being able to be completed?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I am not aware that it will result in layoffs. We haven't had discussions on that issue with Versatile; we've had discussions with respect to John Deere.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, I wonder if the Minister of Labour has been given any indication of layoffs?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: I don't recall a specific notice but I will check on that and advise the House.

Legislative Assistants

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my new question to the Premier is, I wonder if he could indicate why the list of Legislative Assistants has not yet been released.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I will have to check. It has been finalized and it will be circulated very shortly.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, on Monday, June 9th, in response to a question with respect to the Member for Thompson, the Minister of Economic Services and Employment Security indicated that the Member for Thompson was his legislative assistant. I subsequently had my office check with the Executive Council Office and I'm told that the O/C was passed on June 4. I wonder if there's any reason why the Premier is declining to make this public.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the O/C's are certainly public and I'll recheck that. Insofar as the Member for Thompson, it seems to me that the Member for Thompson has been Legislative Assistant to the Minister of Employment and Income Security for the last three years. I think that has been certainly widely known that the Member for Thompson has served in that capacity and has served well working with the Minister of Employment and Income Security.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wonder then if the Premier will give us the assurance, because my office has been checking every few days since the 9th of June when that reference was made, and we've been unable to obtain the Order-in-Council so that we can know who the legislative assistants are.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I can't wait to announce the legislative assistants because all those that will be legislative assistants will be performing a very useful role, as you did, Madam Speaker, when you prepared the regulations and work in regard to Child Care Services in the Province of Manitoba, so that information will be made available quite shortly.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I'm interested that the Premier says he can't wait to announce it but he

has been waiting now for three weeks. Will he make the announcement so that we can know who these people are?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a new question. Order please. Order please, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would like to ask a question.

Manitoba Hydro - Dominion Bridge contracts re Limestone

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines. Just over a week ago a question was taken as notice, on his behalf, by the Acting Minister of Energy and Mines with respect to the awarding of a contract for the construction of steel spillway gates at Limestone. I wonder if the Minister now has the information with respect to the bids and the reasons for the award of the contract to the particular successful tenderer, Dominion Bridge.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes Madam Speaker, I don't have the full information here. I can tell the honourable member that the successful bid was the lowest North American bid.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could give us the list of bid prices and the reasons for award as put forward by the board because we're aware, we have a copy of the news release that tells about the \$19.6 million Dominion Bridge contract. We would like further details. Is he willing to provide them?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Madam Speaker, I would like to provide that. I would like to check with my officials to determine whether there is anything preventing the release of that information. If not, certainly I would like to provide that.

Rape charge - bail criteria

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Attorney-General.

It has been reported that an individual, while out on bail for rape, committed a second similar offence. My question to the Minister is did your department oppose the granting of bail to this individual with respect to the first offence?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I'll have to take the particular question as notice, but I think it should be noted,

Madam Speaker, that bail is set, or not set, by the judge presiding in court at the time that an accused appears, and is determined by the bail provisions of the Criminal Code.

The two criteria which must be met are the likelihood of the accused to show up for his/her trial; and, secondly, whether or not there is a danger to the public in the accused being at large. Those are the criteria that the judges address.

Whether or not my department, i.e. a Crown Counsel, charged with the responsibility, opposed in this case, I'll take that as notice.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Madam Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister.

Does your department have a policy for dealing with matters such as rape, when they come before the court, on the question of bail. If so, what is it?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, the policy is to bring to the attention of the judge presiding any facts which may bear on the two criteria established by the Criminal Code; and where we are of the view that, with respect to either one of those criteria, there are grounds upon which the accused ought not to be released, we then raise that as an argument before the presiding judge.

Day care

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

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

The Minister recently made an announcement with regard to additional day care spaces. However, a number of day care centres, including one in my riding "Children Are People Too", are capped a non-profit day care, is still waiting for permission to expand into the Grosvenor School.

Can the Minister tell the House when these decisions will be made with regard to these day care centres?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: I'll take the question as notice, Madam Speaker, but I think the notification should be provided in very short order.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A supplementary question. Would the Minister also consider doing this with some urgency, in that the day care centres which wish to expand into schools are running into the difficulty that the schools are closing this Friday and, therefore, access to them is becoming severely limited?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, Madam Speaker.

MACC - tax arrears, loss of land, RM of Archie

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture.

During Estimates on June 12th, I asked the Minister if MACC had lost possession of a quarter section of land in the R.M. of Archie due to tax arrears. He said, yes, at that time. I note that the Department of Agriculture has publicly acknowledged that they did lose this quarter section because of unpaid taxes.

My question to the Minister, Madam Speaker, is what arrangements is his department making to recover the land and at what cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, while members have the information that has appeared in the media, it should be pointed out that there was more than one lender involved in the mortgage situation that was there, and there was a lack of communication between the lenders who had mortgages on that same parcel of land and, as a result, it did fall, in terms of the procedures between, I would assume, the legal counsels of both MACC and the other lender. There are discussions now under way with the municipality between MACC to see what procedures might be available to recoup the land.

The land, in fact, Madam Speaker, in terms of value — and the member well knows — is not very highly valued. It may very well be that the final outcome, the inability of the corporation to redeem that land, they may have to look at the option of bidding on it, if and when the municipality decides to put up the sale, if there are no other legal ways of recouping that land.

MR. G. FINDLAY: As agreed to during the Estimates, has the Minister apologized to the R.M. of Archie for the actions of the department?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I indicated that if, in fact, there was a deliberate attempt on our staff to hamper those proceedings in some way, of the municipal council, that we would in fact apologize. The information that I have received was that there was no falling-out in terms of the relationship between the municipal council and our staff, but there was a misinformation between the two legal counsels and staffs dealing with the two credit agencies that did have mortgages on this one parcel of land.

MR. G. FINDLAY: As also agreed during Estimates, has the Minister ascertained whether MACC is presently in tax arrears on any other piece of property they hold in the Province of Manitoba?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I have instructed the staff of MACC to review their procedures in cases such as this, that no other actions and, in fact, lands that might be mortgaged by MACC will fall into tax arrears. It is not the policy of the corporation, nor is it of this government to allow those situations to occur. However, we are reviewing those procedures to ascertain that circumstances of this nature do not occur again.

Topsoil - City of Winnipeg bylaw re stripping of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of the Environment. The City of Winnipeg has a by-law prohibiting the stripping of topsoil within the city limit. In my constituency, I have seen hundreds of acres stripped where there are variances and the land has actually been stripped before the variance hearing has been held. My question to the Minister, since this has a negative effect on the environment within the city allowing water table to lay out, mosquito breeding grounds, and also it's extremely unsightly, does the Department of the Environment or the Clean Environment Commission have any jurisdiction to make the city enforce its own by-law?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

As the member has indicated, this does come under the City of Winnipeg by-law and I'm not aware that, indeed, there is any jurisdiction that my department has to see that by-law is enforced. I shall raise the matter with the staff and see if there are any discussions that can be held with the City of Winnipeg with a view of at least raising the concern that has been expressed here.

MR. M. DOLIN: A supplementary, Madam Speaker.

While the Minister is raising this with his staff, I do have a concern. One piece of property on Pipeline Road where I went and saw the notice for the hearing of being May 27th and it was May 25th when I went there and the land had already been . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West on a point of order.

MR. J. McCRAE: On a point of order, Madam Speaker. You have reminded members on this side repeatedly throughout this Session, Madam Speaker, that supplementary questions are not to be have preambles, and we hear lengthy ones from the honourable member opposite, and I ask Your Honour to call the honourable member to order.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have reminded all members of the Assembly that supplementaries should not have preambles.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, the preamble was to describe the piece of property. I can't ask the question without the Minister being aware of the piece of property in question.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West on a point of order.

MR. J. McCRAE: The issue raised by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, Madam Speaker, is precisely

quandary we on this side have regularly, and we are promptly put to our seats.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member does not have a point of order. The honourable member is arguing with the Chair.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan with a supplementary with no preamble.

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of the Environment.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to the honourable member's supplementary which I'm sure will be in order.

MR. M. DOLIN: The city committee dealing with the environment is meeting on June 27th to deal with this matter. Could the Department of the Environment review those proceedings to see whether or not they fall in line with what is required for a clean and aesthetic environment?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Yes, most certainly, but again I repeat to the member, the matter comes under a city by-law and, as far as I am aware, there is no jurisdiction that my department has in exercising any power over the City of Winnipeg's by-laws.

Livestock marketing cutoff dates

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

There have been many farmers placed on a waiting list to market their livestock through the Manitoba Beef Commission over this past few weeks, Madam Speaker, and the marketings of those cattle that will have to take place after the 1st of July will incur a higher premium and a lower support price. Can the Minister indicate as to whether or not anyone has been advanced in their marketing position, or special privileges given for those individuals marketing prior to July 1st?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, this question was raised by the Member for Virden about two weeks ago and we've had lengthy discussions on this matter. I believe this matter has been aired in the House and I want to advise my honourable friend that all matters dealing with the Beef Commission can, in fact, be discussed during our Estimates process since the Beef Commission is now before the House.

That answer that I gave to the Honourable Member for Virden is within Hansard, Madam Speaker.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, the question is, has there been any preference given to those individuals

who are on the Beef Commission, as far as marketing prior to July 1st? Will the Minister provide lists of the marketings, lists of people who have been on the waiting list and those who have marketed for the last month up to July 1st? Will the Minister assure us that there hasn't been any special privileges and give us that list?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that the July 1st and the January 1st dates for change in support levels under the Beef Commission Program have been in place since 1983. There have been no preferential treatment, that I am aware of, given by the Commission for people who have set their marketing times, whatever time of year, whether it be a week or a month or longer, before or after the change in support dates. The Member for Arthur, of course, makes assumptions that may or may not be correct in terms of the support levels. Those support levels are being calculated by the Commission with the assistance of our staff and will be announced likely this weekend or the early part of next week.

In my reply to the Honourable Member for Virden, we were not aware that there was any undue delay of anyone in terms of not being able to market their animals, provided, of course, they were in the finished category, Madam Speaker, and if the member has any information to the contrary of that, I wish he'd bring it to my attention and we'd have a look at it.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, will the Minister of Agriculture give us the assurance that the Board of Director's member for the Swan River Valley, Mr. Jim Chegwin was not given special marketing privileges and allowed to market his cattle ahead of July 1, prior to other people who had already been on the list. Will he give the House the assurance and the public the assurance that he did not have a conflict of interest and take special advantage of the program, Madam Speaker?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, that is an allegation that I certainly will want to look into and report back

A MEMBER: I guess so.

HON. B. URUSKI: Well, Madam Speaker, I asked the honourable member to raise specifics if he had them. Obviously, he had some information that I was not aware of, and I certainly will want to investigate those allegations to see whether or not they can be substantiated.

Rides, amusement - safety of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour.

In light of the concern caused by the recent tragedy of the West Edmonton Mall, Madam Speaker, resulting in the deaths of three people, in view of the large number of repair orders on amusement rides after Department of Labour inspections, can the Minister assure this

House that all amusement rides are safe for the people of Manitoba?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: I thank the honourable member for the question. I'm sure that all Manitobans were concerned about the tragic accident that happened in Edmonton, and that all Manitobans have a justifiable concern for the safety of similar amusement rides anywhere. Because of those concerns, I did make inquiry of the department to ensure that full and adequate testing would take place in respect to the rides set up for the Red River Exhibition and at fairs throughout the province. I'm given assurance that the checks are very thorough. Of course, we can't guarantee that situations cannot change because of unusual circumstances.

I know I was very concerned hearing that strong wind last night, but I'm sure that the . . .

A MEMBER: I was on the big ferriswheel last night in that strong wind.

HON. B. URUSKI: And I will be in communication again with departmental staff to ensure that there is ongoing inspection of those facilities.

Versatile Farm Equipment

HON. A. MACKLING: While I'm on my feet, Madam Speaker, I want to respond to the question that the Leader of the Opposition asked in connection with Versatile — (Interjection) — well, perhaps I can wait until he's back. Here he is.

I did receive a letter on April 11 confirming that there would likely be a significant layoff of staff at Versatile because of a downturn in the industry. There was a possibility of in excess of 300 employees being affected. I have had further communication with Versatile and they've indicated that they are not in a position to confirm the actual number of employees to be laid off in August, or establish tentative recall dates, and they reference the ongoing situation in the United States in respect to the U.S. Justice Department's consideration of the contractual arrangements between John Deere and Versatile.

Rides, amusement - safety of

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, getting back to the amusement ride question. When the Minister meets again with his officials, will he please satisfy himself that six inspectors during summer fair time in Manitoba, satisfy himself whether that number of inspectors is enough to make all the necessary inspections and orders of repairs, and re-inspections and follow-up work, and perhaps he might report back to the House?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Madam Speaker.

Grain quota system

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture.

In view of the fact that the farmers of this province will be losing 21 percent in the value of any crops that will be held back past the August 1 cutoff on this year's permits, has the Minister taken any action to convey the concerns of the farmers of this province to the Farmers' Union, that has now stated that they would support a strike by the grain handlers at the Lakehead?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, it should be noted that we have ongoing discussions with the Canadian Wheat Board who are the scheduling authority for the delivery of quotas and farmer's delivery of grains into the system. The member is likely aware, as well, that the bulk of the system at the present time is in fact getting filled up, and I'm not certain at this point in time whether all the delivery options, that might be available under the quota system, will be able to be exercised by all farmers, but certainly that is the desire and intent of us.

As well, Madam Speaker, it should be pointed out that we have, and continue to request, that both parties remain at the table and that there is no eminent strike in this matter. Madam Speaker, unlike members opposite who want to be on the side of bankers and the Federal Government, when it comes to interest rates and protection of farmers, we want to make sure that the entire system of the delivery of grain operates on a cooperative basis with no work stoppages, and that means cooperative on both sides of the question.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: My question is very simple, Madam Speaker, does the Minister support the farmers or the union?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend would likely be the first to say, "I will not accept a 20 percent decrease in my standard of living", if he was on the — (Interjection) — Madam Speaker, there is no work stoppage. It is his colleagues in Ottawa who are responsible for mediation services. — (Interjection) — Madam Speaker . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose asked a question, the Minister is answering it. I'm sure all members would be interested in hearing the answer to their colleague's question. Please contain themselves.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, there is always concern when there is a threat of a work stoppage on all sides of this House. We are concerned and I'm sure the honourable members are concerned. Madam Speaker, the whole process of free collective bargaining and mediation services to prevent that occurrence from happening is one that should be pursued, and we have the assurances of the Federal Government that it is being pursued.

In fact, Madam Speaker, there is a recognition, on behalf of all the employees at the Lakehead, that they recognize the impact on the farm community, and that

is more than I can say for my honourable friends who intend to always try and pit one group against another in society. We don't intend to do that.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has the floor. If any other members . . . Order please, after 20 years, you should know you shouldn't be yelling.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture.

The farmers of this province did take a 20 percent cut last year. They're expecting another 20 percent cut, will he pass on those concerns to Mr. Mazur and the union?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, what the honourable member fails to indicate is that the grain companies did not take a 20 percent cut. In fact, Madam Speaker, grain companies have received their tariff increases. It was only that they were frozen this year in the area of tariffs, but they've had increases year in, year out, Madam Speaker, and their employees work for those same grain companies.

Housing starts

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to direct a couple of questions to the Minister responsible for Housing.

Can the Minister inform the members of this House, and the people of this province, about the latest development in the housing construction industry?

MADAM SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable member that questions should not be vague and ask for general policy statements that are too large to be dealt with as an answer to a question.

Would the honourable member like to rephrase his question?

MR. C. SANTOS: I will reformulate my question, Madam Speaker. How many housing starts have been initiated most recently in the province?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to report to the people of Manitoba that the housing industry is one of the strongest and healthiest in the country. And although we thought we had a good year . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I'm sure if honourable members want to participate in question period they know the proper procedure for doing that.

The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So I wanted to say, although we thought we had a very

good year last year, an exceptional year with a 23 percent increase and 6,500 housing starts; this year we're predicting a 36 percent increase and 7,000 housing starts, the best in the country.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Can the Minister inform the members of this House which segment of these upstarts has the most, the fastest growing segment of these upstarts?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I think I've got the question, Madam Speaker. The area that is growing the fastest and that has the most action is single-family units, and the increases are up 50 percent, a phenomenal increase.

National Research Council Building

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I've taken a number of questions as notice recently. The question raised by the Member for Ellice, who asked how many employees are currently employed at the NRC Building in Winnipeg. I understand, as of June 13, there were five NRC employees, one contractor and, in addition, Public Works Canada has eight people there, including five commissionaires.

Signing authority - senior civil servants

HON. V. SCHROEDER: As well, the Member for Pembina asked recently about signing authority at the Manitoba Energy Authority and Hydro. The CEO at Hydro has signing authority of \$1.2 million; vice-presidents have .5 million. Just for comparison, MPIC, there was apparently no limit. Manitoba Energy Authority executive director is .5 million; secretary-treasurer, \$50,000.00.

The Leader of the Opposition — I don't have all of the answer that he asked for the amounts on those intake gate bids. I do have some information for him. Hyundai of Korea was at \$16 million; Impsa of Argentina, at \$19 million. They were rejected on the basis of scheduling risk and inexperience in building those particular gates. They were rejected by the professionals at Hydro on those bases.

The contract does mean 200 person years of direct and indirect employment here in Manitoba; and \$15.1 million of the \$19.5 million in Manitoba economic content; and about \$600,000 in provincial taxes.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Minister could indicate what the bids of Canron and Versatile were, a couple of other North American suppliers.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Madam Speaker, they are a couple of other North American suppliers, but they

were hired than the \$19.5 million bid which was accepted. I don't know exactly, but my recollection is that it was somewhere in the range of \$20 million, \$20.5 million, in there somewhere.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder, Madam Speaker, if the Minister could indicate whether the bid that was accepted was the original bid that was submitted on a closed tender basis, from Dominion Bridge.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'll take that question as notice.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

Fork River - Manitoba Union of Municipalities meeting

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Through you to the Minister, Madam Speaker, I would ask if the Minister would write a full letter of apology to the president of the Union of Municipalities for his misleading statement as to whether or not he was paired, or whether he was not paired, to go to the meeting in Fork River last week? I would ask the Minister to write a letter of apology to the president of the Union of Municipalities.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. It is not in order for the honourable member to ask a Minister to apologize for a statement that he has made outside the House.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs as to whether or not he told the president of the Union of Municipalities in Fork River that he was not allowed a pair to go to that meeting?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. It is a member's duty to ascertain the truth of statements before he brings them to Parliament. Did the Honourable Member for Arthur want to rephrase his question?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, the question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Will he apologize to the Union of Municipalities, and to me, and to the House, and this Assembly, for a misleading statement that he gave to the Union of Municipalities in the Province of Manitoba?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Madam Speaker, I believe the Member for Arthur suggested that the Minister is misleading the House. You, on a number of occasions, have indicated that it is unparliamentary to do so, and that the member should apologize and withdraw those statements.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Did the Minister of Municipal Affairs tell the president of the Union of Municipalities that he did not have a pair to go to the meeting at Fork River?

MADAM SPEAKER: That question is in order. The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Certainly no difficulty with your ruling that the question is in order, Madam Speaker, however, I did not hear the member withdraw the words that he had uttered in respect to the Minister misleading the House, nor did I hear him apologize for that imputation on the character of the Minister.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader is absolutely correct. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, I simply asked a question. I was not directed or asked anything further . . . as I understood you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader did raise, on a point of order, objecting to the allegations that the aspersions that the Honourable Member for Arthur has cast upon one of the members of the House. Could the Honourable Member for Arthur please withdraw those aspersions? His next question was in order.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on the point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, as you have suggested to us from time to time that we ought to consult Beauchesne, and I would refer to Beauchesne, Chapter 7, Page 112, under the list of words, "Since 1958, it has been ruled parliamentary to use the following expressions." One is "misinformed" or "misinforming," reference being Debates of June 24, 1964.

Madam Speaker, I would go further, that beyond that Beauchesne also lists "mislead," "misleading," and "mised," under the appropriate sections on Page 112 of Chapter 7 as having been ruled parliamentary for use.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, again we are treated to a selective use of the references, as the Opposition tends quite often to use selective statistics and facts and figures to make the case. If you will refer to Page 108, you will see that "mislead" has been ruled unparliamentary to use as an expression in the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: I will thank all honourable members for their advice, and both honourable members are correct in terms of the references to a particular word, in that sometimes, depending on the circumstances, it has been ruled unparliamentary. In other instances, it has been ruled parliamentary.

I do think that there is no question about the Beauchesne reference about casting aspersions and

innuendo, etc. I think, under that instance, whether a particular word is used in a way that does cast aspersions is the point at issue. Members have taken offence to the implication that the honourable member has cast aspersions on the Honourable Minister, and has implied that he has misled the House, and the Honourable Member for Arthur himself. Could the Honourable Member for Arthur please withdraw those references?

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, if I had left the

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Arthur has the floor.

Order please, order please.

If the Honourable Member for Pembina would come to order we could hear the Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, if I left the inference that the member had misled the House, then I would withdraw it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

Unfortunately, the time for Oral Questions has expired, so the Honourable Member for Arthur can't ask his question.

Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. C. BAKER: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask leave to make a non-political statement.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?

Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs on a point of order.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: In view of the debate that's taken place for the last five minutes, could I be afforded the opportunity to respond to the question that was raised, by leave?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Spaker, we're prepared to allow the Minister leave to respond, if the Member for Arthur is allowed two supplementary questions.

MADAM SPEAKER: Do the honourable members have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

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

The question raised by the Member for Arthur, the critic for Municipal Affairs, is a good indication of how one's ill-thought reactions can come home to roost. For the benefit of the House, the background to the situation was this. In fact, I did say at Fork River —

not to the Union of Manitoba Municipalities president, but to the whole assembly — that it was my regret that I could not stay longer, but that the Official Opposition had refused to pair me for that afternoon. That was the third in a series of seven meetings.

There was no problem in obtaining leave to attend the meetings at Glenboro, I believe, and Shoal Lake, when members of the Opposition were present, but my request was denied for the Fork River one — (Interjection) — Yes, I would like to explain why.

When the Government Whip asked for a response to my request to be paired, the response was "we are prepared to give you that approval only if the critic for Municipal Affairs can accompany you on the aircraft."

I considered that to be a form of intimidation. I considered that response to be intimidation. I do not intimidate easily.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Arthur on a point of order.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, Madam Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs to apologize to me for the aspersions that he's cast upon me that I would be intimidating on the airplane with him. I ask for a full apology.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Madam Speaker, if the Member for Arthur listened carefully, I did not attribute any form of intimidation to him. I said the response was a form of intimidation. I would welcome the Member for Arthur or any member of the Opposition to travel with me to these UMM meetings, but I will not be put in the position where I cannot attend because you don't want me to.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Arthur was granted leave for a supplementary question. What is the Honourable Member for Emerson up for? Is the Member for Emerson rising on a point of order?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: No, Madam Speaker, I am rising, a precedent has been set in this House that we allow a matter of information at this stage of the game and I would want to clarify that. The precedent has been set, Madam Speaker, and I'd like to use this opportunity to have a matter of information presented, based on the statements made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I want to clarify the situation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Does the honourable member have leave for a point of information? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I think it is important that we get this clarified a little bit, because there have been some comments made about the pairing aspect of it. That particular day, the Government Party Whip came to me with a request, in writing, as we have the system established, asking for a pair for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to attend a meeting in Fork River for the next day. I indicated to the Government Party Whip that our critic would appreciate it if he could possibly join the Minister on the government airplane, which is paid by all people in Manitoba, so that he wouldn't have to drive that long distance down there as a critic to attend that meeting.

The Government Party Whip at that time indicated he would relay that information to the Minister. The Minister indicated initially, no, and then he said he would reconsider it. The Government Party Whip felt it was a responsible request; indicated he'd get back to me. Half-an-hour later he phoned and indicated that the Minister of Municipal Affairs felt he did not want to take our critic along.

Based on that kind of information, Madam Speaker, and the response from the Government Party Whip indicating it was a reasonable request, I refuse the request for pairing.

Based on that kind of a reaction, because we have tried to cooperate. I have refused . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: A point of information; we don't need debate though.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: . . . I have refused all further pairing for the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you.
Now, the Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I just want to clarify this. I write, as the Government Whip, a letter always to the Opposition Whip and he . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Does the honourable member have leave to give his side of this story? Does the Honourable Member have leave? (Agreed)
The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I write a letter — I don't just go and speak to him — put it in black and white the request, and I get that letter back with one word, "Okay" or "Denial," in every instance. In this very instance there was nothing. He came to me with a letter and said "It depends on the honourable member's response; we take our critic." So it really was what the Minister had said is correct. They are wrong. I do think it was intimidation; it was a form of blackmail.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. I do believe we have had all the information on this particular topic that we need. Does the Honourable Member for Arthur have his supplementary questions that he has leave for?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, Madam Speaker, I am granted two questions. The first question being, will the Minister

of Municipal Affairs write a letter to the President of the Union of Municipalities and those people who were within earshot of him, the rest of the municipal councillors, telling him that he was given a pair and refused me a ride on the government airplane?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Well, clearly the Member for Arthur has not been listening for the last 10 minutes. Those were not the circumstances and the approval was never approved. It was never given by the Opposition, therefore, no letter is necessary. What I said was essentially correct.

MADAM SPEAKER: On a final supplementary, the Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, Madam Speaker, will the Minister write the President of the Union of Municipalities fully explaining as to the . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Honourable Member have a supplementary?

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . will he write the letter to the Union of Municipalities telling the truth?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Madam Speaker, I will indeed be pleased to write and explain the truth as you heard here this afternoon from this side of the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the day.
The Honourable Minister of Health. Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Can I please ask the Member for Emerson if I've got my pair for tomorrow, you can come with me if you want.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet had leave a few minutes ago to make a non-political statement. Order please.
The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. C. BAKER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
On behalf of all — (Interjection) — members . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. C. BAKER: . . . I stand up so seldom, Madam Speaker, I wish everybody would listen to me.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of all members I would like to extend congratulations to the 1986 Farmers of the Year, Henk and Yvonne Jonk of Bruxelles.

The Jonk family came to this country from the Netherlands in 1984 with little money and even less English language. Due to their diligence and stewardship, they have become one of the only few Manitoba farm units producing Elite 2 and Elite 3 seed potatoes, a demanding enterprise.

On behalf of the Member for Portage la Prairie and myself — we were both honoured to be former Mr. Manitoba Farmers — it gives me great pleasure to offer best wishes to the Jonk family.

Thank you.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a committee change for Economic Development: Orchard for Johnston, and Enns for Birt.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: Yes, I have changes for the Economic Development Committee: the Member for Kildonan for the Member for Thompson; the Member for The Pas for the Member for Rossmere.

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

On a matter of House Business previous to going into Second Readings, I've had some consultation discussions with members opposite through the Opposition House Leader and the Member for River Heights. It's agreed that today there will be no Private Members' Hour; however, the Agriculture Estimates will continue on in the Chamber until they are completed or committee determines that it is to rise at that time past 4:30 p.m., by leave.

The Estimates for Community Services will continue to 4:30 p.m. at which time the committee will rise in the normal way in the Committee Room. That's on the assumption that we may be able to finish the Estimates for the Department of Agriculture today in order to accommodate that.

Secondly, again through discussions, it's been determined that the House will not sit on either June 30 or July 1, given that a large number of MLA's have events in their own constituencies to attend to, certainly the 1st and some on the 30. It was felt that in order to accommodate that access to the electorate and to our public, it would best if we did not sit for those four days, so we will adjourn on Friday to reconvene on the Wednesday following, by leave, and understanding with members opposite as well.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to also indicate that following Agriculture in the House, the Department of Municipal Affairs will be up for its Estimates review starting whenever we've completed the Agriculture Estimates.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. J. COWAN: I would now like, Madam Speaker, for you to call Second Readings on Bill No. 10 and Bill No. 25 following by Adjourned Debates on Second

Readings starting on Page 2 and continuing on Page 3, starting with Bill No. 3 through inclusive Bill No. 22, in the order in which they appear at which time it would be our intention to go into Estimates.

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 10 — THE MANITOBA HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT CORPORATION ACT; LOI SUR LA CORPORATION MANITOBAINE DE GESTION DES DÉCHETS DANGEREUX

HON. G. LECUYER presented, by leave, Bill No. 10, The Manitoba Hazardous Waste Management Corporation Act; Loi sur la Corporation manitobaine de gestion des déchets dangereux, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: This act, Madam Speaker, establishes the terms of reference for the Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corporation . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: One moment please. May I remind honourable members that private conversations should not take place in the House to the point where they interrupt the business of the House. Would members please have their private discussions elsewhere.
The Honourable Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: As I was saying, Madam Speaker, this bill establishes the terms of reference, providing the corporation with the development, ownership and operating responsibilities for Manitoba's hazardous waste management system which will be designed to handle approximately 20,000 tonnes of hazardous waste produced annually in the Province of Manitoba.

Specifically, the corporation has been given the following terms of reference:

1. Establishing a hazardous waste management system in the short and long term and assuring adequate facilities for the treatment, disposal, recycling and reuse of hazardous waste generated in Manitoba and not otherwise adequately handled.
2. Owning and operating such facilities as are necessary to accomplish this and to meet Manitoba's needs.
3. Ensuring that hazardous waste, as a waste management system, is established, operated and maintained in a manner that will protect the health and safety of the public and environment and will meet all legislative standards and criteria.
4. Ensuring the protection of the health and safety of the public and environment following the closing of the hazardous waste management facilities established as part of that system.

The Crown corporation is being set up now because the program is at a stage where the roles of proponent

and regulator need to be separated. Since the three-phase hazardous waste management program was announced, Madam Speaker, in November of 1982, the province has acted as both a regulator of hazardous wastes and proponent of the hazardous waste management system.

The corporation will now assume the role of proponent while the Department of Environment, Workplace Safety and Health will continue to be responsible for monitoring and regulatory control over the system.

At this point the system needs to be designed, sited, built and operated on one hand and regulated, monitored and controlled on the other hand. Now that the design and establishment of the system is imminent, the role of the proponent and the regulator should be separated as the proponent would not be perceived otherwise to objectively enforce standards against itself.

The establishment of a Crown corporation for Manitoba's hazardous wastes system was endorsed by Manitobans at the March 1983 hazardous wastes symposium which was held in Winnipeg. Later, it also received public support at the first set of clean environment hearings which were held in late 1983 and early 1984.

As well, the Crown corporation concept was also supported by the public at numerous information meetings held over the course of the last four years.

To put the Manitoba situation in perspective, Madam Speaker, hopefully Manitobans will probably never have to cope with a problem such as the Love Canal. Our hazardous waste problem is less concentrated and the harmful effects less obvious. In the short term, the problem cannot be described as an emergency. However, hazardous waste output is cumulative. Unless appropriately handled with comprehensive management the accumulation of wastes will leave for our children an environment of lesser quality and one that is less healthy than the one we inherited.

That is why, Madam Speaker, our system must be designed to meet the current and future conditions that prevail in Manitoba in a manner that will enhance industrial development at the same time without posing a threat to the environment. In this way costs and administrative complexity can be minimized and our children can be assured that Manitoba will be as green and healthy in decades to come as it is today.

Despite Manitoba's large land mass, small population and comparatively low level of industrial development, we have not escaped an industrial waste problem. From the survey that was conducted by the department during the course of the last year, we've established that at least 293 companies and organizations produced Manitoba's combined yearly output of approximately 20,000 metric tonnes of hazardous waste.

The chemical and paper products industries together account for 57 percent of this total volume, followed by metal mining and food processing industries. This industrial output does not include air emissions and wastes currently being recycled. Unfortunately, in Manitoba, the two most common ways to dispose of hazardous wastes is through the sewer system or into our landfills as has been illustrated amply in the newspapers in recent days. Sewers currently receive about half the hazardous wastes disposed in Manitoba each year while landfills receive about one-fifth.

We would all agree, I'm sure, Madam Speaker, that this is totally unacceptable as a method to dispose of hazardous wastes. Existing sewage and landfill facilities were never designed or intended to handle these wastes, and as time passes, the accumulated quantities of waste will pose a growing threat. So we must act now, or our environment will suffer in the future.

The corporation will be phased in over the next year, while its board of directors will be appointed within the next few months. The new corporation will be headed by a chief executive officer reporting to the board of directors who will be selected through open competition.

The startup costs, we estimate, of the corporation is in the order of some \$400,000, with annual operating costs depending upon the type of system to be developed. We are indeed, Madam Speaker, talking about a system to meet Manitoba's requirements.

I hope to announce the board of directors in the near future. Hopefully, it's before the final round of hearings this fall. As some of you may know in this House, Madam Speaker, the hearings had originally been scheduled for the fall of 1985. However, they were postponed as a result of requests from municipalities and other organizations for more time to prepare briefs and presentations.

My department used this time to research hazardous waste programs in other jurisdictions and further develop the legislative framework for the system. The department has also done an extensive cost analysis and a study of a mobile incineration system was also cost-shared in cooperation with the three other western provinces. All of this information will be presented to those who intend to appear in front of the commission at the final round of hearings this fall.

It is my hope, Madam Speaker, that following the release of the Clean Environment Commission's report, upon the upcoming round of public hearings, the program will enter its second phase consisting of system design and site selection. All of this can happen in an orderly fashion once this bill has been adopted by this House.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

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

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Charleswood, that debate on this bill be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 25 - THE LAW SOCIETY ACT; LOI SURLA SOCIÉTÉ DE BARREAU

HON. R. PENNER presented, by leave, Bill No. 25, An Act to amend The Law Society Act, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

HON. R. PENNER: You mean we just passed it? Oh well, that's okay. I don't think they intended to — I wouldn't want to take advantage of that . . .

Madam Speaker, the bill which I am introducing today is the combination of over two years of consultation,

principally with the Law Society, but at times with representatives of the Faculty of Law, the Manitoba Bar Association and the Winnipeg Foundation.

As members are no doubt aware, in 1972 Manitoba pioneered with legislation which in effect attached statutory obligations to the way in which interest on lawyers' trust accounts was collected and used. Interest which cannot be readily appropriated for a particular client is paid by the banks to the government where, pursuant to the Act — that is The Law Society Act — it is held in a special trust account within consolidated revenue to be divided each year between the Legal Aid and the educational programs of the Law Society of Manitoba.

In recent years, Madam Speaker, the amount received has been well over \$1 million. Although the Act itself does not state the proportions into which that money is to be divided as between the two purposes, by tradition established at the time the Premier was Attorney-General, 75 percent is being paid for the purposes of Legal Aid Manitoba and 25 percent for the educational purposes of the Law Society, and that tradition has continued through all administrations.

Madam Speaker, it's long been felt that this fund which has been increasing in value and which, in reality is derived from money which conceptionally might be said to belong to the client group, should be managed as a fund for somewhat broader purposes than those that I've enumerated and should be managed by a non-governmental arms-length agency; i.e., a Law Foundation. The concept of the Law Foundation is not new. All other provinces have such a body, although they are not all constituted in exactly the same way.

Recently momentum has been added to the movement for a foundation by two events. In recent years the amount payable to the Law Society — based on the 75-25 understanding about which I spoke a few moments ago — has somewhat, although not greatly, exceeded the budgetary requirements of the Law Society's educational programs.

To deal with this situation, representatives of the Law Society in my department came to an informal agreement to permit the Law Society to make certain grants which they still — for purposes of legal education — might be said, strictly speaking, to be marginally outside of the sphere envisaged originally by the statute. It became clear that grants of this character should have precise statutory authorization.

More importantly, representatives of the Law Society and of my department after over two years of trying, Madam Speaker, were finally able to negotiate with the banks, a new and better method of calculating the interest, so that the yield from clients' trust accounts is expected to be at least double its recent average.

In designing the foundation we felt it necessary, Madam Speaker, as a matter of good public policy, to afford some protection to the original beneficiaries of the interest on trust funds; that is, Legal Aid and the educational programs of the Law Society. The method employed for doing so — and it will be found in the wording of the Act and will still leave a substantial sum for discretionary spending within the objects of the foundation — was to lower the respective percentage takeout of the original beneficiaries to 50 percent and 18.275 percent respectively, and to build in a floor established as the highest dollar amount received by each beneficiary in the last five years.

The net result is that after making the statutorily protected grants to Legal Aid and to the Law Society, there will likely be a fund of anywhere from \$0.5 million to over \$900,000 from which to meet the expenses of the foundation, which are expected to be minimal, and to provide for the objects of the foundation. The objects of the foundation — again these are in the bill — are legal education, legal research, legal aid services, law reform and the development and maintenance of law libraries.

I should advise the House at this time, Madam Speaker, that by agreement between the society and the department a few grants have been identified to be guaranteed for a limited period of three years, just the start-up time of the foundation. These are, in part, programs presently funded by government or a government-funded agency, but which it is felt would be better funded at arms length, either whole or in part, through the foundation. These include the Public Interest Law Department, presently found within the Act and funded by Legal Aid Manitoba and the Legal Aid Clinic at the Faculty of Law, also funded in the main by Legal Aid Manitoba. These grants will be reflected in my department's Estimates when they come to be considered in committee.

Guaranteed grants in addition to these — and that is still for the period of three years only — are a sum of \$100,000 a year to the Law Reform Commission to enhance its ability to do outside research; \$50,000 a year to the Legal Research Institute at the Faculty of Law; \$25,000 a year to each of the Manitoba Bar Association and the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties for law-related activities.

I should note that these grants are only protected to the extent that there is money surplus to the statutory obligations, to the Legal Aid and the Law Society, about which I spoke a moment ago. So that I make a note here for emphasis, the Law Society, for its educational programs, Legal Aid, have the first demand on the fund as guaranteed by the statutory protection of the amount, that they have received the highest amount in the last five years. It's only when there is discretionary funding over and above that, that the grants which have been agreed to for a three-year period are to be met, or if not met, fully met on a pro-rated basis.

The penultimate comment I wish to make concerns the board of directors, has presently proposed the affairs of the foundation are to be managed by a board of ten directors, five of whom are to be appointed by the A.G., three by the Law Society; and one each by the Manitoba Branch of the Canadian Bar Association and the Faculty of Law. Some of the Attorney-General's appointees, Madam Speaker, will be non-lawyers.

Finally I would like to pay tribute to those in the Law Society and in my department, who have worked so long and so hard to create this foundation. I am proud to have been associated with this development. It is, in my view, a very significant and positive development for a justice system in Manitoba, and I commend this bill to the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a question to the Attorney-General for clarification. I

appreciate that the Minister has consulted the four bodies: the Law Societies, the Faculty of Law, the Manitoba Bar Association and the Winnipeg Foundation; and not knowing the procedure in how the bill arrived in the Chamber, often what is crafted may not necessarily reflect what the consensus of the bodies to the consultative process is, and I would ask that if the Minister hasn't, will he at least refer the copies of the acts to each of these organizations so that they may appear, if they wish, at the time it goes to committee stage?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I thank the member. I've, in fact, already anticipated him and sent a copy of the draft bill, which is the same as the bill circulated, to the Law Society. The Law Society has indicated several concerns which we have discussed with the Law Society. There may be two or three amendments arising from that, that will be brought forward at committee stage, so we're ad idem at this stage.

MADAM SPEAKER: How do you spell that?

HON. R. PENNER: We are together.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that debate on this bill be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Debate on Second Reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Co-op Development, Bill No. 3, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 4, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Stand.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL 9 — THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT; LOI MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LES ÉCOLES PUBLIQUES

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education, Bill No. 9 — the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have just a few comments on this particular bill. Having had a chance to peruse the bill and speak to various people

and organizations who were directly affected by the proposed amendments, I share the comments made by the Minister of Education that, by and large, they are housekeeping matters.

The one area that gave me some concern was Section 194, in the removal of certain specific designated formula for granting monies to school divisions, but after reviewing the process and seeing what is recommended, I agree with the Minister and those who I've consulted, that it is a method whereby they're attempting to streamline the system.

So those are my only comments on the bill but one of my colleagues, I think, has some comments to make.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. L. DERKACH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move, seconded by the Member for Charleswood, that debate on this bill be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 11.

MR. C. BIRT: Stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways, Bill No. 17.

MR. C. BIRT: Stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 18.

MR. C. BIRT: Stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 22, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture, and the Honourable Member for Kildonan in the Chair for the Department of Community Services and Corrections.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY — COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin: Committee will come to order. Page 33, Resolution 32, under the Department

of Community Services, 4.(a) Child and Family Services, Administration.

The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We are starting a new section and I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to make an opening statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Perhaps if I just touch the highlight areas and then leave the detail to the discussion.

As you know, the new Child and Family Service Act was passed last year and proclaimed on March 1 this year; so we've been doing a lot of training and assistance with implementing that act.

We've been further developing work with the Indian reserve agencies and involved in negotiations to extend and renew those agreements and try to resolve some of the unresolved issues with the Federal Government.

The regionalization in Winnipeg has been moving along. It's been very successful in that they're identifying many more cases, but there are some settling-in difficulties. We've put in a workload review study so that we can develop a caseload criteria, because as we're expanding the types of cases, the system is dealing with the staff ratios and therefore the appropriate funding does require a fair bit of study.

We did make a mid-year addition to their funding to assist with the rapid expansion in work load. Each agency had some extra resources to develop preventive services and I would think if we are having a problem in that area, it's that we have a community that is so hungry for preventive services that they want them all to be in place over night. But over time, those are developing very well as a real adjunct to the tools that the workers had at their disposal before.

In the city, there has also been much more involvement and effective cooperation between agencies that have been giving family support services to Native people and working with the main agencies.

The overall Wife Abuse Program has been developing. In '85, we put in a provincial responsibility centre that would manage this program and we have now 21 community-based organizations: 4 crisis shelters, 4 batterers treatment programs and 14 community based wife abuse programs across the province. Again, some specific developments in that field that we can refer to when we come to it.

We put in, in 1985 — I referred to this in the earlier Estimates sessions — a special services group in the Child and Family area. Their responsibility has been to develop policies and programming for children with any particular type of disability. During this year, the branch will focus on developing the system of community-based services for the children they've been dealing with, but also focusing on the children that will be living in the community as a result of the Welcome Home initiative.

In the day care area, the training of 475 child care workers under the Jobs Fund, each has received up to eight weeks of training at a cost of over 1.1 million

in provincial funds to help bring the workers up to the standards required in The Community Child Day Care Standards Act. Again, they've been able to get this training without loss of pay or their position at their day care.

There is currently going ahead in 1986 and 1987 for completion by 1988 a cooperative program with Canada Employment and Immigration Centre to give training in day care management to over 100 directors. There were some amendments to the act governing the day care area, again to give greater strength and clarity.

There has been a system in assessing the levels of child care workers, a competency-based assessment to enable people to bring their experience to bear, not just their formal training, when they are being given their level. We've made a presentation to the Parliamentary Special Committee on Child Care, giving recommendations for a national day care system and some analysis to support our various recommendations.

Education and Community Services have jointly developed a policy to permit the capital construction of day care space in new and renovated public schools.

We've been the first province to support a salary-enhancement grant for child care workers. It was at \$1,300 per worker starting January, 1986, and another \$1,000 will be added January, 1987. This is part of a longer-term plan to bring child care workers' salaries up to being on a par with people of comparable training.

We've also been carrying out a joint review with the Society for Manitobans with Disabilities to sort out community-based services to young children, and identifying what is the most appropriate procedure for placing them in day care or providing service to them, and what support services they require.

Those are the highlights, Mr. Chairman, and I think other more specific items are better dealt with as we move through the division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland. We're on 4.(a).

MR. A. BROWN: I notice that there is no increase in Salaries. Have staff agreed to work at the same salary as what they received last year?

HON. M. SMITH: No, it's just because there are some people leaving and some arriving. Some people get their increments, and others come in at a lower level. The net effect was zero.

MR. A. BROWN: How many SY's do we have in this particular item?

HON. M. SMITH: Six.

MR. A. BROWN: How much of a turnover has there been in the SY's in the last year?

HON. M. SMITH: The makeup of the six has altered slightly. Last year, we had one ADM, three program analysts, and two administrative support. This year, we'll have the ADM, but we'll have a new executive director and two program analysts instead of three and two admin support.

In terms of the specific personnel, there was an interchange where one person went to another division,

and someone from another division came in to replace them. The new executive director is under competition at the present time.

MR. A. BROWN: When that person came in from another division, is he still being paid by that other division?

HON. M. SMITH: The adjustment is made year by year. There was an adjustment to last year's printed vote mid-year, reflecting salary differential of transferred staff. But there are rules governing how the salaries are charged. It depends what time in the year the transfer occurs, whether there's a formal transfer or whether they just draw their salary from the other division for the remainder of the year and get put into the new division for the subsequent year.

MR. A. BROWN: Other Expenditures, can we have a breakdown of the \$17,000.00?

HON. M. SMITH: It's basically operating and travel. It breaks down: 3,000, transportation; 5,500, telephone; 3,500 office supplies; 2,000, office equipment; hotel, 1,500; and meals, 1,500.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The Minister yesterday indicated that she would have the bulletin for the executive director here today. I wonder . . .

HON. M. SMITH: Are you referring to the regional directors in the health . . .

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Probably I am, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will be made available.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(1)—pass; 4.(a)(2) — the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: You were mentioning the new executive director. Is this the same person we were talking about, or is this . . .

HON. M. SMITH: No, yesterday we were talking about the regional directors who will be responsible for the delivery of service in Winnipeg in three regions. They would deliver the range of services on the Health side, public health nursing, home care and so on; on the Community Services side, the mental retardation vocational rehab.

Over here now, on the Child and Family Services, what we're looking at is the central program management for child and family service programs, the day care, the child and family service agencies, family support programs.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Did the Minister indicate that the new executive director, that this is a new position, or is this a position that is just being refilled?

HON. M. SMITH: Because of the size and complexity of this division, we decided to reduce the number of program analysts that we had last year. We had three. We've reduced that to two and designated one of those positions to be an executive director to support the Assistant Deputy Minister.

It's a new position but it's achieved by reallocation of another staff in the same group.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What exactly will the new executive director be doing?

HON. M. SMITH: The administration of this division, as you can see by the sub-titles, it's a large division and a complex division, so the executive director will be like an administrative support person to the Assistant Deputy Minister. They will help with some of the management tasks that are involved in a fairly big division.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What are they asking for for qualifications for this person?

HON. M. SMITH: We can make that bulletin available to you. I don't have it on hand at the moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I perhaps missed this, Madam Minister, and I'm sorry; I had another meeting. This executive director is an additional person to what was here formerly under this administration?

HON. M. SMITH: I have answered that question but I will repeat the answer for the member.

We have six staff in this group, the same as last year, but instead of three program analysts, we now have two program analysts and an executive director. The executive director will be responsible, under the ADM, for the child and family support, day care, and special children's services.

The family dispute area, which includes the wife abuse and family conciliation service will report directly to the Assistant Deputy Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(2)—pass; 4.(b) — the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Just a second. I wonder, would we be able to have a chart of the Child and Family Services for the Winnipeg area only — we know what the rural area is like — with the names of the directors on there and their complement of staff.

HON. M. SMITH: We did hand out an organizational chart and my Deputy is prepared to add names to the chart for the member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(2)—pass.

4.(b) Child and Family Support — the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you. Could we have the SY's in this \$1,730,000.00?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, there has been an increase in this area from 50 staff to 55. Again the comparison: 1 director, 2 deputy directors, the agency support group has grown from 8 to 10; the resource team gone from 4 to 3; the administrative support group from 15 to 17; agency secondments who are field workers remain at 14; program analysts 1; and term time from 5 to 7.

The five new staff years have been assigned to the directorate. One to provide audit capability for permanency planning. This is to ensure that we tighten up both the type of planning and the time frame within which it's done in the total Child and Family Service; and to provide post-adoption counselling relative to the provisions of The Child and Family Services Act; to develop and implement program review and internal audit procedures, relative to the regionalized service system; and to provide administrative support for review and audit activities associated with the proclamation of The Child and Family Services Act. So they're the additional people required to implement and monitor the act effectively.

MR. A. BROWN: I will be asking — and I'm giving advance notice — I will be asking for a breakdown of Item (b)(3) and a breakdown of Item (b)(4). I would appreciate it if we could have those in writing by the time that we arrive at those particular areas, so that we could take a look at them and see just exactly where the major portion of the money in this particular item was going.

Has there been a considerable turnover of staff in this area in the last year?

HON. M. SMITH: One professional staff.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I note in the salaries, they've gone from 50 to 55. I thought that that was contrary to the philosophy of in fact getting rid of the central bureaucracy and moving out into the external agencies, where each one would, in essence, be somewhat self-running.

HON. M. SMITH: The principle behind what we're doing in Child and Family Service is to legislate centrally and fund centrally and decentralize the service delivery — but there is an additional function for the centre — to ensure accountability, there is a monitoring function. That means there has to be some capacity to get data back from agencies and to monitor that the standards are in fact being carried out.

It makes eminent sense, since we are trying to decentralize a lot of service and bring them closer to the community, to ensure that we have that central monitoring capacity, otherwise we may have a system that flies off in all directions and isn't fully accountable. Again, often it gets described as the "decentralization thrust," and what we forget is what we're trying to do is centralize appropriately and decentralize appropriately, but the system is large and complex and without that central monitoring function, we don't feel that we can be accountable.

In that total, it appears somewhat inflated in that 15 positions — and this would show up both last year and this year — 15 of those positions are in fact actually in the Winnipeg West Agency and the reason that they

show up in this manner is that when we decentralized, that particular region was served by direct service people under the government employment. In order to accomplish the transition, we worked out an agreement where they would appear on the list here and then be seconded to that agency. So as far as they're concerned at the working level, they are in the employ of that agency, but they haven't given up some of their accumulated employment benefits, and so on.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister explain, if this group then is responsible for developing standards for all six agencies; because in reading the Annual Reports of the six agencies, there seems to be some differentiation certainly in the standards which they have set for themselves, which makes me question if there isn't some discrepancy in the level of standard. I realize that some of the standards have to be different, because of the type of people they're serving, but is there an overall body that is in fact ensuring that there is at least a minimal level of service available everywhere?

HON. M. SMITH: There are, in fact, 18 agencies throughout the province. The standards, again as you say, are minimum standards, and the agencies themselves have some flexibility over and above those minimum standards to design the service delivery appropriate to the particular need and desires of the community. But I guess we have a combination of central standards and add-on standards that are flexible at the local level.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: In this group of salaried personnel, is there still somebody who is designated as the Director of Child Welfare?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Is that person still considered a temporary employee?

HON. M. SMITH: The person filling that role is an acting director. His name is Mr. Ernie Hasiuk, and he is sitting here to my left.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Not to embarrass the gentleman sitting to your left, is there any indication when he may become a permanent director?

HON. M. SMITH: Our usual procedure, we have completed the board for the executive director and, when we appoint someone in an acting position, we still do advertise and go through the procedure. Often, the incumbent is confirmed, but not always. If there is a person with better qualifications comes forward, there can be a change. But we're now proceeding to board that appointment, that position.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: In that salaried allotment, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell us if the past Child Welfare Director is still receiving salaried monies?

HON. M. SMITH: The former incumbent is on secondment to the university, and that agreement will

expire August 15. We expect the individual to return to government, and we're negotiating in what position.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, are we still on 4.(b)(1) Salaries?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well we'll deal with 4.(b) generically.

MR. J. McCRAE: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I see an increase from last year of approximately \$300,000.00. The Minister tells us that there are five new staff years included in these figures. Let's take last year's figure, which would be for 50 staff years, I take it. What was the increase in Salaries exclusive of the five new staff members?

HON. M. SMITH: Maybe if I give you the components of the increase, that would be the easiest. There's 70,000 added for two staff years approved for the Family Violence enhancement. We enhanced that service in mid-year, in 1985-86. Now they're regular staff years, and the 70,000 is in.

There was a 47,200 general salary increase, and then 181,100 for the five new staff years. They basically are there to ensure that the new elements in the act are carried out. They're basically the audit of permanency planning done in the 18 agencies, and post-adoption work, which will now be required as a result of changes in the legislation.

MR. J. McCRAE: Then further down, Mr. Chairman, Maintenance of Children and External Agencies, (3) and (4), can the Minister explain just how those monies are spent in a general way?

HON. M. SMITH: In the Maintenance of Children area, services are provided by 22 child-caring agencies comprised of five regional offices, four Children's Aid Societies, five Child and Family Service agencies, five Native Child and Family Service agencies, the Ma Mawi-Wi-Chi-Itata Centre, which is a Native family service group but it doesn't deliver mandated services, the Churchill Health Centre and the Sagkeeng Child and Family Services. In addition, we have 40 group homes and five child care institutions.

The breakdown within the amount, there is foster and special rate care, which has gone from 7,849,500 to 8,585,400; other child maintenance, from 762,700 to 854,500. Residential care has gone from 13,767,300 to 13,066,400. Family Support Services have gone from 3,551,900 up to 4,534,200, and Big Brother and Big Sister organization support from 155,100 to 159,700, totalling from last year 26,086,500, this year, 27,200,200.00.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, earlier in the Session, there was a lot of talk in the Legislature about child abuse, child abuse prevention, and how to handle child abuse cases, and whether we were doing it right with the decentralized methods and whether a more centralized method would be right.

During the course of that, the Children's Aid Society of Western Manitoba was having their annual meeting. It came out at that meeting that the situation in Western Manitoba was as bad in terms of a number of certainly sexual assault cases involving children as anywhere else in the province or worse. So the Minister then, when she announced a review of child abuse methods, she told us a day or two after the first question was raised that the study would only include the Greater Winnipeg area. We have, in the western area, just as serious or more serious a problem. Of course, the question was then, well why isn't all of Manitoba included in the study.

Then we find out from information given to us by the Minister's department that the Children's Aid Society of Western Manitoba is looking at a decrease, it appears from this sheet anyway to be a decrease in funding from last year by a small amount, nonetheless a decrease. Perhaps it would be better for me just to leave it open for the Minister to explain why that would be. Really, I just leave it to her to explain, and maybe I could have some questions afterwards.

HON. M. SMITH: The first question I'd like to address is what sheet are you looking at where you're seeing a decrease?

MR. J. McCRAE: The Department of Community Services Payments to External Agencies, 1986-87 Estimates, No. 7: up at the top, under Administrative Grants on the first page.

Perhaps funding, Mr. Chairman, comes from other sources, but if Community Services is the major source of funding, then this sheet seems to indicate that the Children's Aid Society of Western Manitoba, I believe, is the only one looking at a cut in the grant while other Children's Aid Societies and agencies appear to be getting increases. Perhaps the Minister can fill me in on something I don't know about.

HON. M. SMITH: We'll get the detail. It's a reduction of 35,000 over a base of 1.8 million. We think it is a non-recurring cost that was included for that particular agency last year and not this year, but we will get that explanation for you and make it available a bit later.

MR. J. McCRAE: Okay, thank you. Getting back to the problem I raised — I think I raised it in the House with the Minister. Yes, I did. Why was the review that's going on not including the rest of the province? I think this would be a good time for the Minister to expand on the answer since the rules in the Legislature seem to restrict lengthy answers. I'd like to give the Minister an opportunity to explain more fully why other parts of the province were left out of a review which was deemed to be very important, even urgent.

When we're given information from our own area in the Brandon area that the incidence of sexual assault is more prevalent on a per capita basis than in Winnipeg, it's hard to swallow for people out there as to why that part of the province or, indeed, all other parts of the province wouldn't have been included in a macro-review of the whole program province-wide.

HON. M. SMITH: Perhaps just a little background, the development of child abuse services is fairly young,

especially if we take into account the sexual abuse area. It seems to have come to the fore where there's a system response just in the last couple of years.

The development of the program has been province-wide. We've had a fairly major public education thrust. We set out interdepartmental protocols along with the Attorney-General, the Ministers of Health and Education, to govern reporting of child abuse. We have been doing training of workers in the field. As well, the health people have been doing some training of medical people and certainly the justice people have been working with the police.

The elements of the child abuse program, public education, the interdisciplinary crisis response and immediate training, then the follow-up treatment for the child, for the family, for the abuser, those are the programs that are in the stage of development now.

What we started with was a problem that people in the field, the professionals, weren't recognizing. It's only been relatively recently that even the doctors who dealt with children who'd been abused systematically started questioning and then following up. So what we've been in the process of doing is building a system and a capacity throughout the system to respond. When we go to interprovincial meetings, we find that we seem to be a step ahead of where most other provinces are but that everyone is acknowledging there's a long way to go.

I had cut out a little quote from a federal paper that had been done by the Honourable Jake Epp's department where they were saying one of the tragedies of this whole area apart from our revulsion that there's so much of it, but that now that it's sort of coming out of the closet and we're getting it reported, is that there's not general agreement as to what to do about it in terms of prevention, yes, but treatment.

So they have been looking at the federal level putting in innovative programs to test out different approaches. We've been, as I say, in some sense one step ahead in this province in the training and the supporting of programs both for the children, for the abuser and for the total family. I can give some detail about that later. So I think we felt that we were moving as quickly as we can get a sort of total system to move.

The reason for the review was the particular pile-up of particularly serious incidents here in the city. It was felt that the review was particularly important in these new agencies. An agency like the Children's Aid out west is a more stable agency and, in a sense, has been dealing with these problems in a more consistent — they've had in a sense more experience and less instability.

In the review team, we did draw one of the experts from a rural practice. Dr. Eric Sigurdson has been in Dauphin and dealing directly there.

We have indicated that as recommendations on the system issues are brought to the fore that we intend to apply them province-wide even though the focus of the study will be on the city system, the Winnipeg system.

MR. J. McCRAE: That's all for now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder if the Minister has any statistics as to how many cases of child abuse have been reported this year. I'm not necessarily interested in a breakdown region by region unless one region has had so many more than any other area. Then I should think we should possibly be discussing that region.

But I would like to know how many cases of child abuse have been reported, have been dealt with. I would also like to have a further breakdown, if we can, as to how many of these have been incest.

HON. M. SMITH: Again, if we can just give the staff time to bring out the statistics that we have. We don't collect the statistics in quite the form that the member has asked, but I can give an explanation as to — as I say, we'll pull together what statistics we have and I'll explain the system of reporting.

In the Annual Report, Section 4, Table 5 — I don't have the page number — you will find the report covering the years 1981-85, of alleged physically and sexually abused children in Manitoba. The type of abuse and the alleged abuser is listed but we don't break down the sexual abuse beyond that title, so that we don't have the data on incest. In fact, most cases occur with family members but not all.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you. I will be looking at those statistics and I'm sure that there's going to be a lot of questions that follow as a result of looking at those statistics.

We had this one special case recently where this girl was sexually assaulted and died, sexually assaulted with a broom handle. The Minister was going to have an inquiry into this particular case. There were a number of things, I think, that needed to be answered in that particular case, and one of them was that the father had reported that he suspected that there was child abuse going on and that nothing had happened, that there had been no follow-up as a result of this complaint of the father.

I wonder if the Minister has completed her inquiry into that particular case and can she report back to us as to the findings and if she has done anything, so that something like this is not going to happen again.

HON. M. SMITH: Whenever there is a serious incident such as the member is referring to, there's a regular procedure; it's a police investigation. When they have completed their report, and I understand they will complete it shortly, their procedure is to share it with the agencies. If there is a court case, then it goes that route.

I will be asking — again, they follow the usual protection of evidence, and so on, until that process is complete. The kind of report that I have asked for and would normally get, is a review as to whether the problem has arisen because there were no procedures for people to follow, or whether there was not adequate supervision, or whether there were procedures that, in fact, were called for by our department that were not being followed.

Whatever the outcome of that investigation, we will take appropriate action, but we have to determine, we have to sift through the report and determine what, in fact, occurred, whether it was the type of thing that could and should have been prevented and, if so, how?

In some cases, it's an individual worker; sometimes it's an agency; sometimes it's just an area that's so complex that no one could have anticipated the series of events.

We will look at whether the individual or the agency has been remiss or whether there is just a shortage of procedures to handle the incident.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time being 4:30, committee rise.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee please come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply has been considering the Estimates for the Department of Agriculture. We are now on Item No. 8.(a) Income Insurance Fund, Beef Stabilization Plan.

The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of answers I'd like to provide for honourable members, based on questions that were raised yesterday and I'd like to get them on the record before we go into further debate, questions dealing with the research grants to the University of Manitoba, that were raised by honourable members.

In previous years — we're going back to 1976-77, \$700,000; 1977-78, \$700,000; 1978-79, \$800,000; 1979-80, \$800,000; 1980-81, \$800,000; 1981-82, \$850,000; 1982-83, \$850,000; 1983-84, \$850,000; 1984-85, \$875,000; 1985-86, \$875,000; 1986-87, \$875,500. I'm sorry, 1984-85 to 1986-87, it's \$875,500 in each of those years. I missed out the 1984-85, for the \$500 figure.

Mr. Chairman, as we get into the Beef Commission today, the Honourable Member for Arthur, because I did not have an opportunity to answer him in the question period, raised a matter of allegation against one of the members of the Beef Commission about receiving — the allegation was that he received preference in market scheduling this month from the Beef Commission, over and above any other members.

The honourable members will recall I attempted to answer, and I answered some of the questions that were raised by the Member for Birtle-Russell and the Member for Virden, about how many animals, what backlog there was, and the like. I placed that information on record. But the salient information that I think members should be aware of, is that the commission, in terms of allowing the bookings that were occurring and the so-called delays — and this was at the beginning of June — there were some delays at the time but from our past experience no contract holder has waited longer than 15 days from the time marketing was booked until cattle were slaughtered.

At the present, though — and this was in the early part of June when I was answering honourable members, I want to repeat that answer — bookings are relatively current. Those booked Friday, June 6, as an example, in 1986, will be sold June 11, 1986. Packers do have five days after purchase to schedule a kill date so that the kill dates were well in line with the agreement between the commission and demand.

As well, it should be pointed out that consumer demand has been sluggish and packing plants are not

increasing their handle, regardless of the supplies or the price, and members know what's been happening to the price over the last number of years.

The specific allegation that the honourable member has made, I am advised that there was no, absolutely no, preference given on the allegation that the honourable member made, to Mr. Chegwin. I am advised that Mr. Chegwin had cattle booked on June 6 and sold in the third week of June, sold in order of bookings. All sorts of producers are in this situation and they are taken as they are received by the commission.

So whatever allegations have been made by the Honourable Member for Arthur are not factual, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that his colleagues will advise him in terms of that information.

Questions were raised last night, the question about grading and the percent of grading under the commission. Mr. Chairman, we don't have this year's figures for Grade A's but we do have last year's June month figures. In the total of grading record for June 1985, the total sold, total A's, were 10,579 head for a total of 93.8 percent A's of the slaughter animals sold by the commission — 93.8 percent, 10,500, June of 1985 — A1 to 4.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, honourable members will realize that the June marketings as a percentage of A's to the rest of the year were higher in A's than they were for the rest of the year because the total year, for example, in the year 1984, the average amount of A's in the entire year was 92.4 percent A's, and we're increasing the proportion of A's to the total amount marketed.

I guess I should answer this question, as well, raised by the Member for Virden about the appointment of Mr. Spencer to the Natural Products Marketing Council which does relate to the Beef Commission indirectly, Mr. Chairman.

He was appointed to the Manitoba Marketing Council on March 2, 1983, but the first meeting of council was held a month and a week later, April 11, 1983. There were no appeals heard involving Mr. Spencer's inspection activities for the commission. Most of the work for the Beef Commission was done during the months of February and March of 1983 and the last days worked were two days in the month of April, 28 and 29, in 1983.

A response to a question from the Member for Morris, the waiting lists of producers waiting to get quota: milk, there are 69 new producers, 389 existing producers; chicken, 357 new producers, 36 existing producers; turkey, 57 new producers, 24 existing producers; eggs, no waiting list is maintained because existing producers are in a cutback since 1976.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Going back to a question I asked last night about the changing of the dates from January 1 to July 1 to move them three months forward or three months back, whichever way you want to look at it, and the Minister said there had been no representation made or requests in that direction.

I would just like to tell him that I've had four different producers make that comment to me that they would prefer that the dates are three months forward or three

months back. So for his information, there are people asking in that direction.

The thing I want to have him give some comments on right now is the payment delay that occurs from the time the farmer ships his cattle under the Beef Commission until the cheque arrives or the cheque is available for deposit in the bank. In '84 and '85, experience was that about 10 or 11 days were needed from the time you shipped the animals. If you shipped them on the Monday, the cheque got to you by the following Friday, which is 11 days.

The experience this year, various comments that I've heard, is that you can ship them on the Monday, your cheque will arrive two weeks later or 15 days later and, at the very most, it'll arrive on the Saturday, 12 days later, but naturally you can't deposit it until the Monday. So there's a full two weeks of time elapsed from the time the cattle are shipped on a Monday until the cheque arrives.

I've heard comments in the past that when the cheque used to arrive at the Friday, it'll get better in the future; in fact, it's gotten worse and the producers are out that money over that period of time.

Has the commission analyzed any methods by which they can get the money to the producer faster or at least the value of the animal to the producer faster? If you take them to an auction mart, you get the money that day.

The next question that naturally flows from this, who is getting the interest on that money over that two week period? I'd like the Minister's comments on how they plan to rectify this situation of the producer's money sitting in an envelope for two weeks.

Further to that, while I'm on my feet, I would like to ask the Minister if during this two week period of time, are the cattle securely in the name of the producer or is there any potential that the producer may lose those cattle during that two week period of time?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'll answer the last question first. No, once the cattle have been sold through the commission and marketed through the commission, there is no opportunity that I am aware of unless there's some legal ability of some other lending institutions to employ some legal techniques that I'm not aware of, but I would say no, there would be no opportunity of an individual losing those cattle during the period that a sale has been made via the commission. It's been consummated, cattle were shipped and sold through the commission already. If the cattle, in fact, may have been scheduled for sale and picked up at the farmer's yard and not taken to the stockyard by a lending institution, that may be another question; but once they are in their hands and into the stockyards and are being purchased by the deal made, I know of no way that the farmers can in fact lose the cattle.

I am advised, in terms of the payments being made, that the cheques are normally issued on a Thursday and a Friday of the week following a pooling week. There's been no change in the procedure at all employed by the commission, but there's no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that this method that is being used by the commission since its inception to some producers has in fact been a bit of an annoyance.

I want to tell you that any producer who is involved in any orderly marketing system through marketing boards in other commodities is well aware that this is really the process that you undertake. Whether it's poultry or whatever it is, you do not get your payment on the date that you shipped the cattle.

I want to say, as well, that there is interest earned. We've never pretended that there isn't any interest earned on the money that is received by the commission from the packing house, and the cheques made out in that period of time, that money is used to cover part of the administrative costs of the commission, and rightly so, Mr. Chairman.

In terms of the support that the commission, through the stabilization plan, provides farmers, there is a certain amount of what one could call freedom that one does give up in exchange for the protection one gets in terms of income stability.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I guess further then on whether the farmer can lose his cattle, it was brought to my attention the other day by a farmer that he was told by his banker that if he came out there and found the animals not on the property and the money not in the bank, that the farmer was liable. He says, well, I've got a bill of lading. He says that bill of lading isn't worth anything.

Now, I wonder if they've had communication with the banks, if this the approach they're taking on these cattle while they're in limbo for two weeks?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that has anything to do with the commission. There's no doubt that financial institutions in many instances have been putting great pressure on farmers; in fact, forcing them to sell off livestock to pay off certain debts and then basically leaving the farmer with no ongoing cash flow. Get rid of your livestock, pay off your existing debts and then what are you left with? Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, on those kinds of instances, we have, and I have, specifically, been very critical of the financial institutions for employing those tactics.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Can the commission not at the time that the cattle are graded immediately issue a receipt to the producer with his grades and the verification that they're in their possession so that there is security for the farmer; that he knows that the cattle, or he can look at the grade receipts and look at the weights and the grades and determine in his own mind there wasn't a mistake made and it wasn't the wrong group of cattle assigned to his name rather than waiting two weeks and that security, in terms of a receipt to the farmer, should suffice any requirement to determine where the cattle are when the banker checks his yard?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that two days after the animals are slaughtered, a telephone call to the commission would be able to produce the grades of the farmer.

I want to tell my honourable friend I appreciate the suggestion that he is making. It is maybe one way of dealing with that kind of a concern, quite frankly, is in fact speeding up and putting into place the whole discussion that we've had on the manifest system which would provide the kind of bill of lading that the member

suggests might be a way of dealing with this question. Quite frankly, I appreciate that suggestion.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I don't like to be critical, but I know once last year in my own personal situation I phoned and asked for those grades and he says please don't ask me to find them. I've got receipts spread all over this table; I can't find them. That wasn't a very satisfactory answer for a producer.

HON. B. URUSKI: I'm sure that happens.

MR. G. FINDLAY: The other question is when do the packers pay for these cattle relative to the date they're killed?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the normal procedure is that the payment is made approximately 48 hours after slaughter. They grade the cattle normally within the 24 hours after slaughter and the payment is made within the next 24 hours to the Commission.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I guess my last comment in this area is that the Pool closes on a Thursday and you said earlier that the cheques are supposed to be issued on the following Thursday. With the use of computers I can't understand why it takes a whole week to do that processing. The pooling price is set by formula and things should be relatively automatic in my mind.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the kill date finishes on Thursday. The pool date doesn't close until the following Tuesday to take into account for Brandon and all the other areas so that the actual effective date which the Commission receives all its money is effectively Tuesday in terms of the receipts. So it's between Tuesday and Thursday — are the two dates — the 48 hours that the Commission has to process all those receipts and start issuing the cheques on the Thursday and Friday of that week.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Has there been any active consideration of utilizing the auction marts for handling the finished animals like you do with the yearlings and calves? In that way at least the cheques for the amount of the animal could be given to the producer at that time and then the Commission handle the paperwork after that.

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, initially there was great discussion in this area of trying to utilize the auction marts and make a portion of the payment.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, it came down to the issue as to who ultimately is responsible and where the complaints would come. We saw ourselves being embroiled on an ongoing basis and producers being totally frustrated. If there was an error made, you'd have nothing but finger-pointing between the Beef Commission and the auction mart, and the auction mart and the Beef Commission blaming one another if something was lost if there was an intermediate payment and that whole system handled. I'm talking about percentage of the payment made at the time of sale.

Mr. Chairman, that was an issue for yearlings and calves that I'm speaking of in terms of slaughter. We

have been slaughtering on the rail grade. Once you start going through separate facilities for slaughter animals you end up having to say, all right, who's going to pay all those additional costs of yardage fees and the like, in terms of handling of those animals once or twice over.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I certainly don't consider it a detriment that the opportunities made available to the auction marts to earn money on these cattle as they're handled through the process because that's jobs in rural Manitoba — that's where our farm population is — as opposed to shifting those jobs into Winnipeg which is what has really happened in that process.

We have got to have money out in rural Manitoba to keep things running.

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, \$50 million worth went rurally — remember that.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I want to get some clarification on the amount of money that's been put into the Stabilization Fund by the Province of Manitoba.

I have, in front of me, the '84-'85 Beef Commission Annual Report and I can decipher from it that by the end of March 1984, \$10 million had been transferred to the Stabilization Fund; in '85 it appears \$16 million was transferred; in '86 I don't know what the figure was; in '87 in the Budget we got \$16.6 million transferred into — is it a trust fund or what is it? — I'm trying to decipher how much total monies have been transferred into the Stabilization Fund.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the member's question correctly — what the deficit of the fund is currently? Is that his question?

MR. G. FINDLAY: Like I said, \$10 million was transferred in '84; \$16 million in '85; and it appears \$16.6 million was requested for '86. Now I'm looking for the figure between March '85 and '86 — how much was transferred to the fund?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'll try and provide the information to the honourable member in this way.

Total monies that would be provided to producers can be calculated in this way: \$13.4 million in productivity enhancement grants at the beginning of the program; \$26.5 million collected in producer premiums; \$8.1 million in provincial premiums; \$29.3 million provided by provincial loan to the fund; for a total of \$77.3 million of total payments to producers.

In terms of net money, \$50.8 million dollars as net new money to producers since the beginning of the fund until May 31, 1986.

MR. G. FINDLAY: What's the deficit that the plan is at at the moment?

HON. B. URUSKI: \$29 million, Mr. Chairman.

MR. G. FINDLAY: How much of that deficit is in the written-off category?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there would be a small amount in terms of producer bankruptcies that would be in a written-off position.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Okay. I have in front of me the Report of the Provincial Auditor and maybe I can't read the report right, but on page 13 it says "balance of the allowance for losses of government agencies" and under "Manitoba Beef Stabilization Fund, March 31, 1985" it's got \$15.8 million.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm assuming from what the member has read, that would be the deficit at the time of the audit.

MR. G. FINDLAY: But it's classed as a loss by the Provincial Auditor. To me, that's written off and not collectable any longer, is that right?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, if the member looks on page 11 of the Balance Sheet as at March 31, 1985, Fund Account Balances, it shows \$15,752,712 as the Stabilization Fund Account (Deficit) Exhibit C. That's what it's shown as the deficit of the day, if he looks on page 11 of the Manitoba Beef Commission Balance Sheet.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Is it a deficit or is it a loss as the Auditor indicates. It's the same figure.

HON. B. URUSKI: If you want my opinion, I consider that is a deficit to the fund. As the member knows, the program was designed to provide long-term stability. That money is not a loss. There will be a portion of the funds forgiven as producers stay longer in the program.

The program has a minimum amount of eight years but the program is actually ongoing. There is no curtailment date in terms of the contract that we have signed with producers. The program is ongoing. A producer can opt out at eight years but the Stabilization Program will continue so the producer will be able to make a choice at the eight-year period whether he wants to continue on or whether he wants out. That will be a voluntary choice of every producer in the program, as of that time.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Okay then, as I understand the contract then, at the end of the eight years, the producer who decides to opt out can actually opt out with total forgiveness of his deficit, having been forgiven at 12.5 percent per year.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that is correct. If in fact the producer makes the decision at that point in time, if there is a deficit in the account, it would be forgiven; and if there's a surplus in the account, there can in fact be a withdrawal.

MR. G. FINDLAY: You say that with a smile.

HON. B. URUSKI: You never know.

MR. G. FINDLAY: We've heard many predictions of a great market ahead.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, for my honourable friend's information, there are 83 producers who have a surplus in their account at the present time.

MR. G. FINDLAY: They're not selling finished animals though.

On a more serious note, has the Minister of Finance or has Cabinet or has the Minister of Agriculture directed the Beef Commission to make that plan much more actuarially sound commencing July 1, 1986?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there are ongoing discussions and work being done by the Manitoba Beef Commission to work toward a more actuarially sound program. The commission likely will be making its position known to producers and asking producers of their opinion as to what might be the best approach in terms of at least starting to deal with the deficit should market conditions not change over the next several months.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Does that mean that the premium's going up on July 1 and the benefits going down?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that there will in fact, at this point in time — in fact, I can indicate that there will not be a premium change on July 1. That I can indicate.

However, there's no doubt that calculations are being made on the formula and there will be changes made as a result of the formula. In fact, I might indicate to my honourable friend — I will provide a copy for my honourable friend in terms of how the costs, based on those 12 items, how they reflect in the breakdown of costs of raising a calf yearling, a slaughter animal and how the department calculates those costs, and how they're related to the size of the animal, dealing with the cost of production formula.

I'd like to have the Page take this over to the Member for Virden, please.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I thank the Minister for that. I guess that's the information we requested yesterday.

I guess another area that's some degree of concern, we certainly like to raise all the beef we can in Manitoba with a market for it in Manitoba. Has there been any significant change in the proportion of cattle sold through the retail markets in Manitoba that has been raised in Manitoba? In other words, what I'm asking, has there been any noticeable shift in retailers' purchases of carcasses, in terms of purchasing them outside the Province of Manitoba?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, if there are other questions, please raise them. We'll try and endeavour to see whether we've got the information here and provide it for my honourable friend.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Could I flip over to the Annual Report 1984-85 to the notes on Page 15 and look at the accounts receivable? The accounts receivable totals \$302,000, less allowance for doubtful accounts. There's a fair bit of money appears to be lost there. Is there some explanation — well, just definition of what each line involves there, and there are four lines before you get to the total and then less the allowance. Is there explanation for those lines?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate that the question the honourable member raised earlier

about how the next stage, in terms of the slaughtering process, we would have no information as to how much of the beef that has been slaughtered in Manitoba, in fact, ends up through the retail chains in the province.

We probably might be able to get some of that information, but the Beef Commission itself would not carry that information. We would have to go to the packing houses. We know the marketings, yes, but we don't know the amount of Manitoba slaughtered beef in terms of what is being consumed and sold.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the first three lines would in fact be self-explanatory. We will have to check the question of premiums. It sounds to me — and we will check that matter out for my honourable friend — that may be in fact knowledge after sales have been made we found out that actual sales had been made and not reported to the commission and there would be premiums owing.

The other expenses would be ear tags and overpayments that may have been made to producers in terms of calculations or miscalculations or some mixups that may have occurred and then they're finally corrected. That would be the amount of money there; and then you've got productivity enhancement grants where people may have ceased their operations and sold their herd and did not earn the productivity enhancement grant. That would be a debt owing to the corporation, as well as stabilization payments recoverable on animals where someone may have in fact ceased operation, and these funds would have been previously paid out, they are to be recovered by the corporation.

MR. G. FINDLAY: What about explaining the less allowance for doubtful accounts, \$123,915.00?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, those in fact would be writeoffs, where someone has maybe gone bankrupt, where in fact seizures have occurred and a whole host of circumstances which the corporation likely will not be able to collect that money. It's no sense keeping that on the books as a debt owing if you know that the farm may not be in existence or the producer may have passed on or whatever the circumstances. Each case is judged on its own merits and then it's put into an appropriate account.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I've had at least two occasions brought to my attention, not that far from where I live, where the situation was wrapped up. They declared bankruptcy or gone into receivership and everything got wrapped up and all of a sudden along came somebody knocked on the door, saying, hey, you owe the Beef Commission \$8,000 or something; and they, I guess, thought maybe that wouldn't happen. You're knocking on some doors; you're obviously not knocking on all doors if that amount is sitting there as a loss.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that's probably the difficulty that the commission has at times, because at times we find out after the fact and, quite frankly, the commission has taken the position that a debt is a debt and the stabilization payment has been made. If there is any way of recovering it, all attempts should be made to recover it, whether it be on the productivity

enhancement portion of it that's unearned or the stabilization payments that would be owed back to the commission if the producer ceased operations or ceased raising animals.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I guess one last question, going back to what I'd asked earlier. I'm still not clear in my mind how much money has been transferred to the Stabilization Fund by the Minister of Finance. It seems to me, it's at least \$42 million or more.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in terms of net money that is in the fund on which producers pay no interest at the present time as of the end of May, I gave it to the honourable friend, there's a deficit of \$29 million. That money would have been transferred by the Minister of Finance into the fund, because those monies would, in fact, be paid out.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Okay then, maybe our figures are getting close. Would that not include the \$16.6 million that was requested in The Loan Act that went through the House here last month?

HON. B. URUSKI: There's 6.6 in The Loan Act that went through the House.

MR. G. FINDLAY: 16.6.

HON. B. URUSKI: I know, 6.6 would be part of that \$29 million and \$10 million would be new money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

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

I want to just ask a few questions and make a few comments dealing with the Beef Commission. I have one other area that I can wait till the Minister's Salary to go on, because I was not here at another opportunity and I would ask that the Minister would probably accept one at that time, I guess.

HON. B. URUSKI: Put it now and if we've got the staff here, we might be able to answer it.

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, the basic question is dealing with the other area in the Natural Products Market Council. The question directed to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is how much dairy quota or cream quota is allocated outside the Province of Manitoba to producers in Saskatchewan who haul their cream to Manitoba? How much Manitoba quota is allocated to Saskatchewan producers?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we'll have to get that information. I would not know that and neither would our council, I think directly. We'd have to go right to the Milk Board to get that information.

MR. J. DOWNEY: A further question is, Mr. Chairman, is there a reciprocating agreement with Saskatchewan? Do Manitoba producers of cream have quota that Saskatchewan have allocated to them?

I found in the last few months producers coming forward saying that they are able to ship cream because

they got quota from producers in Saskatchewan. Now, I am not certainly opposed to getting along with my friends and neighbours in Saskatchewan, but I have some constituents who are somewhat upset when they are being deprived of cream quota particularly and not able to attain an amount which is satisfactory to them.

Now, we talk about all kinds of restrictions and incomes, this seems to be, as long as there is a fair reciprocating agreement, then that's fine. If there isn't, then I'm going to have to apprise some pressure to the Minister to deal with it and make sure that the Manitoba citizens are treated fairly and equitably, Mr. Chairman.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that when the original plan was set up, those producers of record who would have resided in Saskatchewan, who were shipping to Manitoba creameries, in fact became part of the Manitoba global quota and they continued on as if they were Manitoba producers when the Manitoba global quota was established. So they would have been producers of record.

The same circumstance would have occurred had there been any producers living in Manitoba who were, in fact, shipping to Saskatchewan creameries. The same reciprocal agreement as part of the national agreement would have occurred. I would have to check as to how many to find out how many, but that certainly was part of the initial agreement when the board was established.

Those producers that we speak of living in Saskatchewan actually for record purposes because of shipments became Manitoba producers.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'll revert to the Beef Commission area. My colleague from Virden was far too kind — far too kind — on the Minister of Agriculture and the Beef Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I have fully disclosed to the public, to this House, and it's not an unknown fact that I am the owner of a livestock marketing facility. I'm not speaking and if anybody wants to accuse me of having a conflict of interest, I'm really speaking on behalf of the industry. I am not so concerned about my own personal well being. I get the great income of an MLA and certainly involved as the legislative, but I do think it's in the public interests that I do discuss in some detail some of the things that I see as a difficulty and a problem for the cattle producers, for the taxpayers, and for the industry in total.

Mr. Chairman, we were told that it was the great answer to the saviour of the beef industry in Manitoba. We would have tremendous numbers of cattle being fed and slaughtered in the province. We see a continuing drop, Mr. Chairman, in our cow numbers and our livestock numbers. We see a continuing number of people going out of the livestock business, Mr. Chairman.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, it hasn't reached the objectives, the grand and glorious objectives that were set out. Yes, it has given stability, Mr. Chairman, and I commend the Minister for putting the money that he's put into it. But there is a great big question mark and that's to the operation of the whole program. I think the Minister would be well advised to take a very careful look at it.

Mr. Chairman, for example, we find ourselves in a position this last month where producers who are sitting with livestock ready to go to slaughter, ready to go to market phoning in and saying, I'm sorry, the commission can't handle the beef, the industry can't handle them, the Beef Commission can't market them until after the 1st of July. Well, why can't they market them before the 1st of July? Are the packers shut down? Have they got such great volumes that they can't handle it? It's not the case, Mr. Chairman.

What is really happening is the packers said there's a tremendous pressure of beef cattle coming to the marketplace. We will sit back. We will let the taxpayers pick up the difference and we won't have to worry about it. Mr. Chairman, it's not orderly marketing that we have. It's marketing chaos that has been developed and created under the Beef Marketing Commission — marketing chaos — and I'm going to substantiate the case that I'm talking about.

Mr. Chairman, when an animal is ready to go to slaughter, it should go. People have phoned in and the commission says no, we can't handle your livestock this week, you'll have to wait. We are on the list and you'll market after the 1st of July. I would like the Minister to stand in his place and say that it has been cleared up.

I'll tell you what has happened. The live price bid on a lot of cattle, worked back from the dressed weight from the Beef Commission, they were bidding a week ago about \$1.14 to \$1.15 live weight; 65 cents for slaughter steers. The live market, Brandon Auction Mart, Winnipeg Livestock Yards was in the neighbourhood of 72 cents. In fact, today the market jumped \$4 cwt.

Mr. Chairman, the difference between 65 cents that the Beef Commission were paying and what the open market was paying last week was probably in the neighbourhood of 7 cents a pound. On a 1,000 or 1,100 pound steer, that's \$100, \$70; 7 cents a pound, \$70, \$77, in that range, \$70-80 of which the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba were having to pick up; of which, as the Minister says, the producers are going to have to pay back over the next four years.

I challenge him, and again I'm not near as kind as the Member for Virden, when you've got a \$29 million deficit in the Beef Commission, who is the money owed to? It's owed to the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba. When is it going to be paid back, Mr. Chairman? We've been told that it's going to be after eight years the producer can leave or stay in whatever they like, but what's going to happen to that producer in the next four years? I ask the Minister, is he or she going to pay it back through their premiums and through the lowering of the support level?

I also want the Minister to tell us before this House closes today, because what he said in question period we want to know the answer to, he said the support level has been a determinant. He said the premium has been determined. He indicated that it would be announced or could be announced later this week. Why wouldn't an appropriate time to announce it be in the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture under the Beef Commission? We're a week away from when it has to happen.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, if the producers had have been told three weeks ago that the premiums were not going

to go up on the 1st of July, it would have taken a lot of pressure off a lot of farm people. What is wrong with providing them with information that provides them with the kind of necessary decision-making tools that they need? It is irresponsible, Mr. Chairman, to plug the beef system with Beef Commission cattle, break the market as they did — yes, Mr. Chairman, break the market as they did — and then say that it is orderly marketing. Well, it is marketing chaos that we've had in the last month and I would ask any cattle producer in the province who disagrees with me to come forward and say so. I mean you don't have to be that great a mathematician to figure out that a \$1.15-16 dressed price, Mr. Chairman, is a lot less than a 72 cent live-weight steer, but it's the taxpayers that are picking up the difference.

Why, Mr. Chairman, didn't the beef commission go to the union stockyards, as they've done other times, and offer some of these cattle to the marketplace, so they could have been shipped to other markets? Why didn't they sort the feeder cattle off from some of these cattle because they are some questionable cattle in the lots? Let them stay home on the farms to eat up this lower-price feed grain. Why slaughter cattle that should be fed longer, why slaughter them because the beef commission says there could be an increase in premium at the end of this month or a lowering of the support level. What's wrong with cooperating and giving the producers, who we're all supposed to be working for, the benefit of information?

I ask the Minister, I plead with the Minister to tell us what it is, in his philosophy, with the Beef Commission's philosophy, that would stop them from maximizing the return for the livestock that they're marketing and take some of the pressure off the taxpayers — not only the taxpayers but the beef producers in the next six months — and that's why today I challenge the Minister, before this House closes, before this committee ends, to tell the producers, to tell this committee. I want to know what the premium is going to do on the 1st of July, or when is the premium going to go up, and how much is it going to go up?

He knows the information. He knows it. Why hedge around with it? Why fudge around with it? He's got the calculations — and if he hasn't got the calculations done or the Beef Commission haven't got the calculations done, then they're acting irresponsibly. If they haven't done their homework, then they're acting irresponsibly. He's got the formula, we know he's got the formula. Glen's got the formula, the Member for Virren has got the formula; why can't the Minister come out and tell us precisely what the support level is going to be? Tell us what it's going to be.

Mr. Chairman, I'm telling you, we want to know what the support level is going to be. I want to know what the premium is going to be. I want the producers of beef cattle, who are in the Beef Commission; I want them to know what they're faced with on the 1st of July.

As well, Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister to tell the beef producers that that \$29 million that's in a deficit, is it going to be paid back over the next four years by increasing the deficit and lowering the support level? Is that how it's going to be paid back, or — let's assume and it's time we can assume — what happens if in four years we don't see the kind of increase in market

price that the Minister is projecting? Are we going to see people leave the industry that don't have any commitment back? How is he going to deal with it? Is it going to be the bureaucracy that does the calculations, that is going to say to the farmers, we'll get the money back piece-by-piece, ounce-of-flesh by ounce-of-flesh, wring it out of them. Is that what he's going to do?

Well what have you done for the industry over the first four years, if you've made a great deal about putting so much money into the beef industry only, Mr. Chairman, to drag it out of them, ounce-of-flesh by ounce-of-flesh, over the next four years. Have you done them any favour? No, you've only teased them; you've only temporarily kept them from going down into the pit of desperation and going broke. — (Interjection) — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want an answer as to how the Minister is going to deal with the deficit.

I have another question and I would hope that we can deal with it. He said to the hog industry in Manitoba, "We are going to write off the deficit at the end of July to join the federal program," and oh, during the election campaign, how great it was that they were going to sign the federal program! That was great political marks for them, but oh no — you see and this is where I have to have words with my federal friend. It was fine for them to agree to sign the hog program, because it was great political mileage, but boy they turned around and they just kicked the heck out of them when it came to signing the Tripartite Beef Stabilization Program. They wanted it both ways.

Well is it both ways as far as the beef and the hog industry is concerned? Do the hog producers get their account written off and the beef producers have no commitment from the Minister? Is that what it is? Mr. Chairman, I want to know what the Minister's policy is. I think the public have the right to know what his policy is. It's Estimate time, it's time to tell us how the monies are going to be handled.

The other question dealing with the hog program, Mr. Chairman, is that hog prices have gone up substantially in the last while and the Minister, I am sure, and all the taxpayers should be happy. Will the amount of increase to the hog industry in the prices, will that wipe out any deficit before the 1st of July, and the amount of money he said he was going to write off has now — naturally through the premiums and the return of the marketplace — has that now negated any need for the pay backs? I want to know these answers.

My goodness sakes — if the farmers that were producing beef were making as much money as the people that worked for them in the commission, they wouldn't need any beef cattle on the farm. You see that's the most successful part of any stabilization program, the support that the administrative staff have — and I don't criticize them for it. I'm not criticizing them as individuals. I'm just saying that there are individuals who work for the system who are getting well paid, but I'm not against well pay. All I want is the farmers to have the same kind of treatment, Mr. Chairman, and that's only a fair request.

I've asked a series of questions and I think that we've got to get down to basics. I want to know the true numbers of livestock numbers in the province. I want to know the success of the program. The Minister says there's \$50 million spent. I want to know the future of

the packing house industry in Manitoba. What is the future of Canada Packers because that's one of the major packers in the province. Are they going to stay in the province? Are they going to stay; are they going to maintain their operations? Has stabilization done all those things that the Minister has set out?

But there's one thing I'm quite interested in for a clarification — an explanation of clarification. I go to the report of the Manitoba Beef Commission because it's an interesting comment and I'm really wondering how they can really put this in print. On Page 5 it says a bit of background and under "Objectives," here's their No. 1 objective: "To enhance the economic viability of beef producers in Manitoba through the strengthening, expansion and unification of the total beef industry within the province." Fine, that's a great preamble. "The Commission believes that a viable beef industry includes," and (a) No. 1 is right on, "primary producers." (b) — very interesting, "the country auction system," that's the (b) objective. I am asking the Minister to tell me — maybe they don't understand what makes an auction ring work. An auction ring works and gets — (Interjection) — that's for sure, but you have to have the primary producer but what you have to have is a number of livestock to put through to sell, to take a commission on, and this commission says, no, no, we won't let any cattle go anywhere but directly to the packers through the commission. How in blazes does that support the public auction system and the auction marts throughout Manitoba? It behooves me, Mr. Chairman, to tell the people how they can come out. I want him to tell the public how they can come out with that kind of a statement as an objective? It's a fine grandiose statement.

Well our election commitment, Mr. Chairman, and I don't mind saying it — and I was challenged and I know who the caller was on CBC when I was doing a noon-time phone-in show. When we came out with a commitment as a Progressive Conservative Party to say, the producers would get the same stabilization program, but they would be allowed to market at a market of their choice. The caller phoned and they said, oh we know Mr. Downey, you've got an auction mart and a direct vested interest. Well I immediately had to come back and say, "That recommendation came from the cattle producers, from the Keystone agriculture producers, from several caucus colleagues that I have in the Legislature, from Manitoba Pool Elevators, from many other organizations." That didn't just come from the Member for Arthur, Mr. Chairman, that came from the farm community. — (Interjection) — Yes, Mr. Chairman. What is the matter with letting the beef commission compete with the other system? In fact it would have saved, Mr. Chairman, millions — and I say millions — of dollars this last month. It would have saved the taxpayers millions of dollars this last month. I challenge the Minister to stand in his place and tell me that I am wrong. I challenge him to tell me that I am wrong, that the Beef Commission, in the last month, sold cattle for \$1.15 to \$1.20, when in fact they could have got at least 10 cents a pound higher in a competitive market system to ship their cattle to the other markets.

A MEMBER: You're wrong, Jimmy.

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, I'm not wrong, Mr. Chairman. I'm absolutely correct. I see it daily, Mr. Chairman. Go to the people who are in the business. Go to the people in the business.

What he has done, he has starved the cattle buyers. He has starved the system that has traditionally worked, and he has turned it over to his so-called people who are experts. Well, I'm not challenging their expertise in marketing, but I am challenging their common-sense approach as to whether or not you can get more money at 65 cents for a dressed steer than at 72 cents. — (Interjection) — I hope that that's turned around, because in the open market today, it was 76 to 77. You're still two cents behind. You just can't catch up. — (Interjection) — Particularly when I've got the floor, Mr. Chairman, particularly when I've got the floor.

All I'm saying is I'm pleading with the Minister. I'm pleading with the Minister, Mr. Chairman.

I'm not saying throw out the Beef Commission, I'm saying use the system that's there. Maximize returns to the producer; take some of the weight off the taxpayers because he's admitting that he's put \$50 million into the system. He hasn't said how many livestock numbers he has saved and I think we're still losing them; I still think we're losing.

But a bigger question that we need the answer to is, and that is the support level as of the 1st of July, the premium levels as of the 1st of July, or when it will be increased, and how he's going to deal with the \$29 million deficit. Is he going to try and arrest it at that? Is he going to try and shrink it from that? What is his policy? Or does he say to the directors and the management of the Beef Commission, does he say to them, well, I can go to Treasury Board anytime I like; if we want more money, we can get it? Does his Minister of Finance say, Billie, here's the open purse? Is that what he's saying, Mr. Chairman? Is that what he's saying, that he can go and get all the money he needs?

No, Mr. Chairman, that isn't what's happening. Let me speculate for a minute on what's happening. He goes to the Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance and they say, gee, you know, you didn't win the farm vote with that program, Bill — Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture today — you didn't win the farm vote; you didn't win it. So what are we going to do; how are we going to treat them?

I'll tell you how he said to the Minister of Agriculture we're going to treat them. You go to the producers and get the money back because that's where we have spent it. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

At the same time, and I'm going to put an argument forward for those producers who, in fact, may be expected to pay it back. The Minister sits with a colleague who's prepared to write \$31 million off, or spend \$31 million in The Pas forestry, in the Manfor complex, and not get any of that back. So he'd better question pretty hard how hard he pushes the producers to get money back. He'd better say to those producers, those producers who may still need some support, and I'm talking about the feedlot industry, maybe he'd better develop a program for them.

You know what the Progressive Conservative Party said to the feedlot industry? You, we'll develop a program with you. We had money committed for them, Mr. Chairman. We didn't say you have to raise the calf from a suckling on your farm or go to a custom feedlot,

or go to the market with a bad animal. We said you can either market it as you like or you can be a feedlot operator and get the support, because we believe that every animal fed in the feedlot is as important to the consumers in Manitoba as anywhere else.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has a lot of cleaning up to do. We've got a philosophical difference in the marketing of livestock. He believes in a central desk. It's now a fait accompli. He's accomplished that.

I can tell you there have been certain members of his staff who have worked for years to have a marketing board brought into Manitoba, and he's finally accomplished it. He's finally accomplished it, Mr. Chairman. Well, more power to him; more power to him; more power to him. The bureaucrats have had an objective to work along with him; they have accomplished it. I don't take my hat off to them but I say they've accomplished the path that they wanted to go down. Mind you, if you're given an open purse from the taxpayers, to say to the farmer, you know, come along, we'll make sure we feed you properly until you're totally involved in the system, and then we close the gate on you. That's really what's happened. The gate has been closed. The chop's been put on the trail and the gate's been closed and they're in the corral. Now they're totally dependent upon a government system.

They're now involved in a government marketing system, of which there is very little appeal. I tell you there is very little appeal. I know that there have been many farmers who have phoned the management of the commission and if they don't like particularly what the management says, what is their appeal? Is there an appeal process? I would hope that the Minister would point out one if there is, because, as they keep getting involved in the next year, you can bet what's going to happen.

My colleague from Virden pointed it out. He says the Auditor says that it's written out as a loss, but he says it's a deficit. Well, if a deficit is owed by somebody, it's got to be paid back or else the Minister has to come forward and say it's written off, as he's done with the hog producers. I say I think that the hog producers well deserved to have that amount written off. There are a few who are upset that they didn't get involved, but they'll survive. It will hurt them but they'll survive.

It's nice to cut clean but I'll tell you, they're not going to cut very clean in the beef program. We won't be able to have a federal stabilization program in the next four years in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. There won't be, and I predict this, a federal beef stabilization program for those producers who are involved, unless the Minister does the same thing that the former Minister of Agriculture did, from Lac du Bonnet. He said if you want to cut clean from the provincial program and have no more obligations, you can go to the federal one.

If this Minister of Agriculture stood up tomorrow and said that the producers had no more obligation after the 1st of July to the provincial program and they could go to the federal one, it would be an exodus, Mr. Chairman, it would be a stampede, that you couldn't contain yourself with all your knowledge and wisdom. Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's what would happen.

You know why, Mr. Chairman? It's because the cattle producers are nervous. They're nervous as can be about

the whole operation of this Minister and this government. I stand here, Mr. Chairman, and challenge the Minister to stand in his place and tell me . . . How many minutes do I have left? How many days do I have left?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are still three resolutions until the Minister's Salary.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Are we? Oh, I've got lots of time, then. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, people like the Minister of Labour only resort to the pounding of desks when they don't have any facts. Mr. Chairman, I have all the facts so I don't need to pound my desk.

Mr. Chairman, it is a serious matter. I do ask the Minister, on behalf of those people who are certainly nervous today about what's going to happen after the 1st of July, to tell them today. Don't make us have to come back to question period tomorrow, or any other time. Tell them; come clean.

Why didn't he have a press announcement, Mr. Chairman? It's big news. It's big news to tell them what the future is going to be as far as the premiums they're paying and their support level. Tell us now, Mr. Chairman, it's the appropriate time to do so. I'm sorry that I couldn't be quite as nice as my colleague from Virden, because I think we need some answers and we need them now.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Arthur indicated that he challenged me to tell him that he's wrong. I want to tell him, Mr. Chairman, he is wrong; he's totally wrong on all aspects of his comments.

He is so far out in right field that, Mr. Chairman, you'd have to look over the fence to find him. That's how far out he is.

Mr. Chairman, the beef herd in this province is not declining. I can't be exceptionally proud to say that it's growing by leaps and bounds but, over last year, Mr. Chairman, the beef herd has grown by just about 4 percent, the cow herd. The beef cow herd has increased from 1984 to 1985 by just under 4 percent.

Mr. Chairman, the function of the commission has been to announce both positive and negative announcements. The function of the commission, I have left all announcements dealing with support levels, whether they go up or whether they go down, with premium announcements, with whatever announcements there are in the functions of the commission, have been the duty of the commission.

It is really up to them, on an ongoing basis, to make those announcements. This isn't the first year that those announcements will be made and it won't be the last. Every six months, those announcements are made.

Because the honourable member can get up here and rant and rave, Mr. Chairman, I will not answer those questions, because it is a function of the commission. I have indicated to him, likely that maybe I shouldn't have even gone that far, that the commission is reviewing the entire premium structure and it is unlikely that any change will be made on July 1 dealing with the premium structure.

It is our policy that over the long term, and it has been, to make the plan as self-sustaining as possible.

That is making the assumption, of course, that the free marketplace that the honourable members put their whole trust and faith in will in fact be the saviour of the producers. And it hasn't occurred, Mr. Chairman.

The beef program has saved the cattle industry in this province. There is just no doubt about it, Mr. Chairman. There is no doubt in my mind that if not for the beef program, you would have seen the vast reduction of the cow herd and the beef stocks in this province. There is just no question about that.

Mr. Chairman, the member from his seat says how much is it reduced? I'm telling him that 1985 over 1984, there's been an increase. There have been reductions. One has to look at the whole beef herd in perspective to other provinces; that's really what one has to do; what has happened in Alberta, what has happened in Saskatchewan, what has happened in Manitoba.

So the comments that the honourable member has made, I want to tell him that the commission is reviewing these matters. They've had meetings with producers last year dealing with the question of the deficit and have obtained producer input and producer comments as to ways of dealing with the deficit. There's no doubt that during the next weeks and months ahead that they will be addressing that question.

The question of support is automatic and will be automatic on July 1 and will be announced by the commission. The formula will not be changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(a) — the Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get the answer to a couple of questions that I wanted, one of them dealing with the Hog Commission and the other was dealing with when was the premium going to be announced. I want to know. It's not going to be done on the 1st of July; when is it going to be announced?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the last question first. The commission will of course be making those announcements as they are working with producers. I don't know when the announcement will be made specifically. There's no doubt that the commission will have to consult with producers in addition to what they have done last year because this is not a new question with respect to the deficit. There were consultations last year. When it will be done, Mr. Chairman, at this point in time, the commission will be discussing that with producers and I will not pre-empt the commission in this debate.

Mr. Chairman, the member raised questions about the hog plan. I can't win with the Honourable Member for Arthur because on the one hand he was lambasting us that we should be getting back all the money from both hog and beef producers over the last couple of years. Now he's saying, well, maybe because of the increased market prices you won't get anything back. So what's he talking about?

Mr. Chairman, the reason that we were prepared to write off the deficit in the hog plant, there are several reasons. One, that there was no up-front money given to those producers as there was in the beef program and, secondly, in terms of the program of the hog plan, as part of the agreement, whether there was a surplus or a deficit the producers would not have to repay it

and if there was a surplus in the fund they would not get it back. That was the agreement on Day One of the program, and on this basis we expect that there will be a deficit. It will not be wiped off by the market prices; it will be in the neighbourhood of what is shown.

In the stabilization program that is shown, there's \$5.5 million. There are \$3 million in that amount to cover off any writeoff. The 2.2 is required for the premium, provincial portion of the premiums to the program.

At the present time, I would say that it will be in the neighbourhood of what was projected in that \$3 million. It may be slightly more, it may be slightly less, but those calculations won't be known for a few weeks yet.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm still not satisfied that the premiums that are going to be increased, or whatever happens to them on the 1st of July, will they be retroactive? I want to know that if a livestock person, marketing takes place on the 4th or 5th of July, the premium is the same as it is in June, will the premium be charged or will there be a retroactive charge because the time he works in a six-month period from January to July, will it be retroactive? If there's an increase in premium, will it date back to the 1st of July? I want to know that. I want to know and the Minister saying that the commission should make these announcements, that's balderdash!

He's the Minister; we're in his Estimates. He's asking the taxpayers and the Opposition to approve funds that he's spending through the commission. He can tell us what it is, Mr. Chairman. Don't slough it off to people in the Beef Commission. Tell us; we're the legislators. He's the one that's asking for the money, not them. They spend it. We ask for it, we approve it or don't approve it. He's coming to the Legislature; he has to have the answers. And, darn it, don't tell us that his staff or other people have to be hung for what he should be taking the responsibility for, coward out of it. Tell us what it is, Mr. Chairman. I want to know.

HON. B. URUSKI: I can tell my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, that there are no retroactive payments. How do you begin to attempt to collect on retroactive marketings? That will not be the case of any premium change that may come about whenever it comes about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: I just have one question, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could give us the remuneration paid to the chairman of the Beef Commission and the directors, if it's per diem. Or is it salary? And what are their expenses?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the chairman person of the Beef Commission receives a per diem allowance of \$125 per day plus out-of-pocket expenses, and members are \$100 per day plus out-of-pocket expenses.

MR. D. BLAKE: Could the Minister give us an idea of how many days per year they spend at the commission?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, for example, the per diem expenditures for the chairman were \$6,187 in

1985-86 fiscal year, and for the six other directors the total per diem was \$13,700; split that off into six and that'll give you the amount per person.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(a) — the Member for Virden.

MR. B. FINDLAY: Taking the Minister's comments today and comments he made last night on the premium change on July 1, he's indicated there will be no premium change July 1. He said last night that the tradition of always making premium changes on July 1 and January 1 wasn't a fixed policy.

I am asking him: if it isn't going to be July 1, is he then saying that it may happen some time between now and January 1? Are you saying that?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the member should know that there are really two functions that the commission undertakes. The commission undertakes as a regular function on January 1 and July 1 the announcement of the support levels. At that time the commission is open to announce premium changes or it's not. Premium changes can be announced at any time in the year, but the support levels, the figures that I've given the honourable friend, those changes are made automatically on those dates and they are the function of the commission. Premium levels can change at any time during the year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(a)—pass; 8.(b)—pass.
8.(c) — the Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: In the Hog Income Stabilization Plan, it terminates at the end of June. What are the mechanisms to move into the federal plan? Is there going to be overlap or are hogs going to be covered or what's the program?

HON. B. URUSKI: Our decision, even though we're accused of being late as late entrants into the federal plan, we were not prepared to join until we had reasonable assurances that the administrative structures could in fact be in place. So when we made our announcement for the July 1 entry date, we were reasonably assured that the administrative structure was in place. Even though provinces and other provinces announced earlier that they were going in, everyone is starting on July 1 so that our sort of mentors who accused us of dragging our feet over the last number of months in this whole issue really were to no avail because the entire program across this country starts on July 1 and we made the clean cut-off. We're finished with the provincial program on June 30 and producers who have signed up are in the federal program on July 1.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Does the Province participate in any fashion in the federal plan?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, absolutely. It's a tripartite program and we share in the premium cost. There will be continued ongoing cost into the federal plan to the province. That will be a continued contribution that we will be making.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Those anticipated contributions are in the figures that are in front of us here?

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(b)—pass; 8.(c) — the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Would the Minister explain what the \$812,000 is for?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the \$812,000 represents the final payment that will be going to sugar beet growers in this fiscal year, as part of our agreement with the Federal Government.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: What is the contribution on the '86 crop?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should be aware that the Federal Government has not made its March payment yet. They made their December payment shortly after we did. They still have not made their March payment to producers and this would be our portion of the final payment — the honourable member's question was?

MR. H. PANKRATZ: So the \$812,000 is a balance on the '85 crop — is that right?

HON. B. URUSKI: That is correct.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Is there any contribution to the '86 crop from the Province of Manitoba?

HON. B. URUSKI: No, Mr. Chairman, there is none intended and none asked.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Is the Minister negotiating for the 1987 production any contribution in regard to the tripartite structure which the Federal Government is trying to negotiate with the province at the present?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intent to negotiate any support beyond the 1985 crop year as we have a written assurance from the Federal Minister representing the Federal Government that there will be no further contributions necessary from the Province of Manitoba beyond the 1985 crop year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(c)—pass.
More questions from the Member for La Verendrye?

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I don't accept it when you constantly say "pass". You've got to give me an opportunity, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's why I'm asking the member — more questions?
The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Mr. Minister, I take exception to this, that you are stating that you are refusing to participate in any negotiations in regard to the tripartite structure. You have it in the hog industry today; it's available to you in the beef industry; you have protection in the turkey, in the broiler, the eggs, the milk.

Mr. Minister, I would wish that you would indicate to this House that you would be willing to negotiate.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think I should put some information on the record for my honourable friend so that he could share it with producers and the Member for Rhineland who certainly would be interested.

Mr. Chairman, historically, on April 29, 1985 the Honourable Charles Mayer met with the Premier, the Minister of Finance, the Honourable Vic Schroeder and myself. At the close of the meeting Mr. Mayer indicated discussions on a national sugar sweetener could begin almost immediately at the officials level.

On July 3, 1985 I wrote to Mr. Les Forester, Secretary-Treasurer of the Manitoba Sugar Beet Producers Association. The following paragraph from that letter indicates what had transpired following the April 29th meeting and I quote: "To date there has not been any action by the Federal Government to which we are aware on developing the required long-term policy for sugar. My staff have contacted federal officials a number of times about the need to get on with the job and we are assured we will be involved. However, we are still waiting for some action."

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Charles Mayer forwarded a letter dated July 5, 1985, received in my office on July 9th, inviting us to a meeting on July 24, 1985 in Ottawa. The timing of this meeting, Mr. Chairman, was a surprise to us as a national sugar sweetener policy was on the agenda of the federal-provincial meeting of Agriculture Ministers scheduled for July 22-25 in St. John's, Newfoundland.

Alberta, Mr. Chairman, was preparing a paper on the topic and it was expected that Mr. Mayer would be present to participate in the discussion. We had the issue on the agenda of the National Agriculture Ministers' Meeting in St. John's and yet we have another federal minister calling a different meeting for the same time as we had a paper from the Province of Alberta to be discussed at our Federal-Provincial meeting.

Several telephone calls were made in an attempt to change the meeting date as staff assigned responsibility for sugar beet stabilization would be in St. John's. These requests were not accommodated, Mr. Chairman. The papers presented at the meeting were received from Mr. Mayer on August 26. On September 19 I responded to Mr. Mayer and outlined the Manitoba Government's position as follows: "The position of the Manitoba Government was clearly expressed to you last spring. It is essential that a long-term commitment is made by the Federal Government to a policy that will ensure the continuation of the sugar beet industry. There are a number of options for funding the necessary support to the sugar beet industry. Since the Manitoba Government will not participate financially in industry support as agreed in your telex of May 2, 1985, we feel it is the Federal Government's prerogative to choose the appropriate funding mechanism."

There was no response to this letter and thus it was a shock to receive the March 12, 1986 announcement of the domestic sugar beet policy which stated the following: "Central to the policy is a cost-shared stabilization program for sugar beets. For the 1986 crop year, the Federal Government will negotiate and

share the costs of stabilization program with sugar beet growers. For the following years, the program will be negotiated with growers and the provincial governments of Alberta, Manitoba and Quebec."

Mr. Chairman, officials attended a meeting in Winnipeg on March 20 at which Agriculture Canada officials outlined the proposed stabilization plan for Canadian sugar beet producers. This meeting confirmed that the Federal Government had reneged on its commitment given to Manitoba by Mr. Mayer and that Manitoba would not be required to financially support the sugar beet stabilization beyond the 1985 crop, as he indicated in the telex to us.

While the Federal Government had paid 100 percent of the cost of sugar beet stabilization in the past, it was now proposing to unload two-thirds of the cost on the provinces and producers.

A meeting was called for Calgary on April 1 to work out the details required to implement this plan. How could officials participate in a meeting to implement a plan that was contrary to government policy? Surely the first step before any public announcement was made would have been for the Federal Government to discuss with the province at the ministerial level their decision to back out of their commitment.

But things aren't done that way in Ottawa these days, Mr. Chairman. We have a new approach. Ottawa announces that it's dropping or cutting a program and if the provinces want it, they should pick it up.

Mr. Chairman, the intent seems to be to make the provinces the scapegoat for any negative reaction to the cuts.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, on April 21, I met with Mr. Mayer in Winnipeg. All he could say in defence of the proposed sugar beet stabilization plan is that is the best he could do in the circumstances. Mr. Mayer did not explain why the Federal Government reneged on the commitment he had given nor did he explain why Manitoba was now in a position to bail out the Federal Government on sugar beet stabilization.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, because of the importance of the sugar beet production in Manitoba, we are planning to have officials attend the next meeting scheduled for July 28 in Calgary to discuss the proposed plan with producers and federal officials. That should set the record straight.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: In this formula, what was the amount that the province should contribute, and the grower and the federal government? What was the amount?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, one-third each.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: In dollars and cents, I'm referring to, Mr. Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Pardon me?

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Mr. Minister, could you indicate in dollars and cents what the amount would be?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, you really don't know what your contribution will be, because you don't know what the market price will be.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Would you be able to give us the assurance that you will keep the beet industry alive in the Province of Manitoba?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to give the honourable member the assurance that I will not bail out the Federal Government.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: I would wish that the Minister would be concerned about the agriculture in the Province of Manitoba. — (Interjection) — I sympathize. Actually, as much as I'm critical over the Minister, I also sympathize with him, because there are not very many people on his side of the House, on the government side, that he can get any information from. He is basically sitting there alone, like I just remember from the discussion. The Member of Inkster as being quite lippy. Yesterday he was talking of a potato grower growing 120-some odd varieties. It just proves . . . I don't want to respond to that any farther.

But to the Minister, you know, we have in the Province of Manitoba 28,000 acres of sugar beets. On the average, each acre is paying \$5 an acre school tax. It's some of your top productive land in the province. You're getting a return, and I'd like to compare it basically — I'm in sugar beets and I think I should clarify it for the record that I am — I think also, Mr. Minister, you're in turkeys. Your turkey barns have no school assessment. If your house is on the farm, you're paying no school taxes.

HON. B. URUSKI: Oh yes, I am.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: What percentage? — (Interjection) — okay, I said "if", if it is. I said "if".

Mr. Minister, I can't accept from you that when you are going to put . . . just like, for instance, last year, you waited right till the eleventh hour before you came through with something that the feds and the growers agreed to. This money that you're talking about, that shortcoming, that was on May 12 — (Interjection) — I wish I could, I wish I could. I believe it was on May 12, Mr. Minister, that you agreed . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member should address the Minister through the Chair, please.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Through the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Through the Chair.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Very good. I'm sorry if I will be unparliamentary, because I'll apologize for whatever is unparliamentary afterwards.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to not hold the growers in this province at large for something that he should be negotiating with the Federal Government at the present time. Like he indicated those two dates of the meetings. He didn't send no representative. He didn't attend himself. When a Federal Government is negotiating with four provinces, what does he think? He will call the shot?

I think the Minister should realize that we have a great industry at stake. There are hundreds of jobs in that whole beet industry. The sugar factory alone is

employing roughly 500 people, plus you have the industry that is employing a lot of people on the farm level, plus you have all the spinoffs that it provides. I think this Minister should compare it with what he's doing in other industries. He knows there's a tremendous spinoff that is generated in this industry and if the money — (Interjection) — no no, he won't answer me that long.

If you allow this industry to go, if you allow it to falter, then that money will be leaving the province, Mr. Minister. If you now can get money from the feds on a one-third basis plus create the employment, I think you should discuss it with your caucus; you should come through and you should give us the assurance today that you do not — like two years ago on I think it was May 12 at the eleventh hour, then give us finally — you did not show up at the meeting in Altona which was called where you should be present, and I think I have my Honourable Member for Rhineland here who can verify that. You had no representative. We were waiting for a phone call from your department, and nobody called. They called your office, and there was no answer.

I think, in spite of what we're going through here today, I think you have an obligation to the people in the Province of Manitoba and the agricultural sector. I think, Mr. Minister, you have to give us the assurance that you will put the people, the growers of Manitoba as the No. 1 priority. I think, to not attend the meetings — and I can't emphasize it strongly enough — you have different boards. You have the consumer paying for all the costs, for instance, in the broilers and the turkeys and the eggs. I think if the consumers passed on, this is a very small request made on our Provincial Government to keep an industry of this magnitude alive in the Province of Manitoba.

(Mr. Deputy Chairman, M. Dolin, in the Chair)

So once again, to the Minister, I want to ask you whether you will do everything in your power and keep us informed as to the future of this industry. Actually, what I would like to see you do is make a commitment to us, if you have to, that you would go along with the tripartite stabilization on sugar beets.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I just want to indicate to my honourable friend that I wish he would check the record, because his information is inaccurate.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, had we not last spring dealt with the industry in the way we did, the industry would not have operated as it did not in Alberta. It was your colleagues that, in fact, would have forced the closure of that plant, or else the producers would have taken an additional cut in the amount of money that they would have received for beets, because that's precisely what happened when the Alberta Government put their money up front in that whole negotiation process. It was only your own colleagues in this House who would have closed that plant here, Mr. Deputy Chairman.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do want to respond to that in a positive way, because the Minister is totally right. The feds came through and the company, and it was at the eleventh hour on about May 12 that he finally decided that he would go along with it.

HON. B. URUSKI: May 2.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Pardon?

HON. B. URUSKI: May 2.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: I believe it was the 12th, but I stand to be corrected. I'm going just from memory, Mr. Minister.

But I would just like you to assure this House that this will not happen again, that it will be dragged — (Interjection) — Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to go on record that this Minister will start negotiating today so that we will not have to wait again till May 2 or 12, whichever date then would be the correct one, until we get assurance that we will go into a tripartite agreement.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we're still back on 8.(c) as far as I'm concerned.

The Minister of Agriculture says the Member for La Verendrye is wrong in his statements that he made, and I believe he's pretty close to being dead-on right when he said the Minister wasn't attending meetings. He gave the meeting dates himself, July 24, in Toronto. You gave your reasons for that. — (Interjection) —

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FINDLAY: March 20 in Winnipeg, you were not present.

March 20 in Winnipeg at a meeting right in his own province, he didn't attend, nor any of his staff. I don't know if he was present in Calgary on April 1.

I want to know, is the Minister going to assure the sugar beet growers of Manitoba, that he's going to attend the meeting in Calgary on July 28, with the full intention of supporting the sugar beet growers of Manitoba that he's going to attend the meeting in Calgary on July 28th, with the full intention of supporting the sugar beet growers of Manitoba? Is he going to assure that to the growers of Manitoba, today?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 8.(c) . . .

MR. G. FINDLAY: Is he going to answer the question?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: I thank the honourable member for his comments.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Are you going to assure us that either you, or members of your staff, are going to attend on behalf of the Province of Manitoba? — (Interjection) — A pairing is not needed for members of staff.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, if the honourable member reads the record, he'll know what I have said and what my intentions are, had he listened to my remarks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 8.(c)—pass.

Resolution 13: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$12,606,200 for

Agriculture, Income Insurance Fund, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

What is the committee's wish? 9 — the Member Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Would the Minister give us some idea as to the staff component here and what the funds are used for?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the staff have all been accounted for in other departments. This purchase is strictly for 4.5 million for drug purchases and 795,000 for semen purchases. This is the Drug and Semen Purchases inventory for the next fiscal year.

MR. G. FINDLAY: What's the total budget in that purchase? I would imagine what you've given us is the net difference.

HON. B. URUSKI: No.

MR. G. FINDLAY: No?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, they are the total purchases for the year.

MR. G. FINDLAY: What portion of that then is recovered?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, 5.725 million.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Are you saying then, you're showing a profit here?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, I can't hear.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we do not recover all our costs in terms of the Administration and Semen Centre. There is an excess of revenues over costs but that does not cover completely, as yet, the total administrative costs. I'd have to check that but we're very close to breaking even.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Okay.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution 14: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,299,600 for Agriculture, Drugs and Semen Purchases, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Item 10, Expenditures Related to Capital, Resolution 15 — the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, for the information of honourable members, the total program is the capital grants for water and sewer, water development and future water use, totalling 4.820 for the water services board. These are the capital grants that we make to communities.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Very briefly, I just want to put on the record, Mr. Deputy Chairman, it's with regret that I note that the community of Lundar has been postponed for

their development program. I should point out to you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that during the election, the Premier himself attended a signing of an agreement. In fact, the community of Lundar even helped celebrate the Premier's birthday on that occasion. The community of Lundar was looking forward to this important community development, but now, of course, the election is gone and passed, and so has the program gone and passed.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we will meet all our commitments. As I've indicated the other night, all commitments will be met.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution 15: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,820,000 for Agriculture, Expenditures Related to Capital, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Back to Item 1.(a) deferred item, Minister's Salary — pass? — the Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. We spent some three weeks arriving at this position, to determine what the Minister's salary is worth and we've talked a lot about agriculture and I don't think anybody disputes the fact that agriculture is certainly the most important sector in terms of promoting value-added production in the Province of Manitoba and in terms of job creation.

As brought up during our discussions, the fact that agriculture is only going to get 1.76 percent of the total provincial Budget this year is a pretty small portion of the Budget, considering the fact that this industry supplies 20 to 25 percent of the jobs in the Province of Manitoba.

The question is still in front of us: has the Minister elevated agriculture in sufficient priority to capture more funds from this Budget in the future? I wonder, because our discussions haven't indicated that he's prepared to move in any significant direction.

We've talked a lot in our resolutions about support to the farm community in terms of reducing costs, in terms of fuel and interest rates and we've had no indication he's going to move in those directions yet.

We've talked about a feedlot plan for our beef producers. Certainly he's had a survey done which would indicate that the producers in the province want it. He said no to the federal plan, just the day before yesterday, at a point in time when he could have at least allowed the opportunity for the feedlot operators to enter that plan, but he chose not to do that, a pure slap in the face for them.

He has not indicated that he's going to do any significant study in terms of determining freight rates that the Wheat Board wants to change, in terms of protecting Manitoba. He's indicated he's going to spend \$20,000 on a study of Plant Breeders' Rights and we've asked the Minister to withdraw that contract that he's given for some \$20,000, and I'll come back to that later.

He has indicated discussions on a milk policy on transfer of quota that is imperative that it be resolved before the 1st of August and I wish he would proceed objectively to achieve that end.

We've asked him to put some effort forward to improve and strengthen and rejuvenate the weed

districts in the Province of Manitoba, so that are all municipalities are in it.

We've asked him to be sure that he has his staff actively keeping a watch for diseases and insects that may impact on the Province of Manitoba this summer, as they move in from the United States.

Under the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation, we've requested that he have a better policy in place for wildlife damage. Seventy-five dollars an acre is really not adequate for the degree of damage that can be done by waterfowl and wildlife.

Under MACC, he's indicated quite clearly that there's been over 50 percent turnaround in terms of young farmers applying for loans this year. That's really not satisfactory and not acceptable. There's the Young Farmer Rebate Program we think he should strengthen. They've been particularly strict in the how they're allowing the young farmers to budget — this is particularly for wheat — and the \$5 million for the Farm Start Program is probably not going to be sufficient to really alleviate the hurt in this direction to any significant extent. We would ask him to channel more money into that area to help the young farmers in our rural communities.

In the Budget statement, the Minister of Finance clearly indicated and he identified that the national agricultural strategy was important for Canada. In our Estimate period, in response to many questions, the Minister has chosen the route of feebashing rather than trying to indicate any strong degree of cooperative discussion and trying to resolve our problems through cooperative discussion.

When we talk about Bill 4 in the province, The Family Farm Protection Act versus Bill C-117, The Federal Farm Debt Act, it's a perfect opportunity for the Province of Manitoba to identify that a national strategy can be done in this area of agriculture. Instead of saying that it's a paper tiger, I think the Minister should look at issues like that in a more objective sense and not just start feebashing.

Manitoba is a very small province, in comparison to the other major agricultural provinces in Western Canada, and we're not in the position to take a confrontational position with the Federal Government. I don't think in the long term that it will do us a lot of good.

As I identify what the Minister has done through the course of this Estimate period, I feel he doesn't demonstrate a lot of confidence in the young farmers of Manitoba, and I would move that his salary be reduced to the value of a bushel of wheat, \$3.25 as he identifies, and the remainder of his salary be used to pay the contract for one Pat Mooney, who he feels is worth \$20,000 for six months.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have a motion on the floor. No further debate?

MR. G. FINDLAY: Seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion should be in writing. Can I have a copy please?

MR. G. FINDLAY: Just let me put it in writing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion should be in writing, can I have a copy please?

The motion reads the Minister's salary be reduced to \$3.25, the value of a bushel of wheat, and the remainder of his salary be used to pay for the contract for Pat Mooney.

Seeing no debate, all those in favour signify by saying aye; contrary minded, nay. The nays have it.

1.(a)—pass.

Resolution No. 6—pass.

Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

MR. M. DOLIN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ellice, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair will now accept a motion to adjourn.

The Member for Ellice.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. H. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to put the change in the Standing Committee on Economic Development, the Member for Brandon East substituting for the Member for Dauphin. (Agreed)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: I'd like to thank all honourable members who participated in debate, and I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that this House do now adjourn.

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